

## **PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Sunday, 29<sup>th</sup> March 2015 at 10.30 a.m. in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### **PRESENT:**

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)  
Vice-Chancellor
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Dr. Ajay Ranga
4. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
5. Professor Anil Monga
6. Professor A.K. Bhandari
7. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
8. Dr. B.C. Josan
9. Dr. Charanjeet Kaur Sohi
10. Dr. Dalip Kumar
11. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
12. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
13. Shri Deepak Kaushik
14. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
15. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon
16. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
17. Ms. Gurpreet Kaur
18. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath
19. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
20. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
21. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
22. Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky
23. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
24. Shri Jasbir Singh
25. Dr. Jaspal Kaur Kaang
26. Shri Jarnail Singh
27. Dr. Jagwant Singh
28. Shri K.K. Dhiman
29. Dr. Karamjeet Singh
30. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
31. Dr. Kuldip Singh
32. Shri Lilu Ram
33. Professor Lalit K. Bansal
34. Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu
35. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
36. Shri Munish Pal Singh alias Munish Verma
37. Dr. Nandita Singh
38. Shri Naresh Gaur
39. Professor Naval Kishore
40. Professor Navdeep Goyal
41. Dr. N.R. Sharma
42. Dr. Parveen Kaur Chawla
43. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
44. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh
45. Professor Ronki Ram
46. Professor Rupinder Tewari
47. Professor Rajat Sandhir
48. Dr. R.P.S. Josh
49. Dr. R.S. Jhanji

50. Shri Raghbir Dyal
51. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
52. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
53. Professor R.P. Bambha
54. Dr. S. S. Sangha
55. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
56. Professor Shelly Walia
57. Shri Satya Pal Jain
58. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
59. Dr. Tarlok Bandhu
60. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
61. Shri V.K. Sibal
62. Shri Varinder Singh
63. Dr. Yog Raj Angrish
64. Col. G.S. Chadha ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Ms. Anu Chatrath
2. Dr. (Mrs.) Aruna Goel
3. Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop
4. Chief Justice, Punjab & Haryana High Court
5. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
6. Professor Gurdial Singh
7. Shri Jagpal Singh alias Jaswant Singh
8. Dr. Krishan Gauba
9. Shri K.K. Sharma
10. Dr. K.K. Talwar
11. Dr. Kailash Nath Kaul alias Kailash Nath
12. Shri Krishna Goyal
13. Sardar Kuljit Singh Nagra
14. Shri Maheshinder Singh
15. Shri Naresh Gujral
16. Dr. Puneet Bedi
17. Dr. Parmod Kumar
18. Professor Preeti Mahajan
19. Shri Punam Suri
20. S. Parkash Singh Badal
21. Smt. Preneet Kaur
22. Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa alias Surjit Singh
23. Dr. S.K. Sharma
24. Shri Sandeep Kumar
25. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
26. Shri Surjit Singh Rakhra
27. Shri Sandeep Hans
28. Shri S.S. Johl
29. Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab.

**I.** The Vice-Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I am pained to inform this August House about the sad demise of –

- (i) Professor Gurbaksh Singh, former Professor and Chairperson of the Department of Physical Education, on March 22, 2015;
- (ii) Shri Lee Kuan Yew, former Prime Minister of Singapore, on 23.03.2015;

- (iii) Professor Dharam Paul Singhal, former Chairman, Guru Ravi Dass Chair, Panjab University; and
- (iv) Shri Ram Darshan father of Shri Satish Kumar Sharma, Fellow”

As a mark of respect to the departed souls, the Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over their passing away and observed two minutes’ silence, all standing, prayed to the Almighty to give peace to the departed souls and give strength and courage to the members of the bereaved families to bear irreparable loss of their dear ones.

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

## II.

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

1. Panjab University has organized first DST INSPIRE Camp as a part of 5 year project allotted to P.U., from March 23-27, 2015. Around 325 science students from schools in tri-city region as well as in Haryana and Punjab States, participated in the five days Camp. A high point was an interaction with Professor John C. Mather, Nobel Laureate and Senior Astrophysicist at NASA, USA, via a webcast. Dr. Anurag Kuhad of University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences coordinated this important activity on behalf of P.U.
2. Dr. Madhu Khatri, Assistant Professor of Biotechnology at University Institute of Engineering & Technology has been bestowed with Wellcome Trust/DBT India Alliance Early Career Fellowship with a project grant of Rs.1.5 crores. On need based, an additional amount could also be made available to her later. It is perhaps for the first time that such a prestigious grant has been made available to a faculty member from a traditional University of India.
3. Dr. Arun Kumar Garg, Associate Professor (Orthodontics) of Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., has been honoured with the prestigious Fellowship of the International College of Dentists, USA, on the 50<sup>th</sup> Convocation held on December 21, 2014 at New Delhi, in recognition of his services rendered in the Art and Science of Dentistry.
4. The Enactus Team of 112 students of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology under the leadership of Professor Seema Kapoor, has bagged/won (i) Walmart Women Empowerment Grant (Rs.1,20,000 - First Prize), (ii) Mahindra Rise Special Competition Grant (Rs.1,15,000-2<sup>nd</sup> Prize), (iii) Uniliver Grant (Rs.20,000), (iv) Tata Chemicals Competition (Rs.40,000) and KPMG Business Ethics Grant (Rs.50,000) during the year 2014-15.

The Team in coordination with Punjab Energy Development Agency (PEDA) has also started a new project ‘Bio-Indhan’. Under this project, first biogas plant has been constructed at Kasauli Village, Block Kharar, District S.A.S. Nagar.”

**RESOLVED:** That felicitation of the Senate be conveyed to –

- (1) Dr. Madhu Khatri, Assistant Professor of Biotechnology at University Institute of Engineering & Technology on her having been bestowed with ‘Welcome Trust/DBT India Alliance Early Career Fellowship’ with a project grant of Rs.1.5 crores;

- (2) Dr. Arun Kumar Garg, Associate Professor (Orthodontics) of Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, on his having been honoured with the prestigious 'Fellowship of the International College of Dentists, USA', on the 50<sup>th</sup> Convocation held on December 21, 2014 at New Delhi, in recognition of his services rendered in the Art and Science of Dentistry; and
- (3) The Enactus Team of 112 students of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, under the leadership of Professor Seema Kapoor, on bagging/winning (i) Walmart Women Empowerment Grant (Rs.1,20,000 -First Prize), (ii) Mahindra Rise Special Competition Grant (Rs.1,15,000-2<sup>nd</sup> Prize), (iii) Uniliver Grant (Rs.20,000), (iv) Tata Chemicals Competition (Rs.40,000) and KPMG Business Ethics Grant (Rs.50,000) during the year 2014-15.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos.1 and 4, be noted and approved.

### III.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that there was inordinate delay in providing agenda papers of Senate meeting. In fact, as per Regulation, the agenda papers for the meeting of the Senate are to be sent to all the members at least 10 days before the meeting. That meant, they should have received the papers for this meeting latest by 19<sup>th</sup> March 2015, but unfortunately, when the same were not received even up to 9 O'clock, on 20<sup>th</sup> March, he sent an e-mail because he had to leave for out of station on 21<sup>st</sup> March, early in the morning. He got the reply from the Registrar on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015 that because the Vice-Chancellor and the undersigned had to visit Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India, New Delhi, before finalizing the agenda papers, so the same could not be issued well in time. No emergency has been explained as if the telephone from MHRD came the same day and they left for meeting the MHRD Officials before finalizing the agenda. He just wanted to know is it within the purview of anybody to violate the regulations. If there was an emergency, why the meeting was not postponed to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015? It is not the only thing. In fact, he had been pointing out that the regulations are being violated so frequently, and unofficially, this has been said by one of the highest Officers of the University that tear these books, calendars, statutes, regulations, rules, etc. He just wanted to draw the attention of the House – is there any statutory body in the country which can rule without the Regulations & Rules being implemented.

Shri Deepak Kaushik got up to point out that he got the notice of the meeting between 9.00 a.m. and 9.15 a.m. today only, and that too, without relevant papers. If one gets the agenda just an hour before the start of the meeting, what could he/she discuss?

A din prevailed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that some of their Fellows says time and again that certain persons create problem by raising the technical issues. He added that the day he got the Senate agenda, he sent an e-mail to the Vice-Chancellor stating that in the agenda majority of the items are based on the decisions of the Syndicate meetings of January 2015 and March 2015. Unless and until he knows what happened in those meetings, how could he be able to prepare himself? He also sent an e-mail to the Registrar as he had received the agenda for the Senate meeting from the Registrar. He could not understand the chemistry, as he got the reply from the Vice-Chancellor's Office even though he did not send the e-mail to the Vice-Chancellor. Two days after, he got the draft minutes of the Syndicate meeting held in March 2015. Is the draft agenda approved agenda? So far as he is concerned, unless the minutes of the Syndicate meeting are duly approved by the Chairman of the Syndicate, the agenda of the Senate is not approved agenda. How could they discuss the items, when the approved agenda is not place?

Secondly, the meeting of the Senate was held on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2014 and the draft minutes of that meeting were supposed to be presented to them after one month, but ironically and unfortunately, even those minutes they got in March 2015. How the Chairman of the Senate would present the action taken report of the previous Senate meeting, especially when the minutes of the same are not approved. Thirdly, they have got the notices of the meetings of the Faculties on the day when the meetings are to take place. Is it a deliberate postal delay or a communication gap? How the people like them, who lived in the rural areas, would know about the meetings. Time and again, the Calendar is being violated and when the persons like them fill up some columns or leave some, they (University Authorities) did not give them even an inch and take the shadow off that very Calendar. There could not be different parameters for the Fellows and the Chairman of the Senate. When the Fellows leave some columns blank due to poor quality of Photostat or something else, their papers are rejected by the Returning Officer, they accepted, but when the officials of the Universities committed mistake/s year after year, there is no accountability. Therefore, his question most humbly is why different parameters are being adopted. Why the people sitting at the helm of affairs or at the top hierarchy of the University are not taken to task. What they are going to discuss if the approved minutes of the Syndicate meeting and the agenda of the Senate is not provided them?

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2015, she made a written request to the Registrar, requesting him to supply the DVDs pertaining to the proceedings of the Syndicate meetings held on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2015 and 8<sup>th</sup> March 2015. When till 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2015 (up to 10 days), she did not receive any communication, she again sent an e-mail requesting that the DVDs may be supplied to her urgently. Next day, she got the DVDs pertaining to proceedings of the Syndicate meeting dated 25<sup>th</sup> January 2015. The forwarding letter states that 'we cannot supply the DVDs pertaining to proceedings of the Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2015 because the minutes of the same have not been finalized. She failed to understand as to how the finalization of the minutes is linked with the supply of DVDs. How could the DVDs be tampered/modified/changed? She suggested that whenever any member asked for the DVDs of proceedings of Syndicate and Senate meetings, the same should be supplied to the members concerned immediately. If the minutes of a meeting are not finalized till date, how the items pertaining to them have been included in the Senate agenda.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that if the numbers of days were less than the minimum days required for the notice/agenda to the members under the Regulations, the meeting should not have been convened. Such mistakes/lapses on the part of the office could create big issues. As said by the Professor Rajesh Gill, he also did not know what they have to do with the draft minutes. Therefore, the office should admit that there is a serious lapse and the house should consider the condoning of delay so that they could proceed with the meeting. But the office has to admit mistakes. Since certain members had pointed out this lapse earlier also, they needed to be careful in future.

Principal Tarlok Bandhu stated that he would like to know the operational definition of draft and final minutes. If the drafts minutes are subject to modifications/changes, how could they discuss the items relating to the draft minutes included in the agenda of the Senate?

Shri Varinder Singh and Shri Naresh Gaur said that in the last meeting of the Senate, a decision was taken that the case filed against the students with the police would be taken back. He enquired what action the University Authorities has taken in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a zero hour. The members should raise such issues during the zero hour.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, adding to the point raised by Shri Varinder Singh and Shri Naresh Gaur, stated that it was decided that the case filed against the

students with the police would be taken back. Have the University Authorities taken any step for taking back the criminal case filed against the students?

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that instead of taking up the issue of the students at a later stage, the issue should be considered right now and decision taken accordingly so that the students could lift their dharna. He said that the decision of the Senate that the University would take steps to withdraw the criminal cases filed against the students, should be implemented.

Sh Munish Verma remarked that the promise made should be fulfilled and the case filed against the students should be taken back.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that he had never heard about the words 'Draft Minutes' during his tenure of 15 years in the Senate. When he tried to go through the minutes, he found that in some of the items (10-15), which have been included in the Senate agenda, the discussion was missing. In fact, he was expecting that those items along with discussions would be supplied to them now, as the next meeting of the Senate would be held in the month of September. Somebody was saying that it is due to clerical reasons and somebody else was saying that it has been done deliberately. According to him, such things are eroding the sanctity of the Senate. In the end, he said that no pick and choose policy should be adopted while deciding the items to be placed before the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he sincerely regrets the delay in sending the agenda papers of the Senate meeting. The agenda papers should indeed have gone to the members 10 days in advance, but he could not help the situation as they had a Convocation on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2015 and he had to attend to some urgency on 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> March. In fact, he had to make an unscheduled visit to Delhi on 17<sup>th</sup> March (afternoon). He and the Registrar had to read certain things relating to the agenda papers, but they could not do the same as they returned from Delhi on 19<sup>th</sup> March early hours in the morning. After that, they tried to hurry up as early as they could. Of course, they got delayed by two days. There were no instructions that the minutes of the Syndicate meeting dated 25<sup>th</sup> January 2015 should not be attached with the agenda papers. Minutes of the January 25 Syndicate had also some technical situation as certain numbers of days had not happened when the draft minutes had been circulated to the members. As such, because of this technical reason, the issuance of agenda got delayed. As regards the Minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> March meeting of the Syndicate, obviously certain agenda items were put in as the entire minutes of that meeting were not ready. Whatever agenda item/files came in, the items were prepared and included in the agenda of the Senate. As such, no pick and choose policy was adopted. Still the complete minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> March meeting of the Syndicate have not been prepared; hence, some items are still missing. As the entire Minutes are not yet complete, in that sense the circulated portion of Minutes are just draft minutes. The matter is before the Senate, which includes the members of the Syndicate. On those particular items for which there is a date 8<sup>th</sup> March 2015, i.e., the draft minutes of the Syndicate meeting, the members of the Syndicate, if they wish, could express their opinion first that such and such thing/s has/have not been properly recorded before the members of the Senate express their opinion on that. This is his practical suggestion to them. Whatever has happened has happened under very exceptional circumstances. He had been holding the Syndicate and Senate meetings for 2½ years. Very rarely the delays have happened. If the delays have happened in the recent months because they just had too many things happenings to attend to, e.g., Syndicate meeting, Senate meeting, NAAC review, visit of President of India and so many other distinguished people coming for the Convocation, etc. Some delay happened in the month of January because Registrar, who joined the University in the month of October, had to go back to Pune to get his bag and baggage, which took about 10 days time. He could only promise and assure them that, in future, the Calendar would be obeyed in letter and spirit and there would not be any further violation of the kind that agenda papers were sent 2 days late. Accepting the suggestion of Dr. Jagwant Singh, he appealed to the Senate to accept the condonation of delay of two delays on his behalf.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is within the purview of the Senate to condone the delay. Secondly, the Vice-Chancellor has not replied to the particular point raised by Professor Rajesh Gill that what was the harm in supplying the DVDs of proceedings of the Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2015. What prompted the Registrar to give the reply that the DVDs would be given only after the minutes are finalized by the Chairman of the Syndicate? What is practical, legal also and would be technically correct also in terms of Panjab University Calendar, they had admitted that they have not been able to supply the complete minutes of the meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2015 and in the absence of the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate, if it is expected that now the members of the Syndicate could express their opinion and get the minutes revised, perhaps, that is not practically possible. As said by him earlier, the meeting of the Senate could have been postponed to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 if there were unforeseen reasons which came their way. They should not assume that in this University nothing has been happening before March 2015. This University, in fact, has been the most happening place in this country for all times in the past. All such activities, including Convocation and visits of dignitaries have been taking place in this University on regular basis. But somehow or the other, he did not know the decision not to supply the DVDs to the members has been taken just now, while earlier the DVDs were supplied next day to the meeting. Referring to the draft minutes, he said that they are having the concept of draft minutes for the first time. In fact, the draft minutes are submitted to the person for approval, who has to approve them. He did not know for what purpose the draft minutes of the Syndicate have been circulated to the members of the Senate. Instead the draft minutes should have been sent to the members of the Syndicate stating that if they had any objection, they could point out the discrepancy/discrepancies. As said by Professor Keshav Malhotra, even the draft minutes also relating to certain items, which have been included in the agenda of the Senate, have not been provided to them. There were so many important items which, in fact, should have been discussed only in the Senate meeting. He would not assume that those items have not been brought to the Senate purposely, but it has done the great harm to the people concerned as well as to the Senate as has been pointed out that the next meeting of the Senate would take place only in the month of September. Therefore, his suggestion is that since the Budget of the University could not go beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March and they have got all the papers so far as the Budget is concerned, the Budget should be considered and whatever deficiencies are there, the members could point out. Except Budget, all other items which have been sent duly supported by final minutes should be considered. For the remaining items the minutes of the Syndicate relating to which have not been finalized, another meeting of the Senate may be held in the month of April 2015.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that so far as the issue that the DVDs had not been supplied to a given member before the confirmation of the minutes is concerned, it is his personal opinion that DVDs should only be given when the complete minutes are confirmed by him and circulated to the members. There has never been guideline/s that the DVDs should be given on the next day of the meeting.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that unless and until the issue of supplying of DVDs to the members is resolved to the satisfaction of all, there is no purpose of going ahead with the agenda.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that a given Syndicate, in fact, many members of which are still here, had resolved that the proceedings of the Syndicate meetings would not be videographed. The proceedings of the Syndicate meetings were started to be videographed on an experimental basis some years ago and later on another Syndicate decided in one of its meeting that the proceedings of its meetings be not videographed any more. He had brought this matter, as an information item, before the Senate, which decided that the videographing of the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate meetings be continued. So he would like to remind him (Shri Ashok Goyal) that he was part of that Syndicate which took the decision that there is no need to videograph the proceedings of the Syndicate meetings anymore and now he is saying something else.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that let him remind the Vice-Chancellor that the issue was discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate under the leadership of same very Vice-Chancellor, whose personal opinion is that that the DVDs should not be supplied to the members of the body who are demanding the same before the finalization of the minutes. Under the leadership of the same Vice-Chancellor, certain DVDs were supplied to the non members even when the minutes of the meeting concerned were not finalized. At that time, the Vice-Chancellor had apprised to the Syndicate that they should be very careful while deliberating in the Syndicate as the proceedings of the meeting are videographed and sometimes a wrong message is perceived by the society. Therefore, they have to take call whether they should continue with the videography of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate or not or they should also see that if somebody demands the copy of the DVDs, could they deny. At that time, 2-3 options were given – (i) let it be legally examined whether under RTI Act, they could deny the supply of DVDs; and (ii) if it is not possible to deny those DVDs, let the videographing of the proceedings of the Syndicate be stopped and in that it was not only the Syndicate, but the decision was for Senate also. It was in the year 2009 when the Syndicate took the decision that all the proceedings of the Syndicate meetings would be videographed. From the same day, though there was no decision, the proceedings of the Senate were also started to be videographed under the same decision. It is an era of transparency, especially after the introduction of RTI Act and it is expected not only from the individuals but also from the Institutions to be more revealing rather than concealing. That the expectations of the country and the directions under the RTI Act are that whatever maximum information could be put on the Website of the Institution, should be uploaded on the website so that people do not need to use the RTI Act. Here they had gone 100 steps further, what to talk of RTI Act, they would not give the DVDs even to those, who are the participants of the deliberations. He could understand that this could be the personal opinion of Professor Arun Kumar Grover, but he did not know whether this House would agree that anybody's personal opinion would prevail or under the leadership of same very Vice-Chancellor for 2½ years, the DVDs were being supplied next day of the meetings. He did not know what change the opinion has undergone during the last 2-3 months. If they see the language used in the reply to the demand for supply of DVDs and the objection, he did not think that anybody could appreciate it. If they see the language in convening the meeting of the Convocation, he did not think whether anybody sitting here would appreciate that none of the members of the Senate would be allowed to sit on the dais. It could have been put in a way that the members of the Senate are requested to bear with them in view of the security advised by so and so office, for the time being, they should adjust to the seating plan, till the President is there. However, the language used was as if they were the students of class 2 and are to be taught moral science that this is to be done and this is not to be done. Let him remind that all of them had got experience in their own fields. He understands that there could be unintentional lapses, but while accepting that there have been lapses and the lapses have been because of unavoidable circumstances, then they have to word the letter very beautifully not that they have to be heard. When he wrote that why the minutes of the Senate meeting held on December 14, 2014 have been sent to them so late, i.e., on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015, he got the reply that these could not be sent due to unavoidable circumstances. Whom they had written a letter? In fact, they had written the letter to a member of a Body, who is entitled to get those minutes within one month of the meeting. The Registrar has just written that the minutes could not be sent due to unavoidable circumstances. What were those unavoidable circumstances, have not been explained? If the members of the Syndicate and the Senate are not supposed to know the unavoidable circumstances, who are? Why he is saying that the issue needed to be resolved to the satisfaction of all because the Registrar has issued a show-cause notice to the Chairperson of a Department not even knowing that it is Vice-Chancellor, who is competent to issue a show-cause notice to the Chairperson of a Department. The Registrar does not have even the courtesy to say “as directed by the Vice-Chancellor” instead he wrote that it has been noticed by him (Registrar) that he/she has written such and such letters to the Chancellor. Shri Raghbir Dyal has informed that some nomination papers to the Board of Studies have been rejected. As per regulations, the



members of the Senate filed objections to the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor has to deal with those objections under certain specific regulations and pass speaking orders. Unfortunately, the objections which were raised against the decision/s of the Registrar (Returning Officer) were dealt with by the Registrar himself and letter/s was/were written stating that the objections are not valid. Thereafter, the members wrote to the Vice-Chancellor. Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the letter mailed to the Registrar was replied to by the Vice-Chancellor, but in this case, the objections were raised and written to the Vice-Chancellor and the reply was given by the Registrar. When another mail was sent to the Vice-Chancellor that they raised the objections to his (Vice-Chancellor) goodself, who in fact is the competent authority to decide the objection, still more embarrassing another letter goes that whatever the Registrar has done was done under his (Vice-Chancellor's) instructions. He did not know wherefrom that provision has come that the Registrar could do anything under the instructions of the Vice-Chancellor even if the objections have been raised against his (Registrar's) decision/s. He thought all the people who are there in the social arena, knew as to what is the sanctity of the law relating to elections. If the Registrar has sent a reply under his (Vice-Chancellor) direction/instructions, he does not think that the Vice-Chancellor needed to add even a coma/full stop while sending the reply. The Vice-Chancellor in the second letter changes the ground and says that this has been done as per past practice. The objections were raised strictly in terms of regulations and the Vice-Chancellor is dealing with them as per the past practice/s. When there are specific regulations that the nominations could be rejected only on those grounds and if none of those grounds are attracted, he wondered on what basis/authority those nomination papers have been rejected. This is how the Calendar is being violated. Anyway, the Vice-Chancellor has passed the orders stating that it is final. He (the Vice-Chancellor) should tell him (Shri Goyal) what alternative is left with the members – either to approach the Chancellor or the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. Would that be in good taste? Would the Senate like? As the Senate and Syndicate would not like, one of the teachers has sent a legal notice to the Chancellor. Which member of the Senate is happy with that development, but they have to introspect that are they giving full opportunity to everybody, including the members of the Syndicate and Senate so that they do not need to go out of this/that Hall so that they sit together and are able to resolve all the issues strictly in terms of Calendar amicably. At least this introspection is required. Why he is saying that this item is much more important than the items circulated to them and merits a conscious decision in the Senate because he knows that there are 2-3 persons in the hall, who always go and say that they should not get into the technicalities. If they have not to go into the technicalities, they should take the decision. He further conveyed that on one side, the Act and the Regulations of the University are being violated daily and on the other side, show-cause notice is being issued to somebody, who has violated only the rule/s. He enquired if rule is bigger than regulation or if regulation is bigger than the Section of the Act? They are free to violate anything, but the poor teacher and non-teacher of this University could not be spared even if they moved an inch beyond. He added that in his opinion, they should decide first that alright let the Calendar be torn as they do not have to go into the technicalities. Even while discussing the Budget, some people say that there is no need to go into the accounting procedures. They must think bigger and try to think in terms of as to how to generate more revenue. They are not prepared to think that whatever revenue has been generated, how that revenue is to be accounted for and whatever expenditure has been incurred, how to curtail that. They are only interested to side track the issue.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that it has been said very clearly that in the Syndicate meeting, of which the details have not been circulated, that the things are decided by numbers. The meeting has just begun, but the way the things are being said/argued, is it the way, this august house should decide the issue/s. Senior persons, including retired Diplomats are sitting in this August House.

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed, as some persons objected to Professor Ronki Ram's reference to high status of some of the nominated members. Professor

Ronki Ram decided to walkout in protest of disruptions being created; however, he was persuaded to return to the house by few members

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that one should speak on the violation of regulations and not on the touching reference.

The Vice-Chancellor asked that whether he had the right to conduct the meeting or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has the right to conduct the meeting.

Pandemonium again prevailed.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that he is speaking on the topic under consideration. One of the members has said that there were some lapses and the Chair has accepted the lapses. Now the things should be smooth. Why they are not going to discuss the things? He is a member of the Syndicate and in the meeting of the Syndicate somebody has said that the things were decided by numbers. He just replied to that "No", the things are not decided by numbers, rather the Syndicate take decisions after applying the best of minds. Thus, the members of the Syndicate did their job sincerely and forwarded decisions to the Senate. They should try to put forth their views in a manner which should facilitate the functioning of the meeting of the Senate instead of creating problems.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that the Senate is the highest democratic body of the University and silence is not always golden. In a democracy, they entertain discussion and appreciate those, who speak up. If certain objections/issues are raised, it should not matter as to who is raising them. Time and again, whenever this is done, discrimination is made amongst the members. The who's who should not matter because here all of them are equal as they all are members of this democratic body. Unless they listen to one another patiently, nothing would come out.

Shri V.K. Sibal stated that they had already lost a lot of time and they have been distracted from the agenda for which the meeting of the Senate has been called for. So far as videography of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate is concerned, it was not there earlier and has been brought in as a modification of the procedure. He drew the attention of the House towards Section 31 of the Act, which states "The Senate, with the sanction of the Government may, from time to time make regulations consistent with this Act to provide for all matters relating to the University". Similarly, Section 31(2)(c) says "the procedure at meetings of the Senate, Syndicate and Faculties and the quorum of members to be required for the transaction of business". Therefore, if they wanted to modify the procedure of the meetings of the Syndicate, they have to go to the Senate and the Government of India. If the Government of India approved the same, they could go ahead; otherwise, not because they are neither Parliament nor Legislature nor Municipal Corporation. In fact, they are an Administrative Body and the Syndicate is the Executive Council of this University. The Senate is also a higher level Administrative Body and has powers limited by the Calendar. If they wanted to make videography of proceedings of Syndicate and Senate meetings a permanent feature, they should do it by following the proper procedure.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that they are deliberating on this issue since morning, but nothing concrete has come out. He, therefore, suggested that the issue of students, who are agitating outside, should be taken up for consideration first.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to allow him to proceed with the agenda.

A din prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor appealed to all the members to listen. He stated that he had accepted the suggestion of Dr. Jagwant Singh and certainly regrets the delay in sending the agenda to the members under the circumstances already explained by him. Just in this spirit they should take up the Budget for consideration, because the Budget needed to be approved, before 31<sup>st</sup> March. Shri Ashok Goyal's plea is that they should leave aside the items other than the Budget, which are part of the proceedings of the Syndicate meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2015 and convene another meeting of the Senate to consider those items which are there in the form of draft minutes. Let him give a counter proposal. His (Vice-Chancellor) argument is that the Syndicate members are here and if they (Syndicate members) wish to point out something about the draft minutes different from what has been recorded, and the discrepancy/discrepancies pointed out by them would be incorporated. The members of the Senate could listen to them carefully and, if they wish, could take a call on these items later on. As far as other Items of 8<sup>th</sup> March Syndicate meeting are concerned, they can have two options – (i) they should consider all these Items on a future date; or (ii) Any Item/s on which there is a contentious issue/s, it could be left to another meeting, and the Items on which there is no contentious issue/s, but is/are included in the draft minutes, could be taken up for consideration today. They would see as to how much time they have if the meeting progressed up to 6.00 p.m. in the evening and reached only 10-15 items, there is no issue at all. With these words, he requested the members to proceed with the meeting. They should proceed with the Budget Item and once the Budget Item has been considered, they could take up other items relating to pre March 8<sup>th</sup> Syndicate. Thereafter, they may take up items relating to 8<sup>th</sup> March Syndicate meeting and whichever item has issue, the same would be left for future meeting and the remaining could be taken up today as the members have come from long distances and it would be difficult for them to return at a short notice as they would have to re-plan it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to point out one thing which probably the Vice-Chancellor has forgotten to address. He asked what about those items which have not been included in the draft minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> March meeting of the Syndicate, but have been discussed there? "Whether they would convene another meeting of the Senate for that purpose or wait till September/October when the next meeting of the Senate would be held. If not, why all these items, which have come in the form of draft minutes, be not taken up for consideration along with those, which have not been included at all." He justified that he was saying that the Budget should be taken up for consideration. He added that it was not for the first time that he was saying that the Calendar was being violated. He had pointed out earlier in December and during Board of Finance meeting about the Budget, that how they are not following the principle of accounting as far as Calendar is concerned. Every time an assurance is given that from now onward the Calendar would not be violated. That was why he is suggesting that the Budget, whether by accepting the lapses or condoning the delay, should be considered as the same is to be approved by 31<sup>st</sup> of March. A fair proposal has been given that whatever minutes have been supplied to them, i.e., 25<sup>th</sup> January 2015, and the Budget, which of course, has been considered and endorsed by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2015, should be taken up for consideration by the Senate along with urgent important issues suggested by the members. Another meeting of the Senate after 15 days or 20 days or whenever it is convenient to the Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor may be considered.

Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon said that almost all the members are suggesting that the Budget should be taken up for consideration and for the remaining items another meeting should be convened.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they should proceed first with all those items which do not need the minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> March meeting of the Syndicate. Thereafter, they could consider the items from the 8<sup>th</sup> March meeting of the Syndicate. There is also a proposal from Shri Ashok Goyal that they should leave aside all, but he made a counter proposal that they do not leave aside all and would leave aside only those which have contentious issue/s. Those items on which there is not contentious issue/s, they should

try to take up today, if the time permitted. On this proposal, he requested the members to raise their hands.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, as a member of the Syndicate, he wanted to respond because he (the Vice-Chancellor) has made a statement that while finalizing the minutes, he has to see the DVDs so that no wrong recording of minutes is made though the same DVDs are seen by the lower staff also before submission of minutes to the Vice-Chancellor. The same very Vice-Chancellor is expecting the members to go through the minutes now and point out the discrepancies, if any, without going through the DVDs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he gave a proposal that if any given member of the Syndicate says that this is a contentious issue, it should be left aside. The items which are simple matters and there is nothing contentious therein, what is harm in considering those.

Shri Naresh Gaur remarked a matter could be contentious for one and not for others.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated almost one and a half hours of time has already passed, but nothing concrete has come out. According to him, the Budget is most important for them. Therefore, first they should consider and approve the Budget and if time permitted, other item/s, which are of urgent nature, could be taken up for consideration. The remaining items should be left, as they had already decided to hold another meeting. He requested his colleagues with folded hands to allow the meeting to proceed. The delay pointed out by Shri Ashok Goyal could be condoned as the Senate is the supreme authority, under Section 8 of Panjab University Act, under which the entire power has been vested with the Senate. As such, the Senate has the authority to condone the delay and they should condone the delay of two days and take up the Budget for consideration, appointments, etc.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to remind Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath as probably it has slipped out of his mind that Section 11(2) of P.U. Act says "The Senate shall have the entire management of, and superintendence over the affairs, concerns and property of the University and shall provide of that management, and exercise that superintendence in accordance 'with the statutes, rules and regulations for the time being in force'".

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that Section 8 of Panjab University Act is more supreme as under the Section 'the Supreme Authority of the University has been vested in the Senate'.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that he did not know which law says that one section is important and other is not.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that a meeting of the Budget Committee was held on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2015, but the minutes of the same he did not get. He requested that the minutes of the said meeting should be made available to him so that they could discuss the Budget.

Shri Jarnail Singh requested the Vice-Chancellor not to allow the members to put forth their point of views again and again. He also appealed to the Hon'ble members to allow to take up the Items pertaining to the meeting of the Syndicate dated 25<sup>th</sup> January 2015 as well as the Budget; otherwise, it appears that there is a deliberate attempt to disrupt the proceedings of the Senate, which is giving a bad impression/message to the outsiders.

The Vice-Chancellor did not permit members to speak on general matters thereafter and proceeded to consideration of the appointments and the Budget item. He reiterated and recapitulated whatever he and others had stated earlier to facilitate the

consideration of the Budget by the house. There was a consensus to consider Budget item and all items contained up to the Syndicate meeting of January 25, 2015.

**IV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-1** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-1.** That the appointment and Waiting Lists of the persons to the posts and the pay-scales noted against their names be approved, as under:

Sr. No.	Person/s recommended for appointment	Post/s	Pay-scale	Pay per month
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY</b>				
1.	Shri Ashish Kumar (SC category)	Assistant Professors	Rs.15600- 39100+AGP Rs.6,000/-	On a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.
2.	Dr. Priyatosh Sharma (General Category)			
<b>Waiting List</b>				
(i)	Shri Rajesh Chander (SC Category)			
(ii)	Dr. Jasbir Singh* (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.				
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 2(i))</b>				
<b>UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING &amp; TECHNOLOGY</b>				
3.	Ms. Neelam Goel	General Category Assistant Professors	Rs.15600- 39100+AGP Rs.6,000/-	On a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.
4.	Ms. Yogita			
5.	Ms. Nidhi (SC Category)			
<b>Waiting List</b>				
1.	Ms. Ravreet Kaur (General Category)			
2.	Ms. Preeti Aggarwal (General Category)			
3.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh (SC Category)			
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 2(vi))</b>				
6.	Dr. Vivek Pahwa	Assistant Professors in (EEE)	Rs.15600- 39100+AGP Rs.6,000/-	On a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.
7.	Ms. Aditi Gupta			
8.	Ms. Sabhyata Uppal Soni			

Sr. No.	Person/s recommended for appointment	Post/s	Pay-scale	Pay per month
<p align="center"><b>Waiting List</b></p> <p>1. Mr. Navdeep Singh 2. Mr. Amit Kumar Pandey 3. Mr. Sunny Vig</p> <p align="right"><b>(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 2(ix))</b></p>				
<b>UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING &amp; TECHNOLOGY</b>				
9.	Dr. Suresh Kumar (SC Category)	Assistant Professor in Physics/ Applied Physics	Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6,000/-	On a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.
10.	Dr. Sunil Bansal (General Category)			
<p align="center"><b>Waiting List</b></p> <p>1. Dr. Ashok Kumar (SC Category) 2. Dr. Navneet Kumar (General Category)</p> <p align="right"><b>(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 3)</b></p>				
<b>DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY</b>				
11.	Ms. Sipra Sagarika	Assistant Professor	Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6,000/-	On a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.
<p align="center"><b>Waiting List</b></p> <p>Dr. (Ms.) Jasleen Kewlani</p> <p align="right"><b>(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 3)</b></p>				

- NOTE:**
- The above appointments would be on one year's probation.
  - The letter of appointment to the above appointees have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.
  - 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(s) and to meet the needs of the allied departments at a given point of time, with the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that there is a footnote with \* "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 contribute 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". He thought that such recommendations should not be allowed to be made by the Selection Committee as it is not their prerogative. If they were so convinced with Dr. Jasbir Singh, they should have selected him in the first place. He felt that certain experts after seeing that Dr. Jasbir Singh could not be selected at number one even in the waiting list, they come out with the above referred recommendation. Patently, it looked that it is beyond the prerogative of the Selection Committee. In fact, they should not have made the recommendation for his transfer as the transfer could be made according to the Panjab University Calendar.

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Item C-1 related to selections and there is a comment on one of the selections, but it has no bearing on the selection, which have been made. The matter before them is whether the selected candidate should not have been selected.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that there is no problem on the selections, but the problem is only about the note, which has been incorporated under the selection.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is well taken and next time such note/s would not be incorporated.

Some of the members suggested that the note should be deleted and the item should be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the proposal is well received that the note should be deleted and the item should be approved. However, it had also been pointed out in the Syndicate meeting that the Selection Committee had no authority to make such recommendation/s and it was assured by the Vice-Chancellor that such recommendations would not be made in future. Firstly, what has been done has also not been approved by the Syndicate and the Senate. Secondly, the Vice-Chancellor in the meeting of the Syndicate had said that the fellow, who has been transferred to Chandigarh, was equally good and they were given to understand as if he was at number one on the waiting list, whereas he is shown at number two on the waiting list. That meant, there is somebody who is between the selected person and the person placed at number 2 on the waiting list, whereas the Vice-Chancellor had made a statement that both the persons, i.e., the selected candidate and this person, are equally good and the Selection Committee was of the view that he (Dr. Jasbir Singh) should be brought to the main campus of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Jasbir Singh is indeed at number one on the waiting list for the general category post.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that so far as post for SC candidate is concerned, Shri Ashish Kumar has been selected and Shri Rajesh Chander is at number one on the waiting list. In fact, Shri Rajesh Chander is also working in one of the Constituent Colleges of the University and he has also appeared in the interview for coming to Chandigarh. He did not know why Shri Rajesh Chander, who was also number one on the waiting list SC category, was not transferred?

Principal Gurdip Sharma pointed out that Shri Rajesh Chander, who was working in one of the Constituent Colleges of the University, was on contract basis and not on regular basis.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that the office is committing so many mistakes due which they are facing such problems and the same is not acceptable. It was also pointed out in the Syndicate that the minutes are not being recorded properly. The Senate is rejecting this item only because of the mistake of the office. The whole debate is going on because of the mistake of the office. He suggested that numbering of waitlisted candidates in this item should be got corrected.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that when a Fellow committed a mistake, they did not give even an inch, but when the office committed the mistake, there is no accountability.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that, in fact, it is a wrong type of noting. Whosoever is at number 2 or 3, he/she would come to number one and if the member of

the scheduled caste, if he/she is higher in the merit, is equally entitled to take place of general category and there is nothing wrong in it. He further stated that they could verify from the record the marks awarded to Dr. Jasbir Singh and if his marks are more than the other candidate/s, he should be put at number one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a typographical error (as regards the numbering of waitlisted candidates).

At this stage, again the pandemonium prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him clarify the things. In fact, the office has not made distinction that there are two positions – one for SC category persons and another for general category persons. One candidate has been selected for SC post and one for General category post. Similarly, separate person has been put on the waiting list for SC category and separate persons are put on the waiting list for General category post. As such, only one person has been selected for each post and another placed on the waiting list for each of the posts.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that firstly the working of the office required to be improved whether it is timely issuance of agenda or something else. This item related to appointment of Assistant Professors. Normally, they did not discuss such items in the Senate. But if such serious mistakes are being committed, the same needed to be corrected. Secondly, without going into the issue of seniority, he would like to tell the House that he is also a member of this House for the last 30-35 years and had never seen that a Selection Committee is impressed with a particular candidate and did not select him/her, but recommend his/her transfer. He did not know Dr. Jasbir Singh and he might have qualifications, but they should see that if such a precedence is set, it would be a problem for the Vice-Chancellor and the members of the Senate as a number of persons are working in P.U. Regional/Rural Centres established in the State of Punjab, and they might make similar requests. As per his information, he thought perhaps both the persons had joined after the decision of the Syndicate and the waiting list could not be operated now. If the note is deleted, the person concerned could not join at the University Campus. However, if he has already joined, they could not do anything. He, therefore, requested the Vice-Chancellor to clarify. In the end, he stated that it is very unfortunate that the mistrust about the functioning of the University amongst the members is increasing day-by-day. They should do something to reduce that mistrust.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that this gentleman, Dr. Jasbir Singh, is a regular faculty member at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni and is completely isolated there. Although he is teaching at a place where only undergraduate teaching took place, he has produced quality research, to which the Selection Committee was impressed and felt that if he is embedded in Panjab University campus wherein he would have access to his peers, he would have a superior kind of academic growth. Seeing his scholarship and motivation, he could become a really good scholar in the times to come. However, there was a candidate in that very interview who was even superior to him. Since there was only one position advertised, he (Vice-Chancellor) asked the Professor of the University, who was representing the department, whether they have more positions which are yet to be filled up and the Professor replied "Yes", there are several positions of Assistant Professors which are to be filled up. In the background that only one position was advertised, the Committee had no freedom to increase or decrease the number of positions. Only in the new advertisements, necessary amendment has been made. The Committee felt as senior academicians, it was their duty to recognize the talent of a person, who in isolated conditions has produced high quality research content, deserved recognition and encouragement. In this background, the note has been inserted. But if in the wisdom of the House such a note should not have been recorded, he could only assure on his behalf that such notes would not be recorded in future. He further stated that if his (Dr. Jasbir Singh) transfer has been accepted, not violating the regulations/rules of the University, the same should be allowed. There could be a view that why this pick and choose policy, as there could be similar persons working elsewhere. They could reverse it as it has been



done in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate and the Senate. If the Senate in its larger wisdom thinks to reverse it, then the same would be implemented. However, the reversal would imply that University is not taking pro-active measures to nurture high quality talent. In this very House, Chancellor, Dr. S.S. Johl, who incidentally is not present today, had stated that as to how he had identified Professor Gurdial Singh as a College Lecturer and elevated him to the level of Professor even though the procedures would not have permitted him. Some Chancellors and Vice-Chancellors had recognized Professor Gurdial Singh's talent and was groomed in a befitting manner and they had also honoured him. He did not know whether this person (Dr. Jasbir Singh) has similar spark and that he could become another Professor Gurdial Singh. When he accepted the judgement of the experts and got this recorded, it was in his mind, to make an attempt to nurture few very good people within the University system and permit them to move from an isolated place to a place where they could be groomed properly. He has no hesitation in accepting the wisdom of the House in reversing the thing and not have such things recorded in future.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that he was confused because they had already decided to delete the note. How this person could now be transferred. In fact, he had been made to understand that there is not only one transfer, but there are two transfers. The other people, who are working in the rural areas, also want to enhance their talent. Secondly, transferring/attracting the talented persons to the University meant the other Centres did not require talented persons. Thirdly, if the person has already been transferred and he has joined as such, what was the need for getting the same approved by the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has to come to the Senate for ratification.

Continuing, Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that then they should have waited for the Senate decision. Since it is a question of transfer of two persons, what has been done about the second person? Secondly, what about those who have already applied to the University for transfers? If all of them are transferred, it would definitely affect the Institutions where they are working presently as they would be deprived of best talent. He pleaded that without any concrete transfer policy, no transfer should be made. Thirdly, the Vice-Chancellor has said that, in future, no such transfers would be made, but what about these two.

Professor Rajat Sandhir stated that they are neither questioning the judgement of the Selection Committee nor the merit of the candidate concerned. In fact, they are only concerned that if the flood gates are opened, there would be a lot of people who would like to come to the main campus of the University. The Vice-Chancellor might have good intent, but the intent has larger consequences, which might create problem for them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Professor Rajat Sandhir is well taken.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Rajat Sandhir. He requested that this Item should be taken up for consideration along with Item R-23 & R-24.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now the matter under consideration is approval to the appointments of the selected candidates and the demand is that the note should be deleted and the consequences of that would be seen as and when they proceed to the agenda item/s.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (the Vice-Chancellor) has given the opinion that let this House take a decision that this University does not take into account the academic excellence if they reverse the order. He (the Vice-Chancellor) has put the proposal before the House whether they wanted to reverse it or not. Now, he (the

Vice-Chancellor) is saying that the item before the House is approval to the appointments of the selected candidates.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the appointments of the selected candidates are approved and the note is deleted. The consequences of the same would be seen later on.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-1 on the agenda**, be approved, with the stipulation that note mentioned under Serial No. 2 (below the wait-listed candidates), be treated as deleted.

**V.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-2, C-3, and C-4** on the agenda were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-2.** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme 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 posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Mr. Naveen Dogra (w.e.f. 08.07.2013)	Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur
2.	Ms. Prabha Sharma (w.e.f. 08.07.2013)	
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 2(vii))</b>		
3.	Mr. Akashdeep (w.e.f. 21.08.2012)	University Institute of Engineering & Technology
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 2(viii))</b>		
4.	Shri Harpreet Singh (w.e.f. 02.08.2013)	Economics
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 2(iv))</b>		

**C-3.** That Dr. Navjot be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4) at Department of Political Science, Panjab University, under the U.G.C. 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.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 2(iii))**

**C-4.** That Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi be promoted from Assistant Professor (Economics) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Economics) (Stage-3) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. 08.04.2014, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 2(v))**

**VI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-5** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-5.** That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme 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 posts would be personal to the incumbents:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>
1.	Dr. Pampa Mukherjee (w.e.f. 27.03.2013)	Political Science
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 2(ii))</b>		
2.	Ms. Harpreet Kanwal Chhabra (w.e.f. 01.01.2009)	Psychology
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 2(iv))</b>		
3.	Dr. Archana R. Singh (w.e.f. 12.01.2014)	School of Communication Studies
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 2(v))</b>		
4.	Dr. Satya Prasad Padhi (w.e.f. 28.03.2014)	Economics
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 2(i))</b>		
5.	Dr. (Ms.) Neeraj Sharma (w.e.f. 31.10.2013)	} Evening Studies – Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre
6.	Dr. (Mrs.) Suman Makkar nee Suman Bala Vohra (w.e.f. 30.04.2014)	
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 2(ii))</b>		
7.	Dr. Harsh Gandhar (w.e.f. 15.04.2014)	University School of Open Learning
<b>(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 2(iii))</b>		

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that Ms. Harpreet Kanwal Chhabra, Department of Psychology has been promoted from Associate Professor to Professor w.e.f. 1.1.2009. He suggested that a Committee constituted to suggest that the eligible candidates must apply within 1-2 years from becoming eligible. In this case, the Accounts Branch would have to make calculations for six years and the arrear would also be paid in the next year. Resultantly, the deficit of next year would also be increased unnecessarily.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-5 on the agenda**, be approved.

**Consideration of following Items C-6, C-7, C-8 and C-9 was deferred:**

**C-6.** That Dr. Parminder Singh be appointed Director Physical Education & Sports in the Directorate of Sports, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP Rs.10000/-. He be granted two additional increments over and above the protection of his basic pay as Associate Professor in the College.

**Waiting List**

Dr. Jaspal Singh

- NOTE:**
1. In case Dr. Parminder Singh does not join, the above-said two additional increments be granted to the wait listed candidate as well.
  2. This appointment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 2(i))**

- C-7.** That Dr. Indu Chhabra be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. 27.3.2014, 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.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 2(ii))**

- C-8.** That Dr. (Mrs.) Gunmala Suri be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. 18.12.2013, 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.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 2(iii))**

- C-9.** That Dr. (Ms.) Nishima be appointed Assistant Professor in Chemistry/Applied Chemistry 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 the rules of Panjab University.

**Waiting List**

Dr. (Ms.) Kushwinder Kaur

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 2(iv))**

- NOTE:** The competent authority could assign them teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/specialization(s) 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.

The letter of appointment to the above appointed/ promoted candidates under Item C-2 to C-9 have been issued in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

**VII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-10 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-10.** 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:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the teacher</b>	<b>Department/ Institute</b>	<b>Date of promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage- 2)</b>
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

**(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 5)**

Shri V.K. Sibal pointed out that this proposal was based on a UGC letter and it was not feasible to appreciate the proposal in the absence of the UGC letter. The letter should have been appended. In future, wherever there is a reference to a document in any item, the said document/s must be appended with the item. Secondly, he also pointed out that whichever document has been appended, they are not legible. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to ensure in future that the appended document/s is/are legible.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-10 on the agenda**, be approved.

**VIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-11 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-11.** That the term of appointment of Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction (DUI), be extended for a period of one year w.e.f. 1.2.2015, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 45)**

**IX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-12 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-12.** That, in pursuance of the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), Professor Jagjit Singh (Retd.), School of Punjabi Studies, be re-employed on contract basis w.e.f. the date he reports for duty up to the age of 65 years, i.e. 07.10.2016, the date of completion of 65 years of age, on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 48)**

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that the appointment was up to the date of completion of 65 years of age on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years. As far as he could recall, the Punjab Government had reduced the time period of 33 years to 25 years. Maybe, they have adopted that. He enquired if the pension had been worked out correctly?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the said circular of Punjab Government has not been adopted by them (the University) so far. Later on, it was clarified that the same has been sent to the MHRD for approval, but the approval is still awaited.

Continuing, Dr. Jagwant Singh said that so far as these provisions are concerned, once they are adopted, they came into force with immediate effect. Hence, could not be kept pending, they could not have implemented even the revised pay-scales of the UGC. If they could implement the revised pay-scales, then provision related to pension should also be implemented.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that their pension is governed by a special set of regulations, which are mentioned in the Calendar. General observation of the audit and others is that if there is any change, they have to deliberate as to how the relevant regulations have to be amended. The work on this has commenced and would be completed soon.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that a number of teachers had retired and were getting less pension.

Professor Rajat Sandhir pleaded that they should not wait for the approval of the Central Government and implement the said provision at the earliest.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-12 on the agenda**, be approved.

**X.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-13 and C-14 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

**C-13.** That the designation of Honorary Professor in the Department of Zoology, be conferred on Dr. Ved Parkash Kamboj.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 5)**

**C-14.** That the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Professor Jai Rup Singh, Former Vice-Chancellor of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar (23 July 2006 – 28 February 2009), Founder Vice-Chancellor of Central University of Punjab, Bathinda (28 February 2009–2 March 2014) and Visiting Professor of Universities of various countries (Germany, France and Mexico).

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 6)**

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that though in Item C-13 they are conferring the designation of Honorary Professor on Dr. Ved Parkash Kamboj in the Department of Zoology, in Item C-14 no mention is made as to in which Department Professor Jai Rup Singh would be conferred the designation of Honorary Professor.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that many Departments/Centres have expressed their desire that Professor Jai Rup Singh be associated with them, including Department of Forensic Science & Criminology, Human Genome, etc.

After some further discussion, it was unanimously –

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Chancellor that –

- (1) the designation of Honorary Professor in the Department of Zoology, be conferred on Dr. Ved Parkash Kamboj; and
- (2) the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Professor Jai Rup Singh, former Vice-Chancellor of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar (23 July 2006 – 28 February 2009), founder Vice-Chancellor of Central University of Punjab, Bathinda (28<sup>th</sup> February 2009 to 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2014) and Visiting Professor of Universities of various countries (Germany, France and Mexico).

**XI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-15.** That the pay of Dr. Sarabjit Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Punjabi, Panjab University, be protected at Rs.39100/- + AGP of Rs.8000/- in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 w.e.f. the date of his joining the University services, i.e. 15.10.2014 with next date of increment as usual as per LPC issued vide No. PGGC-46/BCI/3829 dated 18.10.2014 by the Principal, Government College, Sector-46, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 8)**

Shri Lilu Ram pointed out that the pay of different persons in numerous cases has been protected. There is one such case (Dr. Rekha Rani, Institution of Educational Technology and Vocational Education) and the same is pending for the last more than 2 years because it is shuttling between the Accounts Branch and the Registrar's Office.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Lilu Ram to give the same to him so that he could take appropriate action.

When Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there are two more such cases, the Vice-Chancellor said that he should point them out to him and he would look into the same.

Dr. Ajay Ranga remarked that the University normally takes decisions on the basis of face value. The University took decision in 2007 that the teachers, who would come from the private Colleges, their salary would not be protected. Despite that decision, in numerous cases, the salary of different persons, who have come from private Institutes, has been protected even though by getting the same recommended from the Committee/s. In the year 2010-11 a new explanation was given by a Committee and approved by the Syndicate that the salary of the persons even coming from the private Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University be protected. He enquired whether the persons coming from the private Colleges/Universities are not qualified or intelligent. This kind of disparity should not be there. Even though the Vice-Chancellor had given him an assurance that this kind of disparity would not be there, still no action is being taken by anybody in this regard. He pleaded that they should decide that the salary of the persons coming from the private Colleges/Institutes/Universities be protected, provided the persons concerned have applied through proper channel, but it should not matter wherefrom the person is coming.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that, as per UGC and what Dr. Ajay Ranga has said, the salary of the persons coming from any affiliated College be protected. They had authorized the Vice-Chancellor to take step to give the benefit of protection of pay to everybody. If there is any difficulty in certain specific cases, the same should be placed before the Syndicate. Dr. Ranga's concern is justified because the pay of other similarly placed persons is being protected, but not in his case. Dr. Dinesh Kumar has raised this issue twice or thrice in the Syndicate meetings. In the end, he stated that he would request the House to authorize the Vice-Chancellor to protect the pay of the teachers coming from recognized Colleges/Institutes/ Universities, as per the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath is well taken.

Some of the members, including Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Dr. Ajay Ranga, said that they authorize the Vice-Chancellor for the purpose.

Shri V.K. Sibal stated that in the item under consideration, the pay of the person has been protected at Rs.39,100/- and is being granted increment after a couple of days as if the service which he has rendered with his previous employer is a part of the University. According to him, his service could only be counted from the date he joined the University and become eligible for the next increment after a minimum period of 12 months. Recognition of service is different and pay protection/grant of increment is different. He, therefore, suggested that a clarification should be sought from the UGC in this regard.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that they should encourage the movement of teachers within the system, i.e., from one institution to another and should not put them at any disadvantage.

Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that there is provision in the pro forma evolved by the University for promotion wherein it has been specifically mentioned that the previous service would be counted.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they had already framed a meticulous policy.



Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they are authorizing the Vice-Chancellor for the purpose. According to him, the Committee could not amend the regulations as at present the pay of only those teachers is being protected, who are coming from Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University. He pleaded that the recommendations of the Committee, referred to by Professor A.K. Bhandari should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting so that the Syndicate could consider the same and take appropriate decision. The other pending cases of Dr. Ajay Ranga, Dr. Rekha Rani and Dr. Rajinder Kaur related to Punjabi University, Patiala may be cleared once the recommendations of the Committee are approved by the Syndicate.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur said that one of persons to whom Dr. Dinesh has referred to could not be considered, as Ph.D. Regulations have not been implemented on such cases. The appointment of the person concerned is also wrong and the same would be discussed during the zero hour. In fact, persons having M.A./M.Sc. qualification are taking B.A./B.Ed. classes. She enquired if that was acceptable. On one hand, some teachers were allowed to teach on regular basis and on the other hand, now we are allowing them to take classes as guest faculty. In this way, this would put double burden on the University exchequer.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as far as protection of pay of teachers is concerned, the regulations/rules of the UGC, State Government and the Central Government are very clear. However, there are certain ticklish issues. The case of Dr. Ajay Ranga is pending for the last more than three years. This could not be clinched till now despite so many Committees. He recalled that his (Dr. Ranga) case was discussed in the meeting of the Committee of which he was also a member, and it was recommended that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to protect the pay of Dr. Ranga in terms of laid down regulations and rules. He did not know what happened to the recommendations of the Committee as his case is still pending. He also did not know which Committee is looking into such cases. Protection of pay should be done strictly following the regulations/rules/Guidelines laid down for the purpose. Secondly, the Syndicate took the decision for protection of pay of teachers coming from affiliated Colleges in the context that there are private Colleges which are covered under grant-in-aid scheme of the Government and the Government Colleges and the teachers, who were coming from non grant-in-aid Colleges, their pay was not decided to be protected. Keeping in view this background, the decision was taken that the pay of the persons coming from the colleges affiliated to Panjab University be protected, but that does not exclude other Colleges/Institutions/Universities, whereas, here the pay is being protected of the persons coming from the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University only as if the pay of all others would not be protected. Still, if there is any confusion, the Syndicate could revise its decision by including all those. At that time, it was taken care of as the appreciation was that the non-grant-in-aid Colleges did not pay full salary to the teachers instead gave Certificates. So in support of the Certificate, the Syndicate decided that the Certificate be supported by Form 16, as a proof that as much salary was actually being paid. As such, all the precautions were taken to include all the non-grant-in-aid Colleges, but there was no intention to exclude other Colleges/Institutes/Universities.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to note for future.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15 on the agenda**, be approved.

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

**C-16.** That the following persons, in order of merit, be appointed System Managers at Computer Centre-01 and University Institute of Engineering & Technology-01, on one year's probation in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP Rs.7600/- plus allowances admissible under University rules, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University:

1. Ms. Mamta
2. Ms. Monika Rani.

The pay of in-service persons be protected as per Panjab University rules.

**Waiting List**

1. Mr. Lal Bahadur
2. Mr. Ashok Kumar.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 47)**

**C-17.** That the following Assistant Professors, be confirmed, in their posts, w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Faculty Member &amp; Departments</b>	<b>Date of Birth</b>	<b>Date of Joining</b>	<b>Proposed Date of Confirmation</b>
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

**(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 4)**

**C-18.** That the following persons, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the person/ Designation and Branch</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>	<b>Date of Confirmation</b>
1.	Shri Sandeep Chopra Senior Law Officer Legal Cell	17.10.2013	17.10.2014
2.	Shri Sushant Batish Law Officer Legal Cell	22.10.2013	22.10.2014

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 12)**

**Items C-19 and C-20 on the agenda were taken up for consideration together.**

**XIII.** Considered the recommendations of the Board of Finance (**Items C-19 and C-20 on the agenda**) contained in the minutes of its meetings dated 11.12.2014 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9) and dated 19.02.2015 (Items 1, 5, 8, 9, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 and 13), as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 25.01.2015 (Para 10) and 08.03.2015 (Para 4), respectively:

**Board of Finance meeting dated 11.12.2014 (Item C-19)****Item 1**

That the following provisions for establishing Cluster Innovation Centre in Bio-Technology (CIC-B) for the implementation of the project entitled “University Innovation Cluster (UIC) at Panjab University, Chandigarh” under the scheme of Bio-Technology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC), a Government of India Enterprise:

- (i) Rs.5.00 crore for setting up of the Bio-incubator in a staggered manner @ Rs.1.00 crore per year (2014-15 onwards) out of the interest earned/to be earned on the “Foundation for Higher Education Fund.”
- (ii) Rs.25.00 lac @ Rs.5.00 lacs per year (2014-15 onwards) as Panjab University contribution in cash out of the ‘Overhead’ income under the Plans/Schemes/Projects.

**NOTE:** 1. Bio-Technology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC) which is a Government of India Enterprise sanctioned a project of Rs.259.00 lacs for establishing a Cluster Innovation Centre in Bio-Technology with project entitled “University Innovation Cluster (UIC) at Panjab University, Chandigarh” vide sanction order No.BIRAC/UIC/JAN/2013 dated 24.03.2014 as per following details:

- (i) Total Project cost Rs.259.00 lacs.
- (ii) BIRAC Contribution is Rs.234.00 lacs.
- (iii) The Panjab University contribution.

**In Cash:**

Rs.25.00 lacs @ Rs.5.00 lacs per year for 5 years.

**In Kind:**

- Dedicated Chief Mentor: Prof. Rupinder Tewari
- Space – 2800 sq.ft. for UIC Office & Lab Space, Existing Lab Infrastructure, equipments.
- The University has agreed to give Rs.5.00 crores for setting up the Bio-Incubator.
- Accommodation of young innovators in Hostels.

- Access to all the instruments lying in the Instrumentation Facilities of the Department as well as University.
- All possible support for organizing industry related workshops monitoring by University experts, both at technical and business levels.

2. The copy of sanction order is placed at **Appendix-I (P-21 to 24)**.

### **Item 2**

That the pay-band of Sh. Ratnesh Kumar, Foreman, Department of Physics and Shri Dinesh Kumar, Workshop Superintendent, CIL who are already working in the pay-band of Rs.15600-39100 + GP 5700 + Rs.2000 as Secretariat pay w.e.f. 4.11.2012 against the posts (as personal to them) be revised to Rs.15600-39100 + GP 6600 (with initial pay of Rs.25250/-) plus Secretariat pay Rs.2500/- p.m. at par with the pay-scale of Assistant Registrar's w.e.f. the date of approval of the competent authority i.e. Senate. On vacation, these posts shall be filled in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP 5400.

### **Item 3**

That the posts of the Security Officers existing in the pay-band of Rs.10300-34800+GP 5000 be allowed special allowance of Rs.500/-per month for performing strenuous duties at odd hours as per **Appendix - II (P- 25-26)** and simultaneously information as suggested by Shri Sandeep Hans may also be obtained from Punjab Government and Vice-Chancellor is authorized to see if any further action is to be taken on receipt of such information.

### ***Additional Liability : Rs.12,000/- per annum***

**NOTE:** 1. The following posts of Security Officers exist in the University Budget:

- (i) 3 No. posts in the scale of Rs.6400-10640 (un-revised) revised to Rs.10300-34800+GP 4200 w.e.f. 1.1.2006.
  - (ii) 2 No. posts in the scale of Rs.7220-11660 for Officers completing 5 years of satisfactory service (un-revised) revised to Rs.10300-34800+GP 5000 w.e.f. 1.1.2006.
2. On the basis of Notifications of Government of Punjab dated 19.5.1998 and 27.5.2009 the Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate dated 19.07.2013/ 24.08.2013/ 29.09.2013 respectively revised the pay-band of posts of Security Officers of (i) above from Rs.10300-34800+GP 4200 to Rs.10300-34800+GP 4400.
3. The incumbents in senior scale i.e. Rs.10300-34800 + GP 5000 also requested to give corresponding enhancement.

4. The Vice-Chancellor constituted a Committee to look into the matter. The information was obtained from neighbouring Universities of the region as well as PESCO regarding existing pay-band and qualifications for the post of Security Officers. The pay-band for the post of Security Officer is less in neighbouring Universities except Punjabi University, Patiala where a post of Security-cum-Transport Officer exist in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP 8200 with higher qualifications.

The Committee after considering the pay-scale prevailing in the neighbouring institutions as well as in Punjab Government recommended that the request for enhancement of Grade Pay cannot be accepted. However, keeping in view the strenuous duties and fact that they are called for duties beyond their normal working hours as per the duty roaster, the Committee unanimously recommended that the posts of Security Officers in the pay band of Rs.10300-34800 + GP 5000 may be sanctioned a special allowance of Rs.500 per month.

#### Item 4

Noted & ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the BOF/ Syndicate/Senate that the following petitioners/retired Assistant Librarians and Deputy Librarians from various Departments of the University be placed at the minimum stage of Rs.14940/- in the pay-scale of Rs.12000-18300 (Selection Grade) who completed 5 years service in the scale as on 1.1.1996 under Career Advancement Scheme of the UGC in pursuance of the decisions of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana, in the CWP No. 5019 of 2012, w.e.f. 1.1.1996 **Appendix-III (P- 27 to 32):**

Sr. No.	Name of Employee/ Designation/Department	Date of placement in Selection Grade/ drawing Basic pay	Completion of 5 years service in the pay scale of Rs.12000-18300(S.G.)	Earlier date of placement at the stage of Rs.14940/	Revised date of placement at the stage of Rs.14940/- as per directions of the Hon'ble Court
1	Sh. R.S. Dang, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.10.1998), Deptt. of Maths., P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
2	Sh. G.S. Thakur Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 30.9.2006), AC Joshi Lib. P.U.	3.8.1989	3.8.1994	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
3	Sh. B.D. Sehra Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.1.2009), Deptt. of Maths., Panjab University	20.3.1988	20.3.1993	27.7.1998	1.1.1996

4	Sh. Hari Mitter Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.12.2007), VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur	26.11.1989	26.11.1994	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
5	Ms. Aruna Sud Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.3.2008), VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur	8.1.1986	8.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
6	Shri K.C. Ahuja Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 30.9.2000), P.U. Ext. Library, Ldh.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
7	Ms. Santosh Rajput Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.10.2007), AC Joshi Library, P.U.	14.9.1986	14.9.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
8	Ms. Shabad Kapur, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 30.6.2002), AC Joshi Lib., P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
9	Mrs. Vinod Kanwar Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 28.2.2006), AC Joshi Lib., P.U.	17.11.1987	17.11.1992	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
10	Mrs. K. Inder Puri, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.8.2000.), AC Joshi Lib., P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
11	Mrs. Asha Markan, Dy. Librarian (Retd. Voluntary on 4.7.2006), AC Joshi Lib., P.U.	5.9.1989	5.9.1994	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
12	Mrs. Shail Bajaj, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.8.2002), AC Joshi Lib., P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
13	Sh. Prem Parkash, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.12.2003), P.U. Ext. Library, Ldh.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
14	Sh. Sulakhan Singh, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 28.2.2002), P.U. Ext. Library, Ldh.	14.7.1988	14.7.1993	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
15	Sh. Kirpal Singh Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.1.2000) P.U. Ext. Library, Ldh.	16.7.1987	16.7.1992	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
16	Ms. Jatinder D. Paul Kapoor Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.1.2008), P.U. Ext. Library, Ldh.	18.2.1990	18.2.1995	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
17	Sh. Om Parkash Sharma, Assistant Librarian (Retd. on 31.1.2001), P.U. Ext. Library, Ldh.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996

18	Ms. Renu Gagneja, Assistant Librarian (Retd. Voluntary on 30.6.2006), P.U. Ext. Library, Ldh.	19.5.1989	19.5.1994	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
19	Sh. S. S. Bedi, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.10.2009), UBS, P.U.	30.9.1986	30.9.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
20	Sh. V.P. Bhalla, Dy. Librarian (Retd. on 31.7.2000), AC Joshi Lib., P.U.	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996

**Additional Financial Liabilities : Rs.33,41,250/- approx.**

**NOTE:** The UGC letter No.F.3-1/94(PS)-7 dated 19.10.2006 as well as Government of Punjab Notification No.10/39/01-5E.1/2460 dated 20.09.2007 which has already been adopted by the BOF/Syndicate in its meeting dated 17.06.2008/28.06.2008 and also approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 28.08.2008, has been implemented in the University w.e.f. 27.07.1998. Accordingly as per Clause (1) of the UGC letter, the benefit to employees for placement at the minimum of Rs.14940/- was given w.e.f. the date of implementation of the revised Career Advancement Scheme i.e. 27.07.1998.

However, as per the decision of the Hon'ble High Court, the benefit of placement at a minimum stage of Rs.14940/- is to be given to the Deputy Librarians/Assistant Librarians (Selection Grade) with 5 years service as on 1.1.1996 as per Clause (vi) of the UGC letter dated 19.10.2006 as per **Appendix-IV (P-33 to 36)**.

#### Item 5

That the following amendment in Clause 5 of the terms and conditions for "Merit-cum-Means Loan Subsidy Scheme" be made:

Existing Provision	Proposed Provision
"To be eligible for this scheme, the family income of the student applying under the scheme must not exceed Rs.2.00 lacs in support of which the student shall submit an affidavit duly attested by the Executive Magistrate along with the application for loan subsidy."	"To be eligible for this scheme, the family income of the student applying under the scheme must not exceed Rs.4.80 lacs per annum in support of which the student shall submit an affidavit duly attested by the Executive Magistrate along with the application for loan subsidy."

**NOTE:** The Board of Finance vide Item No.25 of its meeting held on 17.10.2012 has already approved the "Merit-cum-Means Loan Subsidy Scheme" in Self-Financing Courses for providing interest subsidy to the financially weaker and meritorious students out of the interest earned on corpus of Rs.1.00 crore created out of the "Foundation for Higher Education and Research Fund". This recommendation have also been approved by the Syndicate dated 04.11.2012 as per **Appendix - VI (P - 38 to 42)**.

**Item 6**

Noted & ratified the following actions taken by the Vice-Chancellor:

- I. in anticipation of approval of the BOF/Syndicate/Senate for sanctioning a sum of Rs.12,84,000/- out of "Estate Fund" for making provision of Toilets for Security Staff/Sanitary Post near Gates at Panjab University Campus, Sector-14 and 25, Chandigarh as per **Appendix-VII(P-43 to 50)** with stipulation that while approving the site plan for the proposed toilet the position of proposed underpass shall be kept in view.
- II. in allowing additional payment of Rs.13,876/-(Rs.9493/-+ Rs.4383/-) (for the months of July & August 2014 respectively) beyond the fixed limit of Rs.10000/- p.m. w.r.t. Sumptuary Expenses incurred for conducting University meetings in Vice-Chancellor's Office.
- III. in making following modifications in the budget provisions relating to the Department of Microbial Biotechnology for the year 2014-15:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Budget Heads</b>	<b>Existing provision</b>	<b>Proposed provision</b>
1.	Salaries & Provident Fund	4155800	4155800
2.	Office & General Expenses	100000	200000
3.	Seminar/Symposia/Workshop/ Special Lecture	20000	20000
4.	Books, Journals, Magazines, Newspapers, subscriptions, software spectrum licenses etc.	75000	75000
5.	Running, repair & maintenance of equipments etc.	350000	200000
6.	Field work, Study Tours, Educational Trips, Training Internship etc.	50000	50000
7.	Purchase of consumables, chemicals & glassware testing	900000	700000
8.	Guest Faculty charges	50000	50000
9.	Lab. Charges for students against receipts		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5700800</b>	<b>5450800</b>
	Lab. Charges	5,50,000 to be transferred from Non-Plan to Development Fund Account	*8,00,000 to be transferred from Non-Plan to Development Fund Account

\*The Lab. Charges collected from the students shall be utilized to the extent of actual fee receipt or the proposed provision, whichever is less, and shall be transferred from Non-Plan account to the 'Development Fund Account' to be utilized for purchase of equipments and upgradation of Laboratory/ infrastructure.

**NOTE:** It does not involve any financial implications as the overall proposed outgo remains the same.



**Item 7**

That a sum of Rs.50,17,000/- be sanctioned out of 'Estate Fund Account' for concrete flooring of backside streets of B, C & D Type Houses in Panjab University Campus, Sector-14, Chandigarh as per **Appendix - VIII (P - 51 to 54)**.

**NOTE:** The Joint Consultative Machinery in its meeting held on 29.05.2014 has recommended that the work of providing backlanes with concrete work for B, C & D Type Houses which are in dilapidated conditions may be taken up providing congenial environment to the residents **Appendix-IX (P - 55 to 57)**.

**Item 8**

That the Audited Annual Statement of account for the financial year 2013-2014 as follows **Appendix-IX (P - 58 to 74)** be approved:

	<b>Page No. of Appendix</b>
i) Plans/Schemes/Projects (Other than UGC) Account	1-3
ii) Plans/Schemes/Projects (UGC) Account	4-5
iii) Resource Mobilization Account	6
iv) Provident Fund Account	7
v) General Provident Fund Account	8
vi) Youth Welfare Fund Account	9
vii) Estate Fund Account	10
viii) Building & Infrastructure Fund Account	11
ix) Revolving Fund Account of the College Development Council	12-14
x) Employees Welfare Scheme Account	15
xi) Infrastructure Development Account	16
xii) Constituent Colleges Account	17

**Item 9**

Noted & ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor, in enhancing the budget provision in the Estate Fund Account for expenditure under the budget head 'Legal Expenses, T.A., Advertisements and Unforeseen Charges' from Rs.2.00 lac to Rs.4.00 lac.

**NOTE:** Due to increase in 'Legal Expenses, T.A., Advertisement Charges' and revision of D.C. rates, the enhancement is required.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 10)**

**Board of Finance meeting dated 19.02.2015 (Item C-20)****Item 1**

That -

- (1) the Revised Estimates of 2014-15 and Budget Estimates for the financial year 2015-16 with non-plan deficit of Rs.313.02 crore and demands for capital projects of Rs.807.75 lac as per Appendix I, II (Budget Part-I & II), III (pages 1 to 3) and-IV (pages 4-9), be approved.
- (2) the following specific recommendations of the Estimates Committee dated 2.2.2015 be also approved:
  1. that the following Committee may be constituted to explore the feasibility of having differential fee structure in a single course to increase the internal revenue and to suggest modalities for extending the benefit of admission/ entrance fee concession to economically weaker students on the pattern of SC/ST students:
    - i) Dean University Instruction
    - ii) Dean Student Welfare
    - iii) Shri Raghbir Dyal, Fellow
    - iv) Shri G.K. Chatrath, Fellow
    - v) Shri Dinesh Kumar, Fellow
    - vi) Registrar
    - vii) Chairperson, University Business School
    - viii) Chairperson, U.I.E.T.
    - ix) Finance & Development Officer
  2. that all the schemes of scholarships, concessions, freeships, etc. available to the students of University shall be uploaded on the University website by providing a separate link on the main web page for the general awareness of the students aspiring to get admission in the University. A joint mechanism with office of DCDC should be put in place to create awareness among the students of affiliated Colleges and Mean cum Merit Scholarships should be made part of prospectus of affiliated Colleges.
  3. that the manpower audit (Academic and Administrative) be completed at the earliest by including nominees from the U.T. Administration, Chandigarh and Government of Punjab and the University should explore the possibility of forming multi-disciplinary departments to cut down the administrative costs.

**Item 4****xxx****xxx****xxx****xxx****Item 5**

That a sum of Rs.19.85 lac be sanctioned out of savings of "Building and Infrastructure Account" (interest on investments) for allocation to sub-head "Renovation/Modernization/ Computerization" in order to clear the pending bills

already booked for different renovation works during 2014-2015 as per **Appendix-X (Page-19)**.

### **Item 8**

Noted and ratified the decision of the Senate dated 28.09.2014 **Appendix-XIV (Page 26)** with regard to grant of HRA and enhancement of remuneration on account of increase in Dearness Allowance to re-employed teachers as under:

- (i) the re-employed teachers be allowed House Rent Allowance at the prescribed rate to be applied on the last pay plus grade pay minus the notional basic pension as applicable for calculating the re-employment monthly emoluments; and
- (ii) the emoluments of teachers be enhanced after 3 years by the same percentage as the DA enhanced from the date of retirement till the date of completion of 3 years.

**Additional Financial Liability : 1,82,40,000/- p.a.(approx.)**

### **Item 9**

Noted and ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor:

in allowing re-appropriation from one budget head to another exceeding Rs.1.00 lac during the year 2013-2014 as per **Appendix-XV (Page 27 to 31)**.

**NOTE:** The Board of Finance vide Item No. 3 of its meeting held on 05.03.2002, duly ratified by the Syndicate/Senate, authorized the Vice-Chancellor to allow re-appropriation exceeding Rs.1.00 lac from one Budget Head to another and bring the same to the notice of the Board of Finance in its subsequent meeting for approval except in the case of re-appropriation to the Budget Heads 'Salary' & 'Medical re-imburement' where from the actual expenditure had to be incurred.

### **Item 2**

That a new budget head "Service Charges to Postal Department" under 'General Administration' be created with a provision of Rs.4.00 lacs for payment of Rs.25,000/- (fixed) p.m. to the postal department plus Service Tax as per agreement made between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Punjab Postal Service from the Session 2015-2016 as per **Appendix -V (Page 10 to 11)**.

**NOTE:** An agreement was made on 29.12.2014 between the Panjab University, Chandigarh & Punjab Postal Circle, Chandigarh on the basis of which the postal department will receive all types of cash such as University Tuition fees, Migration fees, Re-evaluation fees, Examination fees, Misc. fees etc. tendered by the candidates by using proper pay-in-slips and the postal department will provide their services on all working days (including Saturdays). The Panjab University shall pay a consolidated charges of Rs.25,000/- (fixed) p.m. to the Postal Department plus Service Tax as may be applicable from time to time.

**Item 3**

That an amount of Rs.188 lacs for construction of Girls Sports Hostel No. 10 in Sector 25 be allocated as a partial contribution out of Building and Infrastructure Account as per **Appendix-VI, VII and VIII**.

**NOTE:** 1. A Committee headed by the Vice-Chancellor in its meeting dated 7.2.2014 has approved the proposal for construction of Girls Sports Hostel No. 10 in P.U. South Campus, Sector 25, Chandigarh **Appendix-VI (Page 12-13)**.

2. The total estimated cost of the project is Rs.22.39 crore **Appendix-VII (Page 14)** against which following funds have already been allocated/identified:-

- i) Rs.200 lacs out of grant sanctioned by AICTE to UIET.
- ii) Rs.200 lacs from UIAMS (exam.) fund accounts.
- iii) Rs.100 lacs from UILS.
- iv) Rs.300 lacs out of interest earned on the Foundation for Higher Education Research Fund Account as approved by the Board of Finance/ Syndicate in its meeting dated 6.2.2014 and 22.3.2014 respectively.
- v) Rs.200 lacs to be arranged by UICET under the AICTE scheme.
- vi) Rs.150 lacs under the UGC Scheme for creating 100 bed accommodation for sports students.

3. Detailed office note attached herewith **Appendix-VIII (Page15- 16)**.

**Item 6**

That the following recommendations of the Committee dated 28.05.2014 to change the nomenclature and to revise the pay-scales of Laboratory Technicians working in the Panjab University be approved as per **Appendix-XI (Page 20-22)**:

- (i) 1. xxx                      xxx                      xxx                      xxx
2. These persons shall be eligible for the Assured Career Progression Scheme as already approved by the University after completion of 10, 20, 30 years of service.
3. The post of 'Junior Laboratory Assistant-01' existing in the BGJ Institute of Health in the pay-scale of Rs.5910-20200 + GP 1900 (allowance for operating X-Ray Plant @ Rs.50/- p.m.) which is lying vacant, be converted to that of 'Laboratory Technician' in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3200 and the qualifications of the said post shall be same as that of Laboratory Technicians in order to have uniform structure.

4. Another existing post of 'Laboratory Assistant (Clinical Tests) -01' in the BGJ Institute of Health held by the present incumbent in the pay-scale of Rs.5910-20200 + GP 2800 (allowance for emergent cases @ Rs.75/- p.m.) for which the essential qualifications and job requirements are also similar, be also converted to that of 'Laboratory Technician' in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3200. The present incumbent Shri Rakesh Kumar is already getting pay-band of Rs.10300-34800 +GP 3200, hence it does not involve any financial implication.
5. ***The inter-se-seniority of the present incumbents shall not be disturbed.***
- (ii) the above recommendations will be effective from the date when the earlier proposal was approved by the Board of Finance i.e. **05.09.2014.**

**NOTE:** 1. Earlier the BOF/Syndicate/ Senate dated 05.09.2014, 13/26.09.2014 and 14.12.2014 respectively has approved the minutes of the meeting dated 28.05.2014. However the above parts of the minutes have been left inadvertently to be included in the Minutes of the Board of Finance. Now the remaining part of the Minutes needs to be approved by the BOF/ Syndicate/Senate.

2. It may be made effective from the date when the earlier proposal was approved by the BOF i.e. 05.09.2014.

### **Item 7**

That the following modifications in the recommendations of Board of Finance dated 11.02.2013 regarding enhancement in the existing limits for incurring sumptuary expenses by the following functionaries in the University be approved:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Approved Limit</b>	<b>Amended</b>	<b>Limit</b>
<b>1 to 7</b>	<b>XXXX</b>	<b>XXXX</b>	<b>XXXX</b>	<b>XXXX</b>
<b>8.</b>	Deputy Registrars	Rs.700/- p.m.	<b>Deputy Registrars (Administrative Office)</b>	<b>Rs.700/- p.m.</b>
<b>9 -10</b>	<b>XXXX</b>	<b>XXXX</b>	<b>XXXX</b>	<b>XXXX</b>

**NOTE:** (i) The Board of Finance at its meeting held on 04.07.2007 had revised the sumptuary expenses of senior functionaries including Deputy Registrars (Main Office) which was also approved by the Syndicate/ Senate dated 07.07.2007 and 14.07.2007 respectively  
**Appendix-XIII (Page 25).**

- (ii) A post of Deputy Registrar (RTI Cell) was created/introduced in the year 2009 in the Administrative Office and hence shall also be covered under the above proposed decision.

### Item 10

Noted the status of the Inspection Report of Accountant General (U.T. & Punjab) and Internal Audit for the year 2012-2013 is as per **Appendix – XVI (Page 32 to 36) & XVII (Page 37 to 41)** with observation that all out efforts be made to get all the outstanding Paras settled as soon as possible and if need be a committee may be constituted involving the members of Board of Finance for reviewing the outstanding paras in terms of Rule 1.9 (e) of P.U. Accounts Manual for making necessary recommendations.

### Item 11

Noted and ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor:

for sanctioning additional expenditure of Rs.3000/- under the budget head “Impetus to Research” sub-head “Lecture/ University Colloquia” for issue of commemorative postage stamps of “Prof. Ruchi Ram Sahni” as per the actual payment of Rs.6,96,000/- paid to the Postal Department, Government of India.

**NOTE:** Earlier the Board of Finance vide its Agenda Item No. 21(C-I) of its meeting held on 06.02.2014 noted and ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor in sanctioning a sum of Rs.6,93,000/- for issue of Commemorative Postage Stamp “Professor Ruchi Ram Sahni” on the basis of the Notification No.16-22/2012-Phil dated 03.04.2013 issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Communications and Information Technology, Department of Posts (Philately Division), New Delhi.

### Item 12

Noted and ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor:

in fixation of pay of Dr. Keshav Rai Agnihotri, Department of Central Instrument Laboratory for grant of pay-scale of Rs.1200-1850 + 100 Special pay w.e.f. 26.07.1983 as per the office order issued by the establishment branch vide No.19788/Estt. dated 17.09.2014 and vide office order No. 1936-39/A dated 05.02.2015 **Appendix–XVIII (Page No.42) & Appendix-XIX (Page No. 43- 44)** in compliance to the decision of the Hon’ble Punjab & Haryana High Court CWP No. 9761 of 1993.

### Item 13

Noted and ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor:

that the Salary of Ms. Shaveta Mahendra, Stage Craft Teacher, Department of Indian Theatre, who has been designated as Assistant Professor (Personal to her), be fixed notionally in the grade of Lecturer/Assistant Professor w.e.f. 02.03.2000 to 28.09.2013 i.e. the date

when she joined as Stage Craft Teacher to the date on which her case for re-designation as Assistant Professor in the Department of Indian Theatre was approved by the Senate vide Paragraph IX dated 29.09.2013 **Appendix – XX (Page No. 45 to 48)** and the actual financial benefit of revised pay as Assistant Professor shall be allowed w.e.f. 29.09.2013, subject to the result of the CWP No.28159 of 2013 titled Navdeep Kaur vs Panjab University & Others as per the Office Order No. 14668-73/Estt. dated 15.07.2014 as per **Appendix – XXI (Page 49)**.

**NOTE:** Her seniority in the cadre of Assistant Professor will be reckoned w.e.f. 29.09.2013 as per Office orders issued vide No.7264-7268/Estt. Dated 02.04.2014, in pursuance of the decision of the Board of Finance (Item No. 21) (B-I) dated 06.02.2014 approved by the Syndicate/Senate vide Para 4 (Item No.21) (B-I) and Para VIII (Item No. 21 (B-I) dated 22.02.2014 and 22.03.2014 respectively.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 4)**

The Vice-Chancellor stated that Items C-19 and C-20 which contained several items relating to recommendations of the Board of Finance meetings dated 11.12.2014 and 19.02.2015 and the same had been endorsed by the Syndicate in meetings dated 25.01.2015 and 08.03.2015. He expected the members to view these items in the background of the minutes of the Board of Finance meetings as well as some discussions held in the meetings of the Syndicate dated 25.01.2015 and 08.03.2015, which had been supplied to them as draft minutes. The University Budget item is very important. He stated that we have a very unique situation so far as University finances are concerned. The financial requirements of the University are largely met by the Central Government in a structure, which was articulated some years ago, i.e., University has some income (which is generated by the University), small portion of the deficit is met by the Punjab Government and the rest of the shortfall is met by the Central Government on year to year basis. Year 2013-14 was the first time that their shortfall got met from the Non-Plan Budget of the UGC via a directive from the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD). However, they said that in the subsequent years, a limit would be imposed on as to how much shortfall is to be met by the Government of India. However, the University had contested at that time that the kind of limit the Government of India wishes to impose on the growth of Non-Plan Budget could not be applied to the deficit of the University as it had many components, which typically increase at a rate greater than the rate of inflation or Government limit on year to year basis. The representatives of MHRD categorically said that they would not allow more than 8% increase and in such case, they would not be able to meet the revenue needs of the University and this could lead to serious difficulty for the University. This point was appreciated by the MHRD and it was assured that the Panjab University's problem is genuine and they would give consideration to this requirement. But for that, Panjab University should make a case, which will be examined by the MHRD. This is the background in which the financial needs of the University during the year 2014-15 have been considered so far. In the beginning of the year (2014-15), the Government had promised that they would give Rs.176 crore, and the same was short of what their actual needs were. They had little bit over estimated. Since the financial year is closing in about 2 days, now they have more realistic estimates as to what are their needs as on today. Out of Rs.176 crore, Rs.100 crore was given to them by the Central Government as a first instalment and Rs.43 crore was a carry-over amount from the last year. On the basis of Utilization Certificate, whatever money they received till then, they had a little bit excess. The Government has released a total sum of Rs.100+43 = Rs.143 crore and the remaining Rs.32 crore is expected shortly. However, they do want to make a presentation as the representatives of the Government had appreciated that the needs of the University are genuine and the follow up is moving in the right direction. They are hoping that as the financial year would close, some more money would be made available to them. In the meantime, they have had meetings with the Officer In-charge of MHRD after the meeting of the Board of

Finance, in which they reiterated the needs of the University. The Vice-Chancellor along with the Registrar met Shri Satyanarayan Mohanty, the new MHRD Secretary and had a fruitful discussion for more than 1.15 hour. Now, the representatives of the Punjab Government, U.T. Administration and the MHRD are convinced that the problems of the University are structural and they had well understood the financial requirements of the University. The MHRD had also understood that so far as the financial requirement of Panjab University is concerned, this could not be attended to by allowing mere 8% increment, which happened in the Non-Plan Budget of current financial year. In view of that, the MHRD Secretary had offered to visit the University before the close of this academic year (2014-15). He is hopeful that Shri Mohanty would visit the University Campus before the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of May. He (Vice-Chancellor) would arrange his meeting with the entire academic community, including members of the Syndicate so that he could have an assessment of this University's strength and constraints and understand that the Panjab University is a unique institution and the officers of Government of India in Delhi have to have better appreciation of this institution. In the past, the Vice-Chancellor and the Finance & Development Officer had made many trips to Delhi to ensure that the staff get their salaries in time. After every few months they faced financial crisis as they are committed that everybody gets salary as well as Dearness Allowance as per the Central Government norms. They have to treat everybody at par with Central Government and other peer Institutions' Employees – whether in the State of Punjab, Haryana or Himachal Pradesh. They had also visited some peer Institutions to assess as to what income they generate. They found that most of them were generating less income than Panjab University while some generated more than that by the Panjab University. Some of the Institutions are able to restrict their expenditure by paying less salary to their staff, whereas Panjab University is paying full salary to the staff irrespective of the fact whether one is serving at the Campus or Regional Centres or Constituent Colleges. The other Universities of Punjab are not paying full salary, the way the Panjab University is doing. What the Panjab University is doing, is right because they have to compete with the Central Universities in the country, but the authorities who release funds to the University have also to appreciate this situation. At the moment if they look at their account status, this year Panjab University has generated an income to the tune of Rs.171 crore plus Rs.20 crore are to be given by the Punjab Government and about Rs.176 crore by the Central Government. But they are still short of about Rs.30 to 40 crores. The NAAC report is with them and the remarks are there as to what is the shortage of teachers at Panjab University. Of course, they had given the data to them for carrying out academic and nonacademic assessment. 40% of the teaching positions are still vacant, but the reemployed faculty has not been taken into consideration as the positions on which the persons have been reemployed are not vacant. Even then about 25% to 30% positions are vacant. If the manpower audit is done, this 30% figure might get revised somewhat. In any case they would need more money, definitely over and above the notional rate of inflation, at which the Non-Plan Budget of Government of India is typically increased annually. The MHRD officials are conscious about it, but he would still go and articulate their concern. They have no Plan Budget like many Central Universities have, as for PU, there is no concept of Plan Budget. If PU does not have a Plan Budget, they cannot have development in the University. Though they have received PURSE grant and appointed certain persons under these schemes, they become liability for a long term, as the PURSE grants are always for a limited period. Hence, there has to be some serious thinking for which they need to have a think-tank on behalf of the University, which is his responsibility. Such things ought not be left for long to posterity. They have to do it now, not only for retaining the position of the University, but for sympathetic consideration of their case for providing adequate funds by the Central Government. Had they not delayed the assessment by the NAAC, at least there would not have been any objection to consideration of their case for University for Potential for Excellence. Since only one University from the Punjab State was to be selected for University for Potential for Excellence and an objection was raised to PU's case, Guru Nanak Dev University got selected from the Punjab State. They can now compete only in the second round, but did not know when the same would be held.



Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether PU had put up the application for NAAC review in 2013.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they did apply in the year 2013. However, the desired information would be supplied to Shri Ashok Goyal.

Ambassador I.S. Chaddha stated that the Vice-Chancellor has done a good job to draw the attention towards the peculiar situation of this University. In fact, it is a unique situation, which no other University in India faced as they have several Pay Masters, i.e., Punjab Government, Central Government and U.G.C. and the indispensable concern of all of their Pay Masters is to ensure that the expenditure is brought down and the income is raised. This could be done, but for that they would have to try to take steps to increase their income. They should also try to reduce the expenditure, but only wasteful expenditure. However, they have to fill up the vacant teaching positions as they could not let the quality of instructions to the students suffer and research to come down. The way to do it is that they should look at the possibility of increasing the income and reducing the wasteful expenditure and not that expenditure, which contributes towards the quality of output of the University. This should be constantly borne in mind and the Vice-Chancellor has done well to that extent all this apparently. The Vice-Chancellor had wished to have a Think-Tank, which he whole-heartedly supported. People who have vast experience in academics should come up with a solution to meet the requirements of the University by assessing their requirements. Illustrating his viewpoint, they could reduce their expenditure by way of reducing the volume of papers supplied to them for the meeting. Earlier also, he had made this suggestion, but nothing has been done in this regard. Citing an example, he said that the Enquiry Report contained of about 111 pages, which could have been curtailed to less than 10 pages by summarizing the same. Rest of the material has already been summarized in the report of the Enquiry Committee. One of the newspapers had also summarized the report of the Enquiry Committee. As such, there was a possibility of preparing a self-contained note for which they do not have to do what is being done now. The entire file is being blindly got photocopied and supplied to the members. To reduce the expenditure, a self-contained note could be prepared, which required carrying out improvements in the methods of preparing the agenda being provided to the Senators. By reducing the expenditure, they could still improve the performance of the University. Similarly, there are ways to enhance the income of the University, but the same are resisted. They could not eliminate the legitimate sources of income simply because of outdated notions, but both the increase in income as well as reduction in expenditure must be borne in mind. Their goal is to improve the performance of the University so that it could rise further in the global ranking.

Initiating the discussion on Agenda Items 19 and 20, relating to University Budget, Mr. Munish Verma and Mr. Naresh Gaur insisted upon the Vice-Chancellor to certify that all the Items of income have been included in the Budget put up in the House. Referring to the statement of Income and Expenditure in respect of University hostels, both the members casted aspersions on the Vice-Chancellor for being diplomatic and for coning the Punjab Government and Government of India. Without necessary permission to speak from the Vice-Chancellor, both the members continued to speak in an unbecoming manner, which created furore in the House and disrupted the proceedings. Later on Mr. Gaur also noted his dissent on the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him reiterate that he had presented the matter, which has come to them from the Board of Finance having representatives from the Senate, Syndicate and the Governments. The matter had also been considered by the Syndicate, the Governing body of the University, which has been elected by the Senate members for a period of 12 months. He could not provide them anything more than what has been presented to them.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated the members, who were seeking certification from the Vice-Chancellor that all the items pertaining to income of the University had been included in the Budget, in fact, should point out that such and such items have not been included in the Budget, whenever they are allowed to speak.

When the pandemonium prevailed, the Vice-Chancellor said that since it is 1.15 p.m., let us disperse for lunch and they would discuss the item after the lunch.

After the break, when the House resumed, the Dean of Student Welfare answered the various points/queries raised by the fellow Senators regarding the income and expenditure of University hostels under various heads. He also made a reference to the appointment of class IV employees/attendants in the hostels on need basis. He further explained that earlier such appointments were made directly by the DSW and the hostel Wardens, respectively, but now these are being made through the Establishment Branch by following proper procedure.

Adding to the discussion on the hostel funds, Mr. Munish Verma reiterated his opinion about the budget making special reference to income and expenditure statement of Panjab University hostels and levelled charges against DSW for talking in the air and he used unparliamentary language against Dean of Student Welfare. Thus, pandemonium prevailed in the House and Mr. Munish was told to stay in control, behave himself and maintain decorum in the House.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him clarify that the Budget Item/s has/have come to them for consideration after following the same process/procedures, which have been followed during the last so many years. The Budget has been prepared and it contained Items/Sub-Items and details following the past practice. Some colleagues were asking that certain earnings, e.g., from hostels, sports, etc. have not been included in the Budget. Until now, they were being handled in a different manner and this year also, they have been handled exactly the same way. In case changes are needed and they need to have presentation of the Budget in a different manner than the past, surely the same could be considered and incorporated, but that would be for future only. As of today, whatever is there, it is before them. If something is not there and the same is needed to be included in future, surely a proposal could be made and considered by a Committee or could be put to the Syndicate directly and, thereafter, to the Senate so that in subsequent years or from the next year the Budget could be presented in a different manner than what they have been doing till now. In the light of this, he would like to request the members to start considering the Budget Item.

Shri Satya Pal Jain congratulated the Vice-Chancellor, faculty members, non-teaching staff, research scholars and the students for the Budget. In fact, the annual Budget contained the policy and programmes of the year. Though both the financial constraints and the shortage of staff are troubling the University since long, still the University is maintaining its speed of progress, for which he would like to congratulate those non-teachers and research scholars whose names never appeared in the press, but they are working honestly and efficiently for the smooth functioning of the University. So far as Budget is concerned, he has 2-3 suggestions to make. Firstly, the Senate of the University is basically an academic body and neither a Legislature nor the Parliament nor any other Administrative body. Panjab University Act was enacted several years ago. Now, the time has come to get the Panjab University Act reviewed. The University is known by the research standard and the new courses introduced by it, but the same has disappeared. Nowadays, several small issues relating to award of honorary degree, grant of increment/s, pension, fixation of pay, etc. are being placed before the Senate, which is not desirable. He suggested that for such small issues, the Syndicate should be authorized and similarly some of the powers of the Syndicate should be delegated to the Vice-Chancellor. Secondly, so far as research is concerned, a High Powered Committee should be constituted which should examine as to on which issues/topics research could be done. Thirdly, as far as election of Deans of Faculties are concerned, he suggested that since the position of Dean is purely academic, the Deans should not be appointed

through election. In fact, the members of the Board of Studies and the Deans should be from the subject concerned. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to think over this suggestion. Fourthly, he did not see any justification in getting the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate videographed. He suggested that only important discussion should be recorded and, thereafter, the decision should be recorded. Fifthly, he suggested that all the vacancies (both teaching and non-teaching) should be filled up without wasting any more time. So far as finances are concerned, he suggested that a Committee comprising 5-6 senior members should be constituted to take up the matter with the Chief Minister, Punjab as well as the Prime Minister. Finances would have to be provided by the Government as income generating by enhancing the fees alone would not solve the financial problem. It is good that the Deans (Dean of University Instruction, Dean Students Welfare, Dean Research) have been made members of the Senate. However, his personal view is that they should not take part in the electoral politics of the University. When Deans participated in electoral political, the University often faced problem.

On a point of order, Ms. Gurpreet Kaur suggested that all the Deans (Dean of University Instruction, Dean Students Welfare, Dean Research, Dean, College Development Council, Dean Alumni Relations, Dean International Students, etc.) should be appointed on seniority basis.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that the University faced difficulty because of certain decisions taken at the Government of India level. The capping, which does not take note of the ground reality – whether it is API or 8% annual increase, in fact both create a problem for them. The Vice-Chancellor is trying his level best to make them (the officers of MHRD and the UGC) aware that it is not desirable in Panjab University's case. He suggested that when MHRD is putting such a rider that the annual increase could not be more than 8%, they needed to understand that all the notifications relating to the University issued by the Government of India have to be complied with by the University and while complying with them, if at some point of time they lagged behind it would create a problem. UGC itself says that 90% of the posts should be filled on regular basis and only 10% faculty could be arranged as guest faculty. There are 30% to 40% vacancies and with the direction of the Court, they are trying to make up the deficiencies. Naturally the Non-Plan salary budget is bound to go up and the 8% rider would be affected. He hoped that this point, the Vice-Chancellor would discuss with Secretary MHRD, when he visits the campus and persuades him to decide in the University favour. So far as Budget is concerned, he stated the all higher education institutions – whether Universities or others cannot generate much revenue from fees, etc. Even then they substantially increase the fees, which is resisted by the students and others, but the same is peanut of the total Budget. They have to realize that in their system, where the public funding is considered a claim, which has been admitted by none other than Dr. Manmohan Singh, the former Prime Minister of India and if the Budget is going up on that ground, the kind of capping to be applied in other departments could not be applied to the University. Referring to note attached to Sub-Item 4, he said that they were not giving benefit to 20 persons, for which he was concerned. These 20 persons were so aggrieved that they had to knock the doors of Punjab & Haryana High Court to get relief. His concern is that their system is such that they have not been able to address the genuine concerns of the employees and the same was addressed neither by the Finance Department nor by the RAO. Maybe, there was some objection from RAO due to which they approached the High Court. They have to contemplate and evolve a mechanism as to how such objection/s could be addressed. For that, if need be, a Committee should be constituted. He reiterated that to sort out such objection/s and to avoid litigations, they have to evolve a mechanism within their system so they are able to address such issues amicably and nobody (both from teaching and Non-teaching side) is forced to go to the Court unnecessarily.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that though he was a member of the Budget Committee wherein they had very elaborate and exhaustive discussion, he would like to draw the attention of the house towards Page 18, especially to the account of P.U. Constituent Colleges. He has been told by Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development

Council, that they have received a grant of Rs.6 Crore (Rs.1.5 crore each College) for four Constituent Colleges. He further said that it was necessary to give financial autonomy to Regional Centres and Constituent Colleges. For example, if a Constituent College had to conduct an athletic meet, the teachers have to contribute from their own pockets more than Rs.1,000/- each to get the athletic meet conducted and later on submit the bills to the University, out of which some of the bills may not be passed. He, therefore, suggested that partial autonomy within the Calendar should be given to the Constituent Colleges and Regional/Rural Centres of the University, so that they could do their work smoothly. Secondly, some of the teachers in the subject of Computer Science were relieved last year as they were not eligible. However, these vacant posts were not filled even by guest faculty, he pointed out there needs timely intervention such that the studies of students do not suffer. Regarding Sub-Item 4, which related to 'Means-cum-Merit, Scholarships', he stated that the Salary/Income Certificate has been sought to be signed by the Executive Magistrate, which is a very difficult task/process. If they accepted self-declaration about the annual income, it would be better, because he opined that the Executive Magistrate is not the competent authority to issue Income Certificate to General Category people, he could be competent for the privilege class. He had raised this issue in December Senate as well as in the Budget meeting of the Senate; however, the status is still the same. He felt that perhaps the subsidized scheme/s is/are non-starter due to various procedural delays. Last year, he had the data, which revealed that only four students availed this facility, but now he has no data. He said that he was totally against hike in fees because if they earn Rs.1 crore for the total deficit of Rs.500 crore, in Mathematical term, it would be .02% of the total Budget, but they are increasing the fees because the argument is that they should be seen to be increasing the fees. He had been raising the issue of Mean-cum-Merit Scholarship at various forums for the last 5-6 months, it should now be settled. He had asked that they should prepare the prospectus and the College Development Council has also approved it. He said that they should upload all the scholarships on the University Website. So far as Item 20 is concerned, in economic term, there is no fiscal roadmap in the University, though there are financial constraints, to increase fee is not good. He suggested that the academic and administrative audit should be completed at the earliest within a stipulated time so that they should know whether they needed the posts or not and if needed, which posts are needed. As regards as how they could increase their revenue. There are certain courses, e.g. Engineering, Computer Science, M.Sc. (IT), PGDCA, etc., which could increase the University revenue, because in these courses a lot scope for employment is there for the students. They should allow admissions through lateral entry to some of these courses without diluting the academic standard so that the students could opt for more computer oriented courses in affiliated Colleges. Every time they got suggestion that alumni should be approached for getting funds; however, there is no data pertaining to how much contribution has been made by the Alumni to the University revenue. Another proposal was to allow advertisements and hoardings on the University buildings to earn revenue. His disappointment was that often suggestions are well taken; however, they are not well implemented. He requested the August House through the Vice-Chancellor, to please look into this carefully and if they are able to implement even one of the suggestions, he would be grateful.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that revenue generation is the need of the hour. Though the Chandigarh has been declared a solar city, the Panjab University has not taken any step in this regard. His College has curtailed/saved certain expenses (Rs. 20,000/- p.m.) by utilizing Solar Energy. There is an urgent need to have a proper planning for utilizing Solar Energy so that they could obtain finances from the Chandigarh Administration, under this scheme. He further stated that the University has a shopping area where there are several shops. In fact, the market needed to be developed. He has no hesitation in saying that at least one more floor should be added to shops so that they could generate more revenue for the University. Secondly, if they see the appendix i.e., plan of construction completed/yet to be completed, the University has not seen much in the form of Detailed Project Report (DPR). Whatever has been provided, it pertained to major projects. Since now they are going to start new hostels, their first priority should be to have DPR so that the project/s could be completed in a phased manner, especially

keeping in view the fact that the escalation in cost is between 30% and 40%. Referring to Appendix-I, Department of Zoology (Sr. No.21), he stated that this head "Improvement of Education" includes Educational Trip. Since the Government of India very recently banned the killing of animals for research purposes. This particular head is very important and a mandatory. Hence, the review/revival of this provision is absolutely necessary. So far as Teachers Holiday Home, Shimla and Student's Holiday Home, Dalhousie, are concerned, the expenditure is Rs.10 Lac per year, whereas they are not providing any accommodation there, due to their dilapidated condition. So far as Teachers Holiday Home, Shimla is concerned, it is visited by majority of the faculty members of the University and its affiliated Colleges. Its reception area and kitchen needed urgent repair/renovation. Secondly, there is no proper crockery in the kitchen and also needed to be maintained, but no allocation has been for the purpose. Similarly, though they are facing parking problem in South Campus, there is no provision for the same in the Budget. They have to evolve a plan to minimize the parking problem, including near the Administrative Block.

Shri Deepak Kaushik stated that he has been a member of this august House for the last couple of years. During all these years he is seeing that everyone felt concerned about the renovation of both Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla and Students' Holiday Home, Dalhousie, but no one felt concerned about the pathetic condition of residences and residential area and suggested renovation of residences and development of residential area. In fact, the residences of Sector 14 were built in the year 1952-53, and till now no renovation has been done. When Shri Shiv Raj Patil, former Governor Punjab and Administrator once passed through sector 14-15 road, he pointed out the shabby look of the houses, the University has served notice to the employees for encroachment also. He suggested that in Sector 14 houses, which are very old and have very limited accommodation, when any of them is vacated at least one more room should be constructed/added there so that the employee concerned and his/her family could live their happily. Though a meeting was held with XEN and the employees under the Chairmanship of the worthy Vice-Chancellor to consider addition of storey/storeys to the single storey houses at the Sector 14 Campus, no progress has been made in this regard.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that the Estimate Committee has done a very good work and has recommended that feasibility of different fee structures for different courses should be explored. He suggested that the Committee to be constituted should be asked to submit its report within a stipulated time. Secondly, he has been suggesting introduction of Double Entry System for the last 3-4 years at different platforms, including Syndicate and Senate. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to make the introduction of Double Entry System time bound, especially the manpower auditing must be completed by the next session so that they could take appropriate decision at the earliest.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though the issue is not directly related to the Budget, a very pertinent point relating to the students has been raised by some of the Hon'ble members in this House and the same has been raised by the students in the recent past about some funds which are not being reflected in the Budget of the University. The Vice-Chancellor would agree with him that he (Shri Goyal) has been raising this issue in both the Syndicate and Senate from time to time and making them conscious that it should be taken care of; otherwise, one day they might face a problem if somebody else pointed it out. Therefore, they should try to correct it and the Vice-Chancellor had also promised not once, but twice as he is promising today, that the matter would be examined and taken care of, in future. Some of the officials, who always surrounded the Vice-Chancellor, instead of appreciating the merit of the issue/s being raised by the persons, doubted as if it was Ashok Goyal, who is instigating these persons. Anyhow, he did not want to go into it, but he believed that there is no accounting system in any of the organizations, under which they could have separate funds, namely private funds, which are out of audit, especially when the annual income and expenditure accounts have to be placed before the competent body for approval. Not that it has started now, but it has been happening since so many years and maybe decades that the hostel funds have been out of the University Budget. Earlier, they were part of the

Budget, but he did not want to go into the background as to why and how they were taken out of the University Budget and why he had been apprehending that now the time has come when they have to take the hostel funds and the sports funds to the University Budget because they are not subject to audit/concurrent audit as per the regulations contained in the University Calendars. In fact, they are being got audited from the Chartered Accountant and he did not know who has named them as private funds of Panjab University, which gives an impression as if some funds are there and the same are secret funds and are also not even reflected in the main Budget of the University, which is not subject to audit and is not being shown to the Government wherefrom they get the deficit grants. He did not point it out in the Board of Finance meeting because he was expecting that the things would come in the main Budget of the University. He got the notice for the meeting of the Board of Finance only two days before the meeting because the letter of appointing him as member of the Board of Finance came only two days before and simultaneously he got the agenda also. Since there were nominees of Governments both Punjab Government and U.T. Administration, it was not proper on his part to point out that they are lacking here. But what he was apprehending, the same had been raised in the media by the students and some of the students are agitating why these funds should not be subject to audit. Another thing which is being discussed here is as to how they could curtail the expenditure and how to raise the revenue. Since he was in the meetings of the Board of Finance and the Syndicate, he would not discuss the Budget in detail/item-wise, but the concern which he expressed in the Syndicate not once but more than once not that there is a parallel accounting system in the University, which is named as private funds of the University, there is a parallel system of recruitments also. He had raised this issue in the Syndicate on numerous occasions that whosoever is to be appointed irrespective of fact where on regular, contract, *ad hoc*, temporary basis, etc., there should be only one channel of recruiting them and the Vice-Chancellor had received this suggestion also. Rightly or wrongly allegations have been levelled that the appointments, which have been made without the notice of the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar or the Establishment Branch whosoever is looking after the personnel of the University, in the hostels, DSW Office, etc. have been made to oblige some people. He believed and wished that this allegation is proved to be wrong, but why they should give an opportunity to anybody to raise the fingers at all, especially when they had a set system for making recruitments on regular, contract, *ad hoc*, temporary, daily wage basis, etc. The only and only explanation which is given is that it is being done for the last so many years. He did not know what stops them from getting wiser any day. If something is going on for the last so many years, it did not mean that it should continue for future as well. As he had said in the morning that in present era they have to be transparent, i.e., more revealing than concealing. Whether the hostel and sports funds should be part of the Budget, he thought it should have been made clear before the start of the discussion on the Budget that 'no' these are not part of the Budget as the Vice-Chancellor had said that it is because of the past practice. If these could not be incorporated this year's Budget, in spite of the fact that a proposal was made by him and so many others, why could it not be incorporated in this year's Budget and how they are going to act in this direction at least for the year 2016-17.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that there is a deficit of Rs.313 crore out of which Rs.20 crore would be given by the Punjab Government and Rs.193 crore would be the income to be generated by the University. From where they would arrange Rs.100 crore as the same would not be given by the Government. Last time they were told that Rs.206 crores would be given by the UGC, but the UGC promised to give only Rs.176 crores, out of which Rs.30 crore to Rs.40 crore are still to be given by the UGC. How could they walk in this tight situation? Every year suggestions come to increase the revenue and also to reduce the expenditure as one is there for solar system, but once the meeting ended everybody forgets. Even the University Management/Officials do not see as to what suggestions have been given by the members and whether the suggestions are relevant and if relevant, how those could be implemented. Every year, it is being argued that they are carrying out academic and administrative audit. He now understands its purpose as to why it is being done because they could explain to the Government that they are doing it. According to him, even expenditure audit should also be there because

money saved is money earned. He has been giving one suggestion for the last about one year that a pool of drivers should be made because some of the drivers are overloaded and some are sitting idle. They should contemplate as to how they could make maximum utilization of available resources. But he is sorry to say that no action has been taken by the University authorities in this regard. Secondly, all the big companies did not purchase new buses/cars as they hire the same. Ultimately, they realized that it proved cheaper as they saved a lot of money on account of salary to the driver, cost of petrol, maintenance, repair, etc. On the other hand, the University purchases cars, etc., which gave mileage of only 7 kmpl and if one is to purchase a car for his own use, he would never purchase such a car. According to him, hiring of cars is cheaper. So far as students are concerned, he felt pained to see that poor students suffer a lot. Even the scholarship is not given to them in time and they are compelled to take loans from the money lenders to pay fees and the amount of scholarship went in the interest alone. Sometimes the teachers have to pay fees on behalf of their students, which the students returned after getting the scholarship. Even though the University has the amount of scholarships of the students with them, it asked the students to pay the fees and later on give them the scholarship. When the University has to pay the amount of scholarships to the students, why it took fees from them? Though the income from the hostels is being shown Rs.19 lac, but in fact, the income from the hostel is Rs.7.5 crore. In fact, the income to the hostels is coming from guest charges, which meant illegal persons are staying there.

On a point of order, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the regular students should not be called illegal students.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the meritorious students are not getting accommodation in the hostels. The students, including the girl students, of Department of Evening Studies, who got first positions in the University as well as gold medals, did not get accommodation in the hostels and were forced to stay as paying guests in the city. For girls to take admissions in the Department of Evening Studies, the condition is not there that they should be serving somewhere.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, referring to page 39 of Appendix-I, stated that earlier the Budget allocation for P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, for purchase of books was Rs.5.18 lac and in the year 2013-14, it was raised to Rs.7.30 lac. Similarly, in the year 2014-15, it was raised to Rs.8 lac. But the proposal budget provision for the coming year (i.e. 2015-16), it has been reduced to Rs.5 lac after imposition of cut, which is improper because the budget provision for purchase of books should always increase. On the one hand, they are insisting upon that research should be promoted and for the same more and more seminars should be conducted, but for the coming year only Rs.50,000/- has been allocated for P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, which is insufficient. The Bar Council of India team visited P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, which found shortage of classrooms. Thereafter, the Vice-Chancellor also visited P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, and approved construction of 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, which would add more classrooms enabling them to meet the shortage of classrooms and also starting of certain new courses. Though they had recommended in a meeting held several months ago that LL.M. should be started at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, the recommendations have not been placed before the Syndicate hitherto. He urged that the said recommendations should be placed before the Syndicate at the earliest so that they could start LL.M. course at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, from the ensuing session. So far as reduction of expenditure and enhancement of income of the University is concerned, he suggested that a Committee comprising Economists, Financial experts, from University Business School, etc., who should advise the University throughout the year as to how income could be increased/generated. If they have spare land, they could construct a Mall, which should be given on rent. In this way, they could generate some income to the University. In nutshell, he said that for increasing the income of the University, they should make all out efforts.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that, as said by Professor Keshav Malhotra, money saved is money earned. If they look at page IV of the Appendix, they would see that they are paying Rs.4 lac as electricity and water charges and the revised estimates are Rs.7.45 lac, but in this the electricity charges of the hostels have not been included. The electricity bill of none of the hostel is less than Rs.1.5 lac for a period of two months. Since they had 17 hostels, the minimum electricity bill of these hostels might be approximately Rs.170 lac. As such, they are paying Rs.900 lac as electricity charges. He has come to know that in several Departments old air-conditioners have been installed, the electricity consumption of which is 15 ampere to 20 ampere. The persons, who had got projects, should be encouraged to purchase and install 5-Star rating air-conditioners, which could work with 5 ampere. Similarly, in every building, there are 5-6 search lights having 400 watts, which consumes a lot of electricity as these lights normally remained switched on from 6.00 p.m. to 6.00 a.m. (12 hours a day). Since nowadays 50 watts LED lights are easily available, which produced light equivalent to 400 watts, the search lights should be replaced with LED lights. If they go towards energy auditing (replacement of search lights with LED lights and installation of solar system as said by Dr. Dalip Kumar, he was sure that this expenditure on electricity, which is of Rs.900 lac, would definitely come down to Rs.600 lac. Referring to Item 20 (Sub-Item 3), he stated that the Committee has made its recommendations regarding manpower auditing and multi-disciplinary departments. In Panjab University, there are four Departments for Foreign Languages, namely Department of Russian, Department of Chinese, Department of Tibetan (each with one teacher), Department of French and German (with four teachers). If they club them and make a single Department, i.e., Department of Foreign Languages, they would save a lot of manpower. This has already been suggested several times. In the end, he suggested that the University Website should be made more attractive and should also make efforts to increase the number of foreign students because the Website of the University nowhere encourages the foreign students.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated a good part of their Budget is being spent by the Construction Office. In the year 2012-13, Rs.3.15 crore were allocated to the Construction Office for renovation of bath-rooms of residential areas. For the last more than 2 years, he has been demanding, both orally and in writing also, whether the allocated money has been spent, but no record is being given. He failed to understand, why the record is not being given. Secondly, whenever any estimate for Construction Office, it is always more than the market. Everybody knew how their Construction Office worked. He has requested the Registrar to transfer the persons working in the Special Cell for SC/ST to bring in improvements in the effective working of Special Cell for SC/ST. Since the people belonging to SC/ST Categories were facing a lot of problems, the Vice-Chancellor constituted a Committee, which has made certain recommendations. Though different Ministries are providing different welfare schemes and scholarships to the SC/ST students, due to ineffective working of the SC/ST Cell, maximum students are deprived of these schemes/scholarships. A lot of hue and cry was made by the SC/ST students when the SC/ST Cell of Panjab University has not properly followed the welfare schemes/scholarships meant for SC/ST students due to which the students had suffered. The concerned University employees reasoned that they are not at fault, which was also accepted by University, but when a complaint was made to National Commission for SC/ST, it marked an enquiry to Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Haryana. He humbly requested that this should not be taken lightly. In fact, they should give regard to SC/ST people and extend all facilities, which have been given to them by the Governments. They should not victimize these people just because of the attitude of certain people. In the end, he urged the Vice-Chancellor to take care of the problems highlighted by him.

Professor Ronki Ram, referring to Item C-19 ( Sub item 7), stated that the proposed plan of concrete flooring of backside streets of B,C, and D type houses in Panjab University Campus Sector 14, be extended up to E type of houses. On an experimental basis, firstly, 20 houses of E-type houses should be covered for concrete flooring. He further stated that they had a lot of property in different cities not only in Punjab but also outside the Punjab. They made a very intelligent exercise in renovating



the Teachers Holiday Home, Shimla during the tenure of Professor R.C. Sobti as Vice-Chancellor. They had also a big estate namely Dingle Estate, where they could construct a Community Centre, which could be given on rent for holding the functions. In this way, they could earn crores of rupees. Similarly, they had property at Shimla and other places. They could make an exercise to know as to how much property they had and how much income could be generated from them. They should know as to where their markets are and what income comes from there. He knew that it is not good to earn Rs.1 crore or so through fees, but at the same time should know where they are incurring expenditure and from where the income is coming. They are not public enterprises and big corporate house. In fact, they are an academic Institution, and 90% of their Budget goes in payment (of salaries). Whatever they get come from examination fee and other fees. Whenever they visited Punjabi University, Patiala, , Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, and Delhi University, they are charged a sum between Rs.1,000/- and Rs.1,500/- at their Guest Houses, but in the Panjab University Guest House not much is being charged. Hence, they could increase the rates of Guest House, Faculty House, etc. Though a lot of construction works are being carried out by the Panjab University Construction Office, the estimates of the Panjab University Construction Offices are always higher than the outside agencies. They must regulate it ask the Executive Engineer/s to minimize their estimates. In the end, he suggested that certain rooms of Guest House and Faculty House should be earmarked for the Fellows.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that some of his friends had talked about hostels' income and expenditure and he would like to clarify a few things. In fact, how they had worked now, it had been working like this for the last 30-40 years. What they charge from the students is – electricity charges, water charges, dilapidation fee and maintenance charges and out of that 75% of the rent, water charges and dilapidation fee is sent for inclusion in the Non-Plan Budget of the University. When they talk about income from the hostels as far as Budget is concerned, the income is only from the rent and the rest of the items (water charges and dilapidation fee) might have been reflected somewhere else. In fact, they sent Rs.1 crore to the University and not only Rs.18-20 lac as has been reflected from the hostels and the other things were being reflected somewhere else. However, the students consider everything (rent, electricity charges, water charges, dilapidation fee) as fee. So far as electricity charges are concerned, the hostels collect those charges and pay to the Engineering Department of Chandigarh Administration. So far as maintenance is concerned, about Rs.10,000/- is reflected in the Budget, but the Hostel, which has about 400 students, could not be maintained for a year with a meagre amount of Rs.10,000/-. They charged roughly a sum of Rs.1,000/- annually from a student, which goes to maintenance account from where the hostels are being maintained. So far as reflection of that in the University Budget is concerned, he did not think that there could be any problem in future. They have just to consolidate the income and expenditure and, in future, they could make it a part of the University Budget as an Annexure. So far as appointments (of *ad hoc* persons) in the Dean Students Welfare (DSW) Office are concerned, he stated that no appointment has been made by the DSW during the last 1½ years or so and anybody could check the same. So far as appointments (of daily wagers) in hostels are concerned, since there was emergency as the new hostels are to be started and only a part of the staff was provided by the University, rest of the staff, especially attendants were appointed, because the girls' hostels cannot work without the attendants. Initially, they had made some appointments without advertisement. However, after that the posts were advertised, interviews held and selections made involving Establishment Branch. As such, the appointments were made after following due procedures. Besides, emergencies do occur when some of the attendants go on long leave or are not available due to one reason or the other, especially in girls' hostels, they have to make some appointments on temporary basis, for which the Wardens seek approval from the DSW Office and the DSWs permit them. The students were talking to him and there are few suggestions from the students, which he wanted to raise on the floor of the House. The students were questioning as to why they are going in for the fee hike as there could be some other avenues. The other avenues, which they have suggested, are increase in Central Government as well as Punjab Government allocations of funds, which of course, the University is trying. So far as Punjab

Government is concerned, he did not think that the Punjab Government would agree to that though they are trying at their level best to get the previous years' deficit from the Punjab Government. The students were also demanding that the rent of the all the shops and canteens should be revised by the University, which is possible and they must do that. The students also wanted double fold increase in the rate of private and commercial activities except the activities organized by the University students. The students were pointing out that there are several private parties and other parties which are using the facilities of the University, but unfortunately the rates for the private parties are very low and the students wanted double fold increase in those rate. He had already constituted a Committee so far as the rates for holding activities by the private parties around the Students Centre are concerned, but they could appoint another Committee at the University level so that they could increase income from those sources. Of course, they could make an effort to include the income from all sources in the main Budget. Another thing is social audit, which meant total transparency as far as income and expenditure is concerned. Nowadays, since it is an era of transparency, they should go in for it.

On a point of order, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since the Registrar has a lot of experience in estate affairs, he should give special attention and focus on estate from where they could generate income of crores and crores of rupees.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she mentioned about this in the last meeting of the Syndicate also, wherein the Vice-Chancellor had said that something is being done towards that. The financial provision for Panjab University Committee against sexual harassment is not being reflected in the Budget. The Committee was constituted in July 2013 in accordance with the Act and it was a well meaning Committee, but she was wondering how has the expenditure been met? There must have been some meetings of the Committee for which they must have paid T.A./D.A., hospitality/lunch, etc. to the outstation members and honorarium also to the members because no member came to attend the meeting unless there is provision for these things. She wanted to know what has happened during the last 1½ years and wherefrom the money had come; otherwise, if they had made a Committee for heck of it, it is of no use. She felt that they should be more serious about that. Since she was a member of various such Committees, she knew that when the outstation members come, they have to provide reasonable lunch and give them reasonable/respectable amount as honorarium. Somebody should respond as to what they were doing during the last 1½ years.

Shri Munish Verma stated that on page 5 at serial number 18, it has been mentioned that the income from Dean of Student Welfare is Rs.19.50 lac during the year 2009-10 and the expenditure is Rs.2.37 crore. He wanted to know as to how many students reside in the Hostels. Dean of Student Welfare is the mother of the Hostels as is the Vice-Chancellor in the case of the University and its affiliated Colleges. To take care of the students and the hostels is the responsibility of Dean of Student Welfare. On an average about 500 students reside in a hostel and there are 17 hostels in the University. Since they charged about Rs.8,500/- from a student, the total income comes Rs.7,22,50,000/- per annum. About 92% funds came from the Central Government and a grant of Rs.16 crore from the Punjab Government. The Government of India has said that they would give actual of the deficit to the Panjab University. They are generating an income of about Rs.7 crore from the hostels and the same is not being reflected in the Budget, who is responsible for that. What would they like to show by getting these funds audited privately? Shri Raghbir Dyal has also pointed out this earlier, but why they making the same mistake again and again. At pages 85 to 93, the income generated from Guest House, Faculty House, Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla, Students' Holiday Home, Dalhousie, has been shown, but no income from Golden Jubilee Guest House, has been shown. An FDR of Rs.50 lac has been shown to be made in the Registrar. What would they like to show? Similarly, sports funds have been charged from the students of affiliated Colleges and through that a sum of Rs.10 crore has been collected. Where did that money go? He said that his dissent should be recorded as did not want to become a part to the approval to the Budget.

Professor R.S. Jhanji stated that, in fact, he has not been able to go through the Budget thoroughly as he has received it very late. Even then, he has 2-3 observations to make. He has just come to know that there is no provision for Holiday Homes even though they are raising and collecting Holiday Homes funds from the teachers for the last so many years. Majority of them sitting here might not be knowing that there are two sets of accommodation of Teacher's Holiday Home, Shimla – one with even numbers and another with odd numbers. All the colleagues preferred even numbers accommodation as washrooms attached to them are of western style, whereas washrooms attached to the odd numbers accommodation are of Indian style, which caused a lot of inconvenience to the old age colleagues. He is pained to see that though the people are complaining for renovation of these washrooms for the last so many years, but nothing has been done hitherto. In fact, proper maintenance and tiling of kitchens and washrooms is absolutely necessary as so many persons stayed at Holiday Home, Shimla. So far as raising of revenue is concerned, he would like to give just the example of his College. Earlier the electricity bill of his College was to tune of Rs.80,000/- p.m., but after installation of solar poles/lamps, the electricity bill has been reduced to the level of 50% and during the last 3 years, there is no expenditure on maintenance/repair. Earlier, they in the College were also struggling with the problem of arranging funds for paying electricity bills. Though they were collecting funds amounting to lacs of Rupees from the College students in the name of sports and bhavans, the same was not reflected in the University Budget. Where those funds were going? Similarly, they have collected so much funds in the name of sports, but they could not be spent for payment of salary to the staff. Funds collected in the name of sports, stipend and development should be used for providing facilities to the students, instead of paying salary to clerks, groundmen, other staff appointed on contract/temporary basis. Though the Colleges also have inadequate resources, they did not use student's funds for payment of salary to the staff. So far as hostel and sports funds are concerned, these should be got properly audited so that there could be transparency. When the hostels funds are not being properly audited as per the accounting procedures naturally problems are bound to arise and the students have to agitate. Only one cash Book is maintained, but the same has also shortcomings as opening and closing balance is not maintained in the Cash Book. As such, there are certain procedural lapses. Resultantly several FDRs have been made by the University. Though a hostel room is meant for one student, they allowed 3 students in it and charged full room rent from all of them, instead of proportionate room rent. All these issues should be got examined by constituting a separate Committee. He urged that the so called private funds (hostel and sports funds) should also be reflected in the main Budget of the University so these could also be accounted for as per the Accounts Manual, and if need be, a Committee should be constituted to look into the whole matter. They have been requesting more often than not that they should set their house in order. Majority of the Departments have not sufficient information for giving speedy reply. Even the Fellows are not given proper reply. Similar is the problem in the case of students and their parents. As such, everybody is being harassed. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to give necessary instructions to all concerned.

Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang stated that she would like to draw the attention of the House towards the academic developments/activities of various Departments. She pointed out that certain Departments are being discriminated against while allocating funds to them for the academic development/activities. No policy has been evolved for allocation of funds for such activities. Some Departments have been allocated just a sum of Rs.20,000/- p.a. and some other Rs.75,000/- p.m. for academic activities, e.g., holding of seminars, lectures, etc. They are well aware that even payment of T.A./D.A. could be made to the experts/resource persons out of Rs.20,000/- p.a., and how any development could be made with this meagre amount. She suggested that a policy should be framed to determine the amount to be allocated to different Departments. They are trying to generate resources. She had visited certain Universities/ Institutes and found that they are charging more than Rs.1000/- as guest house charges even though they provide less facilities compared to facilities provided in the Panjab University Guest House. She therefore suggested that they should also enhance the Guest House charges.

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that the scholarships which they are giving to the students for academics and sports are good, but his only submission is that normally the sportspersons are not good in academics; however, there are sportspersons, who are good in academics also. He suggested that a limit should be fixed, e.g., at least 10 sportspersons of national level and 10 for those sportspersons who are excellent in sports as well as in academics should be felicitated at the Annual Function held for the purpose so that the students are encouraged and motivated to take up sports and vice versa. He added that the developed countries wanted their youth to be healthy and good in academics as well.

Dr. Kuldeep Singh stated that they should go in for green audit energy, e.g., install solar system, LED lights, etc., which would not only save most of the expenditure, but also make the environment healthy. Since the Punjab Government had started giving grant to the University for the Constituent Colleges, they should start appointing Principals and teachers immediately and, if possible, on regular basis so that the study of the students does not suffer. Referring to page 82 of the Appendix-I, he stated that they are collecting Rs.60/- per student from the affiliated colleges for Students' Holiday Home and had already collected lacs of rupees, but they are not providing any facility to the students as the Students' Holiday Home, Dalhousie is in a dilapidated condition. If they could not provide any facility, they should not charge the students.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that he is not obsessed with the world ranking but he would still like to carry out comparison with other Universities around the world and see how they are progressing economically and do not have any kind of funding problem, which this University is facing. There are three areas in which, he thought, the Universities which have been ranked top 100 are making money and three fronts on which the Panjab University is lacking. One foreign students, if they look at the Universities in India, the only University doing well is University of Poona, Pune, which is earning Rs.80 crore from the foreign students alone (8,000 foreign students). If they look at the Universities in the West, 80% to 90% of their Budget is taken care of by foreign students, but the Panjab University has not made any effort at all. They did not advertise, their Website is rather shoddy and they do not attract foreign students. Secondly, Universities in the West earn money through the endowments. He wondered what kind of endowments they are getting from their alumni because that really needed to be taken care of. If they look at the endowments of the Universities, which are at the top, they would be taken aback because the endowment of Trinity College at Cambridge is equivalent to the whole financial Budget of Punjab State. Thirdly, he had also raised the issue in the last meeting of the Senate that do we make any money from the University Press. He remembered 15-20 years ago, they used to publish a lot of books which were then prescribed for Colleges all around Punjab. They had around 190 affiliated Colleges. Are they now publishing those kind of books at the undergraduate level to begin with and making money out of it. He did not think that the press is really doing its job because if they look at some of the University Presses in the West to which they are trying to compare themselves, they would see that their earnings run into millions because they have outlets, they are selling books, they are printing quality books, and they are not only printing books of people within the University, but there are others who send their manuscripts because they are all peer reviewed and, therefore, they are making a lot of money out of publishing quality books. Lastly, if they look at the report by NAAC and what really they were looking for, he thought that there also they were suffering. One little question which the NAAC Team asked "how many smart classrooms do you have". Do we make any provision in this particular Budget for smart classrooms because they (NAAC) said that Department of English & Cultural Studies had about 300 students; how many smart classrooms are there, to which they (people from the Department of English) replied that they had one smart classroom. On the other hand, they asked, did they use the Power Point Presentations, to which they (faculty of Department of English) said yes they do. They asked from where. The classroom where he teaches did not have even a plug to plug in his laptop because there is no action on that front at all. He thought that in this Budget they must ensure that it is not the buildings which are finally going to bring merit to the University. He knew that they have

to grow, he knew they have to construct hostels, etc., he knew the usual kind of cultural conditioning of saving electricity, solar energy, etc. that is going to make only some difference, but not a tangible substantial difference. The difference will be if they have better libraries, if they ensure that there are more funds for research and also have 7-8 smart classrooms in almost every Department. As regards foreign students are concerned, they do not even have a decent eating place where they could actually have a decent cup of coffee and a sandwich. In fact, the foreign students say that whenever they have to eat, they have to go to the Students Centre, which is rather pathetic.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that he has to make 2-3 suggestions and first related to P.U. Regional/Rural Centres and P.U. Constituent Colleges and they are really feeling financial crunch because they did not have any money available even the money which are available at the disposal of the Principals of affiliated Colleges, i.e., Amalgamated Fund. At least they could allocate some part of the Amalgamated Fund, which could be spent by the Directors of P.U. Regional/Rural Centres and Principals of P.U. Constituent Colleges from time to time. Secondly, the process of recruitment both in the University, P.U. Regional/Rural Centres and P.U. Constituent Colleges must continue because they could not allow the education and process of research to suffer. But his only concern is that whether they are allowing appointment of temporary faculty/guest faculty blindly without seeing their actual workload. The recruitment/ guest faculty should be allowed only in those Departments, where actually the teachers are required. In certain language Departments, though the workload is less, the number of teachers is more. In such cases, the work from the surplus teachers could be taken in some other departments. So far as parking problem in the University is concerned, once they had already passed that they will go in for multi storey parking in the University. When he was a member of the Board of Finance, the proposal of multi storey parking was approved, but the same did not materialize due to shortage of funds. Now they should definitely think about it. Since he has to leave early for some urgent work, the items of urgent nature (appointment of Dean, College Development Council) should be taken up for consideration immediately.

Dr. Emanuel Nahar pointed that no budgetary provision in this year's budget has been made for Centre for the Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy and Dr. Ambedkar Centre. Though the funds would come to these Centres from the Central Government, it will take time. He, therefore, suggested that some funds should be allocated to both the Centres so that they could arrange academic activities. He further said that he agreed with Dr. Ajay Ranga that the SC/ST students faced a lot of problems in getting scholarships. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to look into the problem. So far as funds of hostels are concerned, they did not have any objection if a committee is constituted to look into the matter or if any Hon'ble member of this house wished he could check their record.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Principal Gurdip Sharma and Principal R.S. Jhanji, stated that though they are collecting a lot of money from the teachers' remuneration towards Faculty House, Holiday Homes and renovation has been done during the last 4-5 years, the renovation has not been done properly. The work relating to fixation of tiles still needed to be done. Earlier, the sanitary work relating to connecting the water of toilets, wash basin, etc. used to be connected with the overhead water tank, but after the renovation, the same has been connected with the fresh water connection. He remarked that the curtains provided in the Faculty House are so thin that anybody could see through them and the guests could not maintain their privacy. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to get these problems rectified. So far as air conditioning of Faculty House is concerned, nothing has been done in this regard so far.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that he would like to make a couple of suggestions. The first one is that for preparing the budget, as in Legislatures, they should have an Estimates Committee and Public Accounts Committee. The Estimates Committee should collect the information and make the estimates and then prepare the budget. The Public Accounts Committee would be the one which should get all the papers audited as the same has been seen by him in several departments when he was the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. Thereafter, neither any audit report is required nor any objection is raised by the Audit Department. He has seen since the inception of this University, the number of girl students in this University used to be 10% only and now number of girl students has rose to about 65%, but the number of hostels for them is too less than the requirement. He did not want that their daughters and children, who came from rural areas or from outside, live at the mercy of landlord, who charged between Rs.4000/- and Rs.5500/- p.m. from each of them. So far as raising of funds is concerned, there was a time when they used to earn about Rs.21 crore from the NRI students. Unfortunately, an error has been made and the definition of NRI has been mixed up with the children of NRIs. Last year, a Committee was constituted comprising Dean of University Instructions, Dean, International Students. He added that there is a judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in a case P.A. Enamdar versus State of Maharashtra (Para 131) and in this case the Hon'ble Supreme Court has said that 15% seats could be earmarked for NRIs/their children/wards. In fact, NRI is a separate category and NRIs' children are a separate category. An attempt was made that a large number of NRI were denied admissions, and they took admissions in private Institutions. In this regard, he would suggest that more and more liberal guidelines/rules should be framed for the NRI's/NRI's children/wards so that they could take admissions in this University and the University earn some extra funds from them. He had talked to certain NRIs who are willing to give Rs.4-5 lacs for construction of room in the hostel where NRIs or children/wards could stay while they study in the University. He suggested that a plan in this regard should be prepared as there are a number of NRIs who are prepared to give money equivalent to construction cost of a room. They should not hesitate to get help from those persons and utilize the money for construction of rooms in the hostel so that they could provide facilities to the students and if need be, some portion of the money which they had collected from the students should also be used for the purpose otherwise they are not getting any substantial amount as interest from that money. He has always been saying that this University is a premier institution and while they are not appointing Director, Physical Education, whom now they have appointed. They had a plan to get some grant for laying of Astroturf and also given the contract for the purpose. He had also talked to the Director and suggested that when the Astroturf would be ready, they would call all the Olympians of Punjab and media persons so that players are encouraged to take up the game of hockey. In this way, they would be able to produce large number of Olympians. In the end, he reiterated that to take care of the budget and audit objections, they should appoint Estimates Committee and Public Accounts Committee so that accountability is there.

Shri Naresh Gaur stated that they were demanding that a certificate should be given that all the income and expenditure relating to University hostels has been included in the budget, but the Vice-Chancellor gave only a statement which they believed to be true. Earlier, an increase was allowed with the condition that the increase of Rs.1800/- should be implemented by only those colleges/institutions, which gave retirement benefits to their staff members, but that assurance has not been fulfilled. It has been going on for the last 45-60 years, but they are still allowing it to continue. When they do see the problem, they should rectify the same. When somebody, including the students, write letter/send e-mail to the Chancellor, they objected to it saying why they had approached the Chancellor directly. There must have been some reasons as to why they chose to approach the Chancellor. Instead of appreciating them they are criticizing them. Had they adopted proper system of accounting, the students might not have approached the Chancellor. He, therefore, urged that the income from hostel fees, etc. should be properly reflected in the University budget because the nomenclature of

private fund is not proper as is being done by the governments. The nomenclature of private fund, perhaps, gives a wrong impression. As suggested by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, a hostel has been constructed at the Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana by incurring a huge expenditure. He had also raised the issue in the Syndicate meeting, he is again requesting that LLM should be started at Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana to begin with 10 seats. If they processed the case for starting LLM course at Ludhiana now, only then they would be able to start the course from the session 2015-16. Last year, they had allowed 5% hike in fee with the condition that the enhanced fee would be used for giving freships to the poor students. He should be informed as to how the enhanced amount has been used during the last one year. In the end, he reiterated that hostel fund should be reflected in the University budget.

Principal Tarlok Bandhu, referring to page 47 of Appendix-II, stated that though they are incurring an expenditure of Rs.62,69,700/- at Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni, they are not offering any Bachelor of Education programme there. Referring to page 51 of Appendix-I, he stated that a provision of Rs.60,000/- had been made for the years 2014-15 and 2015-16 in the name of cost of printing and paper. He was sorry to point out that no issue of P.U. News had been published during the last 4 years. He enquired where the funds allocated for the purpose have been utilized. Moreover, since Director, Public Relations has been appointed on regular basis, the P.U. News Magazine should be published regularly. He further stated that in the Budget Estimates, it has been shown that the Department of Education has 10 faculty positions, whereas in accordance with the new NCTE Regulations 2014, which had been circulated to the affiliated Colleges of Education, the total faculty positions should be 40 because four courses are being offered there.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that there are a good number of shops at the Panajb University Campus. For the last 4-5 years, the rent from the 90% of the shops has not been paid by the shopkeepers and the Estate Office of the Panjab University has issued notices to the defaulters. Resultantly, an amount of about Rs.2-3 crore has been held up with the defaulters. The system needs to be streamlined. The Panjab University Students Council has suggested for open auction of the shops. He suggested that to generate more revenue, the new shopping complex should be put on rent through open auction. The estate office should evolve an effective mechanism to realize money from the University properties. So far as making of income and expenditure a part of the Budget is concerned, as said by Professor Navdeep Goyal, it could be made a part of the University Budget in future, but some funds should be made available to the Wardens for meeting day-to-day expenditure. However, he failed to understand as to how the funds like income and expenditure of hostels and sports were being shown as private funds for the last so many years. During the last 1½-2 years, there is an improvement in the functioning of the Panjab University Publication Bureau, but it is not known where the publications are. He suggested that the books published by Publication Bureau should be stored and an outlet book shop should be opened. The allocation of funds for organizing seminars in Social Science Departments and Language Departments has not been revised for the last 7 years. The allocated amount of Rs. 15,000/- to 20,000/- is not sufficient for holding seminars. To organize even small seminar at least Rs.50,000/- is required. As such, there should be a provision of minimum amount of Rs.35,000/- for the purpose and the rest of the money could be arranged by the concerned department from other sources. To promote solar energy, the Chandigarh Administration is providing funds for solar system. The solar system could be installed at the top of the buildings like girls hostels where sufficient space is available. The University can reduce its power bill by 4-5 crore annually as the University is already paying about Rs.9 crores as electricity charges annually. About the library facility, he stated that initially the main library was meant for about 4,000 students, but the number of users has risen to 14000-15000. To reduce the congestion in the Main Library, since the departmental libraries have the required number of books, tables, chairs and air conditioners should be provided there. Regarding revenue generation from Guest Houses, he stated that there is a variation in the rates of Alumni House, Colleges Bhawan, ICSSR which are Rs.1500/-, 500/- and Rs. 600/- respectively, whereas for the Guest House, it is Rs.300/- for the guest. He

suggested that it should be raised minimum to Rs.500/- because in the hotels of Chandigarh, the minimum room rent is Rs.3500/-. The rate of all the guest houses within the University should at least be at par.

Professor Anil Monga stated that, as said by Professor Shelley Walia, in foreign University resources are generated through endowments. Recently, India passed a Legislation in 2013 through which the Corporate Houses have to contribute about 2%. They as a University should made conscious efforts, if need be, through a Committee, that money which the Industrial Houses might be giving, has not reached to the Educational Institutions. If that money comes to the Universities, it would be good.

Dr. N.R. Sharma stated that, as per latest norms of the NCTE, for the curriculum only terminal SIT is there and interaction has been made compulsory, which is not possible on the part of the Colleges. If interaction is done by the University and Corporate Colleges, perhaps, they would get the facilities and in this way, the funds would also be generated by the University. Though he had made a written request to the Vice-Chancellor, and once again requests him (Vice-Chancellor) that there are not even basic facilities in the Department of Education. Even proper washroom is not there for men and women. Since the number of Colleges has now increased, there is not proper arrangement for the sitting of students at the time of meetings of the Research Degree Committees. Sometimes the students are asked to sit in the Library, which is very small, or sometimes the students are asked to sit outside. He pleaded that such like small facilities must be provided in the Department of Education. As said by Professor Shelley Walia, they must make provision for smart classrooms and some funds should also be allocated for maintenance purpose.

Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu stated that though he had brought to their notice earlier, would again like to bring to their notice that the Research Journal Science is not being brought out regularly. The hard copy of issue of 2013 has come in January 2015, and the hard copy of the issue of 2014 is still awaited. There must have been some reason due to which the issue of Research Journal Science for the year 2014 is late. Nowadays, almost all the Journals are on-line, therefore, the Research Journal Science should also be made on-line and with that the publication of the same would perhaps be fast. Secondly, since a hard copy of the Journals is supplied to all the life members, which might be costly, and if the journal is made on-line, that cost would be saved.

Professor Mukesh Arora stated that the girl students are facing hostel problems. Why they are not constructing more hostels for the girls. When more hostels are being constructed for the boy students, why not for the girls? Secondly, the members, who are the Wardens of the Hostels are honest and worked sincerely because he knew how difficult it is to work as Warden. Even if the work is going on smoothly, there is no harm if the income and expenditure of the hostels is reflected in the University Budget. Thirdly, when he went out, he has seen some of the students, whose shirts were torn. On an enquiry, the students told him that they have been beaten up by the security personnel. If the students are listened to, half of their problems would be automatically solved.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that he strongly condemned the incident of beating up of one of the students by the security personnel. In fact, it is the second such incident of beating the students. Through this brutality what would they like to show? Whether the students would be tackled with force? He urged the Vice-Chancellor to send a representative to enquire as to what has happened to the students. He further stated that so far as Budget is concerned, his focus would be on cutting the expenditure and optimum use of renewable resources available. As they had discussed many times earlier, the University should be made a vehicle free zone. Secondly, to resolve the parking problem, they should construct multi-level parking for use by the people who worked around the campus, which would be hassle free and also generate income for the University. Two three separate gates should be constructed for use of multi level parking. The employees who are living in the same sector should be encouraged not to use the



vehicles and should come to their offices on foot, and only physically challenged could use their vehicles, but with permission. Thirdly, since rain water harvesting is a good source, with this they could cut down their expenditure as the water so collected should be used for purposes other than drinking. As per the Photo Voltaic Solar Hours, the Chandigarh region, including the entire belt of Shivalik Foothills belt, is placed at third place, where they could optimally use Solar and Natural Energy. Any new building which is to be erected must have this facility. So far as income and expenditure of hostels is concerned, he felt that there is lack of coordination between Dean of Student Welfare and Panjab University Students Council. He came to know when he met the Vice-Chancellor in the Open Air Theatre, that even the Panjab University Students Council was not invited to the programme. In fact, the basic idea for having the Students Council is to promote academic and cultural environment in the campus. Hence, they should not be shunted out like this. Even if the students were wrong, being an elder/teacher/professor, the Dean of Student Welfare is expected to protect the interest of the students. He suggested that the members of Students' Council should be associated with the hostel committee so that they are apprised of as to what are the expenditure and income and taken into confidence while generating the resources. If students are involved in the matters relating to them, almost all the problems relating to them would be solved amicably. One of the ways to increase the income of the University is that they should increase the guest house charges to Rs.1000/- per day. He further suggested that LL.M. course with minimum of 50 seats should be started in the evening shift as his colleagues, the Advocates from the Punjab and Haryana High Court, are repeatedly making enquiry from him about the same, through which they could earn Rs.1 crore approximately.

Shri Deepak Kaushik, referring to allegation that the security personnel has beaten the students, stated that it is easy to level allegation, but it should be verified and, if they are found guilty, they should be taken to task. However, the security personnel could not beat the students as they are not competent to do so since they had not even lathies and also the orders in this regard instead the security personnel have been beaten up on numerous occasions. So far as the statement of Dr. Ajay Ranga that the employees of Special Cell for SC/ST has not followed the scholarships of the students properly and to the complaint of the students an enquiry is to be conducted by Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Haryana is concerned, the concerned employees might be transferred, if found guilty. As far as the statement of Principal R.S. Jhanji that the students, their parents and general public is suffering because the employees of the Administrative Block are not attending to them properly is concerned, the allegation is not true because here the employees more often than not worked almost 11-12 hours. Hence, they had also some responsibility towards them to see under what conditions the employees of the Administrative Block are working. The staff members of the General Branch, particularly Syndicate/Senate Section have been seen working till midnight/1.30 a.m. He pleaded that a Committee should be constituted to see the difficulties under which the employees of the Administrative Block are working. Although about 2000 persons made enquiries through Single Window daily, they are dealt with properly. Though there are two phones, one could pick up only one phone at a time due to which sometimes certain calls could not be attended to. So far as parking problem is concerned, he said that about 6-7 years ago, it was decided that the pond in front of the Administrative Block should be converted into parking place, but since the Architect had objected saying that it is heritage, the plan/decision could not be implemented. Moreover, since the parking of vehicles is not being allowed around the Administrative Block, the employees have to park their vehicles near the Department of Zoology or Gymnasium Hall. Resultantly, they got late for attending to their duties.

Professor Keshav Malhotra, referring to putting of ropes along one side of the road near the Administrative Block, remarked that in the space which has been covered by the ropes and barricades, the cars could be parked.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that he understand that all of them agreed that the Universities are democratic Institutions. According to the principles, nowadays it is very necessary that the students need reforms in the form of their participation in the

administrative affairs of educational Institutions, which is very important. He did not understand as to why the students have to agitate against their administrators/teachers. Instead of allowing the situation to reach at a high level, they should resolve the issue in the beginning if they (University authorities) think that the demand/s of the students is/are genuine. All the financial problems of the University would have been solved, had it been made a National Institution, which could not happen due to their own reason/s. Due to shortage of funds, they had made less recruitment, which is not a good solution. From the documents made available to him by the students, he comprehended that it is a matter of Rs.5-6 crore only, for which a Resolution should be passed by this August House requesting the Central Government to provide funds to the University and at the same time direct the Punjab Government to fulfil its constitutional commitment. They were talking about hostels for the students as majority of students belonged to Punjab, Haryana and other places, who came to Panjab University for study. The expenditure which they incurred for the comfortable stay of those students, the burden of the same should not be shifted to the students in one form or the other. If the students felt that the burden on them is more, they should take them into confidence and found an amicable solution. Though this issue had been raised about a year ago, he did not know whether any effort has been made by the University authorities in this regard. They should not think that the Students' Council is a formality, but should try to solve their problems like parents. If they treat the students like their sons and daughters and solve their problems, the atmosphere of the University remained peaceful. If the incident narrated by Dr. Mukesh Arora is true, they should treat the students with sensitivity so that there is no grudge in the minds of the students. It has everything to do with the Budget proposal as such, fee should not be increased unless the Governments strongly say that they would not give the money to the University. They should not commercialize the education as they are here to impart education and not to sell it.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, referring to the suggestion of Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa for starting LL.M. in the evening shift, stated that they are requesting the University authorities in writing for the last three years that LL.M. course should be allowed to them. In the Department of Laws, the LL.M. (2-Year) course has been converted into LL.M. (1-Year) course. As suggested by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, they are prepared to take LL.M. (Evening) as well as through Distance Education, whichever the University authorities deem fit, the same should be given to them. He had a meeting with the faculty members, and the members are ready/willing to share the workload of the proposed course. He pleaded that the proposed LL.M. course should be started from the next academic session (2015-16).

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the video relating to the incident narrated by Dr. Mukesh Arora is available. In fact, the student, who was sitting near the Vice-Chancellor's Office, was wobbling. When the Security Officer questioned him, somebody commented that he might have been drunk. He was examined and left. The students started protesting over the issue and they pounced upon the security officer. Only the pocket of one of the students had been torn. All this has been videographed and one can see it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the students have not complained against the security staff. They have specifically mentioned that the Chief Security Officer has dragged somebody, who was sitting on hunger strike, and said that the students are drunk and he will get them medically examined, but he did not believe it. So far as parking is concerned, unless and until there is earmarking of the parking space or somebody to guide as to where the Senators should park their cars, how do they know as to where could they park their vehicles. He said that when he came to attend the meeting and wanted to park his car where already 2-3 cars were parked, the security staff did not allow him to park his car and when he asked as to why others have been allowed to park their cars here. The security people said those persons, whose cars have been parked, would be coming back within a few minutes. When he asked the security staff as to whether they know him (Shri Goyal), they replied that they know him, but it is their duty as they have been instructed by the Registrar not to allow parking of the vehicles here.

In fact, this has happened with him for the third time. He could very well understand that the Panjab University is being converted into a cantonment now because they wanted to create discipline, including traffic discipline by putting ropes on the sides of the road. The impression is being given that even if there is no discipline amongst the students and the human resource, traffic discipline must be there. Because of the ropes and barricades on the roads, Dr. Shelley Walia has fallen and got injured twice. One student was also hurt and taken to Bhai Ghanaiya Ji University Institute of Health Science. Even if the reforms are to be brought, but these cannot be brought overnight. What has been happening for decades, they have to find out the ways as to how to bring the reforms. The meeting of the Senate is taking place, why the students have been allowed to complain like this. Of course, video could be seen. He could also understand that the students are in the habit of exaggerating the things, but they should not take such things so lightly because he did not think that there was any law and order problem.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur stated that firstly she wanted to get information from the Senate as to what is the guest faculty. According to her, guest meant guest. The persons, who have been appointed as Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors on regular basis, are taking classes in other departments, maybe on the recommendations of Academic and Administrative Committees of the department concerned and so on and so forth. These persons are taking full salary for working in their parent departments, maybe in lacs of rupees (Professor Rs.1.25 lac), and also taking a payment of Rs.25,000/- as guest faculty from other departments. Why it is being allowed despite there being a decision that guest faculty would be engaged from outside or retired teachers. She enquired what these people are teaching, which the others could not. In fact, guest meant a person teaches occasionally to meet the emergent requirement. Guest faculty should not be engaged from within the University or a mechanism should be evolved that no one should get more than 10% or 15% of the basic salary while working as guest faculty. If such a phenomenon is going on in the University, it could be rectified. Similarly, when a teacher is shifted to another Department, on the one hand, he/she gets salary from the main Department and also from the Department where he/she is shifted to. She suggested that for such shifting/transfer a policy should be framed. She has sought information about the number of students and the teachers in a particular Department and the reply has been given that there are 113 students. As per UGC, the ratio of teacher students should be 1:15. The said Department has six regular teachers and could engage one guest faculty, but instead of one, the Department has engaged six more teachers as guest faculty and an extra expenditure of Rs.1.50 lacs p.m. is being incurred. The amount which is being paid to them as per their appointment on regular basis (salary, accommodation, etc.) is extra. She added that so many duties/responsibilities have been assigned to some of the Professors and Associate Professors. Could the same be justified?

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that the comments of the members are good and relevant also. After the compilation of the minutes, a group of people say a Committee would go through the same.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that there are a lot of comments/suggestions from the members and all the meaningful. The University's objective is to create/disseminate knowledge and share the same with the community. Regarding this, a lot of things happened and so many Bhatnagar Awards have been awarded this year and these awardees have visited the University. So many talks/lectures have been delivered, seminars/conferences have been held and publications noticed and appreciated. They must give credit to the University for that. In their Institution there are some drawbacks and they are trying to overcome them. At the same time, they should not forget to appreciate good things. One of the thing for which he would like to congratulate is the academic activities which are going on in the University. They are also having cooperation between the Institutions in this area by having Chandigarh Region Innovation & Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) for which they should feel proud of because there are many Institutions in big cities and they work in isolation. Earlier,

unfortunately they were also working in isolation, but the Vice-Chancellor has tried to bring them together and have some sort of cooperation by sharing resources and expertise, which is something that he must appreciate. Numerous suggestions have been made by the members. But what happens is that the suggestions are made in isolation, but it is not the whole working of the University and one is handicapped in the circumstance under which he/she worked. Therefore, his suggestion to his colleagues is that whenever they have to give suggestion/s, they should give in writing (on paper) so that the Vice-Chancellor could be able to take action; otherwise, it looked as if they blame the Vice-Chancellor. It is not a question of blame game, but to make suggestions for improvement. Since they are very senior and responsible people, they should write letters to the Vice-Chancellor that such and such things are in the interest of the University. Then it is for the Vice-Chancellor to process the things. He might inform them that though their suggestion is good, but it is difficult for him to implement the same. All the suggestions which they wanted to make today, should be put on paper and submitted to the Registrar/Vice-Chancellor, who would see what action could be taken. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to take the suggestions of the members seriously and respond to them. As said by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, additional revenue of Rs.1 crore to Rs.2 crore by way of enhancing the fees of the students to the extent of 5% or so, would not make much difference. Of course, he knew the limitations of the Vice-Chancellor as the Government people would say that they are not trying to raise their resources and why they are expecting them to give grants to them. The Vice-Chancellor should try to persuade the Government people that on the one hand, this small amount is not going to make much difference and on the other hand, they are creating certain grievances amongst the students. In the last year, in one of the meetings about a case filed by the Police against the students, it was suggested that he (the Vice-Chancellor) should use his good offices to sort out the issue because the students are their own and they could themselves deal with them. If necessary, request the Advisor to the Administrator or the Administrator to let off the students. He further stated that their University (Panjab University) is very old and their Act goes back to the year 1882 and at that time many things were not visualized. Thereafter, since several developments had taken place, which they are not able to reflect in the regulations/Calendar and some of the regulations are counter-productive. The nature of the University has also changed. When he (Professor Bambah) joined the University, there were only six Professors in the University and out of them (six members), two were on the Senate. Even though now there are more than 300 Professors in the University, still there are only two Professors on the Senate. The subjects like Public Administration, Business Administration, Biochemistry, etc. were never thought of at that time. Therefore, now the time has come to really have a serious study as to how much is relevant and how much is not and then make necessary/essential changes so that they do not have to face any difficulty, which they are facing now. As suggested by Shri Satya Pal Jain, powers relating to minor issues should be delegated to the Syndicate or the Vice-Chancellor. Though they have spent so much time since morning, they really had no discussion on the academics, which is their social responsibility. Society says that they are not producing people who could really help them (society) in making progress. All those things, which they are supposed to discuss, are not being discussed. The less important things should be left to the competent bodies to sort out so that they do not come here. They have had some problems with their employees, but majority of them have been sort out after constitution of Joint Consultative Committee (JCM). He urged his colleagues to be polite. At the same time, the Vice-Chancellor should also be patient, though it is very difficult, but since he has accepted the position, which requires a lot of patience, and should show politeness. Their main objective is to work together for the students and faculty under the regulations/rules, for which the University has been set up.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that there are many things on which there is near consensus. The first and the foremost is the transparency as far as the financial well being of the University is concerned. There is no doubt that all of them desired that all financial dealings on behalf of the University must get presented at the floor of the Senate. At the moment, there are accounts which related to Hostels or Sports and the same are got audited independently. At the annual meeting of the University sometimes

in the months of February or March whenever that happened, even if they follow whatever accounting procedures that they had, concurrent to it everything related to the financial health of the University – whether it is on behalf of the Hostels or Sports or any other independent entity, like, UIAMS, TEQIP Grants, etc., let those all be presented together. There is a progress on the handling of accounts of the University. Double Entry System, the earlier they implement it, it is better for the University. There is no doubt that they should do it as early as possible. There are concerns – firstly about the Constituent Colleges of the University, which are located in the remote areas and serving the remotest areas of the State. They had accepted the responsibility and are trying to implement the policy of the Government of India for enhancing the GER ratio, etc. Quality education on behalf of the Constituent Colleges has to be given and that quality education could not happen unless there is decentralization, effective leadership and so on and so forth. The fact that the Punjab Government is little bit reluctant while releasing the money, but now they had reached a stage that they have been getting money regularly. He had been talking to Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, and had a plan that Principals should be appointed in all the four Constituent Colleges plus in a gradual way the faculty also is to be appointed on regular basis. They should not go to the next academic session without Principals having in place in the Constituent Colleges, along with some fraction of the total faculty on regular basis. Personally, he would like to commit himself that they should do it before the next academic session. So far as money is concerned, it is absolutely necessary because without money the Constituent Colleges cannot function.

Shri Raghbir Dyal intervened to say that until a provision of some finances is made for the Constituent Colleges, the Principals of these Colleges should be allowed to use some portion of the Amalgamated Fund.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor stated that they would have a small Committee set up for the purpose, for which the leadership role should be taken by Shri Raghbir Dyal, on his (the Vice-Chancellor's) behalf. He requested him to give him (the Vice-Chancellor) the proposal so that the agenda is taken up as quickly as possible. So far as accountability is concerned, accountability meant that the money should be spent for the purpose for which the same had been collected. There comes that they are collecting money for Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla and Students' Holiday Home, Dalhousie. They just have only one Guest House functional and that too with half capacity. He thought that this needed very urgent attention and we should do it as early as possible even if it meant committing of some additional money from other University funds. Maybe they should raise loan from somewhere else or collect money from the affiliated Colleges for a few years. At the moment, they should complete this task in a time bound manner, i.e., within a couple of years, and not in 10 years. They are off the time line when it comes to auditing of human resources, both teaching and non-teaching at the Campus, and they have to do it. The NAAC report was there in 2009 and he has got the NAAC report of this year, which he could not share with them until it is released by NAAC Office, Bangalore, but the Chairman of NAAC Team had shared some information with the Chairpersons of various Teaching Departments of the University during the Exit Meeting. The recommendation of 2009 NAAC was to consolidate the small Departments and the same had also been recommended by the current NAAC Team. Therefore, they needed to reconsolidate/regroup and while regrouping, they have to provide and upgrade all the regrouped entities with technology. In fact, the previous NAAC had also desired that ICT enabled education must be provided. The recent NAAC Peer Team has also criticized them that Panjab University had not implemented that. Obviously, Panjab University does not have smart class rooms everywhere and we have not introduced choice based credit system. Their weaknesses are known to them. At the moment, they had no option, but to start attending to these weaknesses in absolute earnest manner, because they had defaulted on NAAC preparedness once and cannot afford to default second time, as the rating by NAAC is linked with so many things. Wherever they apply, several other Universities also apply. When they applied for the status of heritage University, 10 other Universities also applied for the same purpose. In such a case, only those Universities would be considered who had NAAC compliance and

had secured good numerical score. As such, they had no option left, but to remain always NAAC complied. IQAC report has to be filed once in a year. They have to make an attempt to do it semester-wise. They suffered during this NAAC review because their IQAC report was shoddy and they had also not effectively verified the data supplied by the faculty. In fact, verification of the data and input was absolutely necessary. They had to cut a sorry figure a couple of times when the verifiable data was not there, which related to publications, time-table, record of feedback received from the students and in response to the feedback what changes they had introduced. All these things they were supposed to introduce on behalf of the University. Providing information just on behalf of a few Departments was not enough as information from each Department was required. The NAAC Peer Team in 2014 was divided into five Teams, which visited the Departments separately. Even if one of the Teams gives a negative report, 25% of the marks in a given category are gone. To have 'A' grade, minimum 3 out of 4 is required for which the score has to be more than 80%. They had many difficulties and they had to attend to them. The Secretary Higher Education has told him that the Central Government provides support to the Central Institutions and the Central Institutions are IITs, IISERs, IIMs, IIIT, NITTER, etc. and these Institutions provide very high quality education in the Indian System. Many Universities would find it hard to match these Institutions. The Secretary said that if the Panjab University is to be counted along with these Institutions, they should realize where their competition is. Their completion is always with the best of the Central Institutions/Universities and the best of the Universities is Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, the NAAC score of which is 3.89 out of 4.00. The next is University of Hyderabad, though its score had slipped a little bit because of change of formula by the NAAC, still its NAAC score is 3.72. These are followed by University of Jadhavpur, a State University, with a score of 3.65, DY Patil University, which is a private University in the State of Maharashtra, with a NAAC score 3.56, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar with the score of 3.52. Professor Brar had served for sometime on one of the NAAC Committees as Chairman and he is very conscious as to what is required by the NAAC Team. When he had a NAAC review, he had a very good homework done. So Guru Nanak Dev University is the only University, which has been able to retain or improve upon its previous NAAC score, whereas all other Universities are slipping down. The next is Banaras Hindu University (BHU) with NAAC score 3.42 and Aligarh Muslim University (AMU) with NAAC score 3.35. Therefore, their competitors are – JNU when it comes to Humanities and Life Sciences, in Science and Technology, it is University of Hyderabad, a traditionally old University, it is University of Jadhavpur. When it comes to institutions which have similar character, like, Panjab University, these are BHU and AMU. They have just no option, if they have to continue giving the central pay-scales and all other benefits, which are given to the Central Government employees, to their employees, they have to keep their standing right in the University System. Panjab University has to be minimally conscious that their income rises somehow and we make attempt to continuously enhance the fees. The Secretary had also told him that all Central Universities/Institutions are also being asked to continuously enhance the fees. Whether it is IITs, IIMs, NITs, everybody had been asked to generate resources by gradually increasing the fees. The NAAC Peer Team was also not happy with the meagre revenue being generated by such a large faculty from the consultancy, patents, etc., which is much less as compared to other institutions. They have to continuously increase their income. One of the Officers of the Central Government in a meeting of Board of Finance few years ago had pointed out that the University had not tried to enhance its revenue for the last 6 years by increasing fees. In view of the larger role to be played by the University in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Panjab University had assumed a larger responsibility in terms of so many faculties by setting up so many newer institutions for school learners, like, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, University Institute of Legal Studies, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital. In these institutions Panjab University has to maintain teacher-students ratio as 1:15 a premier Institution as per UGC Regulations/Guidelines. The UGC actually maintains its regulatory authority on them. Sometimes, the UGC says that some grants would not be given, till the University has got assessed by the NAAC. They would not consider their such and such case, unless the University secured a good NAAC rating. The MHRD, under a very special arrangement which no other University in the country

has, had said that they would meet the deficit of the Panjab University. The Panjab University is the only University in the country, the deficit of which is met by the Central Government under a very special arrangement. In this background, last year Panjab University increased the tuition fees by 5%. Consciously this House said that it should not happen that the fee would not be increased for 5-6 years in a row and thereafter a large increase is recommended. It was stated that instead the tuition fee should be increased a little bit (2% to 3%) every year so that they could show something to the Central Government. That was why, when the little bit fee was increased this year, a series of meetings were held with the students. Whatever number of the increase is, it is with a ceiling of maximum Rs.1,200/- per annum. His personal suggestion in this regard is that they should increase minimum of fee every year, but they could commit that increase towards paying scholarships, support to the students belonging to the economically weaker sections of the society. This way they would show that they are increasing the fee, but in reality they would be consuming the same for the welfare of their own students. In fact, the increased fee should be utilized for supporting the students belonging to the economically weaker sections of the society – whether in terms of either not charging any fee from them or the entire fee should be reimbursed to them so that the students should not worry about anything else, and properly concentrate on their study alone. Thus, they needed to find some intelligent way that did not burden the people, who actually need support. Of course, they have to strengthen their IQAC, which would definitely be done as they had no option. There are many things at the Campus, e.g., traffic, parking, etc., which needed their attention. They tried it during the Convocation, when the President of India visited the Campus. In fact, they should have a Valet Parking arrangement every time, when the Senate meetings take place. The Senators could come to attend the meetings, the University would provide them Valet Parking as he could find enough volunteers from the faculty for the purpose. So far as introduction of technology in deliberations of Senate meetings is concerned, though they had delayed, they would try to move the file as quickly as possible. Hopefully, when the next meeting of the Senate happens, they would be able to provide soft copies of the agenda to the members. Since they would not be able to discuss the entire agenda, perhaps they would have to meet in the April again to finish the agenda. Though by the next month they would not be able to have it, in September they would definitely have the technology in place. They would try that the members get the things in time. Even though as per Calendar, the agenda is to be provided 10 days in advance, they would try as far as possible that the agenda of Senate is provided to the members at least 15 days in advance, which is not a difficult task. If necessary, the left out items could be provided to the members as a supplementary agenda. He would be the last person to violate the provisions of the Calendar. They had started the meeting with a lot of disagreements and different perceptions, but at the end of the day, he believed that they have reached at more consensuses and less differences. They have no option, but to work together. All of them had a term of four years and had to continuously work. Even the Syndicate members had to sit with him month after month, as neither they have the option nor does he. All the things which had come from the Syndicate, have to come to the Senate and in this regard also, none of us has any option, but to attend to the agenda. The matters which had come from the Syndicate, had come to them after a lot of deliberations by the representatives, whom they chose. They should trust the wisdom of the Syndicate and have debate and if anything is left out, they should point out so that they are seen to be doing the things a little bit. They are being watched by the office bearer of the student community, representatives of the society in the form of media, staff of the University, etc. A large number of staff members are here, who sit here from morning to evening and at the end of the day the information gets disseminated to all. As such, their deliberations are known to everyone. They should do it in a little bit pleasant manner, as said by Professor R.P. Bambah. He would do it, but at the same time, they should also do the same and must perform efficiently so that the given agenda, which had come to them, is finished by the end of the day. In this spirit, he requested the members to accept the recommendations of the Board of Finance, which had been endorsed by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to point out that despite the fact that last year 5% increase in fee was allowed subject to the condition that benefit of the increased fee would be provided to the students belonging to economically weaker sections of the society, the said benefit has not been given to them. In the Syndicate also, he had pointed out this and an assurance was given that the matter would be looked into. What to talk of enhancing the benefit, in fact, the benefit of scholarship/freeship earlier being given to the students belonging to economically weaker sections of the society has been reduced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not do it.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they approved like this, then probably the scholarship/freeship would be reduced equivalent to the tuition fee of 5%, which is being charged.

The Vice-Chancellor said that though out of the way, they should support all the students who belonged to weaker sections of the society.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the official resolution is that subject to the maximum of tuition fee paid by the students belonging to weaker sections of the society, which earlier used to be to the tune of Rs.10,000/-.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate should form a small Committee to look into this issue.**

Shri Ashok Goyal further stated that in the meetings of the Board of Finance and Syndicate also, they had taken a conscious decision that the proposed Budget is approved subject to reviewing it in the month of September after which what actual position they faced with the Central Government because there is a deficit of Rs.100 crore though presently they are hopeful that they would be able to get money from somewhere. As such, in September 2015 all these things needed to be reviewed when the picture would be much clear.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would try to hold the meeting of the Board of Finance in the month of July so that the recommendations of the Board of Finance could be placed before the Syndicate in its meeting to be held in August 2015 and the Senate in its September 2015 meeting.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meetings dated 11.12.2014 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9) and dated 19.02.2015 (Items 1, 5, 8, 9, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 11, 12, and 13), as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 25.01.2015 (Para 10) and 08.03.2015 (Para 4), respectively, be approved.

At this stage, some of the members suggested that only Items C-35, C-53 and C-55, should be taken up for consideration as these are of urgent nature.

**This was agreed to.**

**XIV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in Item C-35 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-35.** That the appended notification of Punjab Government with agenda item along with the following format of advertisement for filling up 1925 posts of Assistant Professors on contractual basis for initial period of three years, under 95% grant-in-aid scheme of Punjab Government, be approved:

“Name of College: \_\_\_\_\_



Application on the prescribed *pro forma* available with the College, are invited for the posts of Assistant Professor **on contract basis for initial period of three years under 95% grant-in-aid scheme of Punjab Government** in the subjects of \_\_\_\_\_. Eligible candidates in accordance with the Qualifications/conditions laid down by the UGC/Punjab Government/Panjab University may send their application to the College within 21 days from the date of publication of the advertisement through Registered Post or in person and a copy of the application be also sent to the Dean, College Development Council, Panjab University, Chandigarh. Reservation for S.C./S.T. candidates and person with disabilities will be followed as per the rules of Panjab University/Punjab Government/Government of India as the case may be. Appointment will be made strictly as **per Punjab Government Notification No.11/148/2013-3 Edu-1/248623/1 dated 20.06.2014 (Honorable Punjab & Haryana High Court CWP 10650 of 2013)**”.

President/Secretary/Principal

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 49)**

After some discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-35 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XV.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-53 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-53.** That –

- (i) the minutes of the College Development Council dated 17.01.2015, be approved.
- (ii) the term of appointment of Professor Naval Kishore, DCDC be extended up to 31.05.2016 i.e. up to the end of the month in which he will attain the age of 60 years.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 35)**

**XVI.** Considered the following amendment/s in Regulation 5 for Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation & Networking (Annual System) w.e.f. the academic session 2014-15, in anticipation of the approval of various University Bodies (**Item C-55 on the agenda**):

Present Regulation	Proposed Regulation
5. The admission of the course shall be open to any person who has passed Bachelor of Library & Information Science (B.Lib. & I.Sc.) from any recognized University.	5. The admission of the course shall be open to any person who has passed Bachelor of Library & Information Science (B.Lib. & I.Sc.) or Two year integrated course of Master of Library & Information Science (M.Lib.& I.Sc.) from any recognized University.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 37)**

**RESOLVED:** That Regulation 5 for Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation & Networking (Annual System) be amended as under and given effect to w.e.f. the academic session 2014-15, in anticipation of the approval of various University Bodies, Government of India and publication in Government of India Gazette:

<b>Present Regulation</b>	<b>Proposed Regulation</b>
5. The admission of the course shall be open to any person who has passed Bachelor of Library & Information Science (B.Lib. & I.Sc.) from any recognized University.	5. The admission of the course shall be open to any person who has passed Bachelor of Library & Information Science (B.Lib. & I.Sc.) or Two year integrated course of Master of Library & Information Science (M.Lib.& I.Sc.) from any recognized University.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting is adjourned to 26<sup>th</sup> April 2015.

G.S. Chadha  
Registrar

Confirmed

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

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the adjourned meeting of the **SENATE** dated 29<sup>th</sup> March 2015 held on **Sunday, 26<sup>th</sup> April 2015** at 10.30 a.m. in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**PRESENT:**

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

51. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
52. Shri Raghbir Dyal
53. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
54. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
55. Professor R.P. Bambah
56. Dr. S.S. Sangha
57. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
58. Professor Shelly Walia
59. Shri Satya Pal Jain
60. Dr. Tarlok Bandhu
61. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
62. Shri V.K. Sibal
63. Dr. Yog Raj Angrish
64. Col. G.S. Chadha  
Registrar ... (Secretary)

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Dr. Ajay Ranga
2. Chief Justice, Punjab & Haryana High Court
3. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
4. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon
5. Professor Gurdial Singh
6. Shri Jagpal Singh alias Jaswant Singh
7. Shri K.K. Sharma
8. Dr. K.K. Talwar
9. Dr. Kailash Nath Kaul alias Kailash Nath
10. Shri Krishna Goyal
11. Sardar Kuljit Singh Nagra
12. Shri Maheshinder Singh
13. Shri Naresh Gujral
14. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh
15. Dr. Puneet Bedi
16. Dr. Parmod Kumar
17. Shri Punam Suri
18. S. Parkash Singh Badal
19. Smt. Preneet Kaur
20. Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa alias Surjit Singh
21. Dr. S.K. Sharma
22. Shri Sandeep Kumar
23. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
24. Shri Surjit Singh Rakhra
25. Shri Sandeep Hans
26. Shri S.S. Johl
27. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
28. Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab
29. Shri Varinder Singh

## **II.**

The Vice-Chancellor said that thousands of people have lost their lives in the earthquake across the Himalaya, especially in Nepal and certain States of India (Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, etc.). Maybe crores of people have been affected by this devastating earthquake.

As a mark of respect to the departed souls, the Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over their passing away and observed two minutes' silence, all standing, prayed to the Almighty to give peace to the departed souls and give strength and courage to the members of the bereaved families to bear irreparable loss of their dear ones.

**II.**

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to extend his best wishes and congratulations to a very senior member of this House namely Shri Satya Pal Jain for assuming the position of Assistant Solicitor General of India. He further said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that –

1. Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) has been awarded the Scientist Par Excellence Award by M/s Minitab Inc., U.K., for his contribution in developing novel and nanoscaled drug delivery system, employing systematic quality by design (QbD) and advanced pharmacokinetic modeling in the past three years.
2. An innovative academic exchange programme has been initiated between Panjab University and Aligarh Muslim University (AMU) to provide opportunities for dissemination to awardees of Ph.D. degrees of two Universities. About three hundred Ph.D. degrees are awarded by Panjab University every year as compared to over six hundred Ph.Ds. by Aligarh Muslim University. It is envisaged that two Ph.D. holders along with their supervisors from a given University will visit the other University and present seminars in their chosen fields once in a fortnight. They will explore research collaborations and utilization of complementary research facilities available at each other's place to enhance quality of research at both the Universities. The first such Panjab University delegation was lead by Professor Rajat Sandhir, President, PUTA. The visit to AMU on April 14 and 15, 2015, was coordinated by Professor P. Venugopalan, Chairperson, Department of Chemistry and AMU, respectively. This has been welcomed by many Vice-Chancellors who participated in the meeting of Association of India Universities held at AMU a month ago.
3. The UGC vide its letter of 8<sup>th</sup> April 2015, has approved the upgradation of the Department of Political Science from DSA-III to CAS-I Programme for a further period of five years, i.e., from 01.04.2015 to 31.03.2020. Rs.77.50 lakh plus salary of two Project Fellows (Actual) shall be made available to this Department.
4. The UGC vide its letter of 9<sup>th</sup> April 2015, has approved the upgradation of the Department of Sociology from CAS-I to CAS-II Programme for a further period of five years, i.e., from 01.04.2015 to 31.03.2020. Rs.91.25 lakh plus salary of one Project Fellow (Actual) shall be made available to this Department.
5. Education-focused Magazine, Education World (EW) has given fifth rank to Panjab University, Chandigarh, among all the educational institutions of the country. Panjab University has been ranked third amongst the traditional Universities of the country. Two premier research Institutions, viz., Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru and Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR), Mumbai, are ranked first and second, respectively in Education World ranking. These are followed by two Central Universities, viz., Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), Delhi and University of Delhi (DU), Delhi."

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they would like to congratulate Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor, for getting the extension. All of them are grateful to the Chancellor who has recognized his merit, especially in the field of research and other areas.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that he would also like to congratulate the Vice-Chancellor for his dignity towards education, commitment for excellency to the field of higher education and creating and boosting the academic environment in the Colleges

during his last three years. He hoped that the scheme of 5 days' week in the affiliated Colleges would be implemented by him very soon.

The Vice-Chancellor, referring to ranking, stated that they should note that the Government of India is planning to come with their own ranking along with the scores being awarded by the NAAC have assumed increased importance, because the Government of India has started to link the release and consideration of additional grant(s) on the basis of NAAC accreditation being valid and the scores being awarded. The employers also have look at such ranking(s), while choosing institutions for campus placements. As such, Panjab University has no option, but to make efforts so that they can continue to be amongst the top institutions of the country.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) felicitations of the Senate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Professor Arun Kumar Grover for the extension in his tenure as Vice-Chancellor for further period of three years;
  - (ii) Shri Satya Pal Jain on his appointment as Additional Solicitor General of India; and
  - (iii) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), on his having been awarded the Scientist Par Excellence Award by M/s Minitab Inc., U.K., for his contribution in developing novel and nanoscaled drug delivery system, employing systematic quality by design (QbD) and advanced pharmacokinetic modeling in the past three years.
- (2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 be noted and approved.

**Items C-1 to C-5 already considered in the meeting held on 29.03.2015.**

**III.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-6 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-6.** That Dr. Parminder Singh be appointed Director Physical Education & Sports in the Directorate of Sports, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP Rs.10000/-. He be granted two additional increments over and above the protection of his basic pay as Associate Professor in the College.

**Waiting List**

Dr. Jaspal Singh

- NOTE:**
1. In case Dr. Parminder Singh does not join, the above-said two additional increments be granted to the wait listed candidate as well.
  2. This appointment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 2(i))**

Shri V.K. Sibal enquired has it been mentioned in the advertisement that additional increment/s would be granted to the person having outstanding credentials?

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that additional increments were being recommended by the Selection Committee in the academic institutions since long.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-6 on the agenda**, be approved.

**IV.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-7, C-8 and C-9 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-7.** That Dr. Indu Chhabra be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. 27.3.2014, 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.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 2(ii))**

**C-8.** That Dr. (Mrs.) Gunmala Suri be promoted from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. 18.12.2013, 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.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 2(iii))**

**C-9.** That Dr. (Ms.) Nishima be appointed Assistant Professor in Chemistry/Applied Chemistry 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 the rules of Panjab University.

**Waiting List**

Dr. (Ms.) Kushwinder Kaur

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 2(iv))**

**NOTE:** The competent authority could assign them teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/specialization(s) 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.

The letter of appointment to the above appointed/promoted candidates under Item C-6 to C-9 have been issued in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

**Items C-10 to C-20 already considered in the meeting held on 29.3.2015**

**V.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-21, on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-21.** That –

- (i) the appointment of Co-Supervisor/s from International Research Centre/Universities (DST approved Institution) for the Ph.D. candidates, provided the Co-Supervisors fulfil the conditions laid down by the University, be approved; and
- (ii) it be recommended to make necessary addition/provision in the revised Ph.D. guidelines.
- (iii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a Committee to extend the facility of appointment of Co-Supervisor/s from International Research Centre/ Universities (DST approved Institution) for the Ph.D. candidates in other Departments/Centres of the University, provided the Co-Supervisors also fulfil the conditions laid down by the University.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 Para 5)**

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that, in fact, it has also been discussed earlier that examiners from outside the country should be appointed for evaluation of Ph.D. thesis. Even if the examiner from outside is unable to come to take the viva voce of the candidate, an arrangement should be made so that the examiner could conduct the viva voce through electronic means.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the way the e-governance is evolving, they could create facilities within the University for such purposes.

Professor Anil Monga said that they should accept and welcome the above suggestion of e-governance.

Dr. Dalip Kumar, referring to the appointment of Co-Supervisor/s from International Research Centre/Universities (DST approved Institution) for the Ph.D. candidates, provided the Co-Supervisors fulfil the conditions laid down by the University, stated that these guidelines were issued on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2014. Their request is only that in spite of the guideline/s, the teachers of the Colleges are being deprived of this facility. He pleaded that if the College teachers fulfilled the guidelines, they should be allowed to act as Supervisor/Co-supervisor without holding the interview. The above-said guidelines should also be applied to the College teachers for appointment as Supervisors/ Co-supervisors. According to him, there are 22 applications of College teachers, which are pending in the University for approval. Secondly, certain Departments of the University are conducting interviews of the College teachers for allowing them to act as Supervisors/ Co-supervisors even though there is no provision. During the last meeting of the Senate, he had got a reply from the Registrar that only four cases of College teachers are pending, whereas 22 cases are pending. In the end, he stressed that if the College teachers fulfilled the conditions laid down by the University, they should be allowed to act as Supervisors/Co-supervisors of Ph.D. candidates



Professor Lalit K. Bansal, Dean Research, stated that there is no restriction on the College teachers for becoming Supervisors/Co-supervisors of Ph.D. candidates. If they qualify all the terms and conditions for becoming Supervisors/Co-supervisors of Ph.D. candidates, they are not subjected to any kind of interview.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that he is not aware that certain Departments of the University are holding interviews of the College teachers. According to him, if any College teacher satisfied the conditions laid down by the University, he/she is automatically eligible. The only thing is that as to who would check whether the conditions are fulfilled by the respective teacher/s. Many Departments of the University are allowing the College teachers to act as Supervisors/Co-supervisors. However, if some cases are pending, they could investigate as to why the same are pending.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that they had raised this issue in many meetings of the Senate and enquired as to why the College teachers are being discouraged from becoming Supervisors/Co-supervisors of Ph.D. candidates. Dr. Dalip Kumar is correct that they are facing problems from certain Departments of the University as they did not allow the College teachers to become Supervisors/Co-supervisors of Ph.D. candidates. It has come to his notice that the letter has been issued by the Department/s of the University to certain College teachers stating that if any demand for Ph.D. Supervisor/Co-supervisor arises, they would let him/her know.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the interviews are being conducted by certain Departments of the University. Recently, he was called by a Department of the University for conducting the interview of one of his colleagues. Though no teacher from the Department came, the Chairperson came. Since the person concerned fulfilled the conditions, he was allowed to act as Supervisor/Co-supervisor of Ph.D. candidates.

Professor Rupinder Tewari said that they are including appointment of Co-Supervisor/s from International Research Centre/Universities (DST approved Institution), the Institutions like ICMR, CSIR, etc., which are also funded by the Central Government, should also be included in it.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that Dr. Kuldip Singh is right. One thing is clear that all the Chairpersons are not following the same approach. Another fellow was also called for the interview.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is taking note of it.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that uniform guidelines should have been circulated to all the departments as applications for allowing the College teachers to act as Supervisors/Co-Supervisors are pending in the departments of the University for years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Principal R.S. Jhanji is well taken. The matter would be looked into. Secondly, the notification in this regard would also be issued within a week. Thirdly, a note in this regard would also be placed in the next meeting of the Chairpersons.

Continuing, Principal R.S. Jhanji enquired when the person concerned has attached all the relevant documents relating to eligibility, what are the reasons for delaying the approval?

Principal Parveen Chawla informed that one of the teachers of Government College, Ludhiana, namely Dr. Ashwani Bhalla has received a letter from the University that whenever a candidate wished to register himself/herself for Ph.D. under the supervision of Dr. Ashwani Bhalla, he/she would be given the chance.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the desire of the UGC is absolutely clear that the faculty members of both the Universities and the Colleges are at the same footing. Their expectations from the faculty members are also of the same kind. If they have to have career advancement, they have to have certain research output to their credit. Persons from Colleges cannot have research to their credit, if they are not allowed to work like the University faculty. There are few individuals who can work on their own throughout their lives. Most of the other researchers would like to have young people to work with them so that they can generate research output. This applied to the science as well as humanities. If huge data are involved, the person concerned would like to have somebody who could work with him/her. As such expectations from all of them are the same. Only qualitatively things vary a little bit. In the template for College teachers, there is only slightly different distribution in the distribution of marks in different bins; however, the rest of the things are the same as those for University teachers. According to him, all the Colleges are expected to have NAAC accreditation. They would not have good NAAC score, if they do not have good research output. As such, it is in the interest of the University that the affiliated Colleges should have good NAAC rating. To have good NAAC rating, all of them have to work together so that the branding of the University always remained high. They are supposed to perform like a Central University or better than the Central University because the grant to the Central University are committed, whereas grant to Panjab University at the moment is committed only on the basis of performance. If they have good performance, their needs would get listened to or get fulfilled on preferential basis. They are not doing well when it comes to number of Colleges affiliated to this University having good NAAC grading. He had been talking to Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council and they are going to put an algorithm in place to help Colleges. They are going to create a sub-cell in the office of the Dean, College Development Council, which would proactively help all the affiliated Colleges that they make applications for NAAC rating. They had a number of persons in their system both at the campus as well as in the Colleges, who visit various Universities/Institutes/Colleges as members of the NAAC team. The only thing is that they need to create a data base of such people. In fact, these people could help their own institutions to see that they do well when it comes to NAAC rating. **He asked Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council to create the data base.**

Professor Mukesh Arora pointed out that about 1½ years back, he had personally submitted the cases of Principal Behl, Dr. Ashwani Bhalla and Dr. Kiran along with all the relevant documents in the University office for allowing them to act as Supervisors/Co-supervisors, but they have not been allowed to act as such so far.

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

Professor Ronki Ram stated that he would like to draw the attention of the House to the point that the UGC has made no difference between the University faculty and the College faculty in terms of pay scales, designation etc. Since there is no difference, UGC expects that the University and College teachers should get promotions on the basis of similar qualifications under rules/procedure, etc. Therefore, it is mandatory on the part of the Universities with which the Colleges are affiliated to ensure that the teachers should get higher pay-scales, designation, promotion, other facilities e.g. allowing them to act as Ph.D. Supervisors/Co-supervisors etc. if they fulfilled the laid down criteria. In addition to qualifications, the University should facilitate to create a system through which they can improve/add qualifications. If they did not allow them to become supervisors of Ph.D. candidates, they would lag behind and would not be able to meet the API score, which is mandatory. ICSSR has already been encouraging the faculty members in preferential research areas because the Panjab University wanted to compete with the other Universities not only in India but abroad also. The Colleges which are willing to come forward should also be encouraged. There is a budget provision in the ICSSR under which some money is sanctioned to the University under capacity building programme for organizing Refresher Courses, etc. Last time, when he attended a meeting in Delhi, he asked why could they not give the said money to the Colleges and they replied that 'yes' they could give the same to the Colleges as well. Resultantly, for the

first time in the history of ICSSR, two Colleges of Punjab were given money under the said scheme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that NAAC reports are made public at some stage. From those reports, it is evident that there are two women Colleges in Punjab, namely Dev Samaj College, Ferozpur and HVM, Jalandhar, which have got good scores. He asked Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, to obtain the NAAC reports of these two Colleges and make these available to the other Colleges affiliated to this University, which would like to get NAAC accreditation.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora stated that he agreed with Dr. Dalip Kumar that there should not be any discrimination between the University teachers and the College teachers. A panel of teachers, irrespective of whether they belong to University or Colleges, should be prepared by the department concerned and uploaded on the University website so that whenever any candidate, including from rural/far flung areas, wishes to register himself/herself for Ph.D. under a particular teacher, he/she could be allowed to act as such.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora is well taken and it should be taken care of by the Dean, College Development Council.**

Principal B.C. Josan said that DAV College, Chandigarh has been recognized as a Research Centre in certain subjects, but so far as the subject of Commerce is concerned, even though it had 25 teachers and had applied for recognition about two years ago, no attention has been paid by the University so far.

**The Vice-Chancellor asked the Dean of University Instruction and Dean Research to look into the matter.**

Principal Parveen Chawla said that about 14 teachers of Ludhiana wanted to do pre-Ph.D course work, but could not do the same at the Panjab University Campus at Chandigarh. She, therefore, suggested that a pre-Ph.D. should be conducted at Ludhiana so that they could do the same.

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

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that some of the Departments, e.g. Department of Economics are inviting College teachers, who wanted to become Supervisors/Co-supervisors of Ph.D. candidates, for interview. However, there are certain Departments like Punjabi, Physics, University Business School, which did not follow the above-said practice.

Principal Tarlok Bandhu stated that recommendation (iii) says “that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a Committee to extend the facility of appointment of Co-supervisor/s from International Research Centre/ Universities (DST approved Institution) for the Ph.D. candidates in other Departments/Centres of the University, provided the Co-supervisors also fulfil the conditions laid down by the University”. According to him, there is no need to appoint the above-said Committee, as the provision is already there in the Ph.D. Guidelines circulated vide No.ST.4732-4821 dated 28.05.2014. In fact, the guidelines did not restrict anybody from outside from becoming the Supervisor of Ph.D. candidate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that three persons, namely Dean of University Instruction, Dean Research and Dean, College Development Council along with ASVC, would repair the things.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that it is right that they should allow the College teachers to become Supervisors/Co-supervisors and the affiliated Colleges should be recognized as approved Research Centre, if they fulfilled the conditions laid down by the UGC and the University; however, the procedure, which the University had adopted recently, needed to be redesigned. According to him, the applications of College teachers came to them for allowing them to become Ph.D. Supervisor/Co-supervisor as they attach their research work, which is to be assessed by somebody. The Dean Research or the Dean of University Instruction, who are the academic heads, should evolve certain norms for allowing the College teachers to become Supervisors/Co-supervisors. However, if the applications are routed through the Departments concerned, the problems are bound to come. Though the interviews of College teachers were conducted, but he intentionally did not attend the same. Since there is no clear-cut policy on the issue, confusion is there. He urged that they should take immediate steps to rectify the things.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what would happen if the number of Supervisors is more as compared to the number of candidates. In fact, the registration of the Ph.D. candidate under a Supervisor in a given Department is to be done on the basis of mutual satisfaction. A small write-up (who they are, what their qualifications and thrust areas are, where they are located, what kind of facilities are available with them, etc.) from all the eligible Supervisors (subject-wise) should be got prepared and put on the public domain, i.e., on the website of the Dean, College Development Council. It could only be done if there are some volunteers (teachers only) from the affiliated Colleges because the Principals could not do it as they are already so much busy. He could also inform the Chairpersons in the next meeting about this.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that the points made by both Professor Yog Raj Angrish and Principal Tarlok Bandhu related to the Regulations, which they had approved. They did not need to call a candidate for the interview. The regulations which they had already approved say that the work of the person, who wanted to become Supervisor, is to be assessed by someone, whereas the Departments are doing entirely differently. He suggested that since they had the position of Dean Research, all the applications of the College teachers for becoming Supervisors/Co-supervisors should be sent to the Dean Research, who should in turn send the same to the concerned Department and should monitor them.

The Vice-Chancellor informed that they had a Research Promotion Cell both for the University and the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Kuldip Singh suggested that since they are facing problems at the hands of Chairpersons of University Teaching Departments, a Committee should be formed to assess the work of the College teachers for the purpose of allowing them to act as Supervisors/Co-supervisors.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-21 on the agenda**, be approved.

**VI.** Considered the Regulations/Rules for Post-Graduate Diploma in Cyber Crime with effect from the session 2014-15 (**Item C-22 on the agenda**) (**Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 Para 6**), and

**RESOLVED:** That the Regulations/Rules for Post-Graduate Diploma in Cyber Crime effective from the session 2014-15, be approved, in anticipation of approval of various University bodies and Government of India/publication in Government of India Gazette.

**VII.** Considered the Regulations and Rules for (i) Master of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology; and (ii) Master of Philosophy in Psychiatric Social work, with effect from the session 2014-15 (**Item C-23 on the agenda**) (**Syndicate dated 22.11.2014, Para 7**), and

**RESOLVED:** That the Regulations and Rules for (i) Master of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology; and (ii) Master of Philosophy in Psychiatric Social work, effective from the session 2014-15, be approved, in anticipation of various University bodies and Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**VIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-24 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-24.** That an amount of Rs.38,28,000/- out of the budget head 'Electricity & Water Charge Fund', with the modification in the heading of the office note, i.e., Rough Estimate Cost be replaced with 'Abstract Cost Estimate' and also in column 4 in the table of the office note, i.e., amount of house be replaced with 'Amount/Expenditure per house', be sanctioned for rewiring (Recessed Type) of the houses in P.U. Campus, Sector-14 and P.U. South Campus Sector-25, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 Para 10)**

**IX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-25 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-25.** That the nomenclature of Diploma Courses in (i) Yoga & Mental Health (ii) Fine Arts Career Oriented Course, be modified, as Advance Diploma Course in (i) Yoga & Mental Health (ii) Fine Arts Career Oriented Course for the session 2014-15, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Finance Scheme:

<b>Syndicate decision dated 17.08.2014 (Para 22)</b>	<b>Modification in Syndicate decision dated 17.08.2014 (Para 22)</b>
that the provisional extension of affiliation, be granted to Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City, for <u>Diploma Course in (i) Yoga &amp; Mental Health (ii) Fine Arts Career Oriented Course</u> , for the session 2014-15, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Finance Scheme.	that the provisional extension of affiliation, be granted to Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City, for <b>Advance Diploma Course in (i) Yoga &amp; Mental Health (ii) Fine Arts Career Oriented Course</b> , for the session 2014-15, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/ Self-Finance Scheme.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 Para 19)**

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that in the modified decision the words should be "Advanced Diploma Course" instead of 'Advance Diploma Course'. She suggested that necessary correction should be made.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-25 on the agenda**, be approved, with the modification that the words 'Advance Diploma Course' be replaced with "Advanced Diploma Course".

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

**C-26.** That the seats of M.Phil. Course being offered in the Department of Defence & National Security Studies exclusively meant for serving officers of armed forces, be increased from five to eleven.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 Para 21)**

**XI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-27 on the agenda** was read and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-27.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 28.11.2014, with regard to devise a fee structure for International Students to do a 'study abroad' for one semester be approved, with the clarification that the semester fee will be half of the normal annual fee of the category to which they belong to.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 32)**

**XII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-28 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-28.** That National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research, Sector-26, Chandigarh, be granted permanent affiliation w.e.f. the session 2013-14 in respect of the following courses with the stipulation that the permanent affiliation would be valid subject to getting approval from AICTE and the institute would mandatory inform the University of AICTE affiliation regularly as the institute gets AICTE approval for various courses on year to year basis:

- (i) M.Tech. Engg. Education (68 Seats= Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (ii) M.E. Manufacturing Technology (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (iii) M.E. Construction Technology & Management (68 Seats=Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (iv) M.E. Computer Science and Engineering (68 Seats = Regular-28 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (v) M.E. Instrumentation & Control (66 Seats = Regular-26 seats and Modular-40 seats)
- (vi) M.E. Electronics & Communication Engineering (59 Seats=Regular-19 seats and Modular-40 seats)

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 40)**

**XIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-29 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-29** That –

- (i) the number of seats for M.Ed. two year programmes offered in the Department of Education, be increased as mentioned against each, from the session 2015-2016:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the course</b>	<b>No. of seats allocated</b>	<b>No. of seats proposed as per Gazette for the session 2015-16</b>
1.	M.Ed. (General)	35	50
2.	M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling)	35	50
3.	M.Ed. (Educational Technology)	35	50

- (ii) since the matter related to change in eligibility condition, which could be recommended by the Board of Studies, Faculty concerned and Academic Council, the matter be referred to the Board of Studies for consideration in the first instance.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 50)**

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that as per the new NCTE Regulations for three courses of 50 seats each, the University required to appoint at least 30 teachers. The norms, which they applied to the affiliated Colleges of the Education, should also be applied to the Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh. He pleaded that the seats should be increased only if the required number of teachers are appointed, setting an example for the affiliated Colleges.

Professor Naval Kishore said that Professor Nandita Singh is present in the House and she would agree with him that if only M.Ed. (General) course is offered, the whole problem would automatically be solved.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the NCTE did not allow M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology) courses.

Professor Nandita Singh said that these courses are regarded as innovative courses and they had taken approval from the NCTE for these. Though they are increasing the seats as per the new NCTE Regulations, they needed to relook into these courses as suggested by Principal S.S. Sangha that they needed to appoint more teachers.

Professor Naval Kishore said that M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology) were discussed in the meeting with the NCTE though it was not on the agenda. In fact, M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology) courses are not required since as per new NCTE Regulation only one course, i.e., M.Ed. (General) is there.

Professor Nandita Singh stated that M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology) courses were started with a vision and these are different from M.Ed. (General). These courses were designed in such a way that there is a provision for guidance and counselling of students so that the students could be prepared to take jobs

in Health Institutions like Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education & Research and other Hospitals as well as in Schools, wherein they could take up the job of counselling. Similarly, the M.Ed. (Educational Technology) course was also designed with a vision. Therefore, instead of taking a decision in the Senate relating to doing away with these courses, the matter should be taken up with the Chairperson, Department of Education.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that maybe Professor Naval Kishore was referring to the notification of the UGC and in that very notification it has been made clear that if they had any special emphasis on any area, they could put the same in the bracket and the same has been done in the courses under consideration. As such, there is no contradiction in having these courses {M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology)} vis-à-vis with the UGC guidelines or elsewhere. Maybe in the December meeting they had adopted the notification relating to nomenclature of the courses, but they had not made corrections in the nomenclatures of the courses. For example, they had a Master of Business Administration and in the said notification they say that either they could have M.Com. (Business Economics) or M.A. (Business Economics). Therefore, they needed to make corrections accordingly because it related to B.Com. (Professional) course. Although he differed with the stand taken by Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. The notification which came in July/August 2014 is to be effective from the ensuing session (2015-16). He, therefore, pleaded that they have to change the nomenclature of their courses in accordance with the afore-said notification so that they did not run into any controversy. However, as far as these courses are concerned, these are as per the latest norms of the NCTE/UGC and nothing is wrong in these courses.

Principal N.R. Sharma stated that Principal S.S. Sangha is absolutely right and there is definitely a problem and the teachers are required to be appointed in accordance with the new NCTE Regulations, i.e., in the teacher taught ratio of 1:10. Therefore, if they allowed increase in number of seats as proposed in the item, they have to appoint minimum of 30 teachers.

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that historically, these courses were started when M.Phil. in Education was discontinued and the teachers had become surplus. Earlier, these courses were not treated equivalent to M.Ed. (General), but later on when some pressure was exerted, it was pleaded as to what is the fault of the students, these courses were equated with M.Ed. (General). He remarked that they should not offer these courses on the plea that these are innovative courses and instead set example for the affiliated Colleges.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that for getting appointed in a College of Education affiliated to Panjab University one is required to have double postgraduation, i.e. M.A. with 50% marks and M.Ed. with 50% marks. As per the Regulations of 1988, the candidates with M.Ed. and UGC-NET were made eligible for the post of Lecturer in Colleges of Education. According to him, M.A. (Education) and M.Ed. are two separate degrees. Since he is connected with the educational institutions in the States of Punjab, Haryana & Himachal Pradesh, only few persons having M.A. (Education) degrees are appointed in the District Education Offices for guidance and counselling, but none is appointed outside. Earlier, they granted increment only to the persons having M.Ed., but now they had equated M.A. Education with M.Ed. He added that for joining M.Ed. course, one is required to have B.Ed. degree, which earlier was of one year's duration and now it had been made of two years' duration. Since the Principals of Colleges of Education are experts, they should devise the ways and means as to how M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology) could be equated with M.Ed. (General) degree so that the students could get employment. If the Department had the facts and figures, they could tell as to how many students had got employment in Educational Offices. In the end, he suggested that it should be examined as to how the students having these degrees could get employment and if need be, a Committee should be constituted for the purpose so that it did not become merely a source of admission in the University Teaching Department.



Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether these courses (M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology)) are approved by the NCTE and are offered by other Universities/Institutes. He suggested that a clarification in this regard should be sought.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that since it is the function of the University to impart education to the masses and the Department has taken an initiative to start these courses, they should be encouraged. Therefore, these should be approved.

Professor Naval Kishore said that these courses could be offered only if these are recognized by the NCTE. He suggested that it should be enquired from the Chairperson, Department of Education, whether these are approved by the NCTE/UGC.

Principal N.R. Sharma remarked that these courses would not be recognized by the NCTE.

Dr. Jagwant Singh reiterated that basically these are M.Ed. courses and special emphasis has been given on Guidance and Counselling and Educational Technology. Therefore, these needed to be approved.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that even the NAAC team which recently visited the University has observed that they could award only those degrees which are approved by regulatory bodies. He, therefore, suggested that a clarification should be sought in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor remarked that the NAAC team was also unconvinced about various (Honours School) courses offered by the University and had suggested amendment.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they should not be mistaken because NCTE approved only those courses which related to teacher training. However, M.A. course is not a teacher training course.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council to seek clarification from the NCTE.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that though he has already clarified, would again like to clarify that if the University has recognition from NCTE for these courses, especially M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology), the UGC would approve the same and if not, the UGC will never give approval.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they (Dean, Faculty of Education, Dean, College Development Council, Professor Nandita Singh and Chairperson, Department of Education) should sit together and give him a solution to the problem.

Principal N.R. Sharma remarked that this meant they were offering these courses in the Department of Education without the approval of the regulatory body.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that even if these are innovative courses, the candidates, who have acquired degrees in these courses, are not eligible for the post of Assistant Professors.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor A.K. Bhandari as to how he would like to proceed in the matter and Professor Bhandari said that he would immediately constitute a Committee to look into the matter, prepare the draft pertaining to the desire of the University and take it up with the NCTE and UGC. Thereafter, they would proceed in the matter accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor Naval Kishore, Professor Nandita Singh and Principal N.R. Sharma to serve on the Committee proposed to be constituted. He added that they have to resolve this issue and for this purpose they have to intersperse. But the matter should be resolved at the earliest as it cannot be left unattended for too long.

Principal K.K. Dhiman suggested that a few members from the affiliated Colleges of Education should also be associated with the proposed Committee.

Professor Nandita Singh suggested that Chairperson, Department of Education should also be associated with the proposed Committee. She added since she had headed the Department of Education from 2010 to 2013, she knew that they had a document which was given to them in 2000, according to which the Department was inspected for these three courses and the same are recognized by the NCTE.

**The Vice-Chancellor said the Committee could co-opt any person, if wished. However, they have to do everything as quickly as possible. Concluding the discussion, he said that he would form a small Committee which would pursue the matter as rigorously as it could so that the admissions to these courses for the session 2015-16 did not affect. Even if the Committee has to make an express visit to Delhi and Jaipur for the purpose, they should do so.**

**This was agreed to.**

Principal Parveen Chawla said that as clarified by Professor Nandita Singh, these are innovative courses which might have approval of the UGC and NCTE for offering these courses, but they could not increase the number of seats.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that the Committee should also protect the interests of the students while making recommendations.

Principal Tarlok Bandhu said that on the one side they are increasing the number of seats and on the other side, they are hesitating in appointing the additional requisite faculty.

Professor Nandita Singh said that the positions in the Budget have been sanctioned only for M.Ed. (General) course. So far as M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology) courses are concerned, when these courses were sanctioned/started, it was said that they have to work with the existing faculty only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first they could enhance the number of seats and thereafter seek faculty. He asked Professor Bhandari to keep in mind the problems highlighted by the members and take immediate steps so that the course/s is/are not affected.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that problems are there in the field of Education because of new NCTE Regulations. They have also to look into the courses in the subject of Education offered through University School of Open Learning (USOL) as problems are being observed there also. As such, the issue needed to be looked into in totality.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue should be resolved on an emergent basis and if need be, series of meetings should be held for the purpose.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the M.Ed. course at USOL has been discontinued. Even the NAAC Team, which visited the University recently, had suggested that they should merge various Departments and create Schools. Whenever the Committee meets, it should explore the possibility of creating the School in the subject of Education and all the courses in the subject of Education should be offered in the said

School. With this, the strength of the faculty members would meet the requirement of the NCTE.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-29 on the agenda**, be approved; and
- (2) so far as constitution of proposed Committee and decision on the recommendations of the Committee is concerned, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Senate.

**XIV.** Considered 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, effective from the session 2014-15, (**Item C-30 on the agenda**) (**Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 13**), and

**RESOLVED:** That the Regulations/Rules for Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing (DPN) under Centre of Excellence effective from the session 2014-15, be approved, in anticipation of various University bodies and Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**XV.** Considered following amendments Regulation 10.2 of Chapter III (**Item C-31 on the agenda**) (**Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 14**), “General Regulations for Examinations” effective 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/ 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><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/ 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>

Existing Regulation	Proposed Regulation as recommended by the Committee dated 29.10.2014
	(ii) the wording, “offered in the Evening Session” in the Existing Regulation be allowed to be restored.

Dr. Jagwant Singh, referring to (ii), said that it should have either been mentioned as note or incorporated at the appropriate place.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Dr. Jagwant Singh is well taken.

**RESOLVED:** That Regulation 10.2 of Chapter III “General Regulations for Examinations”, be amended as under and given effect w.e.f. session 2014-15, in anticipation of various University bodies and Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

Existing Regulation	Proposed Regulation as recommended by the Committee dated 29.10.2014
<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/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><b>No Change</b></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/<b>Post Graduate Diploma Courses 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/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>

**XVI.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-32 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

**C-32.** 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.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 15)**

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have had already some preliminary discussions on the issue of revision of fees and had proceeded to the extent that they should accept the recommendations of the Committee that the 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 in the background that the additional revenue so generated would be utilized in the form of scholarships to the deserving students from Economically weaker sections. They could draw a line for an income of parents at an enhanced level up to which their wards would be considered eligible.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dean of Student Welfare, stated that he had received a letter from the President, Panjab University Campus Students Council, which reads as under:

“On the onset, we expect that our worthy Senate members will patiently listen to the fee hike issue and will find a benign way to provide relief to the students, their parents by setting up a new example this time. There is no denying of the fact that the total expenditure of the University has increased and will increase in the near future, but hiking fee every year is not the only way out. The University has always stood for promoting “the best & an affordable” education & by no means demoting it by making it difficult for the parents to bear the expenses. There are thousands of households who have to take the education loans to meet their children dreams come true by providing them the best education. I think everyone in the Senate could empathize that excruciating pain and toll through which they have to go to pay the interest rates & this extra burden due to fee hike.

As their representatives, I would like to bring a rule passed in 1976 in your notice that the Central & Punjab Government is prerogative to bear the deficit that occurs every year in the ratio of 60:40. Over the years we have been receiving the same fixed grants from Punjab Government and Central Government has not released the whole grant for this season.

I would request you all to take this opportunity to receive the deficit occurring every year from the Government instead of increasing fee & making education as expensive commodity and a privilege only for the upper class.

We assure you that we will go at every length possible with the senate to approach the governments to rethink their decision and thus helping in building a skilled nation.”

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that he could not persuade himself to agree with the agenda item as such. Earlier, when the issue of hike in fees was placed before this very House, the same arguments were given. Even now, the trend of the argument is the same. They should reduce the expenditure wherever possible. The unavoidable expenditure should be met from other sources. Increasing the fees is a simple way to enhance the revenue, but the same is not right. Some additional revenue could be generated by selling the waste materials and this money could be spent for providing aid to the poor students, although this could be of little help. They should devise ways how to get the promised grants from the Punjab Government. The hike of fees to the extent of Rs.500/- and Rs.1200/- as proposed is unnecessary. According to him, if the additional income so generated is to be deposited in a separate account, they have to appoint additional staff for maintaining the same. In this way, the expenditure could be more than the income generated. Perhaps, they were creating one more complication for themselves. He, therefore, pleaded that they should not approve the proposed fee hike. He further stated that since there is a shortage of accommodation in the hostels, majority of the students did not get hostel accommodation at the campus. As such, they are compelled to go for PG accommodation wherein the rent ranged between Rs.6000/- and Rs.8000/- per month. He suggested that they should ponder over the issue and examine as to how more accommodation could be arranged for the students.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said it needed to be clarified whether the proposed fee hike is per month or per annum.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the proposed hike is per annum.

Continuing, Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that whenever any item relating to hike in fee is brought to the House for consideration, he always opposed the same and records his dissent against the approval. Now also, he would like to record his dissent against the proposed fee hike. As told by the Vice-Chancellor that they would give scholarship to the poor students from the additional income generated through the proposed fee hike, since it is a good move, it should be continued. But whenever they increase the fee, the lower strata of the society (Mali, Chowkidar, Beldar, etc.) is badly affected as they did not know at the time of admission whether their wards would be given any type of scholarship. Resultantly, the parents are discouraged and did not allow their wards to take admission. Since even the proposed fee hike an income of only a few lacs of rupees would be generated, they should desist from it. Once a former Senator, Dr. H.S. Mehta, had said that though the total income from the fees is in lacs of rupees, the total deficit of the University is in crores of rupees. Therefore, additional burden which they are putting on the poor people of the society is unfortunate and they should not go for it. However, he agreed that there are some students, who belonged to rich families, they came in cars, stayed in the hotels, etc., but their number is very less. He, therefore, urged that they should think over this issue again and instead of hike in fee, they should think about giving concessions to the poor students. There are several talented students, who could not take admissions due to shortage of funds. Recently, one of the poor students, whose father is a small vendor, has topped the IAS examination. There are certain expenditures, which they could curtail. One of the arguments, which is always given, is that they should get maximum grants from the Governments, but the Governments have their own problems. They are increasing the evaluation charges, travelling allowance, etc. to the members of the Selection/Inspection Committees, which could be curtailed by way of pooling of vehicles, if more than one member is going from the same destination. He suggested that a Committee should be formed to explore ways and means as to how they could get grants from the Governments and how and where they could curtail their expenditure. In the end, he reiterated that he fully disagreed with the recommendation for increasing the fees and his dissent should be recorded.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he just wanted to draw attention of the House to the mindset as to how they are functioning in the University. The Vice-Chancellor had explained his position in the last meeting of the Senate that to satisfy the Government funding agencies, they are taking steps to enhance the revenue by way of increasing fee

structure up to some extent. Thereafter, he made a statement that after enhancing the fees, they would ensure that the enhanced portion of the fees would be distributed among the poor students in the form of scholarships. It looked very nice but the mindset of the university functionaries is that it is a very sorry state of affairs that one of the Committees, which was formed to look into scholarships to the poor students, made their recommendations to the Syndicate that the amount of scholarships should be reduced as the scholarship amount was to be limited only to the amount which the students had paid to the University as tuition fees compared to what was paid to the students during the previous years. Perhaps the said recommendation was also placed before the Senate. As such, they have to see the ground realities. As said by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, a logic was being given that only a marginal increase has been proposed and the additional income so generated would also be utilized for helping the poor students. Secondly, Shri Satya Pal Jain has quoted the example of Dr. H.S. Mehta, they had always been demanding that the proposal of hike in fee should be accompanied by cost benefit analysis, i.e., what additional revenue would be generated with the increased fees, what is the total cost, etc. If the earning from fee in comparison to loss/expenditure is more, the increase in fees should be avoided. He did not know whether as per rough idea, this proposed increase in fees under any circumstances is going to earn them an additional income of more than Rs.1.50 crore. Let them forget about the past, but should see whatever increase in fees has been effected, how much of that has been utilized for helping the poor students or for their welfare. If even for this additional sum of Rs.1.50 crore, they are facing resistance from the students, then how would they meet the deficit? And if the deficit remains the same even by increasing the fees, then probably they should not face the opposition from the students. He knew it is very difficult as Principal Executive Officer of the University to convince the Governments as the whole Senate would not face the Government or its Officers, who might say that unless they (the University) did not increase the fees, they would not release the grants to the University. But if they see the Budget of the University for the financial year 2015-16, they would find a big deficit. Unless and until Government of India and Punjab Government came to the rescue of the University, they would not be able to meet the same. Of course, they did not expect much from the Punjab Government as they had put the ceiling of their grant to the University at Rs.20 crore for the last few years. The Government of India has also said that they are not going to increase its share to the University more than 8% of what was given by them during the last year. In spite of the hope expressed by the Vice-Chancellor and his assuring that the Government would release the grant to the University, he did not think that any positive result has come till date. Therefore, the Senate should be concerned that wherefrom the deficit of the University would be met. As has been suggested, they have to think in terms of reducing their expenditure also and instead of increasing the fees of the students, they must concentrate on how and in what best manner they could reduce the expenditure of the University. According to him, there are so many ways and means for reducing the expenditure, but for that they have to leave the luxurious style of functioning. He knew that it is very difficult, but since they had no funds, what could they do. He knew that they could not run the University without the teachers, but if they did not have funds to pay them the salaries, how could they afford to appoint the teachers. They knew that the efficiency of the University is going to suffer if they did not have supporting staff, but if they did not have funds to pay salaries to them, could they afford to appoint supporting staff, who could work dissatisfied because of non-payment of salary. Now, the situation has come that the Pension Scheme of Panjab University is in danger. To his understanding, a sum of about Rs.17 crore or Rs.18 crore was deposited in the Pension Corpus last year and it was expected that the said amount would be deposited in the Pension Corpus this year as well, but due to scarcity of funds, not even a single penny has been credited to the Pension Corpus. Besides, the deficit of about Rs.100 crore has been projected in the Budget. Even if there is a deficit of about Rs.30 crore, which has to be met mandatorily, unless and until they did not have the methodology to see wherefrom Rs.30 crore would come, they could not function. Whether they are thinking in terms of Rs.100 crore or Rs.30 crore or Rs.17-18 crore, he did not think that it would be a wise decision on their part to tax the students, that too, only for an additional amount of Rs.1.50 crore.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that since the viewpoints have already been covered by Shri Satya Pal Jain and Shri Ashok Goyal, he has nothing more to say.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that according to him, whatever maximum subsidy could be given to Higher Education and Health is welcomed and for that even if all other subsidies are to be discontinued, the same should be discontinued. However, the system is working totally against the higher education. It is clear that the Governments are not supporting the higher education whether it is in the Colleges or the Universities. On the one hand, the UGC is saying that they should fill up the vacant posts and on the other hand, the Government of India is saying that they would not give more than 8% increase in spite of the fact that the Dearness Allowance alone is increasing more than 15% every year. If the situation continued like this, how would the work go? Perhaps, it is right to say politically that other sources for generating the revenue should be explored, but in reality it is not true. Several members from the affiliated Colleges are present in the meeting and they knew that the salary to the teachers has not been paid for the last about 15 months as the Punjab Government has not released the grant. He felt that the Governments irrespective of political affiliations are of the view that the Colleges and the Universities should be put to a corner, so as to encourage the establishment of private Universities; otherwise, there is no sense for putting restriction on grants. They were talking about the implementation of the regulations of the UGC, but he is ready to give guarantee that there would not be more than 4000 postgraduates, who would get higher education through duly mandated ways. The issue is not only of increasing the fees, but the issue is as to how they could meet the deficit of the University. At one point of time, they have to take a stand to request the Government to make their policy clear whether they would fund the higher education or not, and if not, they should be allowed to increase the fees. They are facing problem while increasing the fees of campus students, but they easily increase the fees of the College students because the College students are scattered. In their case even the examination fee is more than the fee they paid for the course for the whole year. The examination fee of M.A. (Economics) is more than that of M.B.A. All this distortion is because the Government did not support them. He agreed with those who say that the Budget deficit would not be met by increasing the fees. As such, the Budget problem would not be addressed and the Budget problem would be addressed only if the Government fulfilled their commitments towards higher education.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha stated that there is a linkage between the proposal to hike the fees and the question of increasing the revenue of the University and reducing the expenditure. This debate has already taken place, when they considered the Budget wherein many suggestions were made to cut the expenditure and he was sure that many more could be thought of. Similarly, many valuable suggestions were made to increase the revenue and he was sure that many more could be thought of. But they are repeating the discussions which have already taken place. The question of increasing the fees is a separate issue and he felt that it is necessary to remove the perception that they are repeatedly emphasizing that they are being unfair to the students. The fact is rightly or wrongly, but according to him wrongly for a long time, there was no increase in fees, which was something like subsidies on Petrol and Diesel, etc. for political reasons, the prices are kept artificially at low level. Suddenly, when they felt the need to increase, there is hue and cry. Here also for a long time, there was no increase in fees at all. If they take it in real terms, the value that they are charging now, is in fact lower than what is fair. The value of the fee structure was higher than what they are proposing now. Therefore, the repeated perception which is being made is a wrong one and they have to explain it to the students. As far as burdening of poor students is concerned, he is fully with those, who felt that there is no burden on the poor students as there is a provision for helping them. If there is an accounting issue, that could be taken care of separately. They had also means of ensuring there is no undue burden on the poor and deserving students. If there are deserving students for higher education, he was sure that ways and means could be found to help them. However, the perception which is encouraged by many of them, he was not able to understand.



Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky stated that first of all he takes a strong exception to what Dr. Jagwant Singh has said. One should not make any sweeping statement on the role of any political party. The political parties are doing their level best for the cause of education. They could themselves see that many schemes had been started by the Central Government, including Mid-Day Meal Scheme, Free education up to Secondary level, etc. So far as hike in fees is concerned, he fully agreed with the viewpoints expressed by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Shri Satya Pal Jain and Shri Ashok Goyal. They already had numerous Self-Financing courses for which they charged huge amount as fee from the students. So far as normal courses are concerned, they should not increase the fees in such a manner. For a person, who is working as peon, small farmer, etc. and is earning between Rs.5,000/- p.m. and Rs.7,000/- p.m., an increase of Rs.500/- to Rs.1,200/- is a big amount. They should take all these things into consideration and should not effect any hike in fees.

Dr. Raghbir Dyal stated that he would like to take this issue ahead from where Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Shri Satya Pal Jain have left. As per the proposal, the minimum increase is between Rs.500/- and Rs.1,200/-. As said by him earlier that whenever any increase in fees is proposed, it should be accompanied by how much additional revenue would be generated. If they took an average increase of Rs.1,000/- and if there are about 15,000 students at the Campus, with the proposed fees hike the additional income would be about Rs.1.50 crore. Out of Rs.1.50 crore, Rs.75 lac would be kept aside for Mean-cum-Merit Scholarship as they had already approved that 50% of the additional revenue generated from the fees hike would be utilized for Mean-cum-Merit Scholarships. As such, only Rs.75 lac would actually be earned by the University. If they see the deficit of the University for the year 2015-16, a deficit of Rs.313 crore has been projected without taking into account the vacant positions. Rs.75 lac would be merely about 0.5% of Rs.313 crore. Though it has been discussed on several occasions, he knew that their implementation and delivery mechanism is very slow. Lengthy debates took place as to how revenue of the University could be increased, how to involve the alumni, how to cut the expenditure, etc., but the end result is that the fees should be increased. They created such a situation only to earn a sum of Rs.75 lac. They could cut their expenditure and also increase the revenue. He had said earlier, but again would like to repeat that their Academic and Administrative Audit process is very lengthy and taking much time. On the University Teaching Departments, including self-financing, an expenditure of Rs.206 + 101 crore = Rs.307 crore expenditure has been projected. As said by Shri Ashok Goyal and others that the filling up of vacant posts is absolutely necessary, but it has also to be kept in view whether they are able to pay salaries to the appointees. Governments are not giving funds to them and the UGC has also put a capping, but they are in a hurry to fill up the vacant posts and also giving promotions from Assistant Professors to Associate Professors and Associate Professors to Professors without seeing whether it is financially viable or not. So far as increase in revenue is concerned, there are several teaching departments, where the number of seats could be increased without any additional liability. So far as diversion of Rs.75 lac to Mean-cum-Merit is concerned, in fact, this Mean-cum-Merit Scholarship scheme is virtually non-starter. As per old data, only 4 students had availed this facility. Since they had not new data, they did not know the present position. As such, they are creating a buffer. They in the University had no roadmap as to how they could bring the intelligent students to the main stream, who dream of getting higher education here. He had strongly suggested in the meeting of the Dean, College Development Council and Budget Committee that a joint mechanism should be evolved so that they could incorporate it in their prospectuses enabling maximum number of students to avail the facility of Mean-cum-Merit scholarship. There are huge inventory losses in the University departments as a number of articles/equipments in the stocks, which could be written off and in this way, a huge income could be generated. But they have never bothered to take any step in this regard. Though he had suggested earlier, again would like to suggest that additional income could also be generated by allowing admissions to certain courses, e.g. M.Sc. (IT), PGDCA, etc. through lateral entry. Fee hike is only meaningful if a strong citizen charter is prepared, which is workable. He had been strongly raising the issue that their delivery mechanism is very poor and the citizen charter also did not exist. He could not tell them

the sufferings of the students of the affiliated Colleges as well as the teaching departments of the University. They should be told what is their roadmap for increasing the fees of the students and what additional income they had generated and up to what level they had reduced the expenditure during the last three years. Since this has never been provided to them, he recorded his dissent on the proposed fees hike.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that some of the points have been made quite clear by his Fellow colleagues. Whenever this issue is placed before the Senate, a lot of discussion takes place because it is very important and the society at large, students, teachers, Senators, political parties and Governments are concerned about it. From this it emerged that they are in a dilemma and while solving that dilemma, they are taking themselves much ahead. Though they are fully aware that the additional income of Rs.75 lacs would not drastically change the financial position of the university, still they are thinking of increasing the fees because they had a directive from the Central Government. Whenever they talk about privatization in this House, they could not say so outside this House.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him remind them once again that so far as difficulty of the Chief Executive Officer is concerned, he had to ensure that the employees of this University get salary every month. The salaries could not be paid until the grant is released by the Central Government and grant in the Centre is released by the bureaucrats and not by the Minister concerned. The bureaucrats have certain ways of functioning. The present Secretary, Higher Education, with whom he had a meeting for about 75 minutes told him that he is fully aware that the problems of this unique University are structural and could not be solved or addressed by having 8% tag/limit, which is being put on the non-plan budget of the Central Universities. So he (Secretary) is fully aware and conscious but he told him that this is a directive of the Centre to all the Central Universities, Institutions including IITs, IIMs, etc. to which they have full commitment to pay salaries etc., whereas they had no commitment of that kind towards this University. Their commitment towards this University is only to meet the deficit, which is about 50% of the total Budget. He (Secretary) said that Panjab University has to be seen to be following the same directive, if the IITs, IIMs, Central Universities etc. are asked to increase in fees in some manner or the other, the Panjab University should also bring about some increase in fees. Whatever proposed increase is, whether Rs.500/- or Rs.1000/- per annum, it is just that notional commitment, which University bodies are permitting them to do. Thereafter, the University can request the Central Government to release its grant to meet the commitment which the Centre had made some years ago. The Centre had made that commitment after sending a team to Panjab University, which evaluated all the concerns of this University. The University had also made certain commitments to Centre. If the University fulfilled those commitments, only then the Centre would meet the deficit. However, there is no commitment given to the Centre that there would not be more than 8% increase in deficit annually. This 8% limit has simply come because in the initial years their deficit was met in an ad hoc manner from a plan budget head of UGC, but now the deficit is being met out of a non-plan budget head of the UGC, which has this 8% annual increase limit. The Centre is fully aware that if they did not give them what they asked last year, they would have to give the same to them this year. It is not that they can go back on their commitment, because it is the commitment by the Government of this nation that the deficit of our University would be met by the Central Government. Prime Ministers and political parties come and go, but a commitment, which is made to a national institute enacted under an Act of Parliament, has to be honoured, irrespective of whatever party/government is in power. If a Government goes back from its commitment, that has to be done on the basis of some assessment and they welcome any assessment to be made by the Central Government. Let the Central Government send any fact finding Committee or whatever else they wanted to do to arrive at such a decision. They as teachers, responsible to the society in this region, have a right to take up the matter with the elected representatives – whether Members of Parliament or political parties, who represent the society in various ways in this very House. They have to talk to them and put up their case to the Central Government that they could not go back from the commitment as they are a national

institution serving a national purpose. If this institution has to go down, let the Parliament of India know as to why this institution is going down. They were asked to have a NAAC compliance, which they complied with. The NAAC team pointed out that 40% of the teaching positions are vacant, of course, they did not take into account the re-employed faculty. According to him, only about 30% positions are vacant. If the UGC gives a directive to fill up all the vacant positions by a given date, they have to do that. If they did not do that, their NAAC rating would definitely go down because they would be falling short of requisite teacher-taught ratio and the branding of the University would also go down vis-à-vis other Universities of the Centre and young people would not find jobs. They would also suffer in various other ways. Everything is related to NAAC rating, including University with Potential for Excellence and money to set up Skill Centre at the campus, etc. It is in that spirit that the hike in fee has been proposed, simply to see so that the Centre releases the money at least in installments for the next financial year, so as to enable Panjab University to pay the salaries to its employees (both teaching and non-teaching). Receiving the money for this year meant that some compliance has to be shown to the Central Government. If they argued that nobody asked them to start self-financing courses and it was the decision of the Senate of this University that they shall start self-financing and other new courses, they could question they did not seek their permission. When P.U. started these courses, there was no commitment from the Central Government that it would meet the deficit of the University. They had done so many things, including establishment of University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, etc. on behalf of this University, but had not done anything wrong as they did start new institutes to serve the society. They should be bold and forthright in saying that whatever they have done, is justified. But if the practicality demands and a given bureaucrat says that Panjab University has to do a little bit so that he/she could release the money to the University to continue it functioning, we should accept his/her argument.. It was in that spirit that this minimum increase in fees has been proposed in order that the University should move on, some notional increase gets effected. If he (Secretary) questioned whether they had done something, he would say that they had effected the increase in fees and the debate took place in this House, which comprised of eminent persons (both elected and nominated by the Vice-President of India) for an institution enacted by an Act of Parliament, residing in this part of the country, he could be shown the proceeding of the Senate if need be. He (Secretary) could himself see the consensus and they had done whatever they could do. He (Vice-Chancellor) could request him not to hold his hands and let this national institution go down. They are at the threshold of crossing the barrier of 200 best institutions globally, they could continue to be amongst the 200-300 institutions or cross the barrier of 200 institutions, only if they continue to recruit new faculty and also grow this institution as a research University and so on and so forth. All this would not happen if some input from the State sector would not get provided to them. In fact, they are not asking for great deal of money from the State sector. If a few tens crores of rupees are given additionally to this University, which is a national institution, it would not make much difference to the government, but it could propel Panjab University to a higher level of performance. They are a national institution and they should be proud of it. As such, their needs ought to be met by the Central Government. The Vice-Chancellor added that he was shown the data in MHRD that they are not receiving the kind of money which the Central University, Hyderabad, and many other Central Universities are receiving, but when it comes to deliverance, Panjab University is second to none. They are producing more graduates, Ph.Ds. and are standing vis-à-vis other national Institutions. Several other national Institutions, including the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR), a deemed University are receiving much more grants than the Panjab University. In fact, this August House would be surprised to know that TIFR is receiving three times more grant than what the Panjab University is receiving, but it is producing less than hundred Ph.Ds. in a year and the Panjab University is producing more than 300 Ph.Ds. annually. He is prepared to fight for his first *alma mater*, viz. Panjab University but he could do so only if they support him. In this background, he would like the debate to move on.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she appreciates the observation that the discussion is repetition sometimes one would feel as if it is the exact copy of what has happened last time (on March 29, 2015). The question is why the House indulged in repetition of discussion time and again. This time, they must introspect it. At various platforms while commenting upon the political system whatsoever it might be, very frequently the complaints against wasteful expenditure done by the politicians. They had discussed so many times in this very House, which comprised eminent people, and time and again insisted that why did they not have a Committee to look into the wasteful expenditure right from top to the bottom. The Committee should examine office-wise, branch-wise, officer-wise, what they could do. But they had not done anything in this regard. Logically speaking, the discussions should lead to a decision, but she thought they are yet to see a decision by discussions. Unless it is disallowed, the discussion is going to be repeated.

Shri Deepak Kaushik stated that he wanted to make two suggestions – one for increasing the income of the University and the other for reducing the expenditure. Referring to Wi-Fi charges of Rs.30/- p.m. to be charged from the Campus students, he suggested that Wi-Fi facility should be provided to the residents of the Campus and for that they could charge a sum amounting to Rs.100/- p.m. to Rs.200/- p.m. because the children of the employees are also the students. In this way, they would increase the income of the University up to some extent. Perhaps, with this, the income might be raised from Rs.75 lac (from fees) to Rs.1 crore. As said by one of the members that they could not avoid filling up of vacant teaching posts as subject-wise teachers are required. Similarly, they could also save some money by allowing the senior persons to officiate against the higher posts, instead of recruiting new persons for whom they have to shell out at least Rs.75,000/- p.m. to Rs.85,000/- p.m. each. If they allow the senior persons to officiate against the higher posts, only one increment is to be given which is a very meagre amount.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that he was the Chairman of this Committee. Some of the persons had enquired whether the proposed fee hike is monthly or annual. There are certain traditional Departments and also certain other self-financing Departments, e.g., UIET, etc. Had they ever compared the fee structures of these Departments? In fact, this University is functioning on the basis of self-financing courses/ Departments. The fee structure of traditional Departments is less than even the fee charged by the schools for nursery class. Had they ever compared their fee with the fee charged by the private schools for nursery class? In the case of traditional courses, only Rs.40/- p.m. has been increased and for those, whose parents have salary in lacs of rupees (for self-financing courses), even if with 5% increase worked out to be Rs.5000/-, only Rs.1,200/- p.m. has been suggested to be increased. On the one hand, the students are paying thousands of rupees as fees in the private schools, whereas in the University they are protesting even an increase of Rs.40/- p.m. According to him, the proposed fee increase has been done after taking into confidence the students, therefore, it should be approved.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora stated that the words 'fee hike' are a sensitive and emotional issue. Whenever this issue had come to the Senate or whenever it would come, all of them would make their speeches as usual. They might have seen that whenever a Budget is presented in the Parliament, the political parties, which are not part of the Government, always criticize the Budget and never say the prices should be hiked. But they have found a solution by appointing a Committee to examine whether hike is to be made and if yes, what hike could be made. He suggested that similar Committee should be formed by them. The recommendations of this Committee should be placed before the broad Committee suggested by him for consideration. To the plea that the students are poor and could not afford payment of fees, he said that in the University campus only 10% students might be belonging to poor families. Had they ever thought about the affiliated Colleges where about 90% of the students belonged to poor families? When the fee in the University is hiked by 5%, the same is hiked @ 2.5% for the affiliated Colleges. Income has to be increased from one source or the other because there is not a single

stakeholder of education and instead education has many stakeholders, e.g., parents, society, students, employees, etc. As such, some of the expenses are bound to increase. When the expenditure on salaries, pension, electricity bills, etc. are going to be increased, from where they would pay the same. Some of them have suggested that some income could be generated by selling wasteful material and increasing the seats, but first they have to find out waste material and then sell. Similarly, if the number of seats is increased, they have to appoint additional teachers, which would again increase the expenditure. He, therefore, suggested that a Broad Committee should be formed to find the solution for hiking the fees both for the University as well as affiliated Colleges.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that issue would always emerge. According to him, they also worked like the Government, i.e., first make an increase of Rs.10/- and when somebody protests, they reduce it to Rs.5/- as usually the Government did while increasing the prices of petrol and diesel. Had the fees been increased only by 2.5%, there would not have been any protest because ultimately they have to take decision at a point or find a middle path. Though all of them had given their viewpoints, but the situation is as it was. According to him, there should be a separate Committee for finding ways and means and how to increase the resources of the University, which now even the Governments are also doing. Schools are being used as Girls Colleges in the evening. They should also think about optimum utilization of the available resources and how to cut the expenses, but they are not thinking in this direction. Instead they are sticking to increasing the fees to which every stakeholder is worried. However, when they go to Medical and Engineering Colleges, nobody asked/protested. He suggested that the students should be counseled and thereafter hike in fee should be recommended. The members of the Committee had made certain promises to the students that they would reduce the rate of hike in the Syndicate/Senate, that is how it is coming out. He, therefore, suggested that the fees should be hiked only by 2% instead of 5%.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that his concern is only that the subsidy of public funding is going to which section of the society and this needed to be watched carefully. In fact, the subsidy of public funding is being taken by those, who are in the merit, and in the merit are those, who studied in Public and Convent Schools. The poor and rural area students did not get subsidy of public funding as they did not get admissions and they have no alternative, but to take admissions in private Institutions where they have to pay huge fees. According to him, the subsidy should go to the poor and deserving students only. The students, who came to the University in luxurious cars and are able to pay high fees, should not be provided subsidized education. They are favouring reduction of fee for those who are coming to this University after studying in private/convent schools, wherein they had paid fees more than Rs.50,000/-. Only 4% of the students taking higher education belong to the rural areas. They should be worried about the poor and deserving students and not about the students, who belong to rich families. As such, they have to carefully watch to whom the subsidy is going. It needed to be seen as to how much expenses the President, Panjab University Students' Council, who had made the representation, had incurred on his election. Since the inflation is increasing, is it not their duty to address the inflation by increasing the fees? Every employee is getting dearness allowance twice a year. Whether the University did not require the dearness allowance in the form of additional income? The Committee had thought rationally and recommended minimum hike in the fees. If the fees are not increased every year, there is a big gap and have to fill up the gap by recommending exorbitant hike, and then some of them make a lot of hue and cry. Therefore, the Senate last year decided that they would effect minimum increase in fees every year so that their regulatory bodies could not question them. He had the sympathy to the students, but to those who could not pay the fees and not to those who could easily pay the fees.

Shri Naresh Gaur stated that some of his friends had argued that people are paying lacs of rupees as fees in the public and convent schools. He wanted to ask those friends as to how much percentage of such students are. They should also know as to how much difficulties are being faced by certain people to pay the fees of the children. He agreed with Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Shri Satya Pal Jain and Shri Harmohinder Singh

Lucky that there are several under-privileged people, and if they know that the University is going to increase the fees, they would stop thinking of providing education to their children. Last year, when they opposed the proposed 10% fee hike, it was reasoned that the fees had not been increased for the last six years. After deliberations, it was decided that this year 5% fee should be increased, but in future, minimum of increase, i.e., 2%. He, therefore, opposed the proposed fee hike and wished that if it is approved, his dissent should be recorded.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that 60% of the students, who studied in Panjab University Teaching Departments and P.U. Regional Centres, are not poor. Therefore, the proposed fee hike is not on the higher side. However, if at all the maximum limit of self-financing courses is to be brought down, it should be brought down to Rs.1,000/- from Rs.1,200/- and the same should be approved.

Shri K.K. Dhiman said that the proposed fee hike should be approved with the stipulation that the upper limit of the hike be brought down to Rs.1,000/- from Rs.1,200/-.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla stated that earlier, they had increased the fees of the affiliated Colleges by 2.5%. Therefore, the fees of the University should also be allowed to be increased and the proposed fee hike should be brought down to Rs.400/- and Rs.1,000/- from Rs.500/- and Rs.1,200/-, respectively. If they did not increase the fees every year, at one point of time they have to effect much increase. Simultaneously, they should also increase the amount of scholarships, which is being paid to poor students.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that instead of writing fee hike of 5% "subject to a minimum increase of Rs.500/- and maximum of Rs.1,200/-", it should be written fee hike of 5% "subject to a minimum increase of Rs.40/- p.m. for traditional courses and maximum of Rs.80/- p.m. for self-financing courses, which would give a lenient view.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that the fee hike proposed by the Committee is very nominal and it should be approved as such. Secondly, some of the Hon'ble members are saying that several students came to the University after studying in public/convent schools, where the fee is much high. He suggested that in the admission form a column should be incorporated "whether the candidate is coming from Government School or Public School and Convent School" so that while increasing the fees next time, they should have some data base. Thirdly, Shri Deepak Kaushik has suggested for making a provision of Wi-Fi facility to the campus residents at month charges of Rs.100 to Rs.200/-. The Vice-Chancellor would recall that he had also suggested some mechanism for making entries of Provident Fund, but he was sorry to point out that nothing has been done in this regard so far. There are certain buildings of the University, e.g., building behind Department of Botany, where the classes are being taken, there also the Wi-Fi has not been installed. He pleaded that there also the facility of Wi-Fi should be provided; otherwise, if the students sat on dharna, they would be in trouble.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that the effect of increase in fees is very small. At the same time, the pressure is there on the Vice-Chancellor to increase the fees up to some extent. Though the members, who are against the proposed fee hike, are right, they are not keeping the total picture in mind. His first reaction was that the Vice-Chancellor should have a meeting with Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Shri Satya Pal Jain, Ambassador I.S. Chadha and others who had experience of working at different levels, to find a solution. Since the people are not prepared to increase the fees, he would suggest that they should accept hike in fees @ minimum of Rs.35/- p.m. and maximum of Rs.80/- p.m. At the same time, he would request Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal to advise them as to how they could meet their deficit as the bureaucracy has asked them to do certain things, which might create unnecessary resentment and problem for them.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that it is an onerous responsibility, which has been bestowed upon him by Professor R.P. Bambah, for whom he has utmost regard. He did feel to take note for the sake of his argument that what is the total implication and the same needed to be kept in mind. He was sure that nobody should whether they are part of the present Government or their Government (Government led by Dr. Manmohan Singh) is/was of this option that the University must effect increase in fees. He thought that it is the Officer/s who is/are expressly/explicitly saying or insisting upon the University that the funds to the University would be released only if they hike the fees whatever little bit, is not a reasonable demand from those people. He knew the expenditure which goes waste in the Government. Maybe, he had made a small point when he referred to waste papers, etc., but that was a point, which he wanted to highlight. He could certainly say and had the experience that whenever they made an exercise to reduce the expenditure, they would certainly succeed. He thought it is view of the Senate, he did not want to speak again unless it is very essential. He would not rush to the Well of the House as he did not think that it is the sound of the democracy and the provisions of the democracy would always prevail. Since he has been asked to plead again, he holds the same view that the Government of India and Government of Punjab are spending a lot of money elsewhere. In fact, this University had almost got the status of Central University, but it was because of the Punjab Government (irrespective of which party was in power at that point of time) that the said status was put on hold. Now, it is the responsibility of the Punjab Government to meet 40% of the deficit of this University as the University has large number of the colleges affiliated to it in the state of Punjab. If the Punjab Government did not wish to pay the agreed 40% of the deficit of the University, he would agree with those who are of the view that they should take up the matter with the Governments. However, he was certainly of the view that they could do well without the proposed fee hike which is only going to generate an additional income of Rs.1.50 crore.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that he was in favour of the proposed fee hike as it is a marginal hike. If they did not effect even this marginal fee hike, they would not be able to meet their expenses. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has rightly suggested that they should pursue their case with the Punjab Government. So far as colleges are concerned, they went to Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court and got released grants amounting to more than Rs.500 crore. He suggested that the University should also explore the possibility of getting full grant from the Punjab Government through the Court. In the end, he said that he was in favour of the proposed fee hike as also increase in the fee structure of the affiliated colleges because the new pay scales are going to be implemented from 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2016, which would definitely put additional burden on the University as well as colleges. As such, the proposed fee hike is justified.

Shri Satya Pal Jain, referring to statement made by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal that Panjab University had almost got the status of Central University, but could not get the same because of the Punjab Government, stated that he just wanted to make it clear that Panjab University could not get the status of Central University because of the entire leadership of the State. Whether the Government was of Akali Dal or the Congress, both had opposed grant of status of Central University to Panjab University. The very next day, the statements of Captain Amrinder Singh and Mrs. Rajinder Kaur Bhattal had appeared in the newspapers that they will not allow the Panjab University to become a Central University. He did not wanted to blame anybody as it was the stand of all the political parties of the State, including BJP. The Vice-Chancellor had rightly said that whenever they went for release for grant, the officers insisted for increasing the fees. The previous Government had put a condition that they would not release the grant unless the corporation imposed the house tax. Ultimately, they gave an undertaking that the grants should be released to them as they would impose the house tax. In Chandigarh, certain schools charged capitation fee amounting to lacs of rupees for class 1, 2, 3 & 4 and people readily pay the same. But when they come to University, their approach is totally different. As suggested by Dr. Dinesh Kumar, a column should be inserted in the admission form as to wherefrom the candidate concerned has got previous education so that they could know how many students had got education from Public/Convent

schools, where they had paid fees in lacs of rupees. When the issue regarding increase of fees by the schools came in Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, the High Court constituted three Committees headed by Retired Judges. Whenever any proposal for hike in fees is received, this Committee collected all the relevant data/documents, and make recommendation/s accordingly. Since they all wished that the University should function smoothly and progress further, they should sit together and find a solution to the problem. Several people are working on contract basis at a salary of Rs.8,000/- p.m. in different organization, including PGIMER, Government Medical College & Hospital, Panjab University, etc. How could they afford to pay the fees and enable their children to get higher education? Under the circumstances, how they would meet their livelihood? Even if a single child is deprived of higher education with their decision of hiking the fees, they all should be responsible for that. Though he is totally against increasing the fees, it should be examined whether they should go for different fee structure differentiating the students belonging to poor and rich families. He, therefore, suggested that a Committee should be constituted to look into the whole issue.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that since certain comments have been made, he wanted to make submission again. He could certainly understand what was being said. Firstly, it was matter of fact that it was only and only the then Chief Minister, Punjab, who had written a letter to the Prime Minister, withdrawing his earlier consent. Secondly, he is associated with a Public School in Chandigarh, i.e., Delhi Public School. Let any person anywhere in the city or elsewhere say that lacs of rupees are being charged by that School. In fact, Delhi Public School is the only School, which gave more seats to economically weaker sections (EWS) even before the provision of 25% reservation for EWS was made by the Government. On the other hand, he did not wish to say what is the support extended to whom by whom. However, he does certainly feel they should not reduce this to a political arena.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the bureaucrat has not said that the money would not be released if they did not increase the fees. The bureaucrat actually wanted to help them. He (bureaucrat) wanted to plead to the Finance Ministry that this University needed the support of an exceptional kind being a national Institution, but is not putting a pre-condition. He (bureaucrat) just told him (Vice-Chancellor) that there is a directive to all the Central Institutions to keep increasing the fees. He (bureaucrat) just left it to them that they are seen to be doing what the other Central Institutions are doing. As such, the nominal hike in fee in fact strengthens his (bureaucrat) hand to plead on behalf of this University to the Finance Ministry. The Governments also have their own compulsions and they have a Plan Budget and Non-Plan Budget. The Government has restriction as to how much increase could be made in the Non-Plan Budget. So long as they were getting *ad hoc* grant from the plan Budget, it was okay, but they could not use the money from the Plan Budget towards a Budget Head which related to payment of salaries and pension. Since a large part of the Panjab University deficit from Central Government goes to the salary and pension, UGC has transferred payment to Panjab University from a Plan Budget Head to a Non-Plan Budget Head. The Non-Plan Budget of the Central Government has a ceiling. Within that ceiling, if that ceiling is not applied to them because their deficit is being met in a certain way and they did not have guidelines in the Non-Plan Budget (of Central Government) that P.U. salaries are to be met like the salaries of teachers of other Central Universities/Institutions, a special case has to be made on behalf of the Panjab University by the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) to help his counterpart in the Finance Ministry. If they strengthen his hand by increasing the fees a little bit, it was in that spirit that the nominal fee hike every year strengthens the P.U. case that their needs are to be met (by Central Government). Let him clarify that no bureaucrat has said that if they did this, they would do this. No such thing has been said. He has just hinted in a broad way that all the Central Institutions have been asked to enhance their income via the budget head of fees. In that spirit, only notional hike has been proposed. Last year, they said that let they not repeat the mistake which they had committed for about six years and decided that fees should be hiked a little bit every year so that whenever they approach the



Central Government, the Government Official cannot point out that P.U. is not doing anything on its own. He appealed to all of them to approve the proposed fee hike.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that he has been in favour of increase in fees for the last so many years. At one point of time, they had suggested 25% hike in fee as the fees have not been increased for so many years as he had differences with Shri Ashok Goyal. But now he understood that Shri Goyal was right and he was wrong. The fee should not be increased at all, as said by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and other because if they see the expenditure side they themselves would find that there are certain areas where they could cut down their expenses. It is rightly said by someone that 'money saved is money earned'. The Vice-Chancellor could tell them that he had saved Rs.10 crore or Rs.15 crore by cutting down expenses at such and such level. They should not increase the fees through which they would earn only Rs.75 lac just to beg from the Government. He had made a study and has found that last year, their expenditure on the Non-Plan side increased by Rs.56 crore. Similarly, the expenditure on salaries increased from Rs.344 crore to Rs.400 crore, but the Government has told they could not give them more than 8%. This meant that Government would give additional grant of Rs.12-15 crore only and if they fill up all the advertised posts, the additional expenditure would be about Rs.15 crore per annum. When they seek grants from the Government in the meetings, including in the meeting of the Board of Finance where the representatives of Governments are present, they reasoned that they are carrying out the academic and administrative audit and getting grants from them. This has been going on for several years. Nobody is thinking about the students and instead they are exploiting them. They are ready to incur an additional expenditure of Rs.15 crore per year after the recruitment of teachers as it would boost the morale of the students, but the income to be generated through hike in fees would not be sufficient. According to him, the additional expenditure of Rs.15 crore per year should not be incurred, till they complete the Academic and Administrative audit, which they had committed in the meetings of the Board of Finance. First they should complete the audit, affect the merger of Departments into schools, etc. through which they could save Rs.10-15 crore annually. He pointed out that till date the sum of Rs.17 crore or Rs.20 crore, which they were supposed to transfer to Pension Corpus, has not been transferred. He knew how the said amount would be transferred to Pension Corpus. These are all business tactics. If they did not carry out the Academic and Administrative audit, ultimately, it would affect their salary and pension. He pleaded that the posts, which they had advertised, should be filled up after carrying out the complete Academic and Administrative audit so that they could justify their expenditure. In the end, he said that he is against the proposed fee hike.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that certain core issues have been emerged and they are inter-related with each other. But the issue which the Vice-Chancellor had raised is very complex. He knew as head of a Research Institution (i.e., CRRID) which is about 35 years old, that his problems and the problems of the Vice-Chancellor, P.U. are the same. As said by the Vice-Chancellor, it is for their information that they are facing problems, which every Research Institution is facing. Professor R.P. Bambah, who is Senior Vice-Chairman, and Shri Sibal, who is also an Hon'ble member of his Institution, could tell them though they are providing all the input for policy formulation by the Government of India and Government of Punjab, they are also facing similar problems in getting grants. He did not know whether the Governments would be able to meet their commitments and that is a big question. What the Vice-Chancellor had told is very important that the bureaucrat wanted to help the University because the Prime Minister used to tell him (Shri Malhotra) that if the bureaucrat wanted to help, nobody could stop him and if not, nobody could get it done. They should definitely respond to the helping hand extended to them by the Secretary, MHRD. Whichever notional increase in fees is to be decided by this House, would establish their credentials with the MHRD and the same is more important than anything else. As such, it is important for the members that whatever increase in fees they wanted to make should be made as it is not a question of Rs.5 or Rs.10, the question is that they have to establish and continue to improve their credentials with the Government at various levels so that they are able to carry forward the agenda of the University. He is little bit disappointed with the views

expressed by both Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Shri Satya Pal Jain, even though both of them are his good friends. Whatever Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has said about the grant of Central University status to Panjab University is right and at the same time, Shri Satya Pal Jain is also right. But the fact of the matter is that S. Parkash Singh Badal wrote the so called letter withdrawing the consent given by the Government for bestowing the status of Central University upon Panjab University. The proposal was withdrawn because of the opposition from various parties, including the Congress, Akali Dal, etc. In fact, the Prime Minister was personally interested that this University should become a Central University so that it could rise to the level of excellence in the country, but was disappointed. There were forces other than the Congress and SGPC also, which prevailed upon the Chief Minister to withdraw the consent already given to the Prime Minister for granting the status of Central University to Panjab University. Though the Chief Minister wanted this University to become Central University, but he came under the pressure of local media, Punjabi media and all those people who had been the opinion makers in the politics of Punjab. As such, the Chief Minister was placed in a helpless position. Therefore, both of them are right. What suggestion has been made is very important because they have to have a roadmap. Today the Panjab University is facing the same problem which many universities, including Punjabi University is facing. When the Vice-Chancellor of Punjabi University increased the fees, the students went on strike and he had to withdraw the fee hike. He suggested that all the heads of the universities should get together with their roadmap and place it before the decision makers what kind of excellence they desire from the higher education system with the present financial constraints or whatever changes they want in the functioning of the universities. They have to look at the things differently. The quality of education is shrinking. He happened to meet some boys and girls who had done masters degrees in English from the institutions recognized by the UGC, but was surprised to see that they were not able to write even two lines accurately in English. The students told him that the universities are interested only in collecting the fees from the students and did not care for the quality of education. He knew the names of such universities, but did not want to disclose. They have also to keep in mind the fact that they are competing with peer institutions and the NGOs which are getting better grants from the Government than Panjab University. Let there be a comprehensive Committee comprising of Vice-Chancellors of the universities in the region so that they could arrive at a consensus as to what kind of help/changes the Government of India wanted so that the Vice-Chancellors have not to run around for mobilizing support for the system.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that the representatives of the students were present in the meeting of the Committee and they agreed to proposed enhancement. Since the proposed fee hike is genuine, the same should be considered and approved. So far as Wi-Fi charges of Rs. 30/- p.m. are concerned, the boarders were already paying Wi-Fi charges @ Rs.50/- p.m. and the Wi-Fi charges have been levied on the demand of the students. He, therefore, suggested that the Wi-Fi charges of Rs. 30/- p.m. should also be approved.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that two types of views had come. Some of the members were of the view that the proposed fee hike should be approved and some others are against it. Some of the members have also suggested that the minimum fee hike should be brought down to Rs.400/- from Rs.500/- and maximum to Rs.1,000/- from Rs.1,200/-. He suggested that without going into any further discussion, it should be seen if the majority of the members are in favour of the proposed fee hike, it should be approved and if not, it should not be.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that if they are sure that with this fee hike of 5% the grants would be smoothly released by the Government, the proposed fee hike of 5% should be approved. If the grants are not likely to be got even in spite of proposed fee hike, this burden should not be put on the shoulders of the students. As said by Professor Keshav Malhotra, they should sensitively think about curtailment of expenditure. So far as levying of charges of Rs.30/- p.m. for using Wi-Fi is concerned, he enquired whether these charges would also be levied on the faculty members as well as

non teaching staff as they also use this facility. He pleaded that these charges should also be imposed on the faculty members as well as non teaching staff. There is wastage of financial resources in the form of electricity charges, water charges etc, which needed to be taken care of. Just to meet the wasteful expenses, they should not effect the hike in fees of the students. To cut down the expenses, at least the local Senators should volunteer to attend the meetings of the University without claiming TA/DA. In the end, he strongly emphasized that as recommended by a Committee earlier, only 2.5% hike in fee should be approved and implemented. Some of the members have said that majority of the students studying in the campus belong to rich families. Had they conducted any survey in this regard? If even 5% of the students, who really belonged to poor families, are deprived of higher education, it would be irresponsible on their part. He reiterated that since the proposed fee hike of 5% is on the higher side, only 2.5% hike in fee should be approved.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that when she was coming to attend the meeting of the Senate, while passing from Sector 8, she has seen that the students were entering DAV School, Sector 8, Chandigarh, for appearing in an examination. She suggested that there are several buildings in the University, which could be allowed to be used for conduct of competitive examinations through which they could generate some resources. She added that they should not wholly depend on the grants to be received from the Punjab and Central Governments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University is a teaching and research Institute, wherein research is being carried out 24 × 7 hour in 365 days of the year. The University buildings in this sense are not free, like in schools, outside the classroom hours.

Continuing, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if they generated some income at their own level, there would not be any pressure on them from any quarter.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that they should not turn the issue of hike in fee into a political arena. If they carry out a objective survey in the University as he carried out in his classroom where there were about 100 students. He posed a question to the students whether they would disagree with the proposed fees hike of Rs.50/- and Rs.100/- p.m. and none of the students raised his hand and objected. In fact, the students leaders and others are politicizing the issue. They needed to get rid of this idea of political stand and look into at it objectively. He was of the view that if they look into it objectively, there are only a handful of students who are making this kind of noise and agitation. Majority of the students are for certain kind of hike in fees because with the hike, the quality of education is also taken care of and seriousness amongst the students would also come in as the students do not hesitate to pay a nominal amount. Keeping in mind the bureaucratic pressure or bureaucratic advice and certain pragmatic view, they should approve the proposed fees hike as it is a marginal hike.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that she was in favour of the proposed fees hike as the same had been recommended by a committee comprising representatives of the students, who had given their consent for this hike. They should not indulge themselves in lengthy discussions as the students are ready to accept the proposed hike in fees. Since she is on the panel of management committee of a school, knew that when the management of the school decided to effect 10% fee hike every year, nobody made any hue and cry. She had come across with managements of many colleges situated in Punjab and Chandigarh, which are running schools as well. Many of the schools are funding the colleges. Since they needed teachers and the salaries are also going up, they needed funds to meet the expenses. As such, the proposed fees hike is justified. Secondly, since the Punjab Government had withdrawn its consent for making the Panjab University a Central University, it should take the responsibility of funding the University. Of course, they should also generate some funds for which they could constitute a Committee.

Professor Rajat Sandhir stated that since it is populist idea he could also say that there should not be any fees hike, but it is the need of the hour to make hike in fees. The proposed fees hike raised between Rs.500/- and Rs.1200/- p.a. which is a very nominal hike and has been decided taking into confidence the representatives of the students. Therefore, the proposed fees hike should be approved. So far as suggestions made by the members for cutting down the expenditure and raising the revenue are concerned, they should definitely go for that.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he had met the leader of the students who has attended the meeting of the Committee and he had told him that he has neither given his consent nor signed the minutes of the Committee. If it was so, there was no need to make such a representation. In fact, his name was being misused. He was a member of the Committee which considered the issue of hike in fees of affiliated colleges and the Committee has recommended 2.5% hike in fees. He pleaded that if at all it has to be shown that the University is also generating some revenue, in the case of University also, only 2.5% hike in fees should be approved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that majority of the members were present in the meeting of the Committee. Though the proposal was that the fees should be hiked by 10%, after a lot of deliberations, it was decided that the fees should be hiked by 5% only. The President, PUCSC, who himself belonged to a self-financed course, was of the view that since the fees of the traditional courses is less, they could increase it more than 5%. He (Professor Goyal) further stated that even though the increase @ 5% in the case of self-financed courses amounted to more than Rs.5,000/-, the maximum increase suggested is Rs.1,200/-. So far as recommendation (2) relating to Wi-Fi charges is concerned, it has been recommended on the basis of the suggestion made by the students themselves because last time there was a strike from the students on the plea that why the Wi-Fi charges are being charged only from the boarders. For providing Wi-Fi facility in Sector-25, tender has already been allocated at a cost of Rs.1.38 crore and there is a continuous expenditure on that; and that was the reason they were paying the amount from that fund. It is better to have that fund supported by the University instead of by his office alone. He had already talked to the Finance & Development Officer and had suggested that whatever amount they collected from the hostels should be shifted to the University account and the same should be utilized for maintenance of this facility. So far as the suggestion made by Ms. Anu Chatrath for utilizing the infrastructure of the University, including buildings, for conduct of competitive examination etc. is concerned, they had already a department namely University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, which conducts such examinations by using various buildings of the University and generates resources for the University.

Professor Mukesh Arora remarked that whatever fee should be increased, should be increased but the second commitment that scholarship/freeship is to be given to the poor students, should be given respectably and not by humiliating the students. One of the NRIs has offered to meet the expenses of education of poor students but when the student came to avail the benefit, he was humiliated by remarking that he has worn a very nice clothes and he could not be a poor student. If such things continue, no one would come forward for the scholarships/freeships.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur, agreeing with the views expressed by Professor Mukesh Arora, stated that the amount of scholarships being given to the students belonging to economical weaker sections of the society is less in comparison to the fees being charged from them. If they are increasing the amount of the fees, the amount of the scholarships should also be increased so that some benefit could also be given to the poor students. Though there are NRI seats in different courses, the department concerned did not issue letters to the candidate concerned, especially NRI/PIO/foreign candidates, due to which the candidates in question could not get visa and admission to the courses. Citing an example, a candidate from Canada applied for admission to M.A. Psychology, but the Head of the Department did not issue the interview letter due to which the candidate could not get the admission. In this way, the resources of the University are wasted.

Dr. Emanuel Nahar said that since both Punjab Government and the Central Government are running away from their responsibilities, the responsibility lay with them to generate the funds. As such, they had no alternative but to approve the proposed fee hike. He, however, suggested that the interests of the students belonging to SC/ST/BC should be taken care of.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when they explicitly knew that they had recommended only minimum increase in fees and they could not survive without that, the proposed fee hike should be approved without any hesitation. They should also keep in mind that if they are not paid salaries due to shortage of funds, where they (teaching as well as non-teaching staff) would stage the dharna whether at the Punjab Civil Secretariat or at any other place. If in the absence of funds, the University could not offer certain courses, the students would join other private universities where they have to pay huge amount as fee. Whether they are prepared for this or not?

Shri V.K. Sibal stated that he had listened to the discussion carefully and he found it more ideological and emotional. They should focus on the proposal which is based on a consensus and perhaps not on real analysis. The University is an institution which gets paid for its services and it is not a free institution. They should understand that fees are an integral part of the University and they have to keep pace with the inflation. The more the gap is there for increasing the fee, the more resistance they would find. They have to reduce the gap and increase the fees based on some evidence and data and not on the basis of discussion or consensus so that the members of the Syndicate and Senate are fully apprised of the situation and take decision accordingly. Even the people in villages prefer to go to private schools as they had more faith in them even though they are more expensive and did not go to government schools because they lack facilities. On the one hand, they want to improve the quality of education being imparted in this University and on the other hand, they want to bring it down in terms of resources. In fact, they need to calmly consider this proposal of hike in fees, which would help them in getting funds for the University and the same are very essential. He, therefore, suggested that the proposal for hike in fees should be approved as it is a very marginal increase.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that the Wi-Fi charges should only be charged from the users and not from all the students as some of the students might not be having laptops, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the figure Rs.1,500/- had been arrived at as if the average fee of a self-financed course is Rs.5,000/- p.m. ( $5000 \times 12 = 60000$ ) and Rs.1500/- is only 2.5% of Rs.60,000/-. As such, it explained the rationale of Rs.1200/-. Now, there is plea of the students that they should do it in a differential way by reducing the gap between the subsidized and non-subsidized courses. It is in that direction that they had suggested low fee hike for the higher amount and high fee hike for the small amount. So it was in that spirit that this number of low limit of Rs.500/- and upper limit of Rs.1,200/- came up. Having given them the argument that this nominal increase in fees is in consistent with the last year's decision of the Senate that instead of not increasing the fees for many years, they should increase the fees marginally/incrementally every year, the hike in fees has been proposed. Doing it in a marginally manner, would definitely help them to articulate their case of having their deficit met. Nothing has come to them in writing that if they did not increase the fees, they (Government) would not give the money. The Central Government had made a commitment that they would meet the deficit of Panjab University and they are not going back from that commitment. No one in the Centre has said that they would not meet the deficit of Panjab University, there is indeed a continuity in the governance of the country. Even though they received Rs.17 crore less than what they needed in the previous year Budget. There was no statement made by any responsible Officer in Delhi that the claim of the University for additional sum of Rs.17 crore is not justified. The UGC had a financial crunch in their non-plan budget before March 31, 2015 and because of that

they stuck to the figure of Rs.176 crore, which they had written to us at some stage, they did not back-out from a number which they had committed. However, they were not in a position to give more grant to even though their Secretary, UGC, said that they would try to accommodate them up to the last date(31<sup>st</sup> March 2015). So this is the situation and it is his duty to inform them about the input which he received from time to time. The Secretary, MHRD, has agreed to visit the University and he understands that the problem of the University is structural and could not be sorted out by putting any cap on the non-plan budget of the University. In the background of this, he appealed to the members to approve the proposed hike in fee though he knew that there are some dissenting voices, but the majority of the members are in favour of approving the item.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that the Committee constituted to consider the issue of hike in fees of the affiliated Colleges has met and made its recommendations, but the same had not been placed before the Syndicate. Since the issue is of urgent nature as the Colleges have to print their Prospectuses mentioning the fees for the ensuing session (2015-16) and no meeting of the Senate is to be held within a couple of months, the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee/Syndicate, on behalf of the Senate.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) Fee hike of 5% be approved subject to a minimum increase of Rs.500/- and maximum of Rs.1,200/- for all courses run by the University and its Regional Centres for the session 2015-2016;
- (2) Wi-Fi charges of Rs.30/- p.m. be charged from all the University students;
- (3) The sub-head of fee structure be merged except those for which separate accounts are maintained; and
- (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.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee/Syndicate pertaining to fee hike of affiliated Colleges, on behalf of the Senate.

The following persons recorded their dissent for approving the proposed hike in fees:

1. Shri Raghbir Dyal
2. Shri Satya Pal Jain
3. Professor Keshav Malhotra
4. Principal R.S. Jhanji
5. Shri Naresh Gaur
6. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
7. Professor Mukesh Arora
8. Shri Ashok Goyal.

**XVII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-33 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-33.** 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.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that the last revision of remuneration for pre-conduct and post-conduct of examination had occurred in April 2012 and since then no increase in remuneration had taken place. However, if they see the budget of the last year, the income from examination was to the tune of Rs.80 crore, whereas the expenditure was only Rs.27 crore. Last year, some increase was made, but that related to only evaluation. In that background, there is an urgent need to increase the rates of paper settings, remuneration for examination duties (Centre Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Invigilators, etc.).

Dr. Kuldip Singh pointed out that though it has been decided that a Committee be constituted to consider revision in the rates of remuneration for various duties relating to examinations, no progress has been made so far. There is no revision of rates of remuneration for the last three years.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Kuldip Singh to give him a note and he would follow it up.

Shri Lilu Ram said that though LL.B. and B.E. MBA are undergraduate courses, why the rates of remuneration for paper setting and evaluation are being approved equivalent to rates of post-graduate courses.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that technically LL.B. is not a post-graduate course, but it is always taken at par with PG courses as admission to LL.B. is based on Bachelor degree.

To this, Shri Lilu Ram said that there are certain other courses admission to which is based on Bachelor degree. Why they are not treated at par with post-graduate courses?

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Lilu Ram to send him a note and the same would be looked into.

Dr. Emanuel Nahar said that the teachers at the evaluation centres are demanding that the rates of evaluation should be enhanced. He pleaded that their request should be considered sympathetically.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-33 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XVIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-34 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-34.** That the recommendations of the Board of Studies of UILS dated 5.5.2014 for amendment in Rules regulating admission and Promotion to B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5-Years Integrated course (1-10 semesters), as proposed by the Academic Committee of UILS, be approved.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 18.5.2014 Para 43)**

**RESOLVED:** That the amendments in Rules regulating admission and Promotion to B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5-Years Integrated course (1-10 semesters), as proposed by the Academic Committee of UILS, be approved.

**Item C-35 already considered in the meeting held on 29.03.2015.****XIX.**

Dr. Jagwant Singh pointed out that item C-35 was, in fact, not taken up for consideration; hence, it could not be approved.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that item C-35 was discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate, but not in the Senate. The item needed to be discussed in this House threadbare.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was said by some of the members that certain items, including Items C-35, C-53 and C-55, are of important nature, these should be taken up for consideration and thereafter these were approved.

Continuing, Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that from this advertisement certain issues emerged as he had filed a Writ Petition in the court. A directive in this regard has already been issued to the Colleges by the Punjab Government. However, this issue needed to be discussed in this House threadbare. These orders have been issued on the basis of the Writ Petition which he had filed in the court and now on the basis of the aforesaid orders, the University is issuing orders to the Colleges. In fact, these orders are contrary to the conditions laid down by the University for grant of affiliation. The Punjab Government has asked for filling up of 1925 posts and a *pro forma* for the purpose has been evolved. Simultaneously, the Government has said that the appointments should be made on contract basis for 3 years, whereas the regulations of the University/UGC and the reports of the inspection Committee say that the posts should be filled up on regular basis and thereafter affiliation should be granted. As such, the orders of the Punjab Government are contrary to affiliation conditions of the University.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that the Punjab Government has taken a decision and filed an affidavit in the High Court that for 3 years they will pay to the appointees basic pay + grade pay. The Syndicate has approved it being a special case. Further, Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University have already given advertisement for filling up the positions in the Colleges affiliated to them. If the Panjab University did not allow filling up these positions, it would lag behind as these posts specially belong to grant-in-aid Colleges.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that he did not question whatever Professor Naval Kishore has said, but they must have some take to address the contradiction. When they were talking about filling up of these posts on contract basis for 3 years, a complication emerges whether the persons appointed would be regularized after a period of 3 years because the selection process including the composition of the selection Committee is the same as is for making regular appointments. Now the problem is that certain teachers, who have been appointed on regular basis against uncovered posts, wanted to apply for appointment against these posts and if they are appointed, would they be regularized after a period of 3 years. They are in the dilemma that if they are not regularized after a period of 3 years, they would also not be able to return to the positions on which they are presently working. Therefore, it needed to be made clear whether those persons should apply for these posts or not. The Punjab Government had simply said in the court that they are going to fill up these posts and so far as the issue of appointment on contractual basis is concerned, it did not come up in the court. Had it been in the court, it would have been resolved. He suggested that they should allow filling up of these posts as per the directive of the Punjab Government, but since these are regular sanctioned posts, from their side the approval to the appointments should be on regular basis so that the appointed persons should not be placed in uncertainty.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that since the words 'contractual basis' have been mentioned in the advertisement, the Principals are going to fill up these posts on contractual basis and in the Syndicate he had said that they could not give panel for filling up the posts on contract basis because they have provision for filling up the posts either on regular basis or temporary basis. It was felt that there is a great need for filling



up these posts and ultimately it was decided by the Syndicate to allow panels for filling up of these posts on contract basis. According to him, till the word contractual is not deleted from the advertisement, the appointee could not be regularized nor approval as a regular could be granted.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that the positions have been advertised on contract basis initially for a period of 3 years. Thereafter, of course, there would be a review and perhaps these could be regularized. Otherwise, at this stage Panjab University could not give approval saying that these are regular positions. However, there is an understanding between the Punjab Government and the court that all the persons appointed against these posts would be regularized after a period of 3 years. He suggested that these posts should be allowed to be filled up.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council has said that the persons appointed against these posts would be regularized after a period of 3 years. If it is so, it should have been/should be made a part of the advertisement so that there is no confusion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that could they take a clarification from the Punjab Government. However, when they say that the appointments are on contract basis initially for a period of 3 years, it is implied that the appointees would be regularized after a period of 3 years. **Anyhow, he would get a meeting fixed with Dr. Roshan Sunkaria, Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab and Smt. Vini Mahajan, Principal Secretary, Finance, Punjab to sort out the matter.**

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that when another issue pertaining to decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015 came to the Syndicate that only the candidates having qualified UGC NET or Ph.D. under the new UGC regulations 2009 are eligible for the post of Assistant Professors, the Syndicate deferred the issue because the Syndicate and Senate of the University have already made the candidates eligible, who have done Ph.D. under the old regulations as well. Whereas as per the new *pro forma* evolved by the Punjab Government, only the candidates having UGC NET or Ph.D. under the new UGC Regulations 2009 are eligible for the post of Assistant Professors and the candidates who have done Ph.D. under the old regulations are ineligible. However, the University has not taken any decision that the candidates who have done Ph.D. under the old regulations are ineligible. He, therefore, pleaded that they should stick to their decision and whenever these posts are advertised, the candidates who have done Ph.D. under the old regulations should also be made eligible. If any clarification is to be sought, a clarification in this regard may also be sought.

Professor Naval Kishore stated that as per the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015, only those candidates are eligible, who have qualified UGC NET or have done Ph.D. under the new UGC Regulations, 2009. Punjabi University followed what Panjab University is doing, i.e. they have also made eligible the candidates who have done Ph.D. under the old regulations, whereas Guru Nanak Dev University had made only those candidates eligible who have qualified UGC NET and it did not accept any Ph.D. without course work. Now, they are re-advertising the positions. As per the decision of the Syndicate, if they did not allow the posts to fill up, expecting that the Supreme Court would review it after 90 days, would the judgment/decision be given by the Supreme Court on the 91<sup>st</sup> day? If the judgment/decision of the Supreme Court did not come for 3 years, whether the process of filling up the positions would be kept in abeyance? On the other side, NCTE has given clear cut guidelines that all the positions should be filled up by 31<sup>st</sup> October 2015 and if not filled up, the course/s would be derecognized with effect from the session 2016-17. Therefore, the decision of making those candidates, who have done Ph.D. under the old regulation, eligible would be in contradiction of the decision of the Supreme Court.

Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that this is a very serious issue and Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council has clarified the whole situation. Since both Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University are filling up the positions, if they did not allow the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, they would be deprived of filling up the positions because as per the decision of the Government these posts have to be filled up within a stipulated time. Secondly, they would also not be able to seek grants from the Government. He added that they had also filed a contempt to allow the Colleges to fill up the vacant posts. Thereafter, it has been decided by the Government that 1925 posts should be filled up. He did not know on what ground they had decided that the posts should not be filled up up to 15<sup>th</sup> June 2015. If they indulged in review, the review might take years and the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University would not be able to fill up these posts and seek grants from the Government. He did not know on what basis they had decided that they would not give panels for filling up the posts up to 15<sup>th</sup> June. So far as these posts are concerned, these are old posts and did not relate to self-financing courses at all. Whether they could not recruit people against the substantive posts? They could not take any decision in this regard because it is a decision taken by the Government, that too, on the direction of the Court. If there is any problem, they should request the Government to review the decision. So far as affiliation for new courses is concerned, they have to recruit teachers. If the Colleges are not able to fill up the positions due to delay in taking the decision or some other reasons, the University would be responsible.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that, if need be, a Committee should be constituted to examine the whole issue and make recommendation. However, it is wrong to say that Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University have already filled up the positions. They should not take decision in haste and make all those persons ineligible whom they have made eligible earlier.

Professor Naval Kishore said that it has been written in the notification itself that in case they did not follow the directive in toto, the appointments made would not be approved.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that Dr. Jagwant Singh had approached the court and they were thankful to him that they are able to get these posts. However, perhaps Dr. Jagwant Singh has forgotten to say that he has again approached the court pleading that these posts should be allowed to be filled up on regular basis, but his plea was not accepted by the court. He had also suggested in the Syndicate that they should not stop the process of filling up the posts. It is very essential to fill up these posts because the Punjab Government has decided to fill up all the vacant posts, including PCS, on contract basis on basic pay for 2 years and not even on AGP has been allowed. Though it is not written, understanding is that the appointees would not be thrown out. He, therefore, pleaded that the process should be allowed to be continued as they have advertised the positions as per the Punjab Government norms. They could not put ban on recruitment for any reason. They have evolved a template wherein only the candidates having UGC NET or Ph.D. with course work have been made eligible. However, if an opposite decision came from the Constitutional Bench, they would review it. He, therefore, suggested that they should continue with the process of filling up the posts.

On a point of order, Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that it is true that on his first Writ Petition the court allowed filling up these posts, but when he saw that the action is different, he filed a clarification writ pleading that the posts should be allowed to be filled up in accordance with the regulations of the UGC/University. The decision was that the posts would be filled up but whether as per the Government letter the posts would be filled up in accordance with the court orders. The court had said that they had directed to fill up the posts and if there is any problem, the issue did not come under Public Interest Litigation (PIL) and only affected party should come in or Dr. Jagwant Singh should file a contempt. He had supplied all the documents and he has been assured that all the appointees would be regularized after a period of 2/3 years. He pleaded that the same policy should be followed in the Colleges also. If they sought at least this

clarification, he did not think they would face any problem. In fact, the letter of the Government dated 30 July 2014 also contradicted with their own decision. In the case of other departments that the appointees would be regularized after a period of 2/3 years, but here it is not being written. If the Government wanted to do that in the case of Colleges also, it should be made clear so that there is no uncertainty.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that, in fact, they had taken a cue from the Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan under which initially the teachers were appointed on less salary for a period of two years and now they have been regularized. So far as period of less salary is concerned, a judgement has now come that full salary be paid for the period for which less salary had been paid and the same has also be implemented in the schools. The legal problem is that these positions have been approved under 95% grant-in-aid scheme of the Government and required to be filled up on regular basis. In one of the cases, they had question that the regular post could not be filled on *ad hoc*/temporary basis and on less salary, but that is a separate case and should be set aside. So far as qualifications for the post of Assistant Professor are concerned, most of the members have not read the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 15.3.2015. In fact, there is a conflict and the judge has said that Government of India has given a direction to the UGC under Section 20 that the qualification for the post of the Assistant Professor be either NET or SLET. The UGC had earlier constituted a Committee, which recommended certain relaxations/concessions, but those recommendations have not been accepted by the Government of India. This meant, that now the ball is in the court of Government of India and not within the realm of Supreme Court of India. Nobody had bothered to see the distinction. In fact, the UGC had done it and according to the UGC the candidates who had done Ph.D. under old Regulations are eligible for the post of the Assistant Professor. The Supreme Court of India in its judgement has said that the direction given by the Government of India under Section 20 is binding. Therefore, they should try to convince the Government of India on the plea that the Regulations say those, who are Ph.D. or obtain Ph.D. degree under new UGC Regulations 2009, are exempted from UGC NET. Now the union leaders should compel the Government to accept the plea that since the persons have done Ph.D. according to the law existent at that time, they could not be declared ineligible now.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur stated that the Government of Punjab has issued a notification in January 2015 to all the Government Departments to make recruitment on a basic pay + grade pay and nobody had been exempted, including College Teachers. As such, if the posts are advertised, the appointments would be made on the basic pay+ grade pay for a period of three years and thereafter the appointees could be regularized. But now the problem is that they are not filling up the posts due to judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court or the UGC. There are certain persons working in the Colleges for the last so many years, who have not done Ph.D. and now wanted to do Ph.D. but they are not allowed to do so either by the College concerned or the University because the University allowed only those teachers who are appointed on regular basis and not appoint on term basis. As such, their future is at stake. Therefore, they have to make clear-cut criteria as to who is eligible for the post of Assistant Professor. At one point of time even the Punjab Government had said that any person, who is enrolled/registered for Ph.D., is eligible and be protected while giving the advertisement; otherwise, they would be out of job.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that the advertisement for filling up of these posts had been issued on the basis of the notification issued by the Punjab Government. Now, since the members have pointed out certain difficulties/problems, they should take up the matter with the bureaucrats of Punjab Government so that a decision could be arrived at; otherwise, the Punjab Government would not allow filling up of the posts at a later stage. The candidates were willing to be appointed even on contract basis for a period of 3 years hoping that they would be regularized later on. If they are deprived of filling up of these posts, what would they do?

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that perhaps the decision of the Syndicate has not been explained in right perspective. In fact, there were two situations – (i) in the University the posts have been advertised contrary to the judgement delivered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. So the discussion was started with a view that these posts be re-advertised after the judgement of the Court, and thereafter, it was suggested that within 90 days review could be filed and if after the review, the judgement is reversed, they could go for another re-advertisement. In that context, they decided that they should wait for 90 days only for review to be filed and not that it was expected that the decision on the review would come just on the 91<sup>st</sup> day. It was not a point of contention whether the decision on the review would come on 91<sup>st</sup> day or after five years reversing the order of the Supreme Court, but till then the existing decision would have to be followed. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath has said that now the ball is in the court of Government of India, but they did not know when it would reach the Captain, who has to take the decision. Could they wait till that day without the teachers in the Colleges? They could well understand that whatever decision has been taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, they could not go beyond that. Because in that very judgement, this has also been discussed in detail as to which Ph.D. candidates would be considered eligible for appointment as Assistant Professor. So far as Colleges are concerned, especially in view of the decision taken by the Punjab Government, apprehension is that under the pretext that the decision of the Syndicate that no position be filled up in the Colleges also till 90<sup>th</sup> day or 91<sup>st</sup> day or till the decision is reviewed by the Supreme Court itself. His simple suggestion in this regard is if they apprehend that the positions would lapse because the Punjab Government has given a time bound programme for filling up these posts, nobody stopped them from filling up these positions even today because it is the judgement of the Supreme Court in terms of what the UGC and Government of India had said. In the meeting of the Syndicate dated 20<sup>th</sup> April 2015, it was decided that from that day onward the filling up the posts be stayed. But there were certain Colleges which have been given Panel by the University and in one of the Colleges even the interview had also been conducted day before yesterday, which is in violation of the orders of the Supreme Court. His simple suggestion is that the panel should only be given to those Colleges which wanted to take the benefit of filling up the positions as per the latest guidelines of the Punjab Government/Supreme Court of India. So far as University is concerned, they would have to wait because they have to revise their advertisement. In the case of Colleges, nowhere it has been mentioned that the candidate should have qualified UGC NET or Ph.D. instead it simply says as per the UGC, Punjab Government and Panjab University norms. As such, for Colleges the norms would be as per the Supreme Court and for the University, they have to wait.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that, in fact, 2-3 issues are involved in it. They might be remembering that they had conducted a Principals' Conference at Gurusar Sadhar. In that Conference, they as teachers and Principals had made a request that in accordance with the judgement of the High Court, the regulations of the University would facilitate them and not create obstacles in their ways. Though the regulations/rules of the University did not allow appointment on contract basis, on less salary, probation for three years, the Syndicate allowed appointment to be made on contract basis in exceptional cases. Further, the posts were covered under the 95% grant-in-aid scheme of the Government and the High Court ordered that 20% share would be of Managements and after three years, the share of the Managements would be 25% and 75% share would be of the Government. He once again requested that the regulations/rules of the University should not become obstacles in their way. So far as qualifications are concerned, since the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India came on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015, these qualifications are not applicable on the posts which have been advertised before 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015, as no decision could be implemented retrospectively. Secondly, the decision of the Supreme Court is not *ipso facto* applicable on them. The UGC had constituted a Committee to review the qualifications and the recommendations of the said Committee have been rejected by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Now, the ball is in the court of Government of India. According to him, when the orders are to be adopted by this House, only from then the new regulations/guidelines are to be applied/implemented. In the end, he said that they should allow the process to continue for

filling up these posts by the Colleges. If any clarification needed to be taken, the same should be obtained from the Government as it would facilitate the Colleges.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that the Punjab Government had issued the notification asking the Colleges to fill up these posts within three years, i.e., 25% up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015, 25% up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016 and 50% up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017. The advertisement with regard to filling up of these posts has to be given in three newspapers and the Colleges had spent about Rs.70,000/- for this purpose. The grant in the ratio of 80:20 (80% by the Government and 20% by the management of the Colleges concerned) is a separate issue. They have to fill up these posts and if not, since there is a ban for filling up the posts, where would they go. He pleaded that panels should be given by the University and interviews should be allowed to be conducted. So far as qualifications are concerned, earlier also they had given approval to the candidates having qualifications of M.Phil. and Ph.D.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that as suggested by a couple of members, a clarification should be sought from the Government. He suggested that the panels should be given for the posts which have been advertised before the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, but not to the posts which have been advertised later on or are yet to be advertised.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that Item C-35 related only to that the Punjab Government issued a notification along with *pro forma* of the advertisement and the same has been approved by the Syndicate and Senate. Whatever issues are now being raised by the Hon'ble members are arising out of. According to him, they could not deviate from the nature of post/s, which has been mentioned in the advertisement. The item is approved and there is no need for any further discussion. If need be, the Vice-Chancellor could constitute a Committee for advice. The panels should be given for posts which have been advertised.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that let him conclude. As rightly stated Item 35 had limited scope and the same stood already approved. Now, there is a broad consensus that their Colleges should not be at a loss. As such, they should not come in the way of filling up of the positions by the affiliated Colleges, on behalf of the University. A small Committee comprising knowledgeable people would also be constituted to study the ramifications and making recommendations, which should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.**

**When the members demanded that the University should give the panels to the Colleges, the Vice-Chancellor said that the panels are already being given and Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, had never said that the panels would not be given.**

**Item C-36 had been withdrawn.****XX.**

Considered letter No.MC/AE/Audit/2015/769 dated 5.2.2015 and the letter No.MC/AE/Audit/2015/788 dated 20.02.2015 (**Appendix-I**) (**Item C-37 on the agenda**) received from Special Secretary Finance for Finance Secretary, Chandigarh Administration on the complaint of Dr. Rajinder K. Singla (**Appendix-I**).

**NOTE:** (1) It was agreed upon in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 08.03.2015 (Para 5) that the University has already adopted the Regulations/Guidelines notified by the U.G.C. from time to time and following the same. The Vice-Chancellor has also written to different quarters in this regard accordingly giving all the details. The University would also write once again to the U.G.C./MHRD in this regard after the anticipated reiteration of it by Senate. If they give any directive to the University thereafter, the same would be placed before the Syndicate/Senate.

**This was agreed to.**

**(Syndicate dated 08.03.2015 (Para 5))**

- (2) As a follow up, on the letter dated 3.12.2014 (**Appendix-I**) of Registrar Education (C) written on behalf of Director Higher Education, Chandigarh Administration addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, P.U., the Vice-Chancellor has remarked on 20.03.2015 that "I had processed all the cases referred to us (*by U.T. Administration*) as per P.U. norms. I understand 14 cases recommended for promotion to the level of Professor have been accepted by the U.T. Administration. All these promotions are effective from 25.09.2014, as per information received from U.T. Administration. The capping criterion applies from November 1, 2014 for teachers of P.U.as the same has been made effective in Colleges under U.T. Administration.
- (3) The Director, Department of Higher Education, MHRD, Government of India vide letter dated 25.3.2015 (**Appendix-I**) has requested to examine the matter and furnish the matter directly to the Finance Department Chandigarh Administration under intimation to the ministry.
- (4) The Resident Audit Officer, P.U. vide letter dated 14.01.2015 (**Appendix-I**) sought certain information to be supplied to Chandigarh Administration with regard to calculating API score to determined the eligibility for CAS promotion. The DUI Office sought the observations which RAO office had sent to Special Secretary Finance, vide letter No. 1513/DUI/DS dated 9.4.2015 (**Appendix-I**). The Resident Audit Officer vide his letter dated 10.04.2015 (**Appendix-I**) has supplied the information to DUI.
- (5) The Joint Secretary, UGC, New Delhi, vide letter dated 1.4.2015 (**Appendix-I**) has informed that the UGC Regulations are of mandatory in nature and all the Universities are advised to strictly comply with them and cannot be over looked at any stage and in any circumstances.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him give them a small background and the background is that the UGC had asked them to adopt something and they adopted that and followed what they were asked to. They had a meeting of the Senate on 25<sup>th</sup> May 2014 and the minutes of the same were written in about two months and when the minutes were confirmed, the month of September 2014 had come. Though there was some delay, they could not go back to that. Initially, they thought that they would implement what the UGC say in September, but since they had given an advertisement for filling up certain positions and the last date for submission of applications was October 31, 2014, they felt convenient, on the basis of the plea made by members of the teachers Associations, that the effective date should neither be May nor October 2014, but should be 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014 which got them into trouble. Though the situation is little bit murkier, they have to take a decision to make progress. They had committed to comply with the directives of the UGC and the freedom is there on the adoption of the directives of the UGC, which should happen as early as they could. While adopting, if they have to take a decision that the decision is to be made effective retrospectively, then it should be a conscious decision. However, in their wisdom they decided that they would not adopt the directives of the UGC from the back date. Therefore, today what they need to decide is – should they accept the directive of the UGC from the date the Minutes of the Senate were signed by the competent authority, and that meant they would have to revise the earlier decision of the Senate, according to which the directive has been implemented w.e.f. 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014, because logically the decision of May meeting of the Senate could either be implemented from May 2014 or the date the Minutes of that meeting were confirmed. Since they had not made the precise date as a part of the Minutes, an ambiguity crept in and the University issued the notification regarding implementation of the capping, etc. in September, 2014. He urged the members not to go into the whole history but just focus on three options – (1) reiterate the decision of the Senate taken in its December 2014 meeting that “the capping be implemented in both direct recruitments and CAS promotions, under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), with effect from the last date of submission of applications (i.e., October 31, 2014) for the posts, which were advertised stating that the capping would be applicable”; (2) revise the aforesaid decision and implement it w.e.f. September 2014, i.e., the date on which the minutes of May 2014 Senate meeting were confirmed, with the proviso that the promotions which had already been made would not be reversed; and (3) decide that the capping be implemented in both direct recruitments and CAS promotions, under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), with effect from 25<sup>th</sup> May 2014, i.e., the date on which the Senate took the decision, but with the stipulation that the promotions which they had already made should be accepted as one time exception.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the UGC instructions regarding CAS promotions specifically provide that the university concerned could make rules. The judgment of the Supreme Court relating to rejection of plea for enhancement of age of superannuation of university teachers from 60 to 62 years (in the case of Dr. Shashi K. Sharma) para 40 page 64-65 says that the notification of the Government did not ipso facto has the effect of reversing or changing the rules made under Article 309. Therefore, he was of the confirmed opinion that as per law they have to adopt the regulations and made effective. The question is that the regulations were adopted in May 2014 Senate meeting and the confirmation of the minutes of the meeting came a little bit later and the persons were recruited on a particular date. Now, he was of the opinion that the date of implementation should be the date on which the minutes of the Senate meeting dated 25.05.2014 were confirmed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath had given the reply, but if they have to exercise any of the three options, they needed to be clear whether it is within their purview to opt for any of the three choices, which the Vice-Chancellor had given. Because there is one view as the stand has been taken by the UGC that the date which they had mentioned could not be changed and that is way, they had asked them to adopt. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath has referred to enhancement of age of superannuation from 60 years to 62 years for the payment of salary from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2006 though the notification was adopted somewhere in the year 2009, but

nowhere the Senate approved that the salaries would be paid w.e.f. 1<sup>st</sup> January 2006. In fact, it was only adoption of notification, but since date of effectiveness was mentioned there, it was automatically followed w.e.f 01.01.2006 and arrears were paid. If they had the option, he was of the opinion that they must reiterate it, but if they did not have the option (out of all the three choices), then probably what the UGC says they have to accept because another strongly worded letter has been annexed in which the UGC has written that if they violate any of the directive/regulation of the UGC, their grant are liable to be cancelled. If the choice is there to change the date to avoid cancellation of grant, he would have liberty to adopt the notification which came in 2013 w.e.f. 2016 after covering all the cases because he is anticipating that w.e.f. 2016 new notification from the UGC would come so far as revision of pay-scales are concerned. Therefore, this needed to be clarified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him give option four and option four is that whatever happened till now, had happened, but the effective date of implementation from now onwards is neither May nor September nor October, but they could go back to June 2013. However, those who did not apply for promotion under the CAS so far even though they were eligible, the capping would apply to them w.e.f. June 2013.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he would like to give option five and the option five is that the Vice-Chancellor should decide this issue in consultation with the Chairman, UGC.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he endorsed the option (5) given by Professor R.P. Bambah. He further stated that there is a letter (Page 52 of the Appendix), which is dated 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2014, written by Director, Higher Education, Chandigarh Administration to the Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh. However, it is so surprising that the letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2014 had reached the office of the Vice-Chancellor on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015. Based on that, the Vice-Chancellor has made noting that "I had processed all the cases referred to us as per P.U. norms. I understand 14 cases recommended for promotion to the level of Professor have been accepted by the U.T. Administration. All these promotions are effective from 25.09.2014. The capping criterion applied from November 1, 2014". But this letter was never brought to the notice of the Syndicate, probably because Syndicate meeting was held on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2015 and the same was followed by the Senate on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2015. So no meeting of the Syndicate was held in-between. Presumably, the Vice-Chancellor thought that it should be placed before the Senate because had this letter been in the knowledge of the Syndicate, the Syndicate would/should have decided that how could they (Chandigarh Administration) question them (the University) so far as capping is concerned, when they themselves had followed the U.T. Administration. Whereas they are saying that since it has already been adopted by the Syndicate and Senate of the University, they would write to the UGC. But the fact of the matter is that if the U.T. Administration itself has already taken the decision, which of course, is contrary to the decision taken by the Government of Punjab and as per the settled system, the U.T. is bound to follow what the Punjab Government does. He did not know under what circumstances, the U.T. had taken a different decision. Had this been in the knowledge of the Syndicate on 8<sup>th</sup> March that vide their letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2014, the U.T. Administration had already taken the decision to this effect, then probably the letter written by the Special Secretary Finance, U.T. Administration, was contrary to their own stand. So he would like to ask as to why this letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2014 reached the office of the Vice-Chancellor after more than three months and why this fact was not shared by the Vice-Chancellor with the Syndicate. There was another letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2015 (page 59 of the appendix) which was received from the UGC. Though some people might say that the issues referred to in the letter are of technical nature, he has observed that the aforesaid letter has been received by the University on 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2015. Was there any deliberate attempt on the part of the office, especially Vice-Chancellor's office to by-pass the Syndicate? Though on 6<sup>th</sup> April he (Vice-Chancellor) knew that the Syndicate would be meeting somewhere in the third week of April (20<sup>th</sup> April), this letter was never brought to the notice of the Syndicate and straightaway ordered that "Add to Agenda papers of Senate Meeting of



April 26, 2015". In this regard, his simple submission is that as per the Statute of the University no paper could be brought directly to the Senate. It had to be brought to the knowledge of the Syndicate, but the Senate has been considering certain papers directly because sometimes the circumstances are beyond their control or the issues were of emergent nature. But in the instant case, it is being written on 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2015 that it should be taken to the meeting of the Senate. He just wanted to have clarification on these points.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, in fact, they are continuing with this meeting of the Senate, which was adjourned on 29<sup>th</sup> March, 2015. The matter was already under the consideration of the Senate after the same was considered at the level of the Syndicate. Thereafter, something came to him. Since the matter was already under consideration of the Senate, he had just added certain papers. As such, he had no intention to by-pass the Syndicate. If there is any lapse, it is only of a technical nature. On hindsight, even if the matter is to be referred to the Syndicate, the matter is already before a larger body where the deliberation of the Syndicate had already been put in. Some additional information had come in between the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, he had put that information before the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the point made by the Vice-Chancellor is well taken but his point is that neither they could subtract anything from the agenda of the adjourned meeting nor add anything to the said agenda.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the matter was already before the Senate and some additional information/papers had come, he had just added to the agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since it is the adjourned meeting, only the agenda of the adjourned meeting could be discussed and they could not add anything to the agenda except that the additional information he had received only that could be added. But they could not add anything to the agenda which was not additional information. He asked why the letter of the UT Administration dated 3<sup>rd</sup> December, 2014 was received in the University on 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2015.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he had already made it clear in the Syndicate meeting that he had carried the promotion for U.T. teachers using the same criteria as for faculty members in the University Campus. Every paper, which has been exchanged between him and the UT Administration, had been placed before the Syndicate. There have been so many communications between Panjab University and UT Administration for carrying out the promotions of teachers of UT Colleges. All the papers relating to that have not been placed before the Syndicate and instead only relevant papers were placed before the Syndicate. At some stage, some papers became relevant and he fished out them from somewhere and included in the agenda. When he started receiving more and more communications from UT Administration, he started fishing out the old relevant documents and thought why the UT Administration is telling him all these things when they are already complying all the things which they are asking to, especially when they are also participating in everything. However, one of their colleagues from the Administration side is writing letter/s to the University as if he/she did not know anything. As such, he was caught in a confrontation and in that context he started looking for everything.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the letter of the UT Administration dated 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2014 was received in the office of the Vice-Chancellor on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015, which meant that the letter was procured on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015 and the same needed to be verified because no number and date has been mentioned on the said letter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is quite possible that he asked Shri Sandeep Hans, Director, Higher Education, UT Chandigarh to give him a copy of the said letter on the basis of which they had started doing certain things. Because he kept asking Shri Sandeep Hans that they are participating in everything and also knew everything

and they also exchanged some information. He requested him to give him a copy of the said information. He perhaps might have procured it from him.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that, perhaps, this letter might have been received in the office of the Vice-Chancellor earlier because the number mentioned on it is of outgoing. He, therefore, suggested that it should be verified.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the outgoing number of U.T. Administration is not there on the letter and similarly incoming number of the University is also not there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be checked.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that only option (1) is relevant because Clause IV of UGC Regulation 2009 empowers the regulatory body of the University to decide date under the CAS. Second amendment of the UGC, which came in June 2013, was implemented by the Punjab Government w.e.f. 1<sup>st</sup> August 2013. Not only, they might remember that the qualifications for the post of Principals regarding raising of experience from 5 years to 10 years and change in panel was adopted by the Syndicate and thereafter implemented. The Punjab Government brought in certain changes in the second amendment issued by the UGC, finalized the same on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2013 and implemented w.e.f. 1<sup>st</sup> August 2013. According to him, Statutory Bodies of the State and the Universities are competent to decide the date of implementation under the CAS of the UGC. Till the date of implementation is not decided by these bodies, the promotions under the CAS have to be made in accordance with the old scheme. Since they are competent to decide the date and they should reiterate the date of implementation of Capping, etc. with effect from 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014 and convey the same to the Punjab Government and U.T. Administration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that his personal opinion is that if they stick to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014, it could cause a problem for them. Therefore, they should implement the Capping, etc. as early as possible. Hence, Option (2) or (3) is better.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Option (5) is better and they should go by it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he had gone through the UGC letter in which they had threatened to stop grants to the University. Since he has love for the grants as the University could not survive without grants, Option (5) given by Professor R.P. Bambah should be accepted.

The Vice-Chancellor remarked that if the grants did not come, he has to give reply. So he is also equally worried about the grants.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that he sees a problem in the Option (5) also. His experience with the UGC is that they always say that whatever they had written is final. They are facing this problem because this issue reached there; otherwise, it might not have been there.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that once the Chairperson of the UGC told him that half of their time is lost to rectify the mistakes of the office. The office continued writing letters and they respond to them. He, therefore, suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should personally take up the matter with the Chairperson, UGC and sort out the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would seek an appointment with the Chairperson, UGC, as early as possible.

Continuing, Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that their decision of implementing the capping w.e.f. 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014 is valid because if the Punjab and Central Governments say that these regulations of the UGC's would be implemented by them on UPSC and PPSC selections, they would definitely reconsider their decision. In all cases, once the

regulations are adopted, only then they could be implemented. As told by Dr. Kuldip Singh, Punjab Government has also implemented these regulations later on. It always takes time to adopt the new regulations/guidelines/ instruction. In November 2008, the MHRD asked the Universities to adopt Ph.D. regulations within 30 days, but it took them 9 months to adopt the same. When the issue is that they have to tell the teachers as to what is to be done/performed by them, it could not be done retrospectively. The promotions which they had already made could not be reversed because the 16<sup>th</sup> March judgement protected them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that had these been adopted w.e.f. September 2014, he would have fought with the UGC in a vigorous way.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that the UGC notified these Regulations on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2013, but they have the saving grace only that because the U.T. Administration made promotions of teachers without capping up to 25<sup>th</sup> September 2014, whereas the mandate of U.T. Administration is that they have to follow the Punjab Government; however, the Punjab Government has implement it from 1<sup>st</sup> August 2013. The U.T. Administration has implemented capping w.e.f. 25<sup>th</sup> September 2014 and the Panjab University has implemented it w.e.f. 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014, which is about only one month later. According to him, 25<sup>th</sup> September is no date. Therefore, the option given by Professor R.P. Bambah is better and the Vice-Chancellor should personally meet the Chairperson, UGC, and persuade him taking the plea that the U.T. Administration has implemented the capping w.e.f. 25<sup>th</sup> September 2014.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that they should seek legal opinion on all the options; otherwise, they might be in a problem.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that neither Punjab Government nor U.T. Administration are facing this problem. In fact, they are facing this problem because some of them have made complaints to the UGC. Now, they are saying that they had done this, and they should be told as to what is the way out.

Professor Rajat Sandhir stated that even in the last week of April 2015, the last date for capping was 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014. Some people had already applied and he also felt that they should uphold the decision of the Senate that the capping be implemented w.e.f. 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014. Secondly, now the UGC itself is reviewing its decision pertaining to capping.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would not resolve the issue.

Professor Anil Monga said that whenever any directive came, it is always written in it that the Statutory Body could decide the date of implementation.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the practical solution is that they have considered the matter in the Senate and in view of the discussion held, they are going back to the original date, i.e., 13<sup>th</sup> June 2013. The UGC asked them to adopt and they processed the adoption through the Syndicate and Senate and the Senate minutes were confirmed on that day. Since the original notification was of 13<sup>th</sup> June 2013, they go back to the original date, i.e. 13<sup>th</sup> June 2013. However, whatever has got done, has been done, but from now onwards they revise the date of 31<sup>st</sup> October 2014 to **original date of notification, i.e., 13<sup>th</sup> June 2013**. Since it is a logical thing, it is easy to defend. He could go to Dr. Ved Parkash, Chairperson, UGC, and request him to rescue the Panjab University because they had abided what they had asked them to do.

**This was agreed to.**

At this stage, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had proposed a Resolution on this issue, i.e., the benefit of capping which is being extended to University teachers and

the teachers of Chandigarh Colleges, should be extended to the teachers working in the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would communicate this to Hon'ble Chief Minister, Punjab, Hon'ble Higher Education Minister, Punjab and Director, Higher Education, Punjab.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take appropriate steps as well as decision in the matter, on behalf of the Senate.

**XXI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-38 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-38.** That the pay of Dr. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal, Assistant Professor in English, University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, be protected at Rs.24920/- + AGP of Rs.7000/- in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 w.e.f. the date of his joining in the University service, i.e., 18.6.2014, as per revised LPC issued vide No. PGGC-11/ 2014/AI/6292 dated 29.10.2014 by the Principal, Postgraduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 7)**

**XXII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-39 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-39.** That the minutes dated 16.01.2015 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to prepare Regulations/Rules for adoption of 'Child Care Leave' to the University Female Employees (teaching and non-teaching), be approved in principle.

**NOTE:** A Committee consisting of Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean University Instruction; Professor Nandita Singh and Professor Rajesh Gill would examine/made necessary corrections in the wording of the proceeding of the Committee as well as *pro forma* appended with the proceeding.

That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to approve the minutes after modifications, on behalf of the Syndicate and it be placed before the Syndicate in one of its meeting as an Information Item.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 9)**

**XXIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-40 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-40.** That the number of seats in the following courses in the Department of Chinese and Tibetan Languages, P.U., be increased from the academic session 2015-16, without financial liability, be approved:

Name of Course	Existing Seats	Proposed recommended by the Committee	Seats
Diploma in Chinese	16 seats	30 seats	
Advance Diploma in Chinese	11 seats	25 seats	

**NOTE:** That Professor A.K. Bhandari with the help of 2-3 senior faculty members would see how many applications, the Department received for these courses during the session 2014-15.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 14)**

**XXIV.** Considered the Regulations for MBA (Executive) at USOL for the admissions made during the session 2014-15 only **(Item C-41 on the agenda) (Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 15).**

Professor Rajesh Gill, referring to page 196 of Syndicate minutes dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2015) stated that the printing of the regulations is such that it is very difficult to read. Secondly, there are so many errors and the language is also confusing. She urged that these regulations should be given to somebody to make corrections.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since these related to USOL, these would be given to Professor Lalit K. Bansal, who is also the Dean Research of the University.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that normally there are so many mistakes in the agenda. He did not know whether somebody translated the Punjabi into English due to which these mistakes occurred. If it is so, a decision should be taken that, in future, the agenda should be prepared and sent to the members in Punjabi. The way, the agenda of meeting of the University Body should be prepared, had not been prepared and it might be due to excess pressure of work on the office. He suggested that they should write correct English.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal is well taken.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that these regulations related to eligibility, admission process and so on and she had pointed out one mistake in the Syndicate meeting, but the same has not been corrected.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that it has been stated here that it should be verified as to how many applications were received. He suggested that it should also be verified as to how many candidates appeared in the examination.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that though M.B.A. course is being offered at USOL, why this course is not being given to the affiliated Colleges in spite of the fact that several affiliated Colleges are seeking it.

Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, said that the NAAC Team which visited the University had also suggested that they should have vertical growth and M.B.A. course should be given to the affiliated Colleges. He felt that they should think for giving this course to the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council to bring a proposal to meet the demand of certain affiliated Colleges. After all some of these Colleges have more than 4000 students and are already like mini Universities. If the Colleges had right kind of infrastructure and faculty, they should be given this course. A Committee should be suggested because these are professional courses and should be run as professional courses. Don't prescribe very strict conditions and at the same time don't prescribe so loose conditions that the standard of the course fell down.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that GGSDS College, Sector 32, Chandigarh and DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh had already applied for this course, but they have not been inspected by the University so far. Recently, the NAAC Team had visited the College and the member/s of Commerce subject had suggested that this College should go for M.B.A. course.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that M.B.A. course is under the AICTE and as per Government of Punjab, any Institution, which wanted to offer M.B.A. course has to get affiliation from Punjab Technical University (PTU), Jalandhar. M.B.A. course be offered in a separate Institution and could not be offered in any of the degree Colleges.

Principal B.C. Josan said that now the approval of AICTE for running M.B.A. course is not required.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that now if they had changed it, he did not know.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that a Committee should be constituted to examine the issue so that it did not happen that all the affiliated Colleges are granted affiliation to offer M.B.A. course and the students start wandering on the roads. As has been in the case of M.B.A. of PTU, the M.B.A. should not become a shop. The M.B.A. of Panjab University must have value.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is conscious that the brand name of Panjab University has a stature. So it should be done consciously.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, had also applied for M.B.A. course and the same was also not given to them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would look into it in a competent manner.

**RESOLVED:** That the Regulations for MBA (Executive) at USOL for the admissions made during the session 2014-15 only, be given to Professor Lalit K. Bansal, Dean Research, to make correction. The Vice-Chancellor be authorized to approve the correct MBA (Executive) Regulations, on behalf of the Senate, in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**XXV.** Considered following amendments in Regulation 3.3 at Page 499 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007 for the BDS 1<sup>st</sup> year with effect from the forthcoming examination (i.e. 2015, **(Item C-42 on the agenda) (Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 17):**

<b>Present Regulation</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment as per the BDS Course Regulation, 2007 of the Dental Council of India</b>
<p>3.3 For First Examination:</p> <p>The candidate may be allowed to take the next three consecutive examinations, a candidate who is unable to qualify in all the three subjects in four consecutive chances, including the first chance to which he was originally entitled, shall not be allowed to continue his studies for the BDS Course.</p>	<p>3.3 For First Examination:</p> <p>Any student who does not clear the first Prop. BDS University examination in all subjects within 3 years from the date of admission shall be discharged from the Course.</p>

**NOTE:** The Regulations of BDS Course available at pages 497-500 in P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, have been revised w.e.f. 2006-2007 and sent to GOI for its approval but the approval is awaited.

Thus, the proposed amendment is to be made in Regulation 3.2 in the revised Regulations instead of Regulation 3.3.

After some discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Regulation 3.3 at Page 499 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007 for the BDS 1<sup>st</sup> year, be amended as under and given effect from the forthcoming examination (i.e. 2015):

<b>Present Regulation</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment as per the BDS Course Regulation, 2007 of the Dental Council of India</b>
<p>3.3 For First Examination:</p> <p>The candidate may be allowed to take the next three consecutive examinations, a candidate who is unable to qualify in all the three subjects in four consecutive chances, including the first chance to which he was originally entitled, shall not be allowed to continue his studies for the BDS Course.</p>	<p>3.3 For First Examination:</p> <p>Any student who does not clear the first <b>Professional</b> BDS University examination in all subjects within 3 years from the date of admission shall be discharged from the Course.</p>

**NOTE:** The Regulations of BDS Course available at pages 497-500 in P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, have been revised w.e.f. 2006-2007 and sent to GOI for its approval but the approval is awaited. Thus, the proposed amendment is to be made in Regulation 3.2 in the revised Regulations instead of Regulation 3.3.

**XXVI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-43 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-43.** That D.O. No. F.1-1/2015 (CM) dated 08.01.2015 received from Professor Ved Prakash, Chairman, UGC, for introduction of Choice Based Credit System (**CBCS**) and adoption of the Credit Framework for Skill Development (**CFSD**) across the Universities and Colleges from the coming academic session, i.e., 2015-16 and for initiating quick action on the following purposes, be adopted and endorsed to the Senate for partially implementation with effect from 2015-16:

- (i) Semesterization of curricula;
- (ii) Restructuring of syllabi in the form of modules;
- (iii) Standardization of examinations; and
- (iv) Switching-over from numerical marking system to grading system.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 18)**

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that since it is a compulsion, they have to do it. But he would like to request the Dean of University Instruction to identify at least 50% of the Departments, where they could introduce Choice Based Credit System (**CBCS**) with effect from the session 2015-16.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that it has to be done, but it could not be possible from the next academic session (2015-16) because the time left at their disposal is very short. All the Faculties could not take equally proactive decision. However, after a green signal from the Vice-Chancellor, the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce has prepared the syllabus, transfer system, Regulations and Rules for Choice Based Credit System, but they could not do it in absence of other Faculties. If it could not be implemented w.e.f. 2015-16, it must be implemented w.e.f. 2016-17. He pointed out that

as per the existing Regulations, they are facing problem while transferring the credits. If a student wanted to transfer here, they are not willing to give him/her credit for the subject/s which he/she has done. On the other side, when their students go abroad, they easily give them credit and accordingly gave him/her admission. He suggested that a policy decision should be taken to give credit to students, who wanted to transfer from foreign Universities, provided the Universities concerned are recognized. Even if certain deficiencies are found after comparing the syllabus, similar process be followed as is being followed in the case of Indian Universities and admission should be given accordingly.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that he was just thinking that to him it is a difficult, complex and mammoth task and could not be completed within two months after which the next academic session 2015-16 would start. During this session they have to restructure the syllabi, standardize the examinations, instructions have to be sent to various Departments as to how they wanted to go ahead because if they talk to the people of the Departments, they are very vague. For example, if they wanted to introduce this system in the Department of English & Cultural Studies, which are the other Departments with which they have to coordinate and what changes are to be brought in the syllabi. Just adopting the system in such a manner is not going to help. They have to send instructions and certain model to the Departments so that they could go ahead in a proper manner. He suggested that they should immediately start doing the exercise of restructuring the syllabi, which is very important.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is indeed a wishful thinking of implementing choice based credit system in all the Departments w.e.f. the session 2015-16. They could only start making a beginning. It is difficult to start w.e.f. the session 2015-16, but it could be done from the session 2016-17.

Shri Ashok Goyal, going through the item under consideration, stated that he had not been able to understand it. Secondly, they should not forget that the syllabi are to be framed by the Faculties and the Faculties are not going to meet before the next academic session starts and standardize the examination system, which is needed to be converted from numerical to credit system. As said by Professor Shelley Walia, if they wanted to approve it theoretically just to satisfy the UGC that their D.O. letter was placed before the Senate, it is alright, but they should not forget that it could not be implemented w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16.

Professor Rajat Sandhir stated that he was also afraid that probably they could not start it from the academic session 2015-16 as a lot of exercise needed to be done. Secondly, the prospectuses and Hand Book of Information are already out. If they really wanted to do it, they have to identify the Departments and the Faculties where it has to be done. He knew for Honours School System the exercise was got started and some draft recommendations pertaining syllabi, etc. were uploaded by the UGC on its website. Since the UGC has invited inputs on those recommendations, they could go slow on it. If they really wanted to start it from 2015-16, they have to be aggressive. However, the teacher community wanted to implement it so that they are not again deficient in NAAC compliance.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that they could not implement the whole system at once, but it could be implemented as a pilot study (experiment basis) in 3-5 Departments w.e.f. the session 2015-16.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that it should not be done only for the sake of direction; otherwise, Department 'A' would not know what Department 'B' is doing and so on and everything would be in the state of confusion. The idea is very good that their Departments should not be in watertight situation, but reforms should not be made in such a hurry. According to him, they have to spend at least a full year on it. If they wished to, it could be done in 1-2 Departments on experimental basis.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that he was hopeful that it could be done in Honours School courses because some work has been done by certain Departments. Therefore, it could be done in M.Sc. (Honours School). So far as B.Sc. (Honours School) is concerned,



the possibility could be examined; however, beyond that it is not possible w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that before starting it, they should take feedback from the faculty members as well as students. According to him, most of the Engineering students would prefer M.B.A. rather than Law. Therefore, as suggested by Shri Pawan Bansal, they have to make an exercise and take feedback from the faculty members as well as students.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Dinesh Kumar.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that he had the experience of working in such a system, which is prevalent in foreign countries. He suggested that they should not put any condition for implementing this system. Though it is easy to implement in one Faculty, but implementing it in so many Faculties would entail so many problems/complications. A Committee of competent persons should be constituted for examining as to what is being done in Harvard, Princeton, IITs, etc., and put up a well thought out programme. Starting it in a haphazard manner, is bound to create problem/s and would do a lot of damage to the system. He, therefore, suggested that they should accept it, in principle, that they are going to do this, but they are not in a hurry. A proper proposal should be made, studied and placed before the Academic Council for consideration and, thereafter Syndicate and Senate, so that it could be started w.e.f. the academic session 2016-17.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor R.P. Bambah, but they should make it a little bit more effective and specific. Therefore, whatever mechanism is adopted a time frame should be given to it so that an impression could be given that they are doing it in a serious manner and see that there is not any indefinite delay.

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that this issue should be placed before the Chairpersons in their next meeting. They could also hold Seminar on the issue in the Departments as to how to go about on it and discussions in this kind of body would not help. He pleaded that they should immediately start working on it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the sense of the House is that they should move in this direction and urgently implement it.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-43 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXVII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-44 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-44.** That the following proposed rates/charges, be levied for using major equipment, i.e., Confocal Laser Scanning Microscope (CLSM) for Confocal imaging of the samples analyzing, at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, be approved:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Users</b>	<b>Amount (Rs.) Per Sample/Per Hour (whichever is higher)</b>
1.	Panjab University	600/-
2.	Other Govt. Academic Institutes/ Organizations	1200/-*
3.	Private Educational/Research Institutes	2000/-*
4.	Industrial Houses	4000/-*

\*Plus the admissible Service Tax.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that since a number of affiliated Colleges have been approved by the University as recognized Research Centres, necessity for these facilities might also be felt by the affiliated Colleges. He, therefore, suggested that in the first column along with Panjab University, the words affiliated Colleges should also be mentioned.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-44 on the agenda**, be approved, with the modification that in column 1 along with Panjab University, affiliated Colleges be mentioned.

**XXVIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-45 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-45.** That the minutes dated 16.01.2015 of the Committee regarding revision of fee structure of Hostels for the session 2015-16, be approved.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 22)**

**XXIX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-46 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-46.** That, w.e.f. the session 2015-16, the students, who had annual income up to Rs.2.5 lac (instead of Rs.1 lac), be made eligible for admission to all Self-Financing courses under Economically Weaker Section Category, and the same be incorporated in the Hand Book of Information, Rules for admission in the guidelines for freeship and tuition fee concession.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 23)**

**XXX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-47 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-47.** That the resignation of Dr. Kailash K.K., Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Panjab University, be accepted w.e.f. 09.04.2013 (A.N.), i.e., the date of relieving from the University (on account of sanction of EOL without pay for one year) instead of 10.04.2014, as requested by Deputy Registrar (P) of University of Hyderabad vide his request No. UH/P-I/5383 dated 16.01.2015.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 24)**

**XXXI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-48 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-48.** That the pay of Ms. Jasleen Kaur Bains, Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science & Application, Panjab University, be protected at Rs.16920/- + AGP of Rs.6000/- in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 w.e.f. the date of her joining in the University service i.e. 7.9.2011, with next date of increment on 1.7.2012, as per LPC issued vide Ref. No. 2419 dated 3.12.2014 by the Officiating Principal, Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector 26, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 25)**

**XXXII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-49 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-49.** That the pay of Dr. Bhupinder Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi, University School of Open Learning, P.U. be protected at Rs.31310/- + AGP of Rs.8000/- in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 w.e.f. the date of his joining the University services, i.e., 16.09.2014, as per LPC dated 18.11.2014 by the Principal, D.M. College, Moga.

**NOTE:** That Syndicate has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to give two advance increments to Dr. Bhupinder Singh, keeping in view his outstanding literary work.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 26)**

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that they must be remembering that the Syndicate had also recommended that Dr. Sarabjit Singh, who has joined Department of Punjabi, be also given two advance increments, but the same have not been given to him, because it has not been recorded. He, therefore, suggested that it should be recorded here that Dr. Sarabjit Singh be granted two advance increments.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-49 on the agenda**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That Dr. Sarabjit Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Punjabi, be granted two advance increments.

**XXXIII.** Considered the report of an Enquiry Committee, pursuant to a discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 26.4.2014 (**Items C-50 on the agenda**).

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.03.2015 (Para 29) had forwarded the above said report to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him give them some background. Last year, some unfortunate/unpleasant incident happened. The Syndicate had considered the issue and constituted a Committee and the minutes of the Syndicate, they must have read at some stage. The Committee submitted a report, which was presented before the Syndicate in its January 2015 meeting. The Syndicate wanted all the annexures, which were presented to it and after having all the annexures, the Syndicate decided that the matter should be forwarded to the Senate and now the matter is before the Senate. He expected that the Hon<sup>ble</sup> members must have read the report and related documents in terms of annexures, minutes of the Syndicate meetings, and so on and so forth. As such, the report is before them and at the moment the matter before them is whether to accept the report or not.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that the Committee appointed by the University has gone into the details and submitted its report. Now, the matter before them is whether to accept the report or not. His suggestion in this regard is that they should accept the report of the Committee.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that there is a representation given by Dr. Karambir Singh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that could be considered separately. He is willing to discuss this issue with him (Dr. Randhawa) later on. Right now, the matter under consideration is only the report of the Enquiry Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to ask as to what are the implications if this report is accepted or rejected. Under what provision/s, this Committee was constituted and what was the term of reference of it? Was anybody issued any charge-sheet? Was anybody made an accused? Is it a regular enquiry? Is the Senate supposed to act as a punishing authority? That was what he said in the Syndicate that unless and until they did not know what it is, how could they comment? Nothing has been mentioned under which rule, the enquiry has been ordered and nothing has been mentioned about the term and reference of the enquiry and which is the authority to consider the report. He thought that before discussing the report, they need to go into all these details because it is very simple to say that call a bad name and hang the person. Even if they are assuming that the enquiry has been properly constituted/conducted by the competent authority, they would find in the report that the Enquiry Committee has not even bothered to go into the basics. He enquired on what basis this enquiry has been ordered, where is the complaint and who is author of the complaint? Where is the statement of the complainant? Whether he/she is the official of the University or the outsider? Nothing has been annexed with the Enquiry Report. At least, he would like to have a reply of all these queries.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the minutes of the Syndicate Committee, which formed the basis of this Committee, were circulated to all the members and he expected that they have read those minutes. Since he was authorized to constitute a Committee, he constituted the Committee. Some people wanted to be the members of that Committee and he made them members of the Committee. The report of the Committee is presented to the Syndicate and the Syndicate has decided that it should be forwarded to the Senate. He did not want to answer anything more than this.

When Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has said that some persons wanted to be the members of the Committee and he made them members, the Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal offered to become a member of the Committee and he made him the member of the Committee. He further said that he did not want to go into the discussion with any given member.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that he had read the report. So far as the constitution of the Committee is concerned, this issue was discussed in one of the meetings of the Syndicate. In fact, it was pointed out by Shri Sandeep Kumar, who had talked about certain complaints, which were of serious nature as a person was appointed a Superintendent in an Examination Centre, who was not an Assistant Professor in any of the Colleges.

When Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether they are permitting to discuss as to what is written in the report and allowing somebody to explain the background, the Vice-Chancellor responded that they are not allowing one of their own colleagues to speak anything at all. Vice-Chancellor stated that at the moment, he did not want this forum to be used to discuss the report in its entirety. If they wanted, he could convene a special meeting of the Senate to discuss this report; otherwise, he expected them to have read the report. At the moment, the matter is the report which has been presented to them. It is 10 minutes to five and if they have to discuss the details of the report, they may need several hours. As regards queries to be answered, the members may make written submissions so that answers can be sought from the Chairman of the Committee, if need be. At this stage, he could neither answer on behalf of the Committee nor is he prepared to do so. He did not think that he should be asked to answer about what the Committee has written. It would not be proper to ask him to answer *impromptu*. If there are

lacunae, please point those to him in writing. He would collate and study them and get back to the Chairman of the Committee and seek answers.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that the Vice-Chancellor has suggested that if the members wished, they could make written comments/queries and thereafter, a special meeting of the Senate could be convened. Those Senators, who would have not made any written queries, should be made aware of the queries made by others before the matter comes up again to the Senate for consideration so that they do not have the repetition of the situation which they are facing today.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could put some algorithm so that they could proceed and have some meaningful discussion.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that it would not be appropriate to ask the members to make their comments in writing before the special meeting of the Senate. He understood as to why he is not allowing a member to speak because his name figured in the report. He felt that at least two persons needed to make written submissions before the Senate meeting – one whose name appeared in the bad light, he should be allowed to make written submission because he is not allowed to speak here and one of the members of the Committee, who has not signed the report, should also be requested to make written submission as to why he has not signed and rest of the discussion should be held on the floor of the House.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said, “ I have attended all the meetings of the Committee, but when the report was written I was chairing another meeting. Should he get a bad name? It is very unfortunate that the Chairman of the Committee has asked me when he met me, I told him that I am a service law Lawyer. The meeting which I have not attended, how could I sign”?

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he felt that a mistake might have been committed by Shri Munish Verma.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are not discussing the report.

Continuing, Professor Mukesh Arora said that the report should not be accepted; rather, the same should be rejected reason being that sometime it happened that he, being an elected member, might have been approached/asked by somebody to recommend appointment of the person as Centre Superintendent and Shri Munish might not be knowing him/her personally.

The Vice-Chancellor reiterated that they are not discussing the report.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath has touched a very pertinent question. The forwarding letter signed by the Chairman of the Committee says “the report of the Committee relating to Conduct Branch signed by three of its members is enclosed for your kind consideration. Mr. Chatrath was also a member of the Committee and participated in all its proceedings, but refused to sign the report in spite of requests and long persuasion without assigning any reason”. But Shri Chatrath said he not only gave the reasons, but also argument/s in favour of the reason that he is a service Lawyer and is not expected to sign the proceedings of the meeting, which he has not attended. The letter further says “it would have been alright, had he refused to be member of the Committee and not participated in the proceedings, but once he participated, it was expected of him to sign the report or record thereon his own reasoning and conclusions after disagreeing with all or any of the conclusion arrived at by the other members of the Committee”. This letter shows as if Shri Chatrath has no reason not to sign the report of the Committee. Maybe Shri Chatrath had difference of opinion with other members of the Committee, which he did not record in writing by giving reasons. However, Shri Chatrath is saying that he was asked to sign something, the proceedings of which he had not attended.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members, who wished, could make written submissions to him as to what answers they wanted and he would ask the Chairman of the Committee to give those answers. When a couple of members suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred, the Vice-Chancellor stated that give him reasons for deferring the item, he would defer it. One reason for deferring has been given that certain members wanted to have certain clarifications and in their views certain shortcomings/lacunae are there in the report. They would make written submissions and he would go back to the Chairman of the Committee to seek answers.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that either elaborated discussions on the item should be allowed or the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to seek a clarification that if they did not make any written clarification, would they be allowed to raise the issue in the meeting of the Senate when the issue would be discussed next time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could do that, but the point is if they again asked certain microscopic of the report, which only the Chairman of the Committee could reply, he could not give those answers.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the report is to be discussed, every point related to it would have to be discussed, e.g., this is not clear, there are some lacunae. Then obviously, the Vice-Chancellor would say that he would refer these points back to the Chairman of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they wanted to seek certain answers from him, give the same to him in writing so that he could have a chance to seek answers from the Chairman of the Committee.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that this is a preliminary enquiry and they are not going to punish anybody on the basis of this report. On the basis of this enquiry, they could hold a regular enquiry or whatever they wanted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is to be decided by the House and not by him (the Vice-Chancellor) as he did not know whether the Senate could institute a regular enquiry or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that was why it was asked in the Syndicate meeting, but at that time nobody clarified, which enquiry it is. Whether it is a regular enquiry or a preliminary enquiry? Had the clarification been given then and there, maybe the Syndicate had taken the decision either to accept or reject the enquiry report.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter was placed before the Syndicate and the Syndicate members chose not to have detailed discussion on it and also did not raise detailed queries either in January 2015 meeting or at the subsequent meeting. The Syndicate simply forwarded the report to the Senate and the report has been placed before the Senate for consideration. Now, the Senate could take a decision to refer the report back to the Syndicate.

Some of the members suggested that a Sub-Committee of the Senate should be constituted to examine the report.

Ms. Gurpeet Kaur pointed out that certain teachers are on term appointments and sometimes the Department concerned is biased against them, especially when there are examinations of the students. Such teachers are called by the Department saying that it is their moral responsibility to help in the conduct of examinations, especially in the months of May and June. They have also to evaluate the dissertations of the students. Even if the teachers concerned are out of duty, i.e., after the month of March

when they are not on the rolls of the Department/College, they are being asked to perform duties.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not a matter, which is under consideration at the moment.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that it would have been better if the given Hon'ble member had attended the meetings of the Committee and raised all these questions there and he was sure that the Committee must have addressed those issues. Now, when the enquiry is over, he should not raise issues and if he wanted to do so, he should give the same in writing so that the Vice-Chancellor could seek answers from the Chairman of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he expects written queries from the members. He would evaluate those queries and whatever answers he could provide, he would try to provide as and when the next meeting of the Senate happens; otherwise, if there are queries which the Chairman/members of the Committee could answer, he would go back to members/Chairman of the Committee. Now, it is end of April and those, who wish to make queries, could send the same to him in writing by 15<sup>th</sup> of May 2015 so that he has adequate time.

**This was agreed to.**

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that the main question which is being asked again and again that he (the Vice-Chancellor) is answerable to this and that. According to him, the Chair could not be answerable particularly when it related to Fact-Finding Committee or Enquiry Committee. The report of the Enquiry Committee is there and if the members think that there are a good number of lacunae, they could reject the report and if the report is okay, they could accept the same. The moment, the Vice-Chancellor replied, it meant he is biased either for acceptance of the report or for rejection of the report. As said by the Vice-Chancellor that the members could seek clarifications, which the Vice-Chancellor would seek from the members/Chairman of the Committee. Instead of replying to those queries himself, the reply given by the members/Chairman of the Committee should be provided to the members.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he (Professor Grover) is the Chairman of the Senate and is a competent person. He, however, suggested that the queries which the members wanted to make should not be addressed to him (the Vice-Chancellor) and instead should be addressed to the Registrar, who in turn would seek clarifications from the Chairman of the Committee. If any query, which is needed from the Vice-Chancellor, should be directly sent to him (the Vice-Chancellor) and the query/queries, which are required to be answered by the Chairman of the Committee, should be sent to the Registrar and he (the Vice-Chancellor) should not be involved in that. In the next meeting, the queries along with the answers should be provided to the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that neither the enquiry is being conducted against the members of the Senate, who are expected to give something in writing, nor against the Chairman of the Enquiry Committee that they would submit something to the Registrar and the Registrar would submit the same to the Chairman of the Enquiry Committee. In fact, as and when the report of any Committee or Enquiry Committee is considered by any competent body (Syndicate or Senate), whichever is competent, the issues are discussed in the meeting itself. Just because they have constraint, did not mean, as the Vice-Chancellor has said that he did not want the Enquiry Report to be discussed in its entirety and they have only to limit themselves to accept or reject it. At the final stage only the report is to be accepted or rejected and that has to be preceded by discussions and whatever is to be pointed out whether in support of the Enquiry Report or against or about the missing facts, it is not that they have to write to the Chairman of the Enquiry Committee to fill those gaps. The Enquiry Committee had submitted their report with all ability and efficiency at their disposal. Now, they have to see and since Shri Chatrath

says that it is a preliminary enquiry, but he did not know because it was not replied in the Syndicate whether it is a preliminary enquiry or under which provision the enquiry has been ordered and what are the implications of the decision which the Senate is going to take today if the report is accepted or rejected. If it is right that it is a preliminary enquiry as said by Shri Chatrath, if they are not satisfied with the enquiry report, they could order another enquiry pointing out the facts which are missing. But if it is a regular enquiry, they have to see against whom a regular enquiry could be ordered, which is the competent authority to order such an enquiry, which is the competent authority to take action, and what kind of action could be initiated against the person who is indicted in the enquiry report (whether the person concerned is the employee of the University or not) and what are the further steps which could be taken. Therefore, it is not sufficient to accept or reject the report and thereafter, what is to be done, is also to be decided by the Senate. So it was in that context that he wanted to know under which provisions the enquiry has been instituted and is it a preliminary enquiry report which has been submitted to the Senate as discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate held in April 2014 or it is a regular enquiry. That was why he had asked for the term of reference of the Enquiry Committee. So far as he understands, it is not a departmental enquiry and it could not be a departmental enquiry as it is only a preliminary investigation. There are so many things which the Committee had mentioned in their report with their best of efforts, but there is no supporting evidence. Suppose it is mentioned in the report that such and such things happened, but there are no supporting evidences, from where he could verify that whether such things have actually happened or not. Not that the Committee had intentionally recorded something wrong, but anything could be wrong. The Syndicate had not ordered the enquiry against a particular person; rather the Syndicate had only decided that enquiry should be ordered as to how it has happened. Now the impression is being given as if the enquiry has been conducted against one of the members of the Senate and some members are trying to shield that member of the Senate and some are against that member of the Senate. That impression needed to be removed. In fact, they are only interested in the transparency and while discussing the transparency, they should keep in mind that all the members of the Senate are equal and have same dignity. As such, no pick and choose policy could be adopted so far as one class of the members of the Senate is concerned. That was why, he is saying that they should be very conscious as to under what provision/s, they are moving ahead.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that it is now being revealed that if some decisions were taken in the Syndicate meeting by the Chairman of the Syndicate and the other members of that Syndicate were not aware about the said decisions. The issue was raised in the meeting of the Syndicate held in April 2014 that something is going on wrong with their examination system. Instead of sharing the responsibility by the Syndicate as a body, the responsibility is being shifted to the Chairman of the Syndicate alone. Why the Syndicate itself did not decide as to what would be the nature of the enquiry? Nobody stopped the Syndicate to decide that. Why the Syndicate did not decide that it is a preliminary enquiry or something like that or it is a regular enquiry? Why did the Syndicate not decide that it is not an enquiry against a person or member of the Senate, but to look into the loopholes in the examination system. In fact, the enquiry was primarily ordered to look into something which had gone wrong. Now, since the report has been submitted by the Enquiry Committee and the same has been considered by the Syndicate, at this stage how could they say that the report is wrong. According to him, the responsibility lay with the entire Syndicate and not with the Chairman of the Syndicate alone.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him reiterate and clarify. In fact, the matter was reported to him by a member of the then Syndicate in April 2014 and a long discussion happened. He would request each one of them to go through and read the summary of the deliberations of April 2014 Syndicate meeting. He appointed a Committee as a part of directive given to him to appoint a Committee. The Committee was handed over all the documents, including the minutes of the given Syndicate. The Committee did whatever it could and submitted its report and he placed the report of the Committee before the Syndicate (new Syndicate) in its January 2015 meeting. The



person, who had made the complaint, is not present in the House today. In the January 2015 meeting of the Syndicate, one of the members pointed out that since the annexures have not been attached, they could not evaluate whether whatever is written in the report is right or wrong. The annexures were circulated to all the members of the Syndicate well before the next meeting of the Syndicate so that the Syndicate members have enough time to study the report as well as annexures before the next meeting happens. The next meeting happened in March 2015, wherein a brief discussion happened and the same had been recorded. He requested the members to read once again the minutes of the Syndicate meetings held in January 2015 and March 2015. They already had the Enquiry Report as well as annexures. Now, if there are some detailed queries to be made or some lacunae, it is his humble submission that they should make the queries in writing or point out those lacunae so that he had some time to address those concerns. *Impromptu* if they ask something and request him to respond, he could not respond to those lacunae. It would justify the time spent in the House in discussing the things once again if the questions/queries/lacunae get submitted to him and he had some chance not only to study himself, but also has time to seek answer/s from somebody else, he had the opportunity to seek those answers. Otherwise, it is okay with him that they could meet again repeatedly. But when it happened, it was told in the meeting of the Syndicate held in the month of April 2014 that the matter is of very serious nature when it comes to confidence of the society and public in the functioning of the examination system of the University. They are a Teaching Institution, Research Institution, but for the 190 affiliated Colleges, they are also an examining body and it is the examining body in which the society *per se* has a huge confidence. It is because of that confidence that they had an Examination Wing, which conducted the examinations other than the University examinations, which also fetches them a little bit of income and the same is used for the development of University in the form of once in a while for hostels and other things. Though the matter is indeed serious, it is alright if it takes a little bit long time to address and plug the loopholes/weak points.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the matter should be referred back to the Syndicate for reconsideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the House decided to refer it back to the Syndicate, it is alright with him.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that according to him, the question about discussing the report is not as simple as that either it should be accepted or rejected. He was sorry that he could not go through the report the previous day, but one part on which there is consensus in the House is that there is something serious which went wrong in their examination system. For the sake of credibility of their examination system, they needed to fix certain things and correct certain things. Maybe on the part of the office or the Syndicate some points have been missed – what sort of enquiry it would be. In the absence of these, they have to treat it a preliminary enquiry. When they discuss that, maybe on a part, i.e., what when wrong, there would not be any difference. Who are the guilty persons, is a separate issue. There might also be consensus that ‘yes’, these are the guilty persons, who are clearly responsible for the mistake. For some, there might be needle of suspicion and for some, that the person/s is/are not guilty. Once they discuss that, there has to be a proper enquiry on that part. On that part, they have to bring out as to who is/are the guilty person/s and that exercise has to be undertaken independently. Thereafter, another exercise would start whether the guilty person/s is/are to be punished. However, it seemed that maybe the members are not ready to go through the discussions, but at the same time he also agreed that if the questions are to be asked, they could not ask the Chairman of the Enquiry Committee to be present here in the House to answer their questions as the same is not right. There are certain things on the basis of which they might seek some clarifications, but the information which is not available with the Enquiry Officer at that time, they could not say that why this information is not being given. Finally what emerged out of the discussion is to be seen, but for that a lot of discussion is required in the subsequent meeting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that if the Syndicate has forwarded the Enquiry Report to the Senate for discussion, it did not mean that the Syndicate members could not discuss the same in the Senate meeting. He wanted to ask Professor Ronki Ram ji, who is a very learned member, that if the Syndicate endorsed the Budget to the Senate or forward the report of the Committee to the Senate, it did not mean that the Syndicate members could not discuss the same in the meeting of the Senate. Is it a question that since they had not spoken in the meeting of the Syndicate, they could not speak here. When they had reserved their right that they would speak in the Senate, they could not be deprived of that right now. What is the harm of that person speaking in the Senate? Secondly, there are a lot of issues to be debated along with this issue, which is of a serious nature. However, there are certain issues which are plaguing their examination system and those issues needed to be discussed in this House. Referring to the suggestion of the Vice-Chancellor that the members could send their queries to him in writing, he stated that since some of the members have recorded their queries in the proceedings, what is the need for seeking the queries again from them? The Vice-Chancellor should go through those queries and come prepared with the answers in the next meeting of the Senate, and thereafter, would consider and decide whether to refer it back to the Syndicate or take the decision itself.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that, in fact, it was pointed out by Shri Sandeep Kumar that one of the persons, who have been appointed as Centre Superintendents in various Examination Centres, is not a faculty member in any of the Colleges. Enquiry has to be conducted as to who is that Superintendent, who could be appointed as Centre Superintendent and who could appoint the Centre Superintendent. According to him, it is a preliminary enquiry and if there is a name of one of the Fellows, they have to see as to who could conduct the enquiry against the Fellow and who is competent to order/institute the enquiry.

Professor Rupinder Tewari said that he would like to ask that when the Syndicate had once decided to refer the matter to the Senate, why they are now suggesting to refer it back to the Syndicate. He was sorry to say that it is nothing but just a farce (Tamasha). On the one side, they did not speak in the Syndicate meeting and on the other side, they wanted to speak here and it would become a precedent. So far he is concerned, once the Syndicate referred the matter to the Senate, it should not be referred back to the Syndicate and instead it should be discussed here and decision taken. If they have to save some one, they would continue doing this, referring the matter to the Syndicate and Senate again and again. Yes, they could hold a special meeting to discuss this report, but it should not be referred back to the Syndicate under any circumstances; otherwise, it would be a mockery of the system.

Shri V.K. Sibal stated that the Enquiry Report is the only document which is complete in itself. It would be very unfair to go back to either members of the Committee or the Chairman of the Committee because they had conducted the enquiry to be best of their ability and submitted their report. If there is any objection/s. people are free to give the reasons as to what is wrong. Secondly, he did not think that it is a preliminary enquiry because the preliminary enquiries are held by very junior officers and thereafter, a regular enquiry is instituted by the competent authority. So far as this enquiry is concerned, it has been conducted by a retired High Court Judge. In fact, it is a Fact-Finding Committee and not a preliminary enquiry. So far as action following that is concerned, that is a separate issue and the same has to be examined by the Administration. Firstly, since it is a Fact-Finding Enquiry, it has to be seen whether the facts mentioned in the report are correct or not. If the facts are found to be correct, the report should be accepted. Secondly, he did not understand that the Syndicate, which is the Executive Government of the University, it is its responsibility to discuss the matter before making recommendation/s to the Senate. He asked as to why no discussions were held in the meeting of the Syndicate on the item. Whatever is being stated/enquired here or if there were any shortcomings, those should have been pointed out in the Syndicate itself and then made recommendations to the Senate. In fact, not discussing the matter in the Syndicate in detail, is a kind of deviation from their responsibility. He had gone

through all the annexures, documents, etc. and it is correct that in the Syndicate meeting one of the members wanted to be a member of this Enquiry Committee, but when he was appointed the member of the Committee, he did not attend any meeting of the Committee. Another member of the Enquiry Committee has not signed the report of the Committee on the ground that he did not attend a meeting of the Committee. It would have been proper for him to record his dissent if he did not agree with any/some of the findings of the Committee as he had attended other meetings of the Committee except one. Thirdly, it is not a charge-sheet because charge-sheet would only be issued after the acceptance of the Enquiry Report. The Hon'ble member of the Senate, whose name has been given in the report, has been given six opportunities to clear his position, but he never came. If somebody did not come to clear his position, the inference is against him/her.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is no difference between Fact-Finding Committee and Preliminary Committee and both are one and the same thing. In the Syndicate, they were not clear whether it is a Fact-Finding Enquiry, Preliminary Enquiry, Regular Enquiry or something else. If it was a Regular Enquiry, the Syndicate could not discuss even its coma, full stop, etc. as it has to come to the competent authority directly. In the case of 'A' Class Officer, if some enquiry report is submitted before the Syndicate, the Syndicate has nothing to do with it, but to forward it to the Senate without commenting; otherwise, it amounted to influencing the mind of the competent authority. Secondly, any enquiry did not become automatically a regular enquiry just because it has been headed/conducted by a senior person/officer and an enquiry conducted by a junior officer did not automatically become a preliminary enquiry. A regular enquiry could also be conducted by a junior officer. It depended upon the competent authority to whom it appointed the Enquiry Officer, of course, there is a law that junior officer could not conduct the enquiry of senior officer. In the instant case, nothing was clear and the Syndicate only took the decision as to how it has happened. But now an impression is being given as if it was a regular enquiry against a member of the Senate. Of course, it is a very serious matter. He had said this in January 2015 meeting of the Syndicate and even saying so even today. If some members of the Senate are involved or some officials of the Examination Branch of the University are involved, probably the preliminary Committee has not done justice to see as to where are the loopholes in the system, which had led to this situation. In fact, the spirit behind the decision of the Syndicate was to see how it has happened and how they could plug the loopholes. Nothing has been suggested in this regard. However, he agreed with Shri V.K. Sibal that enquiry is not being conducted against the members of the Committee or the Chairman of the Committee that they would pose them the questions and they would clarify the position. They have only to discuss the report, which is before them. As Professor R.P. Tewari has said that since the Syndicate has forwarded it to the Senate, why should the Senate send it back to the Syndicate? Unless and until the Syndicate did not know what enquiry it is, under what rules/provisions the enquiry has been ordered/conducted, how did they know that they are competent to discuss it or not. Had they known, maybe they had discussed it threadbare. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath had given them the option that either they should accept the report or forward it to the Senate. He had asked Shri Chatrath and the Vice-Chancellor also in the Syndicate itself that unless and until they knew that it is a preliminary enquiry or regular enquiry, how did they know that they are competent to discuss it or not. Ultimately, it was said that alright since it has to go to the Senate, let them refer it to the Senate. To say that those members, who did not speak in the meeting of the Syndicate and are speaking now, that probably would be unfair towards the members of the Syndicate because technically if it was a regular enquiry, they could not have spoken on it and under the impression that it is a regular enquiry, they did not speak, but now an impression is being given that it is a preliminary enquiry and it is not a regular enquiry.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that in April 2014, when the matter was raised by a member of the then Syndicate, it was not clear/there was nothing on the horizon that a member of the Senate could have any role in whatever happened. He did not want to go into the details as they could go back and read the minutes of the meeting of the

Syndicate themselves. So it was said that the matter is serious and it should be looked into by a Committee and Shri Ashok Goyal had offered to serve on the Committee. He formed a Committee under the chairmanship of Justice G.C. Garg (Retd.), comprising Shri V.K. Sibal, Fellow, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, Fellow & Syndic, Shri Ashok Goyal, Fellow & Syndic and Shri Jagpal Singh, Fellow and Syndic. Thus, it was a Committee of sufficiently experienced people of all aspects, e.g., law, administration, functioning of the University, etc. Hence, the Committee was as competent, as senior and as comprehensive, as it could be. He had not interacted with the Committee while the Committee deliberated on the issue. When the report came, only then it turns out that one of the members of this House could have a role in it. He came to know about Justice G.C. Garg, when he visited the University for some other work. He thought that they should have debate in the Senate itself and it would not be appropriate to send it back to the Syndicate. He requested the members to come prepared having read through all the papers and also requested them to bring all the papers. If any of them misplaced the papers, he/she could send an e-mail and they would send him/her all the relevant papers. However, if they wanted, the University could also send them all the papers again. Now, only thing which needed to be decided is whether they wanted a special meeting or a regular meeting.

Some of the members said that they did not want any special meeting for this issue. It should be discussed in the regular meeting itself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they have to fix a time limit as it could not be infinitive because there would be several other items for consideration/discussion. Therefore, they would discuss this issue within one hour and those who wish to speak should communicate to him in advance so that he could allocate some time.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that firstly it should be discussed in the Syndicate and thereafter, in the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he is not recommending that it should be referred back to the Syndicate, but if they wished, they could decide so because they had already discussed it in the Syndicate, wherein it was told that such reports are discussed in the Senate. Moreover, since it has been presented to the Syndicate twice, it would be better to discuss it in the Senate itself.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the item be deferred till the next meeting. In the meanwhile, if the members wished, they could make written comments/queries to the Registrar by 15<sup>th</sup> May 2015 so that there is adequate time with him. The Registrar/Vice-Chancellor would evaluate those queries and whatever answers could be provided, the Vice-Chancellor would try to provide as and when the next meeting of the Senate happens; otherwise, if there are queries which the Chairman/members of the Committee could answer, he would go back to members/Chairman of the Committee.

**XXXIV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-51 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-51.** That the request dated 5.11.2014 of the Principal of Post Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for M.Phil. in Physical Education (ten seats) from the session 2014-2015, be acceded to.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 31)**

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that this has become the first College, which has been granted affiliation for M.Phil. by the Panjab University. He, however, pointed out that Deputy Registrar (Colleges), Panjab University, issued a letter to the College on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2015 stating that temporary extension of affiliation has been granted to the College for the session 2014-2015. When this letter was issued, the

session 2014-15 was already over. He, therefore, suggested that the temporary extension of affiliation to the College for M.Phil. should be granted from the session 2015-2016 instead of 2014-2015.

Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, said that there could be some lacunae due to which the letter might have gone late; otherwise, it could not be. Secondly, the course might not be started by the College. Therefore, the matter be examined and the temporary extension of affiliation to Post Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, for M.Phil. be granted accordingly.

**RESOLVED:** That the matter regarding grant of temporary extension of affiliation to Post Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, for M.Phil. for the session 2014-2015 or 2015-2016, be examined and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Senate.

**XXXV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-52 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-52.** That the validity of Joint Entrance Test conducted for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. Programme of the students, who have/had done M.Phil., be extended from two years to three years from the date of declaration of result of Joint Entrance Test as sometimes the whole process of declaration of result of M.Phil. takes more than two years.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 32)**

Dr. Dalip Kumar pleaded that the condition of joining Ph.D. Programme by the students, who have/had done M.Phil. within two/three years, should be waived off. Even if they referred to the concerned proceedings of the Syndicate, they would find that the majority of the members were in favour of waiving off this condition.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that the validity of Entrance Test, which they conducted for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. Programmes, is two years. The validity has been kept two years because if they keep it valid indefinitely, they would not be able to determine as to who is eligible – whether the candidates, who had qualified the Entrance Test earlier or in subsequent years. Secondly, they would also not be able to compare the students qualifying the Entrance Tests in different years on the basis of their marks as the same might be equal. Since the students were facing problems as sometimes their dissertations/result of M.Phil. were declared late, i.e., after two years, they have demanded that the validity of Joint Entrance Test conducted for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. Programme of the students, who have/had done M.Phil., should be extended from two years to three years from the date of declaration of result of Joint Entrance Test. According to him, there is nothing wrong in it.

Dr. Jagwant Singh suggested that it should be checked whether the new UGC Regulations for award of Ph.D. did not stipulate that the validity of Joint Entrance Test for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. Programmes shall be two years.

**Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it would be checked.**

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired if the turn of the candidate/s for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. Programme did not come/mature within two/three years, where he/she would go?

The Vice-Chancellor said that there were numerous Supervisors in the affiliated Colleges, the turn would definitely come somewhere.

Professor Anil Monga said that the validity of Joint Entrance Test for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. Programme could not be unlimited. Therefore, the proposal is alright and the same should be approved.

**RESOLVED:** That the validity of Joint Entrance Test conducted for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. Programme of the students, who have/had done M.Phil., be extended from two years to three years from the date of declaration of result of Joint Entrance Test as sometimes the whole process of declaration of result of M.Phil. takes more than two years.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That Guideline 1 of “Revised Standard and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree – in conformity with UGC (Minimum Standard and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. degree”, wherein the validity of Joint Entrance Test for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. Programme of the students, who have/had done M.Phil., has been mentioned, be modified accordingly.

**Item C-53 already considered in the meeting held on 29.03.2015.**

**XXXVI.** Considered the Regulations/Rules for B.Com and BBA (Semester System), effective from the session 2014-15, with the stipulation that the internal assessment be 10% instead of 20% and necessary correction/s be made in the relevant Regulation/s **(Item C-54 on the agenda) (Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 36).**

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that incidentally, the draft Regulations/Rules for B.Com and BBA (Semester System) was prepared by him. So far as Regulations/Rules for other courses, including B.A., B.Sc., etc., which are being offered under the Semester System are concerned, he had not come across them so far. He just wanted to point out that when M.Sc. (Biotechnology) course under Semester System was introduced, a similar mistake was committed because of which they faced a embarrassing situation. There could not be two opinions that if they wanted to offer certain courses under the Semester System, they needed to have Regulations/Rules for the same. So far as the Regulations/Rules for B.Com. and BBA (Semester System) are concerned, he stated that some changes had been made by the Syndicate – (i) that the number of seats should be 70 instead of 60. Each Faculty knew better about their course curriculum and how they are going to impart instructions. The Faculty of Business Management & Commerce had recommended 60 seats per unit. From the very beginning, the seats for B.Com course were 60, but under some pressure they started giving 10% additional seats. Thereafter, people started seeking 10% additional seats on 70 seats and so on. But the UGC Regulations pertaining to minimum standards for grant of degree stipulates that the number of seats should be 60. As such, they are not taking a conscious decision while increasing the seats from 60 to 70. However, he understood the concern of Shri Jarnail Singh expressed by him in the meeting of the Syndicate. The first para in the transit regulations was missing. It gives an impression that they are going to reduce the number of seats to 60. A proposal was made that if there were 3 units of 70 students each in the B.Com course, they could make admission of 240 students during the next session, but no additional seats would be given. They made some changes in the method of instructions which was existing in the year 2003 so that the colleges are not burdened and at the same time the conditions laid down by the UGC for maintenance of minimum standards are also complied with. As such, he was still of the view that there should be only 60 seats in a unit for B.Com course and the colleges could go to the next multiple of 60 instead of 70. Each Faculty has its own way of evaluation of students. When they try to mix two faculties, problem arose as they have internal assessment for certain kind of activities, e.g., seminar, projects, etc., but each Faculty has different criteria for assessing the students for the purpose of internal assessment. He also pointed out that they had 20% internal assessment from the very beginning, i.e., from the start of this course and the same is awarded on the basis of assignments, seminar, projects, etc. He, therefore, pleaded that 20% internal assessment recommended by the Faculty should be retained and approved.

Principal Parveen Chawla stated that they did not want to decrease the seats from 70 to 60 because the students are already suffering a lot as many deserving students did not get admission to B.Com course due to which they took admission in Punjab Technical University (PTU). Resultantly, the University as well as the colleges would also suffer. She, therefore, suggested that a unit of 70 seats should be approved. When someone suggested that if there are more admission seekers to B.Com course, the College concerned could seek more units, she said that then the Colleges would be asked to go in for inspections. She suggested that if the seats are not allowed to be increased to 70, another unit should be allowed without inspection and assessment of workload of teachers otherwise there would be problem.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he happened to be a member of the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce for many years. He has learnt that the course of B.Com has been differentiated from other identical courses like B.A., B.Sc. The UGC asked to start a course which they would support. There is not a single post of teacher in schools for which B.Com B.Ed. candidates are eligible, only M.Com candidates can be appointed as a Lecturer in a school. The internal assessment should be the same as for other courses like B.Sc and others. He suggested that the internal assessment should be 10% in the B.Com course.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that for the last about 40 years, the internal assessment in the B.Com course is 20%. The course should not be compared with B.Sc. There is a special requirement of 20% internal assessment for B.Com. There is no provision of 10% internal assessment. He, suggested that the internal assessment for B.Com should remain 20%.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that since inception of the course of B.Com, the internal assessment of 20% is based on the practicals like banking, insurance, etc., whereas in other courses like B.A., etc. there was no internal assessment at all. The provision of internal assessment of 20% was duly considered by the Board of Studies and the Faculty and recommended accordingly. If there was any problem/change required, the Syndicate should have referred the matter back to the Faculty. However, according to him, 4 marks allocated to attendance seemed to be on the higher side and the same should be reduced so that more marks could be allocated to assignments and projects which would motivate the students.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that at the time of adoption of semester system, uniformity was adopted and the internal assessment was kept at 10% in all the courses and the same has been approved by the Senate. However, the purpose for which the internal assessment was introduced, has now been defeated. In fact, internal assessment has led to tuitions. He, therefore, pleaded that so far as internal assessment is concerned, they should maintain uniformity in all the courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he objected to the statement made by Dr. Kuldip Singh that the internal assessments are being sold. In fact, there was no internal assessment in any degree course and the same was introduced on experimental basis in mid 90s when the Senate took a decision to introduce 10% internal assessment in other degree courses. So never ever it was compared that since it was happening in B.Com, the same should be introduced in other courses as well. Perhaps, it was also discussed that internal assessment should be as existed in B.Com. Hence, what was being done in B.Com earlier has nothing to do with other degree classes. If they are consciously convinced that the internal assessments are being misused, then it is not in the case of Commerce alone but in all other faculties. Therefore, let they take a decision that there shall be no internal assessment in any class. Anyhow, he submitted that internal assessment of B.Com course should not be equated with any other course because there are courses at P.G. level in which the internal assessment is 50%.

Professor Mukesh Arora remarked that they should themselves see that when the internal assessment was not there, only 3-4 candidates obtained first division, whereas

after the introduction of internal assessment system, the number of students obtaining first class has gone up to 200-300. Since the internal assessment is not equal in all the courses, the courses wherein the internal assessment is on the higher side, the students get benefitted at the time of securing jobs. Therefore, internal assessment in all the courses should be equal.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that they could not compare B.Com course with science courses which are having practicals. So far as internal assessment in B.Com is concerned, they as teachers evaluate the students whole of the year and award marks of internal assessment accordingly. She, therefore, pleaded that for B.Com the internal assessment should be kept at 20%.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that he agreed with the decision of the Syndicate, which has decided to keep the internal assessment of B.Com course at 10% in uniformity with other courses. The argument that there was no internal assessment in B.A. earlier, is not true because there used to be internal assessment in B.A. as well in the years 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that what the recommendations of the Academic Council are in this regard.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that the regulations governing B.A./B.Sc. (Semester System) have been prepared and have also been approved by the Syndicate in its meeting held in the month of March 2015 and the same would be circulated to the concerned quarters soon. So far as internal assessment for B.Com. is concerned, it has been found later on that the Commerce Faculty had already 20% internal assessment since long. Secondly, to decide the internal assessment for a particular course, is the prerogative of the Board of Studies and Faculty concerned. Even if there is a problem, they could not change it arbitrarily, but could only refer it back to the Faculty concerned. Thirdly, as per the latest recommendations of the UGC, they could have internal assessment up to 30% even for undergraduate courses. Therefore, keeping the internal assessment of B.Com. at 20% is not wrong. Confusion was also there in the last meeting of the Academic Council and the same was referred back to the Faculty and the Faculty has again recommended that the internal assessment for B.Com. should be 20%. Now, 20% internal assessment for B.Com. should be approved.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that again the regulations for B.Com. and B.B.A. say as if only the boys are being enrolled/admitted and the girls are not. She pleaded that whenever any draft regulations are to be prepared, they must be gender sensitive and frame the regulations in a neutral language. As such, while drafting the regulations, they must be very conscious.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that he was of the opinion that the internal assessment for all the courses should be uniform. Therefore, as recommended by the Syndicate, 10% internal assessment for B.Com. should be approved. If they see the courses of BCA, Computer Science, I.T., etc., despite there being prescribed several summer training programmes, the internal assessment has been kept at 10% only. Therefore, he was of the strong opinion that for B.Com. also, the internal assessment should be 10% only.

Professor Anil Monga said that nowadays even the students having qualified B.Com. examination, take admission in M.A. Courses and they took advantage of 20% internal assessment over the other graduate students where the internal assessment is only 10%. Earlier, they might have 20% internal assessment in B.Com., but there should be uniformity in the internal assessment for all the undergraduate courses.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that since in the semester system, the teachers are more involved with the students in their assessment, the internal assessment should be kept at 20% for all the undergraduate courses and this decision be conveyed to the Deans of all the Faculties for necessary action.



Principal Sanjeev Kumar Arora said that there should be uniformity in the internal assessment of all the courses as they could not differentiate their own courses. On the one side, they are talking about Choice Based Credit System and on the other side, they are deciding different internal assessment for different courses. If they kept different internal assessment for different courses, how the students would be able to opt for Choice Based Credit System.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in some courses, the internal assessment has been prescribed 10% and in some other courses, it has been prescribed at 20%. So far as jobs are concerned, the students of Panjab University alone did not compete for jobs in the market, but other Universities like PTU also where there is more than 20% internal assessment. He, therefore, suggested that this issue should be referred to the Faculties concerned and if they wanted, they could also enhance the internal assessment accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let they retain this 20% internal assessment for B.Com. course. However, Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction, would inform the other Faculties about the recommendation of the UGC which says that even for undergraduate courses the internal assessment could be up to 30%. If the Faculty concerned also recommended 20% internal assessment for their courses, the same would be approved by him, on behalf of the Senate.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that the Faculties looked after certain subjects and the Academic Council looked after the Faculties. As such, Academic Council is the body, which is responsible for taking such decisions. Therefore, they should not ignore the Faculties and the Academic Council. He suggested that the matter should be referred to the Faculties and the Academic Council for deciding the internal assessment for various courses being offered at undergraduate level. When the marks of internal assessment are increased often, the students felt victimized and they made complaints that the teachers are victimizing them. He, therefore, suggested that the matter should be referred to the Faculty concerned and the Academic Council where all the representatives are present so that they could consider it threadbare and take appropriate decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that, in fact, it was not a decision of the Syndicate, but only one of the members had pointed out that perhaps 20% internal assessment for B.Com. course has been mentioned by mistake as 10% internal assessment is there for all other courses. He (Dr. I.S. Sandhu) had suggested that correction be made that the internal assessment for B.Com. should also be 10% instead of 20%.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the *status quo* be maintained and if the other Faculties wished to enhance the internal assessment for their courses from 10% to 20%, they should make recommendation.

**RESOLVED:** That the Regulations/Rules for B.Com. and BBA (Semester System), effective from the session 2014-15, be approved, with the modification that the internal assessment be 20% instead of 10%, in anticipation of various University bodies and Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**Item C-55 already considered in the meeting held on 29.03.2015.**

**XXXVII.** Considered the following Resolutions proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar and Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Fellows, **(Item C-56 on the agenda):**

Resolved that Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007 Chapter (II)(A)(vi) page 56 and 57 may be amended as follows:

Proposed amendment referred to Agenda Items 7 and 8 of the Syndicate meeting held on dated 27<sup>th</sup> January, 2013.

**(A) Background Note:**

Agenda Item No. 7. To nominate, under Regulation 6 at page 57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 the Committees to discharge the functions of Boards of Studies in the following subjects as also their Conveners for the term 1.4.2013 to 31.3.2015:

1. M.Tech. Energy Management
2. M.Tech. (Instrumentation)
3. M.Tech. (Microelectronics)
4. Applied Sciences Engineering
5. B.E./M.E. (Information Technology)
6. B.E. (Food Technology)
7. B.E. (Bio-Technology)
8. M.E. (Electronic & Communication Engineering)
9. B.E./M.E. (Computer Science & Engineering)
10. M.E. (Construction Technology & Management)
11. M.E. (Instrumentation & Control)
12. M.E. (Manufacturing & Technology)
13. Police Administration
14. M.Tech. (Engineering & Education)
15. Human Genomics
16. Vivekananda Studies
17. Women's Gender Studies
18. P.G. Diploma in Health, Family Welfare & Population Education
19. Human Rights and Duties
20. M.Sc. Solid Waste Management
21. M.Tech. Nano-Science & Nano-Technology
22. Nuclear Medicine & Medical Physics
23. Social Work
24. MBA CIT
25. Geology
26. Ayurveda
27. Biochemistry
28. Environmental Education
29. Social Sciences
30. Homoeopathy
31. Biotechnology
32. Bioinformatics
33. Microbiology
34. Gemology and Jewellery
35. Fashion design
36. Public Health
37. M.Sc. Forensic Science & Criminology
38. M.Sc. Instrumentation
39. Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering
40. If any.

**Explanations:**

- (i) As per Regulation 6 Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in these regulations; where, in the opinion of the Syndicate, it is not possible to form a Board of Studies in the case of subjects listed in Regulation 1.1, 1.2, 2.3 and 2.5, in accordance with these Regulations the Syndicate may nominate a committee to discharge the functions of the Board of Studies.

**(ii)** The Board of Studies for the subjects mentioned at Sr.Nos.13, 17, 19, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33 and 35 may not be nominated as number of Colleges affiliated in these subjects is more than two and the election to these Boards shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the Regulation 1.3 which states, “the Boards in the above subjects shall be elected every alternate year in the month of March and shall assume office from the first of April”.

**(iii)** These subjects are being imparted by number of affiliated Colleges. This provision would provide diverse/democratic representation to the faculty members.

**(B)** Background Note:

Agenda Item No. 8 (Syndicate meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> January, 2013) to nominate, under Regulation 4 at pages 56-57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 the Board of Studies in the following subjects as also their Conveners for the term 1.4.2013 to 31.3.2015:

1. Arabic
2. Architecture & Planning
3. Arts (Fine Arts)
4. Bengali
5. Chemical Engineering
6. Chinese
7. Civil Engineering
8. Computer Science & Applications
9. Dental Surgery
10. Defence & Strategic Studies
11. Electrical Engineering
12. Electronics & Electrical Communication
13. French
14. Gandhian Studies
15. German
16. Home Science
17. Indian Theatre
18. Law
19. Library Science
20. Mechanical Engineering
21. P.G. Medical Education & Research
22. Music & Dance
23. Mass Communication
24. Postgraduate in Nursing
25. Nursing
26. Persian
27. Pharmacy
28. P.G. in Pharmaceutical Sciences
29. Physical Education (Undergraduate)
30. Physical Education (Post graduate)
31. Russian
32. University Institute of Legal Studies
33. Tibetan
34. Telugu
35. Tamil
36. Kannada
37. Malayalam

38. Assamese
39. Slovak
40. Urdu
41. Sindhi

**Explanations:**

- (i) As per Regulation 4., “The Boards of Studies in the following subjects and their Conveners shall be nominated by the Syndicate”.
- (ii) The Board of Studies for the subjects mentioned at Sr. Nos. 3, 8,10,16,18,22,23,29 and 30 may not be nominated as number of Colleges affiliated in these subjects is more than two and the election to these Boards shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the Regulation 1.3 which states, “the Board in the above subject shall be elected every alternate year in the month of March and shall assume office from the first of April”.
- (iii) These subjects are being imparted by number of affiliated Colleges. This provision would provide diverse/democratic representation to the faculty members.

**NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.03.2015 Para 41 had decided that the above-said Resolutions proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar and Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Fellows, be referred to the Senate with the remarks that the recommendations of the Committee dated 16.01.2015, be approved.**

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 16.01.2015, be approved.

Arising out of the above, Professor Mukesh Arora said that he along with Dr. Dalip Kumar have moved a Resolution several months ago proposing that the candidates be allowed to appear in M.A. (Sociology) examination privately. He did not know the fate of above-said Resolution as the same has not yet been placed before the Syndicate.

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

**Item C-57 had been withdrawn.**

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired as to why Item C-57 has been withdrawn.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that, in fact, Item C-57 should not have come to the Senate at all. As per provision of the Act (Section 18), the recommendation of the Syndicate conferring the title of Honorary Professor on any distinguished teacher is supposed to be sent to the Chancellor directly.

When Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he wanted to raise an important issue, the Vice-Chancellor said that he could do so during the Zero Hour.

**XXVIII.** The information contained in **Items R-1 to R-24** on the agenda was **read out**,  
viz. –

**R-1.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation for M.D. (Radio-diagnosis) course to Govt. Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh, to admit maximum 6 students, for the session 2015-16, subject to the condition that the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 Para 28(v))**

**R-2.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Tanvi, Assistant Professor (temporary), University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism, w.e.f. 13.11.2014 after completion of one month notice on 12.11.2014.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 Para 28(vi))**

**R-3.** In partial modification to this office Endst. No. 10059-66/Estt.-I dated 30.10.2014, 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 & Applications 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 and 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.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 23(i))**

**R-4.** That 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.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 23(ii))**

**R-5.** That the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name in anticipation of the approval of the Senate:

Shri Surjit Singh Rakhra (Minister of Water Supply and Higher Education) Education Minister Punjab, Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education
--	--

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 41)**

**R-6.** In terms of letter No. 1-2/2009 (EC/PS) Pt. VIII dated 07.12.2012 received from the UGC regarding extension in date for participation in Orientation/Refresher Course up to 31.12.2013, adopted by the University vide Senate decision dated 24.03.2013 (Para V), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has approved that the following Assistant Professors, be treated as promoted from Stage-1 to Stage-2, w.e.f. the actual date of his/her eligibility, as mentioned against each, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.7000/-, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme, as per UGC Regulation 2010, at a starting pay to be fixed under the Rules of the Panjab University. The

post would be personal to the incumbents and he/she would perform the duties as assigned to him/her:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the teacher</b>	<b>Department/ Institute</b>	<b>Date of promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2 i.e. original date of their eligibility</b>
1.	Dr. Dipti Sareen	Biochemistry	<b>14.11.2009</b> instead of 23.03.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e. 22.03.2010 vide order No. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011
2.	Dr. Kashmir Singh	Biotechnology	<b>01.07.2009</b> instead of 11.03.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Orientation Course, i.e. 10.03.2011 vide office order No.13092-95/Estt.-I, dated 11.10.2011

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(i))**

**R-7.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has allowed to remove the difference of Rs.4 (24930-24926=4) to be paid to Dr. Rupinder Bir Kaur, Assistant Professor, University Business School, as basic pay of Rs.24930/- in view of her LPC (revised) instead of Rs.24926/- already fixed vide Endst. No.603-604/Estt. I dated 17.01.2013.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(ii))**

**R-8.** In partial modification to letter issued vide No.EST/14/9343/Estt.-I dated 26.09.2014 the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed to re-fix the pay of Dr. (Ms.) Simrit Kahlon, Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, at basic pay of Rs.27070/- + AGP of Rs.8000/- in the pay band of Rs. 15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.8000/- w.e.f. the date of her joining i.e. 22.03.2013, with next date of increment i.e. 01.07.2013.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(iii))**

**R-9.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has fixed the pay of Dr. Vishwa Bandhu Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, at Rs.22010/- + G.P. of Rs.6000/- in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + G.P. of Rs.6000/-, after adding one increment w.e.f. the date of his joining as Assistant Professor i.e. 19.03.2013 with next date of increment as usual.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(iv))**

**R-10.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Puneet Raina, Assistant Professor (temporary), Department of Zoology, w.e.f. 25.11.2014 with the condition that he has to deposit the one month salary in lieu of one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(vi))**

**R-11.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has sanctioned the following retirement benefits to Dr. Surinder Singh, Professor, Department of History, P.U., who is retiring voluntarily from the Panjab University services w.e.f. 31.12.2014:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183, 186 respectively of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, weightage of up to five years be given as an addition to the qualifying service actually rendered by him for calculating gratuity in view of Regulation 17.8 at page 133 P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007; and
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 96 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009. In terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013, the payment of leave encashment will be made only for the number of days, Earned Leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(x))**

**R-12.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council/Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following recommendations dated 16.12.2014 (Item 8) of Faculty of Business Management & Commerce, that:

- (a) Master of Business Administration for Executives (MBAEx) programme, be restructured/restarted w.e.f. the session 2015-16.
- (b) Name of the programme will be "Master of Business Administration for Executives".
- (c) The Programme will be spread over a period of two years comprising of four semesters.
- (d) Tuition fee of each semester: Rs.40,000/-.
- (e) Number of seats: 30
- (f) The classes of the Programme will be held from Monday to Saturday. The timings of the classes will be 6.15 p.m. to 9.15 p.m.
- (g) Each full subject will be devoted 3 hours class room teaching and seminar courses will be devoted 1.5 hours of class room interaction.
- (h) The admission will be made on the basis of the Entrance Test (85% weightage) to be conducted by Panjab University, Group Discussion (7.5% weightage) and Personal Interview (7.5% weightage).



- (i) Regulations/Rules as per for the course i.e. MBA for Executives (MBAEx), w.e.f. the academic session 2015-2016.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(xi))**

**R-13.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Faculty of Languages dated 16.12.2014 (Item 14) that the students who have passed their graduation in any stream from Panjab University or any other Indian University, be allowed to appear in Hindi, English and Sanskrit (Elective) as an additional subject.

- NOTE:**
1. The Senate at its meeting held on 29.03.2008 (Para XVII) has approved that a student who has passed his/her graduation from Panjab University or any other Indian University can appear/clear subject of Punjabi (Elective) as an additional subject.
  2. The above provision is required to be made a part of Regulations concerned in P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(xii))**

**R-14.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Committee dated 18.07.2014 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the pay of Dr. Jasleen Kewlani, former Assistant Professor in Sociology, P.U. Regional Centre, (P.U. Extn. Library), Ludhiana, be protected as under as on 30.11.2011 (A.N.) i.e. date of her joining in the Panjab University, on the basis of the last pay certificate (No. 1197/RGNUL/Estt.-I Dated 24.05.2012) as a special case on notional basis not to be quoted as precedent:

Basic Pay	Rs.15,600
Increments for service @ Rs.600/- per academic session + 5 Non-compounded advance Increments on account of acquiring Ph.D. degree before joining in P.U. (already issued vide orders No. 3476-82/Estt.-I dated 24.04.2014)	Rs.2,400/-
Grade Pay	Rs.6,000/-
D.A. @ 58%	Rs.13,920/-

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(xiii))**

**R-15.** That the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee dated 20.01.2015, and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has adopted the Gazette notification of Govt. of India dated 1.12.2014/AGRAHAYANA NO. 10, 1936 which are in supersession of the NCTE (Recognition Resources procedure) Regulations 2009 to implement the new Regulations w.r.t. recognition of the courses provisioned under this Act- B.Ed., M.Ed., B.P. Ed., D.P. Ed., and M.P. Ed. w.e.f. the session 2015-16, in toto.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(xiv))**

**R-16.** That 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 89 days after giving them one day break as noted against each or till the posts of Foremen (against which they are appointed) are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions:

Sr. No.	Name of Employee/ Department	Designation	Term up to	Date of break	Period of further extension
1	Ms. Cheshta Arora Computer Unit	Programmer	9.12.2014	10.12.2014	11.12.2014 to 09.03.2015
2	Ms. Charleen Kaur Computer Unit	Programmer	30.11.2014	01.12.2014	2.12.2014 to 26.2.2015
3	Mr. Neeraj Rohila Computer Unit	Programmer	14.12.2014	15.12.2014	16.12.2014 to 12.03.2015

**(Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 Para 52(vii))**

**R-17.** That 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:

Name of employee/ Department	Earlier term upto	Date of break	Period of further extension
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

**(Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014 Para 23(iii))**

**R-18.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed:

- (i) to release/the pro-rata pension/service gratuity except leave encashment in respect of Dr. S.P. Gautam, Professor, Department of Philosophy, up to 01.12.2004 i.e. the date he rendered service to this University.
- (ii) to transfer the above stated benefits to Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi.

His Service particulars regarding service rendered at P.U. are as under:

- a) Date of Birth : 26.10.1951
- b) Date of appointment in the University :
  - i) 15.04.1980 (Lecturer)
  - ii) 28.02.1989 (Reader)
  - iii) 27.07.1998 (Prof. CAS)

- c) Date of lien termination from the University : 02.12.2004 i.e. the date from which he proceeded on EOL without Pay to join JNU, as Professor and the date of his confirmation at JNU
- d) (i) Total service in Panjab University : 24 years 7 months 18 days
- (ii) Previous service rendered in other University/Institution : NIL
- e) Period of leave without pay : EOL without pay w.e.f. 01.08.1991 to 31.07.1993, under Regulation 11 (G) of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, to enable him to join the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla as fellow for pursuing the project entitled "Theoretical Foundations of Contemporary Social Science".

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 Para 28(i))**

**R-19.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has increased the viva-voce fee of 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester (BHM-231-Industrial Training) of B.Sc. Hospitality & Hotel Administration, from Rs.250/- to Rs.500/- at University Institute of Hotel Management and Tourism, from the session 2014-15.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 Para 28(ii))**

**R-20.** That the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name in anticipation of the approval of the Senate:

Shri Vijay Kumar Dev, IAS, Advisor to the Administrator U.T., Chandigarh	1. Science 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology
--	---

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 6)**

**R-21.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the decision of the Senate, dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), has approved the re-employment of Professor H.P. Sah, Department of Philosophy, Panjab University, on contract basis up to 04.01.2020 i.e. the date of his attaining the age of 65 years, as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

**NOTE:** Academically active report should be submitted by him after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance

copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 47(i))**

**R-22.** That in pursuance of office orders No. 557-67/Estt.I dated 20.01.2015 vide which placement of Dr. Latika Sharma in Senior scale of Lecturer has been preponed to 11.6.2001, the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate has also approved the preponement of her promotion as Reader, under CAS and re-designation as Associate Professor, w.e.f. the date(s) mentioned below:

Date of Promotion as Reader under CAS, already approved vide order No.14508-17/ Estt.I dated 2.11.2011	Date of Re-designation as Associate Professor already approved vide No.14555-61/Estt.I dated 3.8.2012	Date of preponement of Promotional as i) Reader and ii) re-designation as Associate Professor
20.06.2009	20.06.2012	i) 11.6.2006 as Reader ii) 11.6.2009 as Associate Professor

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 47(ii))**

**R-23.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has transferred Dr. Virender Kumar Negi, Assistant Professor in Law from P.U. S.S. Giri, Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur to University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. with immediate effect. His salary will be charged as such against the post of Assistant Professor in Law, P.U. S.S. Giri, Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 47(iii))**

**R-24.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has transferred Dr. Jasbir Singh, Assistant Professor, from P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib to Department of History, P.U., Chandigarh against the vacant post of Assistant Professor in the Department. His seniority as Assistant Professor shall be next to the person/s already selected/appointed (if any) to the post of Lecturer/Assistant Professor prior to 29.05.2011 i.e. date of decision of Syndicate dated 29.05.2011 (Para 2 (xx)) vide which he was appointed as Assistant Professor.

**(Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 Para 47(iv))**

**Referring to Sub-Item R-1,** Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that whenever any College/Institution sought affiliation/extension of affiliation, it is asked to submit a NOC from the Punjab Government and the Regulatory Body, but in the instant case, the affiliation has been granted to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, subject to the condition that the College would obtain the mandatory approval from the MCI.

Professor Naval Kishore clarified that MCI had put a condition that once the affiliation is granted by the University, they would grant the mandatory approval.

**Referring to Sub-Item R-15**, Principal S.S. Sangha stated that it is true that they are adopting the Gazette notification of Government of India dated 1.12.2014/AGRAHAYANA NO.10, 1936. He had also talked to Dean, Faculty of Education, that the syllabus has not been framed in accordance with the above-said Gazette notification and the Dean has told him that they had written to the University for holding a workshop, but has not received any response from the University. Secondly, the meeting of Board of Studies is not being convened and it is being told that since the members on the Board of Studies have not been nominated, how could the meeting be convened? Under the circumstances, they would not be able to frame the syllabus before the meeting of the Academic Council as the Summer Vacations are approaching and the next academic session would commence in July. As such, the matter is serious.

Professor Naval Kishore informed that Dean, Faculty of Education, had sought funds for holding a workshop and the requisite funds have been sanctioned.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that the major problem is that the University has not notified the adoption of the abovesaid Gazette notification, whereas all the neighbouring Universities, including Punjabi University, Patiala, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla have notified the same. If they did not notify the adoption well in time, problem would be there. So far as workshop is concerned, since the funds have been sanctioned by the Dean, College Development Council, the workshop would be organized at the earliest.

Professor Naval Kishore clarified that the issuance of notification is at the final stage.

Principal Tarlok Bandhu said that the notification and preparation of Syllabus are two separate issues. So far as Board of Studies in Education is concerned, 10 members have been elected and only certain members are to be nominated, which should be nominated at the earliest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate had constituted a Committee to nominate members on Board of Studies in various subjects.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that he had also sent an e-mail to him (the Vice-Chancellor) for nominating members on the Board of Studies in Education. He had also asked the General Branch to convene the meeting of Board of Studies in Education, but they said that until the members are nominated on the Board of Studies, the meeting could not be convened.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath assured that the list of persons to be nominated on the Board of Studies in Education would be supplied to the General Branch tomorrow (27.4.2015).

Professor Mukesh Arora said that a B.P.Ed. course is being offered, it should be checked whether they had got approval from the NCTE for the above-said course.

Shri Lilu Ram stated that since they are adopting the Gazette notification of Government of India dated 1.12.2014/AGRAHAYANA NO.10, 1936 from 5<sup>th</sup> January 2015, would it not be violation of regulations/rules if the screening of the applications is done on the basis of old regulations/rules/criteria for the interview fixed for 5<sup>th</sup> May 2015. He pleaded that in order to avoid embarrassment at the later stage, they should screen the applications in accordance with the new regulations notified by the Government of India through its notification dated 1.12.2014.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur stated that she has observed in the University system that everybody – whether Dean of University Instruction, Dean of the Faculty or anybody else, knew the regulations/rules about the screening for the post of Assistant Professors and is also very vocal about them. However, when the turn of Professors came, they all forget

the regulations/rules. Though they had adopted the above Gazette notification in toto, the B.A. B.Ed. is missing. According to the new regulations, no post of Professor is there in the Department as only the post of Principal/Head of the Department is there and both desirable and essential qualifications are also mentioned there. Secondly, on the basis of these new norms, the University has decided to discontinue certain courses and instead has decided to start 2-Year B.P.Ed. course and so on. She enquired why these norms are not being implemented for the screening for the posts of Professors in the University. Could they implement these regulations partially? Thirdly, there is question of non-applicable of mind by the Screening Committee while screening the applications for the post of Professors. So far as advertisement is concerned, the advertisements for both the posts of Professors and Assistant Professors were issued earlier. Whether the Dean of University Instruction did not know the norms as the screening is being done totally against the norms of the NCTE.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that first of all the name of the Department is not B.A. B.Ed. Institute and instead it is Institute of Educational and Vocational Technology. So far as University teaching departments are concerned, there is no position of Head of Department (HoD) as there are only positions of Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor. However, when they talked about Principals, the Principals are equivalent to Associate Professors and not Professors. Secondly, when they talked about any University teaching departments, there are different courses including BA/B.Ed. and M.Ed. and the department should have the post of Professor for the course concerned.

Principal N.R. Sharma stated that as on today in the University, no post of Principal for any vocational course or other courses existed. Secondly, the Committee, constituted by the University for NCTE new regulations, has decided that the minimum teaching experience for the post of Principal would be 10 years instead of 8 years. In the University budget also, the department has been sanctioned the post of Professor.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that the screening has been/was being done in accordance with the advertisement. It is a separate issue that whether the posts should be filled up in accordance with the new regulations or not.

Principal N.R. Sharma enquired whether M.P.Ed, B.P.Ed. and Disability courses had been recognized by the regulatory body?

Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu stated that the University Grants Commission issued new guidelines on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010. The University had fixed interview for the post of Assistant Professor, Department of Zoology for 1<sup>st</sup> July 2010. Though the candidates also came for the interview, but the interview was not conducted because a few days ago, University adopted the new guidelines. He pleaded that whenever they received any new guidelines/regulations and adopted the same in toto, they should proceed according to the new guidelines/regulations.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that this very University constituted a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, which recommended that the minimum experience of 10 years is required for the post of Professor.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as clarified by Professor A.K. Bhandari that the screening is being done in accordance with the advertisements, the allegation levelled that the screening is not being done properly, is wrong.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that the Vice-Chancellor has received representations from two faculty members regarding NCTE guidelines. He did remember that the item pertaining to these guidelines was approved by the Syndicate when the meeting was about to over, that too, on the request made by the Dean, College Development Council that this is an urgent item. He suggested that before moving further for completing the interview process, it would be better to postpone the matter because the applicants are

claiming that according to these guidelines the experience required for the post of Professor is 8 years, about which he is not quite sure, reason being that though these guidelines were adopted in toto, not discussed at all. It is very strange that 8 years experience is there and he had still doubt about that.

Professor Rajat Sandhir, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Dinesh Kumar, said that he has also received representations from two colleagues stating that they are eligible in accordance with the NCTE guidelines. He, therefore, pleaded that the matter should be examined.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that, as per the UGC Regulations 2010, for the position of Professor, the experience required is 10 years and for the post of Principal, the experience required is 15 years, whereas in the case of Colleges of Education, the requisite experience is 10 years out of which 5 years should be in secondary educational institutions and for Professors it is the same.

Dr. Kuldip Singh said that the screening should be done as per the advertisement and the process should be continued for filling up the posts.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur suggested that a clarification in this regard should be sought from the Chairman, NCTE.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now they are discussing Item R-15 and not anything arising out of that.

Principal Tarlok Bandhu said that the meeting of the Committee was held on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2015 to consider the adoption of new NCTE Regulations issued vide Gazette notification of Government of India dated 1.12.2014, whereas the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) issued a circular to all the affiliated Colleges in December 2014 directing them to implement the new NCTE Regulations with immediate effect. How the Colleges have been directed to implement the new NCTE Regulations without being adopted by the University?

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are arising out of things and he could not give them off and on answers. He requested Principal Tarlok Bandhu to raise the issue during the Zero Hour discussion and if he could answer, he would answer; otherwise, not.

Principal Tarlok Bandhu said that he is speaking on Item R-15, which pertained to new NCTE Regulations. On the one side, he (the Vice-Chancellor) says that the members should raise the issues pertaining to the item under consideration only, and when he is raising the issue on the item itself, he is not replying. Had the meeting been held earlier, reference might have been given. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to give reply.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not remember each and everything.

Professor Naval Kishore said that so far as the circular issued by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) is concerned, the new NCTE Regulations were adopted and, that was why, the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) directed the Colleges to implement the same immediately, but the University Teaching Departments were left. In fact, Professor Nandita Singh pointed out that the University Teaching Departments are left and the matter was brought to the notice of the Dean of University Instruction. Thereafter, a Committee was got constituted, which met on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2015 and reiterated the adoption of new NCTE Regulations.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that immediately after the receipt of new NCTE Regulations, the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) issued a circular to the Colleges for implementation. Thereafter, the matter came to the Syndicate.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur pointed out that though it has been mentioned that “The new NCTE Regulations as per Gazette notification of Government of India dated 01.12.2014/AGRAHAYANA No.10,1936 are in supersession of the NCTE (Recognition Resources Procedure) Regulations 2009, the University is still following the old regulations.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that on the one hand, they had directed the Colleges to implement the new NCTE Regulations, and on the other hand, the University *per se* is still following the old regulations. He pleaded that the selection to the post of Professor should be as per the new NCTE Regulations.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the whole issue should be got examined and thereafter an appropriate decision should be taken. In fact, his colleagues are saying that since the University is going to conduct certain interviews, if they have to proceed in accordance with the new NCTE Regulations, then they should have to issue a corrigendum calling other applications as well and thereafter get the same screened.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that meant, they have to decide whether the post has to be advertised as Professor as per UGC or NCTE or they have to go by the precedence.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that in the advertisement the qualifications for the posts of Professors and Associate Professors have been mentioned as ‘Postgraduate degree with minimum of 55% marks in the discipline relevant to the area of specialization, Postgraduation in education, M.Ed./M.A. in Education with minimum 55% marks, Ph.D. in Education or in the discipline of area of specialization or any other qualification prescribed by the UGC (UGC-NET) professional experience as per UGC or State Government norms’.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have advertised the position/s of Professor in a University Teaching Department. However, all these arising out of points would be got clarified by him himself.

**The House unanimously decided that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the above-said matter, on behalf of the Senate.**

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur stated that they have adopted the new NCTE Regulations in toto and in toto means everything, i.e., fee structure, regulations, rules, faculty positions, working of non-teaching, etc. Though the posts of Assistant Professors were advertised earlier, they implemented the new NCTE norms in their case, but not in the case of Professors and Associate Professors.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the problem in the case of Assistant Professors had come because of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since a lot of changes are involved, a Committee should be constituted to examine the whole issue and make recommendations so that they did not face any problem from the regulatory body side later on.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that the Dean of University Instruction and the Chairperson, Department of Education, should be asked to check each and everything thoroughly so that they did not face any problem later on.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that Dean, Faculty of Education, should also be associated with the Dean of University Instruction and Chairperson, Department of Education, to check each and everything thoroughly.

**Referring to Sub-Item R-18**, Dr. Jagwant Singh said that so far as pro-rata service gratuity is concerned, it is alright, but what is meant by pro-rata pension.



It was clarified that it is pension contribution calculated on pro-rata basis as is done for commutation of pension. Secondly, it is being done as per CSR Rules.

**Referring to Sub-Item R-23 & R-24**, Professor Rajat Sandhir stated that since he is representing PUTA, whatever he is going to say is the voice of the teachers of the University. The PUTA has also given a resolution/representation to the members of the Syndicate. Although it did reach some of the members, he did not know whether the same was deliberated upon or not. Whatever has happened in the recent past about these two transfers, has created a lot of resentment amongst the teachers' community of the University. So far as these two transfers are concerned (Items R-23 and R-24), they have strong reservation. If they have to come to the University Campus, they would have to come through the open selection only and not on transfer basis.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that R-23 and R-24 are not two identical cases. In fact, R-24 is a person, who has appeared for selection for a University Department, but is a regular faculty member at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib. This candidate, as he had explained in the meeting of the Syndicate, had performed extremely well. Had there been another position in the University Department or had the Committee any option to enhance the number of positions in the University Department or had they freedom to enhance the number of positions, this candidate would have been selected. So it was in that spirit that appreciation of this candidate was recorded in the minutes of the Selection Committee. Alright the Syndicate members felt that it was not proper thing to put on record in the proceedings of the Selection Committee and the point was well taken. However, if it is recorded, it is not something that they had seriously violated anything. It is not that this should not have been done, but has been done. Since there are no strict guidelines on that, it is just an appreciation. He personally felt that this guy was isolated at that place and, if in isolation, he could do good quality work; and if brought to the main campus, he would definitely flourish more. So in that spirit his transfer was recommended, accepted and so on. But if for whatever reason/s the Senate decided to reject it, it did not matter much to him as he is a good person. He (Vice-Chancellor) would talk to him and he would go back to his parent place as the position is lying vacant there. As and when the position/s at Campus is/are advertised, since this guy is a strong enough candidate, he would compete with other candidates at a later stage. This guy is indeed a very good guy and if they accepted his transfer, they would not be violating anything because he has already appeared in the interview for selection along with all other candidates for this Department. Since he is very good, if they accepted his transfer, they could start nurturing him. Academically, they are doing nothing wrong in nurturing a young person. As such, they are doing nothing which he thought is not in the larger interest of the University. So Items R-23 and R-24 could not be treated on the same footing. So far as Item R-23 is concerned, the recommendation came in the following sense. There is no hesitation of the parent Department in releasing a person and the other Department of the University is willing to accept him/her. So in that spirit the transfer was accepted. While the matter was under consideration, one of the members of the Syndicate pointed out that there could be other such cases, where such a possibility could also be there. He had pleaded that they should not adopt pick and choose policy and a name of another candidate was also pointed out. When later on he went and checked up, another candidate had indeed made an application for transfer from P.U. Regional Centre and she was also a regular faculty member. Her case was also referred for consideration by him and he was told that wherever she wanted to get transferred, no position is available. However, during the last few weeks, after the Registrar has made a trip to P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, the candidate has once again made the request and the same has been received in the University office. He has personally checked with the Directors of other Regional Centre, where she wanted to get transferred and he has been told that now a vacancy existed to accommodate her. He personally has no hesitation in accepting that provided the Director of the Regional Centre gives his concurrence in writing. He will not hesitate to recommend the transfer of that candidate also. As pointed out by one of the members, he personally is not in favour of pick and choose policy. He has explained everything regarding these two

candidates. He, therefore, requested the members to wind up the discussion and take decision on Item R-23 and R-24.

Shri Raghbir Dayal said that for the last 2½ years, he has been requesting time and again to appoint full time Directors at Regional Centres. On the one hand, the University has appointed about 200-250 Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors, and on the other hand, the positions of Directors of Regional Centres and Rural Centre are not being advertised due to which the Centres are suffering a lot. As told by the Vice-Chancellor, the candidate (Dr. Jasbir Singh) might be undoubtedly is a good faculty member, but he is surprised to learn that attempts are being made to bring him here. He questioned whether the other candidates working in other Centres are not good. Secondly, are they ready to open a Pandora box for transferring all those persons working at the University Campus to Regional Centres, if they did not perform their duties well (although all are performing well). Should the PUTA be ready to accept such a step? Whether the substitutes against the persons, who have been transferred to the Panjab University Campus, would be given, and if yes, when. It is good that the Director has been appointed at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, but did they fill up the vacancy of English, which occurred after the exit of Dr. Dhillon. He wanted an assurance from the Hon'ble Chairman of the Senate, for how long, the situation would continue like this, i.e., in isolation. He has been requesting the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor for the last two and a half years to listen to them, what else he could do. Whether he has to gather the numbers to get himself attended to or he has to bring an agenda item or sit on the floor of the House. He needed his (Vice-Chancellor's) spirited guidance as to when Regional Centres would be provided faculty members, even as guest faculty. Similar position is prevailing in the Panjab University Constituent Colleges. Certain persons have been appointed as Computer teachers in P.U. Constituent Colleges and it has been mentioned in their appointment letters that they would be paid Rs.30,400/- p.m., but for the last three months they have not been paid any salary. Perhaps, an audit objection has been raised how this appointment letter has been issued and how such a huge salary has been given. Only one Professor of Law is there at the Regional Centre, which is a kind of back door entry as first year the admissions are made there and the very next year, the students are migrated from there to Panjab University Campus. Tomorrow they might say that another person is doing good work at another Regional Centre, he/she should also be brought to the Campus. If this continued, what would remain there? Whether they had any clear-cut policy in this regard? On the one hand, they are giving impressive lectures for inclusive education, for which they could arrange faculty development programme. He could not understand as to what are the bindings, which are stopping the Vice-Chancellor to fill up the vacant positions. He emphasized that the transfers should be allowed, if PUTA accepted and that too, after evolving a policy.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that there is no such type of danger which is being feared by the members that after transferring the person/s from the Regional Centre to Panjab University Campus, some of the teachers could also be transferred to the Regional Centre/s as a kind of punishment. Transfers would be allowed only if – the persons concerned are willing to go, Head of the Institutes are ready to relieve them and the Head of the Institutes where they are to be transferred are also willing to take them. As such, there is nothing like this that the persons would be transferred from P.U. main campus to P.U. Regional Centres as sort of punishment. He pointed out that it is being mentioned in the appointment letters that “The competent authority could assign him/her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his/her 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”. As said by President, PUTA, there is no case that somebody would be transferred to P.U. Regional Centre, as a punishment. According to him, these transfers have been made on merit and these should be allowed. If there is merit in another case, the same should also be allowed later on.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him provide them some more input. It is not that these transfers are happening for the first time in the University system. Though he

has not seen all the records, in one of the files at least on three occasions this has happened.

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that the recommendation of the Selection Committee regarding transfer of Dr. Jasbir Singh was not within the jurisdiction of the Selection Committee. When they met last time in the month of March 2015, he was not aware that the transfers have already been effected, but if they recall the conclusion, they had not accepted these transfers and a decision was taken in the previous meeting of the Senate (29.03.2015) that the persons would go back. Therefore, the item should not have been there. Though he is not against these transfers, there has to be some transfer policy under which the transfers should be made. Citing an example, he said that a person working at Kurukshetra, if selected, is willing to join at Chandigarh, but not at Hoshiarpur and the person at number 2 in the merit showed his willingness to join at Hoshiarpur. As such, he is selected and if later on, he is transferred to Chandigarh, it would create problem. Once the post/s is/are advertised for the Regional Centre, the selection/s should be made on merit for the Regional Centre itself, and if transferred to main campus later on, it would definitely affect the merit. That is policy matter and the same needed to be discussed threadbare. According to him, Regional Centres are not Teaching Departments, but are the part of the Departments. If at all, they are going to set a precedent by making these transfers, it would be a bad precedent. If they wish to transfer persons from Department of Evening Studies to main Department concerned or University School of Open Learning and *vice versa*, the opinion of the PUTA should also be given weightage.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him clarify. His (Dr. Jagwant) argument that a person working at Kurukshetra might be ready to join at Chandigarh, but not at Hoshiarpur, is not right. Dr. Jasbir Singh had got selected for P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni for a permanent position first, he might now be on the waiting list or whatever it is. In fact, he is a regular faculty member at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni and had applied for a regular position in the Department of History, Panjab University, Chandigarh. Nobody prevented a (hypothetical) Kurukshetra person to apply for a position in the Department of History. Had a person from Kurukshetra applied for a position in the Department of History and got in the waiting list, then he (Dr. Jagwant) could have an argument.

Professor Mukesh Arora stated that, as suggested by Dr. Jagwant Singh, first a transfer policy should be framed and thereafter, the transfers should be made. Otherwise, the people would approach the Senators for their transfers, which would be a problem for them. Three applications for transfer, recommended by Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal, have already been received from P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that he is in favour of bringing talent to the University. This is not something unprecedented. He put it on record that previously six transfers had been made from P.U. Regional Centres to Panjab University main campus, viz. Dr. V.P. Upadhyaya from V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur to Panjab University main campus, Dr. Dharamanand Sharma from V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur to Panjab University main campus, Dr. Neeraj Sharma from University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Chandigarh to Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, Shri Rajinder Kumar from P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar to Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, Shri Gurjaswinder Singh from P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar to P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, and Shri Vinod Kumar from P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar to Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh. As such, this is not something unprecedented; rather as per University rules, therefore, he is in favour of these transfers.

On a point of order, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that out of these six, two namely Shri Vinod Kumar was transferred from P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar to Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Shri Gurjaswinder Singh from P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar to P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, but later

on, complaint/s was/were made to the Chancellor that these persons appointed at such and such places and have been transferred to such and such places, which is a backdoor entry. He did not know what happened later on, but they were overnight transferred back to their original places. Secondly, out of these six, two transfers were made from V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, which was never a Regional Centre, but just like a Department of the University.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they knew that no transfer policy is in place so far. Professor Arun Kumar Grover, as Vice-Chancellor, also felt that this guy, Dr. Jasbir Singh, is a brilliant person and needed to be brought to the Department of History, Panjab University. However, what was the hurry in allowing these persons to join at the main campus of the University, especially in the absence of transfer policy. Secondly, even if these persons are to be transferred, first approval of the Syndicate and Senate should have been sought and allow to join later on.

Principal Tarlok Bandhu stated that, in fact, the purpose of establishment of Regional Centre at Muktsar and Rural Centre at Kauni was to impart quality education to the students of that backward area as it was difficult for the students of the villages to come to cities to get education. Whenever appointments at these Centres are made, it is always mentioned that these appointments are solely for P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni or P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar. If good teachers/scholars joined there, would it not be beneficial for the students of those areas. Did those students not need quality education? He added that there were 19 posts of Library Assistants at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana and the University appointed only six persons against those posts. After joining, the candidates immediately submitted applications for their transfer from P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana to Panjab University main campus at Chandigarh. In fact, these posts were lying vacant there for the last more than 15 years. He, therefore, pleaded that such a policy of transferring the persons from one place to another, especially to Chandigarh, should be discouraged and the persons should be asked to work wherever they have been appointed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that he is in favour of these transfers as there are reasons for the same. So far as Item R-23 is concerned, the person concerned is from Law. In fact, positions were advertised for University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh as well as for Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, but somehow because of the court case the positions could not be filled up here, whereas four positions of Hoshiarpur were filled up. As such, sufficient number of teachers was available at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, whereas there is a shortage of teachers at University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh. That was the reason that when the person concerned requested for transfer, the Director, Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, gave his consent and the consent was also given by the Chairperson, University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh. Since it is a need-based transfer, it should be allowed. So far as transfers of Vinod Kumar from P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar to Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Shri Gurjaswinder Singh from P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar to P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, are concerned, the rules at that point of time were different. The rules have been changed about 7-8 years ago adding certain clauses in the appointment letter. He read out the extract from the appointment letter, viz. 'in accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 28<sup>th</sup> August 2008, I am desired to offer you an appointment as Lecturer in Laws for B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) (5-Year) Integrated Course at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur. Thereafter, it has also been written that the competent authority could assign him/her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his/her 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'. That meant, they could assign duties at other places as well. As such, the provision for transfer is there.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that so far as Item R-23 is concerned, Principal Gurdip Sharma has named certain persons, who had been transferred in the past. In the recent past, Shri Sanjeev Sharma was transferred from University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Chandigarh to Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur. Dr. Vikram was also transferred from V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur to Department of Sanskrit, Panjab University, Chandigarh and that too, when there was no Regional Centre at Hoshiarpur. In fact, at that time V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, was just like a College. People used to be transferred from Department of Evening Studies to main Department and vice versa. So far as he knew, Dr. V.P. Upadhyaya was transferred from V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, to Department of Evening Studies and Department of Evening Studies to main Department and later on again to Department of Evening Studies. As pointed out by certain other members, it is being mentioned in the appointment letters that 'the competent authority could assign him/her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his/her 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'. Therefore, he was in favour of these transfers.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that he had got recorded his dissent about these transfers in the meeting of the Syndicate. Two issues that are emerging from the discussion are very important. He could provide a list of the names of the persons who were refused transfer from Department of Evening Studies to main department. In the absence of any transfer policy, what was the need to transfer the person from Hoshiarpur to main campus. The teachers instead of teaching would strive to get favours for their transfers. This would open a Pandora box and ultimately would prove to be a big problem for the University because there may be charges against you for adopting a pick and choose policy. Secondly, some persons are interested in coming to the main department from Department of Evening Studies. Would they allow such transfers and is there any transfer policy? In the absence of any transfer policy, if the persons get themselves transferred by whatever means, it would amount to be an arbitrary and set a wrong precedent. Whenever there is an advertisement for teaching positions, the number of applications received for a regional centre is less as compared to University teaching department thereby the chances of selection of a candidate at a regional centre are more. This mechanism is used to get transfer from a regional centre to the main campus which may be termed as a backdoor entry.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the person concerned had appeared in interview for the Department of History and his transfer could not be said to be a backdoor entry.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that the practice of transfers is not a new one. As stated by the Vice-Chancellor that in both the cases, the merit has been considered and the transfers have been made with the consent of the Heads of both of the Departments, he is of the view that attempts should have been there to bring the talent to the University but to address the doubts as expressed by some of the members, a Committee should be constituted to prepare a policy in this regard. As regards the other two cases, these persons were transferred because the number of students in the subjects of the teachers concerned was not adequate. But later on when the proper admissions were there after a period of two years, the Directors of the Regional Centres had requested the Vice-Chancellor either to make fresh appointments or send back the persons who had earlier been transferred from the Regional Centres. Consequently, the persons were sent back to their parental centres and suggested that in view of that Item R-23 and R-24 should be approved.

Dr. Kuldip Singh stated that it is the prerogative of the Vice-Chancellor to effect transfers for the academic betterment. He pointed out that in the past also, some transfers have been made on the insistence of some of the members who are today talking in high tone, whose names he could give just now. Secondly, some of the teachers, who are appointed at Regional Centres, do not make admission deliberately so that they could manage to come to the University. Keeping in view this tendency, he

suggested that a transfer policy should also be framed so that the Regional Centres could survive. Both these items may be approved and a transfer policy may be framed for future.

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that she is fully in favour of Item R-23 and R-24. So far as Item R-23 is concerned, it is not for the first time but in the past also such transfers have been made as also pointed out by Dr. Kuldip Singh. According to her, the appointment by way of transfers is a recognized mode of appointments. It is not an illegal appointment. There are three conditions for making a transfer. Firstly, the Head of the Department from where the person is to be transferred, should be ready to relieve the person. Secondly, the person who is being transferred should be ready to join the place where he is being transferred. Thirdly, the Head of the Department where the person is being transferred should also give his/her consent and the availability of the position should be there. In the instant cases, all these three conditions have been fulfilled and the persons have already joined after the approval by the Syndicate subject to approval by the Senate.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that it is matter of really perception and *bona fide*. Srinivasa Ramanujan was made a Fellow of Society even when he was not a Ph.D. and Madras University gave him the scholarship. The issue is that some exceptional cases are always there, but the people who take the decision should not suspect so that no one could say that the decision is incorrect. There is also a problem when somebody says that when they start something it becomes precedent and pressures are there in the system to accommodate the situations which are not *bona fide* cases. His (Professor Bambah) predecessor had transferred somebody from Hoshiarpur to Chandigarh and that fellow wanted to get promotion from Hoshiarpur quota. However, he (Professor Bambah) told him that since he had been transferred to Chandigarh, he would get promotion under Chandigarh quota. Another person appeared in the interview for a position in the Department and he was not selected. He also appeared in the interview for a position in the Panjab University Evening College, where he got selected and was later on transferred from Panjab University Evening College to main Department without the post being created or abolished. He (Professor Bambah) took the decision for transferring him back to Panjab University Evening College. The person concerned approached the Court and won the case even though his argument was that neither the post of Panjab University Evening College has been abolished nor the post has been created in the main Department, so this transfer is not valid. Similarly, the person, who was transferred from Hoshiarpur to Chandigarh, was transferred back to Hoshiarpur. When the person refused to go there, he (Professor Bambah) ordered that he be not paid the salary. He personally felt that if they had faith in the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor felt that it is in the interest of the University and the employees, they should accept his decisions. If they are sure that the transfer of the person is in the interest of the University and also person concerned, they should go ahead. The view that the Regional Centres also needed talent, should also be taken care of so that the Regional Centres are not deprived of good/talented people. Therefore, before taking such a decision he (Vice-Chancellor) should ensure that whatever decision he is taking is in the interest of the University, Regional Centre and the employee concerned and then they would support him. If the decision is taken under pressure, it would create problem. As far as these transfers are concerned, since there are precedents and courts have also taken different views, he would request the Senate to ratify these transfers as these are made in right spirit and in the interest of the University.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that they had taken a decision that Panjab University Teaching Departments and P.U. Regional Centres are one and the same thing and are part and parcel of each other. Whatever recruitment is made, it is made for all the three divisions of University Institute of Legal Studies together, i.e., University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, and University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur. Usually, they charge Rs. 40,000 from a student who migrate from other institutions to University Institute of Legal

Studies, but did not charge this amount from the students, who migrate from University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, and University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur as they treat them their own students. Similarly, the students are allowed to migrate only if they had cleared all the papers, but this condition is not applicable on the students of P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, and P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur. So far as the transfer of Hoshiarpur person is concerned, 4 new persons have been appointed and a couple of persons out of those who were working there for the last 8-10 years, have been relieved from there, where as 7 posts are lying vacant at University Institute of Legal Studies Chandigarh and majority of these posts belonged to ST Category and could not be filled up owing to court case. Since the request for transfer has been received from both sides, i.e., Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, and University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U., Chandigarh and there is a need for it, the transfer should be allowed, especially when the University Institute of Legal Studies has been allowed to start LL.M. Course from the ensuing session. This person (Dr. Virender Kumar Negi) is Ph.D. and would prove to be useful. He therefore, supports this transfer. So far as transfer of Dr. Jasbir Singh is concerned, as said by Professor R.P. Bambah, it is within the power of the Chief Executive Officer of the University even then he had showed greatness and brought it to the Syndicate and Senate. Since this transfer has been made in good intention, they should approve the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it has been mentioned in the item itself that his seniority as Assistant Professor shall be next to the person/s already selected/appointed (if any) to the post of Lecturer/Assistant Professor prior to 29.05.2011, i.e., date of decision of Syndicate dated 29.05.2011 (Para 2 (xx)) vide which he was appointed as Assistant Professor. This has also not been seen that in this manner he would become senior to the persons who have been selected in comparison to him, who has not been selected. Hence, it should not have been done. Of course, Professor R.P. Bambah has said that there are precedents of all kinds and decisions also. Without commenting on the merit of this case, he drew the attention of the House that here is a member of the Senate (Professor Shelley Walia), who was appointed in the Department of Evening Studies. He requested that he should be transferred to Department of English, but his request was not acceded to. He was asked to compete for the position and appear in the interview. Ultimately, he appeared in the interview and was appointed as a fresh recruit in the Department of English and the seniority which he had attained in the Department of Evening Studies was also not given to him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a mistake and it should not have been there that his (Dr. Jasbir Singh's) seniority as Assistant Professor shall be next to the person/s already selected/appointed (if any) to the post of Lecturer/Assistant Professor prior to 29.05.2011, i.e., date of decision of Syndicate dated 29.05.2011 (Para 2 (xx)) vide which he was appointed as Assistant Professor. He, however, said that he has taken note of it.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that, undoubtedly, the Vice-Chancellor had kept merit in mind. He knew that the intentions of the Vice-Chancellor are very good and he also knew that there have been many precedents where many people have been transferred. He did not know what practice or consideration would follow then. So he does not take these as precedents at all. The precedent for him would be only merit and that he (Vice-Chancellor) stood for talent somewhere. He knew that his (Vice-Chancellor) intentions are good and it would help the University, to keep in view the fact that there are Regional Centres, which should be considered to have parity with the University Teaching Departments. When they talk about appointing Supervisors/Co-Supervisors, they say that the University Teaching Departments, P.U. Regional Centres and Colleges affiliated to Panjab University are at the same level, they are equal and there is no difference at all. In his opinion and as said by Shri Ashok Goyal, that I was not transferred to the Department of English from Department of Evening Studies. I served in Department of Evening Studies for one and a half years, before I was moved to the Department of English because the then

Vice-Chancellor (Lala Suraj Bhan) said that I have to come through the procedure laid down by the University. Therefore, I waited patiently. He was of the opinion that they should not create vacuum in P.U. Regional Centres by bringing talented people here because talent was also required at Regional Centres. If Dr. Jasbir Singh stayed at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, he would attract talent, enhance academic environment at that place and when time arrived he would appear in the interview and get selected for the position here at the Campus. He urged that in the light of the arguments and opinion of PUTA that they are not against the decision of these transfers, they should reconsider these transfers. They should postpone the coming of Dr. Jasbir Singh here. Let him compete in in the open selection and get selected for a position at the University Campus.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that he has been seeing for the last about 15 years that no transfer has taken place. Before the tenure of Professor K.N. Pathak, former Vice-Chancellor, transfers might have taken place. So far as the transfer of Shri Gurjaswinder Singh is concerned, Shri Gurjaswinder Singh was transferred from P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar to P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana and thereafter again to P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar. Since the approach of Dr. Jasbir Singh and Dr. Virender Kumar Negi is strong, their transfers would be got done. Secondly, if the person concerned had appeared in the interview and was intelligent, why he has not been selected by the Selection Committee and placed on the waiting list alone?

Dr. Emanuel Nahar said that he is in favour of these transfers as these are genuine appointments. So far as Item R-23 is concerned, this transfer has been made on the consent of both the Heads concerned and is based on need and would not affect anyone. Secondly, they are introducing LL.M. course at University Institute of Legal Studies, this transfer is genuine. So far as Item R-24 is concerned, he would like to inform the House that it is not a transfer, but an appointment, which has been made on merit. He, therefore, urged that they should accept them.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he would now like to conclude both Items R-23 and R-24 one by one.

At this stage, majority of the members in one voice said that both these items are approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that those who are in favour of these transfers should raise their hands.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the practice of voting should not be set; otherwise, it would happen in each and every item.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him respond. Shri Ashok Goyal had pointed out a case to him namely that of Ms. Savita Grover and he looked into the relevant file and he had taken an initiative to see that she could be transferred. So far as he is concerned, if there are similar cases, he would not come in the way of their movement provided it satisfies the individual concerned. After the person is a part of Panjab University faculty – whether at place A or B. If movement of a person from place A to place B is permissible not disrespecting anything and the person is willing to move and somebody is willing to accept him, he/she should be allowed because when the person concerned is happier/satisfied while remaining a part of the faculty/system and he/she would be able to give better input, which add to better output to the University. Better output meant, better branding of the University. He could not say anything about his successors, but he would be willing to facilitate such transfers.

Majority of the members said that it is okay, the transfers should be treated as approved.



Professor R.P. Bambah said that transfers should be made in exceptional cases; otherwise, it would create problems for the University.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the husband of Ms. Savita Grover is at Hoshiarpur. Secondly, her parents are very sick. Since there is a position vacant at Hoshiarpur, he would bring an item regarding her transfer to Hoshiarpur to the Syndicate and Senate for consideration.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that at least he agreed to these transfers provided the persons placed in similar situations should also be considered for transfer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now these cases are for ratification, but in future, he would bring such cases for consideration of the Syndicate and if the Syndicate recommended, the same would be placed before the Senate and if the Senate approved, only then the transfer would happen.

Again the majority of the members in one voice said that it is alright, these transfers be treated as ratified/approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that an impression is being given as if he had given a name for transfer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal had pointed out the case of Ms. Savita Grover.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as six names have been read in the House, he did not want to comment anything. He (the Vice-Chancellor) knew under what circumstances these transfers have been effected. At the same time he also knew that some of the transfers were reversed, but since he (Vice-Chancellor) has referred to a particular name, in fact, he had told that pick and choose is being adopted by the University and only recently a lady applied for transfer and he (Shri Goyal) explained the circumstances. He did not know her even and he added that he did not know that she has got married. He knew about her case when she was yet to get married. Thereafter, he came to know that her request for transfer was declined by the Vice-Chancellor. Anyway, it was in the context of as if A could be transferred and B could not be. As such, it was in that light that there should be a transfer policy to which Professor R.P. Bambah seems to have some reservations. His (the Vice-Chancellor) proposal that from now onwards he would not bring any such item for ratification, but for consideration of the Syndicate and Senate, is not acceptable in the absence of any transfer policy. Let they not leave it to the Syndicate and Senate and make it a number game. If a transfer policy is in place, then they would not have to give reasons even for transferring the person/s, but reasons for not transferring the person/s. As has been said, how could they ignore the couple cases? They have to consider the couple cases, but not only of the Regional Centres because he remembered, when the first Regional Centre at Muktsar was established, thereafter at Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur, a decision was taken that nobody would be transferred from the Regional Centre to the Panjab University, Chandigarh. What is wrong in it if the people are saying that a transfer policy should be framed and in that transfer policy it should be included that if somebody wanted to get transfer from Department of Evening Studies to main Department or vice versa or University School of Open Learning to main Department or vice versa, they should be allowed. Similarly, if the University also wanted to use the talent from one Department to another and all these things should be covered in the transfer policy in the best interest of the University as well as the teachers so that it should not become a discretion, which is not to be used discretely. As said by Dr. Jagwant Singh, the only difference of opinion is what to do with these transfers. He did not think anybody is against making the transfer policy. The difference of opinion is let the transfer policy be made and then these transfers could also be considered under that policy or let these transfers be ratified and transfer policy for other transfers could be made. This could be decided by the House. On this issue, if a consensus is made because nobody is against anyone. As said by Professor R.P.

Bambah, they had full faith in the wisdom of the Vice-Chancellor and they assume and presume that nothing has been done under any pressure and it has been done in the best interest of the University only. But sometimes they committed such mistakes and mistakes are committed by mistakes only unless and until they are deliberate. He thought it is duty of the Chief Executive Officer of the University to look into the complete satisfaction of PUTA, members of the Syndicate and Senate, and all the teachers working in the University, P.U. Regional Centres and P.U. Constituent Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now there are two options – (i) they ratify these transfers and make a transfer policy; and (ii) the transfer orders are kept in abeyance and they are allowed to continue as they are. A transfer policy is framed and if the transfer policy did not permit their transfers, they should be reverted back to their parent Department/Centre. He, however, recommends option (i).

Majority of members were in favour of option (i).

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Item R-1 to R-24 on the agenda**, be ratified.

The Vice-Chancellor announced the item R-25.

Some of the members said 'No Sir'.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this would open gates for all.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, the way the University is bent upon ruining the P.U. Regional Centres, his walkout against that should be recorded. He further said that if the people had numbers, he does respect the numbers. No problem, but his point is that there is no clear-cut transfer policy. He again said that he respects the numbers. Since he did not have the numbers, there is no problem. He respects the decision of the people. With these words, he staged a walkout and stated that he would return for zero hour.

Principal Tarlok Bandhu, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Rajat Sandhir, Professor Karamjeet Singh, Shri Munish Verma and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal also staged walkout against ratifying the transfers of Dr. Virender Kumar Negi and Dr. Jasbir Singh.

Professor Keshav Malhotra added that "Sir, while opening for the door for two persons, you have opened the way for 20. As a part of cost saving measures, close the Regional Centre and transfer all of them here." By making such policies the cost will be saved and the work will also go on.

The members suggested that next item on the agenda should be taken up.

The Vice-Chancellor again announced Item R-25.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he thought that there are some people, who are hell bent in spoiling the University. The Vice-Chancellor had given two options – (i) ratify these transfers and make a transfer policy; and (ii) let them continue and simultaneously a transfer policy be made and if the transfer policy says no, these transfers could not be made, they would be sent back. If the transfer policy permitted, they would be allowed to continue wherever they have been posted now. His simple request in this regard is that such decisions should not be taken by way of voting because nobody is interested to harm the University and the teachers. As Chief Executive Officer of the University, he (Vice-Chancellor) is very much considerate about the interest of the University and the members of the Senate are also equally considerate. But if the decisions are taken in the form in which only some of the people want, then probably they are not helping the

University. There was a demand that voting might be got done, to which some of the people objected saying that they should not start a new practice. If that is not allowed, where is the problem in reaching at a consensus? Two well thought out proposals were given to take care of the satisfaction of all the members.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath pleaded that let the majority decision prevail.

At this stage, the Shri Ashok Goyal handed over the mike to Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath and said take whatever decision they wanted to and announce the same. He added that Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath is not stopping, and not allowing him to speak.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath put the mike on the floor, threw the agenda papers and started to leave the house and while going out from the backdoor could not resist the use of an unparliamentary word in anguish.

This prompted the Vice-Chancellor to adjourn the meeting *sine die*.

G.S. Chadha  
Registrar

Confirmed

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