

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 08th March 2015 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover ... (in the Chair)
Vice-Chancellor
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor A.K. Bhandari
4. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
5. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath
6. Principal (Dr.) Gurdip Kumar Sharma
7. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
8. Shri Jarnail Singh
9. Professor Karamjeet Singh
10. Shri Naresh Gaur
11. Professor Navdeep Goyal
12. Principal (Mrs.) Parveen Kaur Chawla
13. Professor Rajesh Gill
14. Professor Ronki Ram
15. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
16. Professor Yog Raj Angrish
17. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)
Registrar

Shri Sandeep Hans, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

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

- (i) Dr. M.S. Bajwa, Associate Professor (Re-employed) of the Department of Evening Studies – Multi Disciplinary Research Centre on 31.1.2015; and
- (ii) Shri Bhupinder Singh Waraich Son-in-Law of Dr. Jagpal Singh, Fellow in the recent past.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. M.S. Bajwa and Shri Bhupinder Singh Waraich and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the honourable members of the Syndicate that –
 - (1) Professor Harkishan Singh, Professor Emeritus, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences has been honoured by the Punjab Academy of Sciences, Patiala, with Lifetime Achievement Award in recognition

of his outstanding contributions and achievements in the field of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

- (2) Professor Jitendra Mohan, Professor Emeritus of Psychology Department, Panjab University, has been conferred with the first Life-time Achievement Award by the Indian Association of Positive Psychology on 27th February 2015 in recognition of his distinguished contribution to the discipline of Psychology.
- (3) Dr. Ashok Kumar, DS Kothari Post Doctoral Fellow at the Department of Physics, has been awarded 'Young Scientist Award' by the Punjab Academy of Sciences in the field of computational modeling of materials.
- (4) Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, has been awarded a 'Travel Grant' on competitive basis up to the value of £ 750 plus other benefits like, free Registration and Hospitality to attend 8th International Orthodontic Congress (WFO 2015) scheduled to be held at London, UK from 27-30 September 2015.
- (5) Technology Information, Forecasting and Assessment Council (TIFAC) has granted a Patent No.253740 to the Panjab University, Chandigarh for an invention entitled 'A Modified Poultry Feed for Production of Eggs' for the term of 20 years w.e.f. 24.8.2005 (date of filing the application). Dr. Satish Kumar Taneja (Retd.), Department of Zoology, Panjab University, is the inventor of the above patent.
- (6) Professor Raj Pal Sharma, Department of Chemistry, Professor A.K. Agarwal, Department of Mathematics and Professor M.P. Bansal, Department of Biophysics, have been awarded UGC Emeritus Fellowship for two years.
- (7) Dr. Surya Kant, Professor of Geography (Retd.), has been awarded Senior Fellowship by the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi, for two years. He will work on research project entitled "Demonolithing Scheduled Caste Population in India".
- (8) Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhry, IAS (Retd.), Mrs. Urvashi Gulati, IAS (Retd.) and Mrs. Keshni Anand Arora, IAS, have donated Rs.4,00,000/- (Rupees four lakhs) for initiation of an annual Memorial Lecture in the memory of their father (Late) Professor J.C. Anand of the Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh."

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath pointed out that the photograph of Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon, who was Speaker of the Lok Sabha and had remained Syndicate and Senate member of this University for more than 35 years, is missing from the University Anthem.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that photographs of prominent personalities like Dr. J.N. Kaushal, Dr. P.N. Chutani, Shri Pawan

Kumar Bansal, Dr. Ruchi Ram Sahni, Dr. S.B. Bhatnagar, etc. should also be included in the University Anthem.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that, if need be, a Committee could also be constituted so that at least 20 such prominent personalities' photographs could be included in the University Anthem.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath to give him proposal in this regard and he would look into it.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar informed that today is International Women's Day and he congratulated all the members present in the House a Happy Women's Day. It was endorsed by all the members present in the meeting.

RESOLVED: That –

(1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –

- (i) Professor Harkishan Singh, Professor Emeritus, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on his having been honoured by the Punjab Academy of Sciences, Patiala, with Lifetime Achievement Award;
- (ii) Professor Jitendra Mohan, Professor Emeritus, Department of Psychology, Panjab University, on his having been conferred with the first Life-time Achievement Award by the Indian Association of Positive Psychology;
- (iii) Dr. Ashok Kumar, DS Kothari Post Doctoral Fellow at the Department of Physics, on his having been awarded 'Young Scientist Award' by the Punjab Academy of Sciences in the field of Computational Modeling of Materials;
- (iv) Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, on his having been awarded a 'Travel Grant' on competitive basis up to the value of £ 750 plus other benefits like, free Registration and Hospitality to attend 8th International Orthodontic Congress (WFO 2015) scheduled to be held at London, UK from 27-30 September 2015;
- (v) Dr. Satish Kumar Taneja (Retd.), Department of Zoology, Panjab University, for an invention entitled 'A Modified Poultry Feed for Production of Eggs', which has been patented by Technology Information, Forecasting and Assessment Council (TIFAC) for 20 years;

- (vi) Professor Raj Pal Sharma, Department of Chemistry, Professor A.K. Agarwal, Department of Mathematics and Professor M.P. Bansal, Department of Biophysics, on their having been awarded UGC Emeritus Fellowship for two years; and
- (vii) Dr. Surya Kant, Professor of Geography (Retd.), on his having been awarded Senior Fellowship by the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi, for two years.
- (2) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Serial Nos. (5), be noted;
- (3) the donation made by Mrs. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhry, IAS (Retd.), Mrs. Urvashi Gulati, IAS (Retd.) and Mrs. Keshni Anand Arora, IAS, for initiation of an annual Memorial Lecture in the memory of their father (Late) Professor J.C. Anand, be accepted; and
- (4) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 21.12.2014, as per **(Appendix-I)**, be noted.

**Appointment of Director
Physical Education &
Sports**

2(i). Considered minutes dated 29.01.2015 **(Appendix-II)** of the Selection Committee for appointment of Director Physical Education & Sports in Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that Selection Committee had recommended allotment of accommodation on the University Campus to the selected and waitlisted candidate on priority basis, which is not within the purview of the Selection Committee. He stated that if the selected candidate wanted to get the accommodation at the University Campus, his application should come either through the House Allotment Committee or the Vice-Chancellor. He, therefore, suggested that this recommendation should be treated as deleted as the Selection Committee could only recommend additional increments.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that to allot University accommodation on priority to anyone, is the prerogative of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Selection Committee could recommend additional increments to the selected candidate/s. The Selection Committees should not make recommendation/s which is/are not within their purview as the Syndicate carefully perused all the recommendations of the Selection Committee. Secondly, this should be noted that this part should be excluded from the minutes of the Selection Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point raised by Shri Ashok Goyal is well taken.

RESOLVED: 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.

So far as the other recommendation of the Selection Committee regarding allotment of House to the appointed person is concerned, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to consider the same.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (1) Dr. Jaspal Singh be placed on the Waiting List. 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.

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

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Computer Science & Applications

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 13.02.2015 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: 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. 27.03.2014, 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.

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

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 13.02.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: 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.

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

Appointment of Assistant Professor in Chemistry/ Applied Chemistry at UIET

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 18.02.2015 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professor in Chemistry/Applied Chemistry-1 (General) (Advt. No.7 (2013) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though he had nothing against the selected candidate, there is another Item No.16 on the agenda and the name of Dr. (Mrs.) Nishima has also been mentioned in the report of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no relevance of this item with Item No.16.

RESOLVED: 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.

The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize 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.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. (Ms.) Kushwinder Kaur be placed on the Waiting List.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of appointment/promotion to the persons appointed/promoted under Item **C-2(i)**,

C-2(ii), C-2(iii) and C-2(iv) be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Issue regarding Conferment of title of Honorary Professorship to Professor T. Ramasami

3. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the title of Honorary Professorship, be conferred on Padmabhusan Professor T. Ramasami.

- NOTE:**
1. The Joint Academic and Administrative Committees, Department of Chemistry in their meeting dated 19.02.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) have recommended that the title of Honorary Professorship be conferred on Padmabhusan Professor T. Ramasami for his exceptional contribution to science and community service.
 2. Regulation 18 appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

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

3. Bio-Data of Professor T. Ramasami enclosed (**Appendix-VI**).

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Chancellor that the title of Honorary Professorship, be conferred on Padmabhusan Professor T. Ramasami.

Recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 19.02.2015

4. Considered the following recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 19.02.2015 (Items 1, 5, 8, 9, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 and 13):

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 enhance 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' and '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 10-11).**

NOTE: An agreement was made on 29.12.2014 between the Panjab University, Chandigarh and 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 lacs **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 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:

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

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.

Referring to Sub-Item 3, Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested a minor correction in the Note (Sr. No.2) at page No.8 should be made, i.e., the amount of Rs.22.39 lacs be substituted with Rs.22.39 crore.

Continuing, Professor Karamjeet Singh congratulated and appreciated the Finance & Development Officer for presenting zero-based budget for the last two years. He (Professor Karamjeet Singh) had also been associated with this job as a member of different Committees. He suggested that Double Entry System, which is a better system, should be adopted by the University on the pattern of Pune University.

Referring to Sub-Item 7, Professor Karamjeet Singh pointed out that a budgetary provision of Rs.700/- p.m. as sumptuary expenses had been made to the Deputy Registrars working in the Administrative Office only. Certain Deputy Registrars are also working in other Offices/Departments, e.g., Dr. Harbans Singh Judge Institute

of Dental Sciences & Hospital, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, etc. He enquired if there was any provision of sumptuary expense in the budget for them too.

It was clarified that the budget provision exists for all the Deputy Registrars, including Deputy Registrars working in the Departments. But for the Deputy Registrars working in the Departments a separate provision of sumptuary expenses had been included in the Budget for the Chairpersons of the Departments.

Referring to Sub-Item 3, Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired whether the amount of Rs.188 lacs was for the construction of Girls Sports Hostel No.10 or for Girls Hostel No.10, it should be clarified.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that this provision was for the construction of Girls Hostel No.10 in Sector 25, Chandigarh, but some accommodation of the said Hostel would be earmarked for the Girls Sportspersons as well as Research Scholars. Out of the total estimated expenditure, only Rs.200 lacs are pending which is to be arranged by UICET under the AICTE scheme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be clearly mentioned.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that there is provision of Rs.16000/-, Rs.22000/- and Rs.25000/- under the Budget Head: Seminars/Symposia/Workshop/Special Lecture in the Departments of English & Cultural Studies, Art History & Visual Arts and Geography, respectively mentioned in the Budget Head, Appendix I of the University at Pages 28, 29 and 31. She asked that what kind of seminars/special lectures could be arranged in such a meager amount by the concerned Departments and this provision also varies from Department to Department.

It was clarified that some of the Departments of the University are receiving grants from the U.G.C. under SAP and CAS Programme for this purpose under 5-Year Plan and that was why it varies from Department to Department.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since the work of the Social Science Departments actually based on the field works, the provision of funds to these Departments should also be based on actual expenditure.

It was clarified that, in fact, these provisions based on the actual expenditure, the departments, which could not spend their previous year allotment, were proportionately allocated in current budget.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that the Double Entry System in the University should be implemented in a time-bound manner.

The Vice-Chancellor said that draft Manual for adoption of Double Entry System has already been prepared.

It was clarified that it is a welcome step but they could not implement this system with the general cadre staff. For this purpose, they would require trained staff.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal had already done some work on Double Entry System. If there is any difficulty, they could train the staff.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a small Committee could be formed to look into the proposal.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that the Double Entry System should be adopted in a time-bound manner.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that since the majority of the newly appointed Clerks had M.Com., M.Sc. (I.T.) Qualifications, they should be assigned the duties in accordance with their qualifications.

Endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Dinesh Kumar, Shri Naresh Gaur said that it would be better for the University.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Dinesh Kumar to tie up with the Finance & Development Officer, and in consultation with both Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur, should submit a complete proposal.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that in the absence of proper budgetary provision, the meeting/s of the Sexual Harassment Committee could not be held.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Professor Rajesh Gill is well taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though he was present in meeting of the Board of Finance, but he wanted to suggest that, in future, the names of the members of the Board of Finance (FDO) should be clearly mentioned. In the minutes of the Board of Finance, the name of FDO is mentioned in the list of members of Board of Finance, who is not the member of the Board of Finance. Two nominees of the Punjab Government had been allowed to attend the meeting of the Board of Finance, whereas as per the provision only one nominee of Punjab Government could do so. As far as FDO is concerned, it should be taken care in future. Earlier, the Registrar was the Secretary of Board of Finance as there was no post of FDO. Now, since the post of FDO had been created, the FDO should act as Secretary of Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point raised by Shri Ashok Goyal is well taken.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the meetings of the Statutory Bodies of the University, i.e., Board of Finance, Syndicate, Senate, etc. should be held in accordance with the Act/Regulations. Secondly, the point raised by Shri Ashok Goyal should be examined as per the provisions of the Act/Regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would do it after considering the Act of the University.

Principal Gurdip Sharma asked as to how the University would meet the deficit regularly without enhancing the fee, since they had not enhanced the fee during the last five years.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that the University had enhanced 5% fee last year.

During a general discussion that ensued on the visit of NAAC Peer Team, the Vice-Chancellor said that it should not be just the duty of a given Vice-Chancellor, a given Syndicate and a given Senate to worry about the requirements during the review by NAAC Team. He has become conscious that there is a need to scrutinize each and everything in the University so that when the NAAC team comes to the University Campus next time, things should be in place and the University ought not to suffer on any count irrespective of the fact that as to who is the Vice-Chancellor, who is the Dean of University Instruction or who is the Dean Research. We should always be in NAAC ready mode. He stated that the NAAC Team visits University Campus after every five years, the term of the Vice-Chancellor is for three years, the term of the Senate is for four years and the term of the D.U.I. is for two years. The Panjab University is a much bigger Institution. We cannot put at stake the future of so many thousands of students, faculty members and the employees because of the working or non-working of few people, the system of the University should not suffer on any count.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that most of the members of the NAAC Peer Team are the Vice-Chancellors.

The Vice-Chancellor said that amongst the 15 members of the NAAC, five were Vice-Chancellors. Two of them are serving Vice-Chancellors and three are former Vice-Chancellors.

Continuing, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they did not know that this University has a unique character. As per the Act of the University, the entire power is vested in the Senate. There are certain things which have to be prepared and told to them. I knew and personally met some of them and apprised them about the unique character of the University. They appreciated the unique character of this University. In the newly established Regional Universities, the entire power is vested with the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor and the Governing Body is merely a formality, but here in this University, the entire power is with the Senate/Governing Body.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the University has a unique character and here everything is being done as per the provisions of the University Calendar whether it is the procedure of selections, constitution of Board of Finance, etc. Being a Body Corporate, they could not do anything as per their own whims and fancies.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he had experience of visiting various Universities as a member of the NAAC Team. He suggested that there should be a plan from right now onwards relating to our strengths and weaknesses.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Calendar is a statute which is prepared by human beings. According to her, how it is being implemented and how it is put to practice is most important. They need manpower that could objective, capable of doing things objectively without biases.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that University has a unique control system by way of Syndicate and Senate. But he was sorry to point out that a very dirty picture of Syndicate and Senate was presented before the NAAC, which, in fact, had seen the Syndicate and Senate as the biggest hindrances in the way of the functioning of the University. This was the feedback which was given to the NAAC. Though the idea was to enhance the image of the University in the eyes of the NAAC, it had given a negative impression to the NAAC. He wished that his opinion is wrong, but this kind of projection had been done in the presence of large number of the University staff. He did not know whether among the present 15 members of the Syndicate, six are mafia and out of those six, one is mafia don and one is the don of the mafia don. That is the definition of the Syndicate and Senate which was told to the NAAC. Probably, Dr. Ronki Ram had said that they must adhere to the Calendar of the University, which is not the right thinking in true spirit. He pointed out that excel sheets were prepared and shown to them from 1992 onwards as to how many of them were on the Syndicate, Senate and how many of them are the mafia and how many of them are mafia dons.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they knew that sometimes certain officials were elected as members of the Senate, Syndicate and Deans as well and thus, not always only Professors are elected.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that one of the hon'ble members of the Syndicate told things during the visit of the NAAC, if it was in the knowledge of the Vice-Chancellor, he would request the Vice-Chancellor that he should tell the members how far it is correct.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if it was done, it was very bad and it should be condemned.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, referring to the views expressed by Mrs. Bhavana Garg, IAS that she had apprehension that the Central Government might not like to take such a responsibility in future. It needed to be clarified. How a Secretary of Finance of a State could speak on behalf of the Central Government. They have complete faith in the Central Government. The Central Government is committed with the University under Section 72 of the Re-organization Act, whereby the Government of India had been authorized to apportion the share of the Central Government. The Central Government said it is okay and committed to apportion the liability of the University. Secondly, many people did not know why appointments were not made in the University, who is responsible for it. Is the Panjab University responsible? When the Punjab Government refused to give grant more than Rs.16 crore and the Government of India refused to grant more than Rs.24 crore. In fact, Dr. Manmohan Singh, former Prime Minister of India, who was alumnus of this University, came to the rescue of the University and gave them sufficient grants. Now, this has become responsibility of Government of India. Education as per law could not be made commercial and they were very conscious about the rights of the poor men. He requested the Vice-Chancellor that, in future, the Finance Secretary might separately be informed about this that it is a decision under the Parliamentary Act and nobody could run away from this liability.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in case, the Central Government has not given as they had demanded, what would be the action plan.

Secondly, a statement had been recorded at page III of the Budget (Volume-I) that “@ The UGC has approved an amount of Rs.17600.00 lacs for release of grant to Panjab University for the financial year 2014-15 by allowing a uniform growth @ 8% on last year’s sanctioned grant of Rs.16300.00 lacs. Against this provision, the University has already received an amount of Rs.10000.00 lacs and therefore balance of Rs.7600.00 lacs is expected to be received from U.G.C. by 31.3.2015...”. In the morning, he enquired from the Finance & Development Officer whether the said amount has been received and the answer was negative. In the meeting of the Board of Finance, an apprehension was expressed that they had to ensure that salaries to the employees is paid on the 1st of every month. If the grants are not received, from where the salaries would be paid.

It was clarified that necessary sanction had been made by the MHRD and there is certain delay and the money would arrive.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is going to MHRD Delhi on 11th March 2015 and he would enquire about this.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in the Governing Bodies of the University, there are officers from the Punjab Government as well as from the Central Government. They should make coordination with them instead of any confrontation.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of Board of Finance contained in its minutes dated 19.02.2015 (Items 1, 5, 8, 9, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 and 13), be endorsed to the Senate for approval, but Note 2 to Item 3 be read as under:

“2. The total estimated cost of the project is Rs.22.39 crore **Appendix-VII (Page 14)** against which following”.

Letter dated 5.2.2015 received from Special Secretary Finance for Finance Secretary, U.T. Chandigarh on the complaint of Dr. R.K. Singla

5. Item 5 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

5. To consider:

- (i) the letter No.MC/AE/Audit/2015/769 dated 5.2.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) received from Special Secretary Finance for Finance Secretary, Chandigarh Administration on the complaint of Dr. Rajinder K. Singla (**Appendix-VII**).
- (ii) the letter received from the Special Secretary Finance, U.T., vide letter No.MC / AE /Audit /2015 /788 dated 20.02.2015 (**Appendix-VII**).

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor has clarified the position on the issue, to Shri Nagesh Singh, Joint Secretary and O.S.D. to Vice-President of India, New Delhi and to

Professor A.N. Rai, Director
NAAC, Bangalore
(Karnataka) vide letter No.
242-43 / VC / DS dated
23.1.2015 (**Appendix-VII**).

2. Copies of the above said letters were also sent to Ms. Bhawana Garg, IAS, Director Local Audit, U.T., Chandigarh vide letter No.119-120/R dated 6.2.2015.
3. Minutes of the meeting of the Campus Senators held on 06.02.2015 are enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).
4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he did not know whether it is technically correct or not, but Item (i) says “the letter No.MC/AE/Audit/2015/769 dated 5.2.2015 received from Special Secretary Finance for Finance Secretary, Chandigarh Administration on the complaint of Dr. Rajinder K. Singla.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, Mrs. Bhawana Garg has signed the said letter on behalf of the Finance Secretary, Chandigarh Administration.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a suitable correction could be made in the record.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that then it is a letter received from the Finance Secretary, Chandigarh Administration and not from the Special Secretary for Finance because even a Superintendent could sign a letter for Finance Secretary. Thus, it is letter from the Finance Secretary or at the most if there is any confusion, it could be written as ‘letter received from Finance Department, Chandigarh Administration’.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that when any letter is written by anyone on behalf of an Officer, it meant the responsibility is the Officer on whose behalf the letter has been written/signed.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the letter is on behalf of the U.T. Administration, but when he asked the Adviser to the Administrator about it, he said that he was unaware of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, it could never be because when a letter is written on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, it did not mean that the Vice-Chancellor is supposed to go through the said letter as he could not afford to go through all the files daily.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the subject matter which was straightaway copied from the RTI activist’s complaint, written on behalf of the U.T. Advisor. When Advisor to Administrator arrived, he

asked the Advisor to the Administrator about the same, he (Advisor) said that he was not aware of it and, in fact, it should not have happened.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, it is not a letter on behalf of the Chandigarh Administrator or Advisor to the Chandigarh Administrator, but a letter written on behalf of Finance Secretary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even the Finance Secretary, U.T. Administration, was not conscious that the subject matter has been copied from the letter of the RTI activist.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that the letter has been written in an unauthorized manner.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that it was an official letter; however, the Officers did not take cognizance of the fact that "subject matter" had been taken from the complaint via cut & paste.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated one could not take cognizance of verbal communications between University and Administration. Therefore, let them discuss the documents at hand.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that once a letter is written on behalf of (or for) an Officer, it is an official communication. Typically, an office person takes orders on the file from the concerned Officer and issues orders accordingly.

Professor Ronki Ram interjected by stating that the letter is before them and they should proceed to discuss it, without worrying about the functioning of civic administration or for that matter deemed Universities.

The Vice-Chancellor then apprised the members of the background of the issue, i.e., with reference to several communications from Shri R.K. Singla addressed to the Director, NAAC and communication from Special Secretary (Finance), Chandigarh Administration, dated 5th February 2015 and 20th February 2015 about observations of alleged violation of UGC norms regarding appointments and promotions under Career Advanced Scheme by Panjab University. He informed that the University has already communicated to the Director, NAAC that Panjab University has been complying with the provisions of UGC Regulations regarding minimum qualifications for appointments of teachers and other academic staff of 2010 and its subsequent amendment of July 2013 (as adopted by the Syndicate on 29.6.2010 and by the Senate on 10.10.2010, and by the Senate on 25.5.2014 and 14.12.2014 respectively). The 2nd amendment of UGC Regulations of June 2013 at its second page mentions and implies that it would need adoption in the statutes of the University by its Regulatory Bodies. The second amendment of UGC Regulations dated 14.6.2013 regarding appointments of teachers and other academic staff was adopted by the Senate in its meeting held on 25.5.2014. However, the confirmation of the minutes of this meeting took place on July 31, 2014 and their circulation as well as notification took some time and the circular concerning this was issued on September 19, 2014. In the meantime, the University issued an advertisement for direct recruitment of teachers, the last date for applying for which was October 30, 2014 and the eligibility conditions of various advertised posts were based on

the amendment dated 14.6.2014. In the meeting of the Senate held on 14.12.2014, it was reiterated that the date of implementation of this amendment should be the same for both CAS promotions and direct recruitments, i.e., October 30, 2014.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the NAAC representative asked him as what is the present stand of the University, and he reiterated the stand of the University. Now, the copy of the said letter is before them. However, he would like to share with them as to what the Finance Secretary told him. The Finance Secretary told him that after this/these observation/s of Local Audit Department and the letter of the Special Secretary Finance, there would be no communication to the University on behalf of the Chandigarh Administration as they are not the people who make available the money to the University and the money is coming to the University from the UGC. Now, the matter is between the University and the UGC and if the UGC does not do anything to the University keeping in view the explanation given to the UGC by the University, they would not interfere. As such, the matter is before them, and if they wanted they could choose to endorse the letter which the University had written to the Chairman, NAAC, which has been supplied to them. If endorsed by the Syndicate, a copy of this letter, as an intimation, could be sent to the Chandigarh Administration, UGC and all other authorities to whom the letter had been forwarded by Ms. Bhawana Garg. They could also inform the Senate about this so that the Local Audit Officer does not sit over the financial sanction of the promotions, which the Syndicate and Senate had approved. As such, the Syndicate could iterate whatever they had already written and could also get the same reiterated from the Senate.

At this stage, a couple of members said that they approve the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor.

Continuing further, the Vice-Chancellor stated that he would like to inform the Hon'ble members that the U.T. Administration had forwarded for processing 15-16 cases of Government Colleges of U.T. for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. These were dealt with on the basis of decision taken for University teachers on the Campus and were sent back to them. Out of them, in three cases appointment letters have already been issued by U.T. Administration. On one hand, U.T. Administration is saying that the cut-off date of CAS Promotions as adopted by the University is wrong, and on the other hand, the U.T. Administration has itself approved similar cases by issuing appointment letters to three Associate Professors under the CAS norms practiced in the University.

Professor Rajesh Gill asked about the relevant of few papers of Delhi University, which was circulated with this item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Delhi University's case is different one because whatever had happened after the 6th Pay Commission, they are ignoring the same. In that context, they were asking certain concessions from the UGC.

Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that the UGC has categorically told Delhi University that they have to follow the UGC Regulations/Guidelines and the same applied to Panjab University as well.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Panjab University is following the UGC. The UGC had asked the Panjab University to follow capping and adopt the same through the Statutory Bodies of the University and the Statutory Bodies had adopted the capping, but the date of implementation is when the highest Statutory Body (Senate) adopted the same. The date could have been the day of the notification, as issued by the University Grants Commission, but the Senate did not decide that. The date could have been the meeting of the Senate or when the minutes of the Senate were confirmed. When it came to process stage at Senate, it was May 2014, and when the minutes of the Senate meeting dated 25.5.2014 were confirmed and circulated, August 2014 had arrived. In the meantime, they had issued an advertisement, the last date of submission of applications was in September 2014, which was later on extended to 31st October, 2014. However, in September, they issued a circular that capping would be applicable, but the same could not be applied retrospectively, and it could only be prospectively. Thus, the applicability of capping could either be the date, when the circular was issued (September 2014) or the last date of submission of applications against the advertisement, i.e., 31.10.2014. The issue went to the Senate and the Senate decided that the capping be made applicable w.e.f. 31.10.2014. Now, the issue is before them, and if they wanted that the date of implementation of capping should be 25.05.2014, then they could pass a resolution.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that the adoption of such U.G.C. Regulations/amendments indeed takes some time, as these are first to be approved by the Regulatory Bodies of the University.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that a clarification regarding the date of implementation of capping should be sought from the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no need of taking up this matter with the UGC as the UGC has said that the University should get it adopted by their Statutory Bodies. As the UGC said that it should be adopted, the date would be when the same is adopted by the University Bodies. Even if they write to the UGC, no reply may come from there. The Vice-Chancellor added that though they had already communicated in writing as well as personally, the matter pertaining to Leave Encashment of teachers from 180 days to 300 days, is pending with the University Grants Commission for the last two years. It has been learnt that the UGC had referred to the leave encashment matter to an Anomaly Committee. Earlier Anomaly Committee had been disbanded, but no new Anomaly Committee has been constituted so far.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they should reiterate their earlier decision in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor continued to state that whatever resolution the Syndicate would pass today, the same would be taken to the Senate and whatever decision is taken by the Senate, they would write to the University Grants Commission again. If the UGC has any objection, they would write to the University and if the UGC did not write, it would be presumed that whatever the University had done is right. However, if the UGC wrote back saying that the University was asked to adopt the circular retrospectively, but the same had not done, therefore, such and such promotions should be

reverted. Then the matter would be placed before the Syndicate/Senate.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that firstly the UGC says that the Statutory Bodies of the Universities might adopt its Regulations. However, the Regulations of the UGC could be implemented from the date when they are adopted by the Statutory Bodies of the University. Secondly, it is the basic settled law that the persons, who have become eligible during the intervening period, have to be considered according to the old norms. As such, new norms could not be applied retrospectively.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, probably without discussion just reiterating something which had come to them, is not acceptable and desirable. That was why according to the papers supplied to them, it seemed whether the Vice-Chancellor, though he is pained to note as to why this issue had been considered in a meeting of the Campus Senators alone. Since the issue related to the University as a whole and it related to the decision taken by the Syndicate and Senate collectively, when this letter was received, why the Vice-Chancellor preferred to call a meeting of the teachers Senators of the Campus. Why the others were left out? They would have also contributed. Even if there was an emergency, all the local Senators should have been called for the meeting; otherwise, of course, the meeting has no official standing. It has become a part of official proceedings that the meeting of the Campus Senators, which is presided by the Vice-Chancellor, has taken place, wherein it has been resolved "that a delegation led by President, PUTA along with former Presidents, PUTA, should meet Ms. Bhawana Garg, Special Secretary Finance, Chandigarh Administration, on 06.02.2015 itself in her office and report back to the Vice-Chancellor". Instead it should have been resolved that such and such persons, on behalf of the University or the Campus Senate, should meet such and such. Because it gave very bad signal that the Governing Body of the University depended on the PUTA. Though he had nothing against PUTA, they as a University are not supposed to act as a Trade Unionist and instead are supposed to act as a Government of the University, which they are. Secondly, it is very disturbing that the letter had not been written and the Vice-Chancellor has said (page 24) "Thereafter, he contacted the Adviser to the U.T. Administrator, who sought the copy of the letter and other communications made by the University to various offices, which were supplied to him at his temporary residence, i.e., U.T. Guest House. When Ms. Bhawana Garg was contacted on phone, she told him while many colleagues were listening to the conversation that U.T. Administration would withdraw the letter". He enquired whether this 'him' is Vice-Chancellor or the Adviser.

The Vice-Chancellor said that here 'him' is the Adviser.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant Ms. Bhawana Garg told the Advisor that she would withdraw the letter, but she has not withdrawn. What action the University has taken?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not take any action against an Officer of Government of India and that is why the matter has been placed before them.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that did he write to the Adviser that in their presence the Special Secretary Finance had assured that the

letter would be withdrawn and she has not withdrawn the letter; rather, they had got another letter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had not written any such letter, but had put all the facts before them. Whatever decision is taken by them, he would write to the Adviser accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thought they must write. In case a responsible bureaucrat not only promised, but had undertaken before her superior that the letter would be withdrawn. On the basis of that assurance the Vice-Chancellor and others would have satisfied that the letter stood withdrawn. He also talked with some members of the Syndicate in private, and he was told that the letter would be withdrawn by tomorrow. But next day, he came to know that instead of withdrawn that letter, they wrote another letter.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that she came to attend the meeting of the Board of Finance, and the very next day she sent another letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on 21st he came to know that on 20th another letter has been received.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what could he do? That is what the fact of the matter is. She attended the meeting of the Board of Finance. She said nothing and he also said nothing because the impression was that the letter would be withdrawn. On 21st he was surprised that the letter was not withdrawn. He asked the Finance Secretary, who told him that this is the last they have to say. They (Chandigarh Administration) did not give them (University) any money and the money came to the University from Delhi directly and they should sort out their matter themselves. Since he did not want any confrontation and he knew that some mistake/s has/have been committed at some level, the problem would deteriorate in precipitating that. So let him close the thing and not cause more embarrassment to the U.T. Administration because the situation has hardened up. If with reiteration the matter could be resolved and the UGC did not give them any new directive that should go back to 2013, and they disclose all the facts to the UGC, so that the matter is resolved without fixing the responsibility as to who and how did this happen? If the matter is resolved without escalating the confrontation and they could continue without causing more anguish to each of them, so that the life could move on. In fact, what they want is that the teaching community should have no unnecessary anxiety and pain. If they implement capping retrospectively, it would definitely pain them. They have to review all these things, the faculty members who could get affected have not faulted. They all will have to face problem if the capping is forced to be implemented w.e.f. 2013. For the promotions done up to 31.10.2014, the University had invited experts from outside and spent money and time, and only due to a small technicality, why to reopen this issue. If it could be resolved, then his personal advice is that it should be resolved, and the issue should not be escalated and their own community should not be injured. As the assurance from the U.T. Administration came, it looked that they would not follow it further, and so if the Syndics reiterate and we get it reiterated from the Senate and send it to the UGC, and if the UGC does not give any fresh directive, the matter would end.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that earlier the U.T. Administration verbally said that they would withdraw the letter, but they issued another letter. Now, the Administration is verbally saying that they would not pursue it further, but they did not know what they would do. As such, they should not go by the verbal assurances.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he still did not want to go into confrontation with the Administration, but only wanted to resolve the matter.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that two-three things are clear that as said by Shri Goyal it was verbal assurance from the Chandigarh Administration that they would withdraw the letter and would not make any communication in future. Ultimately, whatever is there, is in the papers? He was of the view that promise on paper should be there, so that there is realization on both ends, and something done in hurry could go wrong. His humble request is that how they could tackle it. There was a time when U.G.C. made their Ph.D. after 2009 compulsory. The U.G.C. had told to the Universities that they could give some exemption to their faculty members and on the basis of that they had exempted their faculty members up to 2002 and thereafter on the request of some faculty members, they extended this benefit up to 2001. He was of the view that they should resolve this issue amicably without any confrontation with them. They are in larger administrative set up. They should have some magnanimity, and try to resolve it.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that the issue is about the date only. The Vice-Chancellor has explained the whole position to the House on what basis they had replied to the letter received from U.T. Administration. They had told them that the promotions/appointments have been made as per the U.G.C. norms, but the Administration is saying that these are not as per the U.G.C. norms. The Administration has suggested that the University should take up the matter with the U.G.C./MHRD, as they are being the source of funds to the University. The University would write to the U.G.C./MHRD as per the observations of the Local Audit Department and if the U.G.C. accepts it, then it is okay. As such, he requested the House that they should accept this proposal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that, in fact, the issue related to date of adoption and they could clearly see that the date of adoption is different in different Universities so far as Punjab is concerned. Citing an example, he said that the date of adoption in the case of Principals, the UGC Regulations came in 2010 and the Punjab Government adopted the same in 2013. Similarly, the Punjabi University had a different date of adoption of amended regulations. As such, it depended on the date of adoption and the adoption dates are different for different institutions and Governments also.

Principal Sanjeev Arora said that as the Vice-Chancellor has told that they had received a letter from the Chandigarh Administration. There is no question whether the U.T. Administration withdrew the letter or not, as the funding is coming to the University from U.G.C./MHRD. They should see it technically as every University/Institute would have separate dates of adoption. If they are afraid from such letters, they would start receiving such letters daily. Every University, such as Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar; Punjabi University, Patiala, etc. have different dates of

adoption of U.G.C. Regulations for promotions/appointments of teachers. They could not adopt these Regulations of the U.G.C. without approval of the Syndicate/Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the R.A.O is not clearing the appointments/promotions made as per these Regulations.

Continuing, Principal Sanjeev Arora said that they should write to the U.G.C. and if U.G.C. has no objection, then it is okay.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as per the record, the letter from Chandigarh Administration was received in the University on 5th February and the Vice-Chancellor ordered a meeting of the In Campus Senators on 5th February itself. The meeting was convened on 6th February. In the meeting he apprised the members that he had contacted the Finance Secretary, he met the Advisor to the Administrator in his Camp Office on 5th itself. It meant that everything had happened between receiving the letter and meeting convened on 6th February. He further said that everything had happened in such a fast way on 5th February that Vice-Chancellor had convened the meeting of the In Campus Senators, talked to the Finance Secretary, the Advisor to the Administrator and the Finance Secretary assured him (Vice-Chancellor) that he would attend to it on Monday, i.e., 9th February 2015. This matter was between the Vice-Chancellor and the Chandigarh Administration. Probably, it should not have been made public as it was between the Vice-Chancellor, Finance Secretary and the Advisor to the U.T. Administrator. The Vice-Chancellor without waiting the assurance given by the Special Secretary, (Finance) that they would withdraw the letter, convened meeting of the In Campus Senators on 6th February and discussed the whole thing, which was reported in the local newspapers on the very next day. He was of the view that such things should not be made public. Once it had become an issue in public, he was of the view that whatever decision they had taken, it should be revised. Secondly, Regulations or whatever decision conveyed by the U.G.C., he did not know, but as suggested by Principal Sanjeev Arora, they should write to the U.G.C. and probably the same thing had been advised by the U.T. Administration as far as adoption of these Regulations of the U.G.C. are concerned. Now, the University was not ready to write to the U.G.C.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University never said that they would not write to the U.G.C., but he did not want to throw the ball in the court of the U.G.C. unnecessarily, unless and until the U.G.C. asks the University in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as far as adoption Notification of pay-scales is concerned, they were implemented in other States Universities from 2006. The U.G.C. notified pay-scales from 1.1.2006 and the same were adopted by the University on 2nd September 2008 and were granted with effect from 2nd February 2006. If the date of adoption of pay-scale, i.e., 2nd February 2006 was justified as it was notified in the Gazette of Government of India w.e.f. 1.1.2006, were they in a position to change the date already notified in the Gazette of Government of India? If they were in such a position, then, probably, they should not be afraid from anybody and they should go ahead, be it U.G.C., the Chandigarh Administration or MHRD. If it is about confrontation with the Government, then the University should evaluate the pros and cons. Instead of any confrontation with any

funding agency or non-funding agency and instead of recording such observations on paper, let the University try to resolve such issues in the best interest of the teachers and non-teachers, that is what he wanted to say. He suggested that a Committee of learned people may be constituted to assess it legally. If they were wrong somewhere, let them resolve it amicably and if they were on the strong footing, and done everything as per the law of the land, they should reiterate. Shri Ashok Goyal reminded the Vice-Chancellor that he had asked the Vice-Chancellor in February 2013 that unless and until clearance from the U.G.C. is received, tomorrow they would have to face some embarrassing situation and the Vice-Chancellor at that time assured him that he would go to the U.G.C. Office personally and seek clarification from there. In the meeting of the Senate in March 2013, the Vice-Chancellor informed that Secretary to Vice-Chancellor had gone to the U.G.C. office and circulated that note written by him containing the discussion with the Secretary of U.G.C. in the meeting and they thought that the matter ends. But at that time, they were told that the U.G.C. has directed the University to take decision at their own level and they went ahead and took decision. They thought that it was within their purview to take decision/s and had also taken the right decision. Now, if the U.T. Administration had taken objection the copies of the letter had also been sent to the U.G.C. and they must be very well aware of that. But the Vice-Chancellor said that if the U.G.C. says no, then they would again come back to the Syndicate and Senate for reviewing the decision. The correspondence between Delhi University and U.G.C. circulated in the meeting and the Executive Body of the Delhi University had to change its earlier decision and ultimately the Delhi University had to take the decision back. It is also not in good taste. They should also keep in mind that the dignity of the decisions taken by the Syndicate/Senate. Instead of meeting such eventuality, they should take such corrective measures so that no damage is done to the prestige of staff of the University as well as to the prestige of the Syndicate/Senate.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that U.G.C. Regulation 6 says, they should adopt it and make necessary insertions/amendments/Rules. They have to do it. Secondly, though it is an old story that in 1988, the qualification for the post of Lecturer was 2nd Division in Master's Degree. In 1989, the G.N.D.U., Amritsar had stopped approval of one Lecturer in English of Baring Union Christian College. He filed a Writ Petition in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court and the Court took decision that the revised qualification shall only be implemented from the date of adoption by the Executive/Governing Body of the concerned University. There was only a Syndicate as a Executive Body of the University. This was his personal case, he researched it and he had got it done. Thirdly, basic thing is that they had received letter from the U.G.C. and they had to adopt it. Prior to the date of adoption, some people had become eligible for consideration to be promoted or to be appointed. In the case of Panjab University, it is promotion case. Those who become eligible for consideration for promotion/appointment, they could not declare them unqualified w.e.f. retrospective date. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has gone to the extent in another case in 1983, where some people were to be promoted and some percentage of posts were for direct selections. The Government had decided that after a particular date all the posts would be filled through direct selections. The Supreme Court had hold that those persons who were eligible for promotion prior to the date of amendment of rule, were to be promoted as per the old rule.

Professor Ronki Ram said that some of the their own colleagues have given in writing that such and such persons have been promoted wrongly and are doing injustice to the University, and the same must be stopped.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Resident Audit Officer had done wrong. He should not do it. Before doing such things, University should have been spoken to by R.A.O.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the posts were advertised and in between the rules were amended and the Hon'ble Supreme Court had hold that the same old rules would be applicable in the case of those posts, which had already been advertised. Now, he has referred to a case, which is very extreme. Regarding the present status, he referred to cases of A.K. Kariappa, the judgement of five judges and judgement of Pravesh Kadar. The Government had cancelled the promotion cases of I.F.S. Officers in 1970. The Supreme Court had gone to the extent that those persons who were eligible in 1970 when Shri A.K. Kariappa was promoted, would only be considered for promotion and not the new applicants. He wanted to bring to the knowledge of his colleagues that they could not implement the Regulations/Rules, unless and until the same had been adopted by Governing Bodies. Under Section 8 of the Panjab University Act, the entire power of the University is vested in the Senate.

Professor Ronki Ram said the letter was delivered in the Office of the R.A.O. and the R.A.O. had delivered a copy of the same letter to the Vice-Chancellor's Office. He wanted to know where the power of the University lies, is it in the Syndicate or the R.A.O.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if they were on the right footing, then there is no question to be afraid and if they were weak somewhere, then they should not be in a confrontation with the Government. His simple question is that if the power to adopt such letters is lie with the University. If something had been notified in the Gazette of Government of India in 2013 and it is up to the University to adopt whether from 2014, 2015 or 2016. It is effective from the date of adoption of the notification. If they don't want to implement it, they could delay it. If they are allowed to do so, there is no problem.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the delay was not on the part of the University.

The U.G.C. says categorically that till the revised Regulations are notified and University could go with the old Regulations. But in the case of Gazette Notification, it is specifically mentioned that it should be effective from the date of notification in the Gazette of Government of India. It meant either they are wrong, who are dictating the things should be effective from such and such date or the University is wrong who is saying that these should be effective from the date of adoption, one has to be wrong. If the University is wrong, then they would have to find out some via media to resolve this issue.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath wanted to be clarified regarding the latest University Grants Commission regulations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the University Grants Commission stops the grant, then what the University would do.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that it is not right what had been stated by Shri Ashok Goyal while citing examples of implementation of pay-scales. He informed that the pay-scale revised in 1996 from 1.1.1996, but the same were adopted from 9.7.1998. The University Grants Commission scales, which were due from 1.1.1996, were given w.e.f. 9.7.1998. Similarly, the Punjab Government revised the pay-scales w.e.f. 1.1.2006, and the same were given to them w.e.f. 1.1.2006. Hence, they could not compare these two issues at par. He said that when the letter for amendment in the capping came to the University in 2013 and they could not implement the same before its adoption by the Syndicate/Senate. They had not delayed it knowingly. The date from which these regulations have been adopted by the University and from the same date, these were implemented. As such, in adopting these amendments by the University, they had no malafide intention. He opined that they should not get involved in detailed discussion on this issue.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. I.S. Sandhu.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that there are three stages, i.e., University Grants Commission, Panjab University and Finance Department, U.T., Chandigarh Administration. It has happened in the history earlier also that whenever the University Grants Commission notified any guidelines, the same could not be adopted by the University from the date of notification. In the first instance, the same were required to be adopted by the Governing Bodies of the Panjab University and thereafter the same were to be implemented. Similarly, the date of notification and the date of implementation may vary. Earlier no such objection was raised. Now the University had written a letter to the University Grants Commission on this account but the University Grants Commission is still silent. They had only problem from their Local Audit. They should clinch the matter by constituting a Committee as suggested by the members and find some amicable solution so that the teachers promoted/appointed as per the old regulations would not suffer as their salaries are not being paid. He informed that they had received the revised Regulations of U.G.C. in 2013 and the same had been adopted by the University on 25.5.2014. The University had also advertised some posts and as per the Supreme Court of India ruling, they could not implement the new rules on the teachers who had already been appointed/promoted as per the old regulations. So they had to fill those posts as per the old Regulations and that was why the date of adoption by the Senate in its meeting held on 14.12.2015 had revised it up to 31.10.2014. Technically they are very much sound, but due to some certain reasons, they had to tackle the Local Audit. They should not assume, merely on the basis of the observations of the Local Audit, the U.G.C. would stop grants to the University. According to him, it is not the appropriate time to assume. If the U.G.C. gives any direction to the University that it is mandatory to implement the new regulations from the date of its notification, then it could be seen later on. As per his personal opinion, they should reiterate on their earlier decision.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that as Shri Ashok Goyal basically said and there is also a saying that ignorance of law has no excuse. He was of the view that once the Government issued any Notification, whether they could change or not. But at the same time other members of the House quoted the University Calendar/s, which is the Regulatory Body and they were saying that it could be implemented

from the date of its adoption by the Regulatory Bodies, there is no doubt about it. But what he wanted to point out is bit technical. He wanted to draw the attention of the entire house towards the U.G.C. letter dated 24th April 2014 written to the Delhi University, one line of which was underlined by the U.G.C. itself. According to him, this line would basically create the entire trouble. As per this letter, "Any interview held after issuance of these Regulations must be in accordance with the new provision of these Regulations". The technicality he wanted to submit was that whenever they used the word, "Any interview", they should keep in mind two things (i) date of eligibility and (ii) date of interview. As Shri Chatrath Ji has already said that those who had already become eligible and due to the University's fault, the University could not conduct their interview for one or the other reason. Moreover, the University Grants Commission has nowhere prescribed that if he/she becomes eligible today and he/she has to apply within three, four or six months, this is one thing. Those who were eligible and the University has conducted the interviews for them and then what this Regulation says. As per his understanding, when the University Grants Commission has written this particular word of this line, what they meant, in case, they are going for direct recruitments, in that case, the new recruitment should be as per the New Regulations, which they are fulfilling. His personal submission to the Vice-Chancellor is that since he was going to U.G.C. on 11th March 2015. In case, it was possible, he should take a note regarding this item and place it before the Secretary, that this is your communication with the Delhi University and this is their problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this letter was addressed to the Delhi University and not to them. So there is no question of talking with reference of this letter. This was just a downloaded letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether this letter was received from U.T. Administration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the U.T. Administration quoted one reference number in their communication addressed to the University. When they were searching that letter, it was not found and this letter of 24th April 2014 was downloaded. This is the factual position.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that nobody knew about this letter of the U.G.C. written to the Delhi University.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar quoted last para of the letter of U.T. Administration addressed to the Vice-Chancellor that "In case the University intends to contest the observations of the Local Audit Department, the matter may please be taken up with the U.G.C. and MHRD, New Delhi". Meaning thereby, this is the final verdict from the Chandigarh Administration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a letter from the Finance Secretary, U.T. Administration.

Continuing, Dr Dinesh Kumar said that they had no problem, but they continuously conduct the interviews. He was of the view that unless and until they find a solution to this problem, the Local Audit would not clear the files. Either they re-consider the matter in this meeting or fix a new meeting of the Syndicate or reiterate on the same date or take up this matter in the form of an item in the ensuing

meeting of the Senate. Now, the concern is this, when the teachers applied, when the interviews were conducted and, thereafter, promotions/selection were made, but the same would now be got stuck at the level of Resident Audit Officer (RAO)? What benefit would the teachers get? Therefore, they first should contemplate and find a mechanism, as to how this problem is to be solved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has talked to Shri Vijay Kumar Dev, Adviser to the Administrator on phone and he promised that he would attend the ensuing meeting of Senate scheduled on 29th March 2015.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that even if Shri Dev attends the Senate meeting, he (Dr. Dinesh Kumar) does not think that they would be able to solve the problem. He added that Shri Vijay Kumar Dev is a member of the Senate and makes a statement as an Ex-Officio Member, whether that would help to solve the problem.

The Vice-Chancellor wondered whether such instructions had been issued to RAO by the Chandigarh Administration or he was acting as such on his own! When Shri Dev would attend the meeting and make a statement, it would be clear to them whether such instructions had been issued by the Chandigarh Administration to RAO or he was doing this at his own. If he (Shri Dev) did not make it clear, he would ask Shri Dev to make it clear.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that for a while, if they assume that Shri Vijay Dev is sitting on one of the Chair and gave his consent on this issue, whether the letter in question/under consideration would be treated as withdrawn.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not say anything in this regard.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they would welcome Shri Vijay Kumar Dev to the meeting, but so far as this issue is concerned, it would be proper for them to meet him personally so that an appropriate solution is found at the earliest.

The Vice-Chancellor asked where did he said that they would not meeting him (Shri Dev) in this context.

Dr. Naresh Gaur stated that, as said by Shri Ashok Goyal, the University had not implemented the New Regulations of the U.G.C. pertaining to capping from the date of its notification, which is a mistake on the part of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is his (Shri Gaur) opinion only as the matter was resolved by the Syndicate.

Shri Naresh Gaur stated that it is his opinion, that as per law, the guidelines/regulations would have to be implemented from the date they are notified by each and every Department/Institution. Since they are not on sound footing, this issue should be got settled amicably for the interest of the University/teaching community and for the sake of the Syndicate/Senate at the earliest without going into reason/s as to who is at fault. Otherwise, they (University) are at fault.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him clarify that, according to him, there is no mistake of any teacher. He did not think that the given Syndicate, which passed the resolution, has landed them into this problem. The given Senate, which has accepted the recommendation/s of the Syndicate, has done anything wrong. The Senate just reiterated and clarified that the date of implementation of this for both direct recruitments and promotions under the CAS would be the same. The same Senate, which had adopted it in May 2014, had reiterated and clarified the date of its implementation. They had not anticipated that a RTI activist would get this information and on the basis of that somebody from the Office of RAO would misuse it. Nobody had anticipated any such thing. The RTI activist/s wanted that NAAC team should not come to the University, as if some false statement has been made on behalf of the University. The plea of the RTI activist has not been accepted by the NAAC. The NAAC team did come and also gave an opportunity to the said RTI Activist to articulate his point of view. After meeting the RTI activist, the representative of NAAC personally came to him and asked whether he had something to add to what he had already provided to NAAC. The representative of NAAC asked him to give in writing, addressing the same to Dr. Rai, Director, NAAC. He had assigned this responsibility to the Dean of University Instruction (DUI), who happens to be a member of the Syndicate and the DUI promptly reiterated everything. Of course, he endorsed the draft prepared by the DUI and signed the same. Since the DUI is here, he would like Professor Bhandari to clear the position to the House in his dual capacity as a DUI as well as the member of the Syndicate, because he has presided over all offices of the University for much longer period than anybody else in the contemporary time.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that all the aspects had been discussed by all the members already. The Senate adopted it from certain date. Now, there are letters or communications regarding the dates of adoption of capping as per New Regulations of the U.G.C. He was of the view that they should endorse/reiterate their earlier decision.

Professor Karamjeet Singh wished that whatever they had already passed, it should remain as such. Being a teacher, his primary responsibility is that the teachers should not suffer at any cost. But he had some reservations about the statements given by the senior colleagues present here, who have been in the Senate for long. The impression is given by the senior people that Senate is the Government of the University and whatever they did, is okay with them. According to him, Senate is not above the Government of India/Act of the University and the Regulations passed by the Government of India.

On a point of order, Shri Jarnail Singh said that only the issue under consideration should be discussed.

Continuing, Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that when Regulations of 14.6.2013 came, in the Gazette it was written that these should be passed/implemented immediately. He was also a member of the Syndicate and the Senate during that time. They brought it to the Senate in May 2014. Though the Punjab Government adopted these regulations in January, they (the University) adopted later on. As such, many things were set aside. Since the issue has been raised, what his concern is about the

documents which they have received about Delhi University. It is good to be transparent, but all the documents, which they had made public, are against them (Panjab University). His concern is only that since they had no other option, whatever they had done was done with good intention, as the issue pertaining to date of implementation, i.e., whether it should be from 14.06.2013, as has been raised. Instead of having any confrontation with the Government/s or to be more transparent, their decision should be for the convenience of the University people. In fact, this information should have gone from the top Officers (Vice-Chancellor or the DUI). If he as a layman got this information, that since the UGC has not allowed Delhi University, they had no other option, but to implement these from 14.06.2013. His submission in this regard is that they should not make this issue public as the issue is merely of date – whether it should be 14.06.2013 or some other date. He suggested that they should decide that whatever decision has been taken by the Senate, the same should be kept intact. Let them wait for the UGC, if they respond they would decide accordingly, if not, then also it is okay. In the meantime, just to resolve the issue, as said by Dr. Dinesh Kumar, they form a strategy to resolve the cases of appointments/promotions or by persuading the RAO by involving any of the Senior Officers and there would be no harm in it. They should limit the discussion and resolve the issue; otherwise, they would make the issue more complicated.

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to the argument made by Shri Chatrath, stated that the letter dated 24.4.2014 written by the U.G.C. to the Delhi University clearly says “I am directed to inform that these guidelines/instructions/ procedures decided by the UGC are of mandatory nature and cannot be overlooked under any circumstances. If this contention of the U.G.C. is presumed to be wrong, though he felt that they are wrong, according to them the UGC is wrong. If the UGC is wrong, let them try to bring that document proving that the UGC is not legally correct. But if there is some substance what the UGC is saying, the issue should be considered accordingly, because the Notification of the U.G.C. dated 14.6.2013 had been adopted by the Delhi University on 17.8.2013 and only after a gap of two months and the U.G.C. is not ready to condone the delay of even two months. As such, he suggested that they should seek clarification from the U.G.C. in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the case of Delhi University did not relate to that of Panjab University as the same is totally different. Therefore, they should not confuse the matter. In fact, the case of Delhi University is entirely different. They (Panjab University) had adopted the capping and had not violated anything, whereas the Delhi University has not adopted any guideline/instruction of the UGC from earlier years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Delhi University adopted the Guidelines/Instructions/Procedures of UGC dated 14.06.2013 on 17.08.2013.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the dispute is about all the previous cases.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, all right, he was saying that the UGC Notification regarding capping came on 14.06.2013 and the Delhi University adopted the same after two months. Whether those two months were given to them to set aside the old cases?

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, personally, he is not the Government of the University. Personally, he is not recommending that they should try to see as to what has happened to Delhi University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then he should not have brought the papers relating to Delhi University.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he was forced to bring it because there was some reference in the letter February 2015 written by Ms. Bhawana Garg, the copy of which was not given to him. Therefore, he asked the RAO to get him the copy of said letter, but the RAO did not get him the copy.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor should have written a letter to the Special Secretary Finance to send a copy of the said letter.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he did not want unnecessary confrontation. Now, the Finance Secretary has told him that this is the last communication from their side and the University should take up the matter with the UGC and get the same resolved. He asked the RAO to give him the copy of that letter as the same was with him. Anyhow, he did not want any confrontation with the RAO, as he has a practical difficulty being sitting on the executive position. Majority of the files go to the RAO and he did not want to bring the entire system to a standstill. As such, he was for a practical solution and the practical solution is only that they have already adopted all the guidelines/instructions of the UGC and only issue is about the date of adoption. The date could be 25.05.2014 on which date the Senate had adopted. Had the date been 25.05.2014, perhaps, there would not have been any problem from the UGC. The only thing is that they had opted for the date 31.10.2014 instead of 25.05.2014. During that period (from 25.05.2014 to 31.10.2014) only two promotions have been made, which are without capping and those two cases were also of the persons, who were at the fag end of their career and have now retired. If they re-compute their cases with capping, probably, they would be eligible with capping as well. He could explain this at personal level to the Adviser to the U.T. Administrator that this is the situation. Whatever has happened, has happened and plead to the Adviser that he should instruct the RAO not to obstruct other cases and they would write to the UGC that this is the situation. But he would not write that what should they (University) should do out of the three options. Let the UGC feel that whatever they (Panjab University) has done is not right and give a directive, then they would see as to what is to be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, why he was suggesting because the letter of the U.T. Administration says that they should get the objection of the RAO removed by taking the matter up with the UGC/MHRD. They say that they would write to the UGC and in the meanwhile, by meeting the Adviser to the Administrator, they would see that the audit objection is removed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to enhance the confrontation.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the Vice-Chancellor is saying again and again this letter (letter of the UGC addressed to the Delhi

University) has no role. He, therefore, requested that the said letter should be removed from the supplementary agenda. If it remained a part of the agenda; otherwise, it becomes a part of the agenda and they could not say at a later stage that it did not relate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with the suggestion made by Dr. Dinesh Kumar.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that how could they remove the said letter from the agenda now.

At this stage, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath raised his hand and sought permission to speak.

The Vice-Chancellor said that okay, Shri Chatrath should speak whatever he wanted to, but within 30 seconds.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the Regulations of the UGC are superior to any letter written by any Officer/Office. In fact, the UGC Regulations are legislative in character. It has been written in the UGC Regulations itself that the University will adopt and make amendments in the Regulations/Rules accordingly. He had also given them the Judgement of the High Court as early as 1988.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that whether they wanted to take matter to the Court.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the Vice-Chancellor has put forth a pertinent question as to whether the RAO is doing this on his own or on someone's instructions. He would like to go on record that the RAO is doing on his own and not on anybody's instructions.

It was agreed upon 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.

**Assignment of Fellow to 6. Considered and
the Faculties**

RESOLVED: 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science 2. Law 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology
--	--

Pay Protection of Dr. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal, Assistant Professor in English, U.S.O.L.

7. Considered if, the pay of Dr. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal, Assistant Professor in English, University School of Open Learning, P.U. 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 (**Appendix-VIII**) by the Principal, Postgraduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh. Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 4.1 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, reads as under:

“Save as otherwise provided in the regulation, the fixation of salary, accelerated increments, grant of allowances, etc. shall in case of employees holding permanent post, rests with –

(a) Senate- in the case of employees of Class A

(b) & (C) XXX XXX XXX”

2. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal was appointed in the University as Assistant Professor in English at USOL in the pay-scale of **Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/-** vide (Para 2(ii)) of Syndicate meeting dated 18.05.2014 and (Para XLV) of Senate meeting dated 25.05.2014.
3. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal vide application dated 03.12.2014 (**Appendix-VIII**) has submitted LPC (through Chairperson, USOL) issued by the Principal, Postgraduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh. But the D.R. (Estt.) informed the Chairperson that Dr. Rajesh Kumar may be advised to submit the revised LPC as the pay-scale has not been mentioned in the LPC.

It, however, reveals that as per photocopy of the service book submitted by the Principal, Dr. Rajesh Kumar **was appointed as Lecturer (temporary) w.e.f. 14.05.2005 in the pay-scale of Rs.8000-275-13500** in the Postgraduate Govt. College, Sector-11. **As per office orders issued by the Principal of the said College Dr. Rakesh was placed in the senior scale of Rs.15600-39100 + 7000 AGP** w.e.f. 14.05.2011 but admissible w.e.f. 19.06.2011.

4. The A.R. (Accounts) has observed that as per pay protection rule grade pay of Rs.7000/-

cannot be protected. However, the pay of the incumbent can be protected as: Basic Pay-Rs.25920/- + AGP Rs.6000/-.

Referring to Sr. No.4 in the note of the Item, Professor Karamjeet Singh, pointed out that the observation of the A.R. (Accounts) is wrong. He observed that this needs to be corrected. He said that up to the Grade Pay of Rs. 6000/-, Rs.7,000/- and Rs.8,000/-, there is no change in the designation of the person, it remains as Assistant Professor. In this case the Basic Pay of the person is Rs.31,920/- and G.P. Rs.7000/-. He further said that there is another item of pay-protection on the agenda where the office has suggested protection of pay. He suggested that in the instant case, the pay should be protected as per the Last Pay Certificate.

It was clarified that the Grade Pay could not be protected if the person joins from higher post to lower post. In this case, there are three stages of Grade Pay in the cadre of Assistant Professors, i.e., Grade Pay of Rs. 6000/-, Rs.7,000/- and Rs.8,000/-. Hence, the present case is also of Assistant Professor's Grade Pay protection, so it could be done.

The members were of the unanimous view that the pay of the person in question should be protected as per his L.P.C.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pleaded that a Committee for pay protection of teachers had already been constituted and the minutes of that Committee, including the pending cases of pay protection should be approved. There are some more cases where the pay of the teachers had not been protected for the last three years. He was of the view that everybody should get his/her dues in time. All such pending cases should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting. He had also raised this issue in the meeting of the Syndicate on 25.01.2015.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point raised by Dr. Dinesh Kumar is well taken and told him to remind the Vice-Chancellor after 14th of March 2015.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: 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 (**Appendix-VIII**) by the Principal, Postgraduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh.

Recommendations of the Leave Committee dated 16.1.2015

8. Considered the minutes dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.01.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 16-01-2015, as per **Appendix-IX**, be approved.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 16.01.2015 regarding 'Child Care Leave' to the University female employees

9. Considered the minutes dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-X**) 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).

- NOTE:**
1. Application format for availing Child Care Leave enclosed (**Appendix-X**).
 2. These Regulations/Rules should be made part of relevant P.U. Calendar.

Initiating discussion, Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that the drafting as well as language of the minutes of the Committee needed to be revised.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that it should be adopted as per the U.G.C. Guidelines. He said that there is a provision of two years Child Care Leave during the period of whole service.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that though the Committee had done a good work during its meetings, but 2-3 members of this Committee could be assigned the job of re-drafting the language of the minutes for Child Care Leave.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Rajesh Gill along with Professor Nandita Singh and other 2-3 members of the Committee could sit together and correct the language of the proposed Rules/Regulations and revise the application *pro forma* for child care leave.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, referring to the members of the Committee, suggested that, in future, such Committee should be formed in a balanced way by taking equal number of teachers as well as non-teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there were Professor Preeti Mahajan, Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Karamjeet Singh, Professor Nandita Singh and President PUTA were the members of this Committee.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he had attended few meetings of this Committee, but due to some reasons he could not attend the meeting of this Committee on 16.01.2015. He informed that in one of the meeting of the Committee he had suggested that as and when an employee would be on CCL, in that year, she could be allowed to avail only 8 Casual Leaves instead of 20 Casual Leaves; however, in the final proposal, this was missing. He was of the view that the Child Care Leave to the University female employees should be adopted, but there are more than 75% female employees in the University and before its adoption, its feasibility should be examined.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the proposal of the Committee regarding 8 days Casual Leave to such persons also needs to be re-looked.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that the provision of Child Care Leave should not only be for female employees, rather, it should be for both the parents.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, nowadays the people have only one or two children and they need this leave at different stages of their service for the care of their children and it should be adopted as per the norms of the Central Government and they could also not change the nomenclature of this leave.

Principal Praveen Chawla said that Child Care Leave Rules/Regulations for University employees (Teaching & Non-teaching) should be prepared keeping in view the U.G.C. Guidelines as well as Punjab Government Rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that after making necessary corrections, the item should be placed before the Syndicate for approval.

Professor Rajesh Gill endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that it should be as per the U.G.C. Guidelines.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that PUTA President was a member of the Sub-Committee, which prepared the Rules/Regulations of Child Care Leave and if there is any language problem that could be sorted out.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor A.K. Bhandari should see the Rules/Regulations of Child Care Leave after making corrections/amendments in language of minutes by Professor Nandita Singh and Professor Rajesh Gill.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-X**) 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. However, 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.

RESOLVED FURTHER: 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.

Resolution proposed by 10. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Fellow Considered the following Resolution proposed by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Fellow:

“Parity should be maintained in adopting the same date of implementation (i.e. 31st Oct., 2014) of the UGC API score capping system for appointment/promotion under CAS for University as well as its affiliated Colleges.”

EXPLANATION

1. There exists a glaring disparity in the date of implementation of the UGC API score capping system for the appointment/ promotion under CAS for University teachers and the teachers in its affiliated Colleges (i.e. 31st Oct., 2014 for University teachers and 13th June, 2013 for the teachers of affiliated Colleges).
2. Based on the discussion in the Senate meeting dated 25th May, 2014 (Para V), it was resolved that the calculation of API score to determine eligibility for promotion under CAS, taking into consideration the UGC notification dated 13th June, 2013, the date of implementation of capping system has been fixed on or after 25th May, 2014.
3. Furthermore, the date of implementation of capping system was extended from 25th May, 2014 to 31st Oct., 2014 in the interest of the teachers in the meeting of the Senate dated 14th Dec., 2014.

Initiating discussion, Professor Karamjeet Singh informed that this item also related with item No.5 on the agenda. He stated that there are three types of affiliated Colleges, i.e., Government, Government Aided and Unaided Colleges. As far as Government and Aided Colleges are concerned, there is no problem as they follow the Rules of the Punjab Government, but as far as Unaided Colleges are concerned, they have to appoint a Selection Committee for promotion from Stage-3 to Stage-4 in the case of Associate Professors. In such Selection Committee/s, there is a representative from the University, but there is no representative from the D.P.I. (Colleges). They had not approved the constitution of Selection Committee for such Colleges. He was of the view that a circular from the Office of the Dean, College Development Council should go to all the Unaided Colleges that what rules of promotion of Assistant Professors from Stage-3 to Stage-4 are followed in the University, should also be followed there and the Dean, College Development Council be authorized for constitution of such Selection Committee/s.

Principal Praveen Chawla said that there is no such rule in their Colleges and the service book/s of the teachers go to the office of the D.P.I. (Colleges) and the Assistant Professors promoted to the post of Associate Professors and there is no requirement of Selection Committee/s.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that Punjab Government had already adopted capping and they should not change the date of its implementation at this stage. If they allow changing it, they would land in a direct controversy with Punjab Government.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he was not talking about the change of date of capping.

Professor Yograj Angrish said that the Resolution is for change of date of capping.

Shri Jarnail Singh informed that whenever any Resolution proposed by a Fellow placed before the Syndicate, there is a set procedure of constituting a Committee on the Resolutions. The Committee considered that Resolution and thereafter it could recommend or reject the same. If the Committee recommended the Resolution then it was again placed before the Syndicate and Syndicate forwarded it to the Senate for its final acceptance. He suggested that let them form a Committee on this Resolution.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a Committee to examine the Resolution proposed by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Fellow.

Arising out of it, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as far as this Resolution is concerned, a Committee could be constituted. But as far as the point raised by Professor Karamjeet Singh, he suggested that in the case of promotion/selection of teachers in Unaided Colleges, a simple Resolution could be passed that the Selection Committee would be constituted as per the set procedure in the University excluding the nominee of the D.P.I. (Colleges).

Professor Ronki Ram said that rule is rule and they should follow the set practice for the promotion/selection of teachers in the affiliated Colleges. According to him, there is no need of formation of any Committee on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had already suggested that what had been done in respect of Item No.5, the same could be done in respect of this Item also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not force/dictate the Punjab Government for changing the date of the implementation of capping in respect of teachers working in affiliated Colleges.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that they had adopted the date of capping in 2014. He pleaded that there is a problem of promotion to the teachers working in the Unaided Colleges and against the Unaided Posts in some Colleges, they should be given the same benefit of promotion, which they are giving to the University teachers as the rules of Punjab Government would not implement in such cases.

Shri Gurdip Sharma stated that whenever NOC was issued to any affiliated College by the Punjab Government, the concerned College submits affidavit to the Government that they would follow all Rules and Regulations of the U.G.C./Punjab Government/University even in Unaided Colleges.

On a point of order, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in respect of Unaided Colleges/Unaided Posts, the Punjab Government could not pay even a single penny. The Punjab Government never sent its

nominee in the Selection Committees of teachers in Unaided Colleges/Unaided Posts. If any benefit is given to such teachers as per the University rules, Punjab Government never objected to it. Whenever D.P.I. nominee attended the selection of Unaided Posts, he/she wrote in the recommendations that Punjab Government would not give any grant/no binding on them.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that if they had adopted the Regulations of the U.G.C., they are bound to follow the same in all the affiliated College. As a Regulatory Body of the University, they could not differentiate between Aided and Unaided Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there are different Selection Committees for Aided and Unaided Colleges. Whenever any Selection Committee is appointed for selection/promotion in Unaided Colleges, the nominee of the D.P.I. (Colleges) does not include. Whenever any Unaided College sought any Selection panel for promotions under Career Advancement Scheme, the University staff unofficially said that they did not have any guidelines for Unaided Colleges. He was of the view that there is no difference between Aided and Unaided Colleges as far as Selection Panels are concerned.

It was clarified that whenever any Unaided College sought Selection Panel for promotion of Associate Professor for unaided posts, they could send Selection Committees consisting of nominee of the Vice-Chancellor, subject expert minus nominee of the D.P.I. (Colleges). The University had continuously been receiving applications for this purpose from the Colleges. The Punjab Government had sanctioned 1925 posts as a special case and the University is giving panel for these posts. Similar procedure could be adopted in respect of Unaided Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that a date which had been fixed by the Syndicate/Senate, could be changed by the Syndicate/Senate.

Principal Gurdip Sharma wanted some clarification that University is not sending D.P.I.'s nominee in the Inspection Committee, but till date the office of the Dean, College Development Council is writing about D.P.I.'s nominee in the Inspection Pro forma. Due to that in some Colleges, D.P.I.'s nominee is coming in the Inspection Committees.

It was clarified that in most cases of Inspection, they said no, but as far as new courses are concerned, the D.P.I.'s nominee was included.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that D.P.I.'s nominee go in the Selections provided they ask for grant.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that Punjab Government had sanctioned 1925 contractual posts in the affiliated Colleges. He enquired whether they have any such provision in the Calendar to fill the contractual posts. Secondly, if there is no provision, the posts should be advertised. He was of the view that they should not give selection panel for filling up of such posts; otherwise, the College Managements would start giving Rs.21,600/- fixed emoluments to the teachers working against permanent posts and in this way it would be a violation of the University/Punjab Government/U.G.C. norms.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that at the time of advertising these posts, they would have to mention the Circular/Notification number issued by the Punjab Government in the advertisement.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the word 'Contractual' should be removed from the format of advertisement of these posts.

It was clarified that the format of advertisement for filling up of these 1925 posts had already been approved by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 25.01.2015. There were clear-cut instructions from Punjab Government to fill up these 1925 posts initially on contract basis and after three years they would assess them and they would be regularized. Initially they would be paid a sum of Rs.21,600/- The Punjab Government had filed an affidavit in this respect in Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. He further clarified that during the College Development Council meeting, it was informed that Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and Punjabi University, Patiala had filled all the posts. He was of the view that these posts came after so many years, Selection Committees should be given as the Punjab Government had instructed to give advertisement of such posts in three newspapers. In their Circular, the Punjab Government had said that if the Universities could not accept it in true letter and spirit, they would not get any grant.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that there is a via media of advertising these posts by giving reference of the Notification of the Punjab Government by mentioning that the College is going to fill up such and such post under Aided posts as per the Punjab Government rules.

Citing an example, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if some Colleges of DAV and SGPC Management advertise posts on contract basis and start paying fixed salary of Rs.21,600/- to the such teachers, how would they refuse to them?

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is being allowed as a special case as per the Notification of the Punjab Government. They would separate it from other appointments.

Professor Ronki Ram said that all the affiliated Colleges of the University would have to follow the Rules/Regulations of Panjab University/Punjab Government and U.G.C. They could not say that, in case of Unaided Colleges/Unaided Posts, they are not bound to follow the rules of the Punjab Government. These are affiliated Colleges of the University; otherwise, they would be in great trouble.

Principal Parveen Chawla stated that, first of all, they should fill up the posts according to Punjab Government Notification. Secondly, in the Selection Panel there would be five members as per the Punjab Government requirement and not as per the U.G.C. Regulations. Only one member out of these five members panel would be Vice-Chancellor's nominee and that too should be the subject expert in the subject in which the teacher/s is/are being recruited. The Punjab Government had approved a template of advertisement two-three days ago and instructed the Colleges to fill up the posts according to that template. They had left only 21 days and they have to fill up the posts at the earliest.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that Punjab Government has issued another notification for their own employees even if they are appointed on permanent basis, they would remain on contract for a period of two years and they would be paid Basic Pay + AGP. Though they are recruited through Punjab Public Service Commission (PPSC), they would be paid only Basic Pay + AGP. This is the policy of the Punjab Government adopted by the Cabinet. He was of the view that they would fill these posts at the earliest; otherwise, the Colleges would be financially burdened.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that they would have to fill up these posts as per the Punjab Government Notification. If the Private Managements would try to fill up posts other than 1925 posts by taking note of this notification, the Panjab University would not allow them to do so.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they have no option and to fill these posts as per Punjab Government Notification. The Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and Punjabi University, Patiala would fill up these posts and Panjab University would lag behind. Secondly, they would be conscious so that the Managements of Private Colleges would not take any undue benefit by taking the shelter of this Notification of the Punjab Government.

Issue regarding extension in the term of appointment of Er. V.K. Bhardwaj, Technical Advisor, Construction Office

11. Considered if, the term of appointment of Er. V.K. Bhardwaj, Technical Advisor, Construction office, P.U., be extended for a period of another one year, w.e.f. 22.02.2015 on the same terms & conditions.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.01.2008 (Para 26) appointed Er. V.K. Bhardwaj as Technical Advisor for Construction office, Panjab University, w.e.f. 22.02.2008 at a consolidated pay of Rs.15,000/- p.m. His term of appointment was extended by the Syndicate/Senate from time to time on year to year basis.

His last term of appointment was extended by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.03.2014 vide (Para 33 (iii)), w.e.f. 22.02.2014 to 21.02.2015 (**Appendix-XI**).

2. An office note from Executive Engineer-I, P.U. enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the reasons given in the office note for seeking extension in the term of appointment of Er. V.K.Bhardwaj for another one year is not sufficient. He was of the view that his brief bio-data, age and brief summary of projects to be completed/undertaken have not been provided. In the absence of these things, it is very difficult for them to extend his term.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he understood the point raised by Shri Ashok Goyal and, in future, it would be kept in mind.

RESOLVED: That the term of appointment of Er. V.K. Bhardwaj, Technical Advisor, Construction office, Panjab University,

be extended for a period of another one year, w.e.f. 22.02.2015, on the same terms & conditions.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 27.01.2015 regarding appointments on compassionate grounds

12. Considered minutes dated 27.01.2015 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 27.01.2015, as per **Appendix-XII**, be approved.

Issue regarding grant of extension for submission of Ph.D. thesis to Shri Prem Singh, enrolled under the Faculty of Engineering & Technology by 31.12.2014

13. Considered if, Shri Prem Singh, a Ph.D. scholar, enrolled under No.15183/Ph.D. w.e.f. 03.03.2003, under the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, be allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis by 31.12.2014.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 26.10.2014 (Para 14) (**Appendix-XIII**), has resolved that Shri Prem Singh, a Ph.D. scholar, enrolled under No.15183/Ph.D. w.e.f. 03.03.2003, under the faculty of Engg. & Technology, be asked to substantiate his claim with documentary evidence/s, including the period during which he was on foreign assignment for Indian Air Force, that he deserved special treatment and allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis by 31.12.2014.
 2. Shri Prem Singh, now submitted his documentary evidence (**Appendix-XIII**) for the period he was on a foreign assignment for his organization i.e. "Indian Air Force" and could not submitted his Ph.D. thesis on due date i.e. 04.12.2009.
 3. A comprehensive office note enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).

Referring to the Item, Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that there is a minor correction in the date of submission of thesis. It should be up to 31.3.2015 instead of 31.12.2014. They could not pass anything which belonged to the past.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that Professor Karamjeet Singh is very much right and they should correct it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this item has not been placed before the Syndicate for the first time, but it has been placed earlier also. The ground for non-submission of Ph.D. thesis every time remained the same, i.e., due to foreign assignment, he could not submit his thesis. He enquired what was the duration of his foreign assignment and who had stopped him from submitting his thesis in 2009 and thereafter in 2013 when special chance was given to everyone. If his foreign assignment came in the way of his submitting the thesis, then they could consider it. He read out the resolved part of the minutes of the Syndicate dated 26.10.2014 that Shri Prem Singh, a Ph.D. scholar, enrolled under the Faculty of Engineering and Technology, be asked to substantiate his claim with documentary evidence/s, including the period during which he was on foreign

assignment for Indian Air Force, that he deserved special treatment and allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis by 31.12.2014. The officer was deputed on foreign assignment from 18 March 2008 to 20 January 2009 to UN mission in Congo on Peace Enforcement mission. He remained on foreign assignment only for 15 months. Further from 25 July 2011 to 31 August 2014, the Officer was working on special assignment as member of 'Go Team' for investigation of aircraft accidents in IAF. He was not on any foreign assignment during this period. He was required to submit his thesis within the period of three years, i.e., up to 04.12.2006. Neither thesis was submitted by him within the period of three years nor extension was sought by him after the period of three years, i.e. up to 04.12.2009. The Syndicate has extended the last date for submission of Ph.D. thesis as a special chance up to 30.6.2013 for all the candidates enrolled under old/new Regulations. This chance was for everyone though he/she had requested for extensions or not. Though he had not requested for any extension in submitting his thesis, he was considered under that special chance. He was asked to substantiate his claim from 2006 to 2014 for his foreign assignment, which he could not substantiate as per the document attached in the agenda. In his request he could not justify the reasons for non-submission of Ph.D. thesis. As per his opinion, his case should not be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to see the research content of his thesis, his case should be referred to a Committee comprising Dean of Faculty of Engineering & Technology and two experts, i.e., one from NITTTR and one from Punjab Engineering College. Thereafter, he would be permitted to submit the thesis only if he gave a pre-Ph.D. Seminar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should revise the earlier decision of the Syndicate; otherwise, there is no sanctity of the decisions of the Syndicate as he had not able to substantiate his claim.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would have to examine the research contents and ask him to give pre-Ph.D. seminar/presentation and if the research contents are okay, only then they would consider it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever the Vice-Chancellor has said might be right, but he had not sought extension to submit his thesis after 2006. He was of the view that item should not be considered on the basis of false statement submitted by the candidate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in Panjab University they tried to accommodate their students, if there is a delay in the submission of the thesis. But in this case, there is a mis-representation on the part of the candidate. He had submitted wrong information by saying that he was on foreign tour. They should maintain the sanctity of the rules prepared by them. Secondly, they should not be allowed to submit his thesis at this belated stage and some message should go to the researchers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the suggestion put forth by Professor Rajesh Gill is well taken.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is a very good suggestion. He was of the view that if they allowed Shri Prem Singh to submit his

thesis at this stage, in future, such requests start pouring in from the teachers of the University. They should not compromise with the academic standards of the University.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that there is no genuine cause on the basis of which they could allow him to submit his thesis up to 31.3.2015. He was of the view that they should not consider it.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that last time; they had given blanket exemption for more than 10 years. In this case, the suggestion of the Vice-Chancellor is good and they should examine the contents of the research and if the research contents are relevant, they should allow him to submit his thesis.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that as the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.1.2013 (Para R-xvi) has given a special chance for submission of Ph.D. thesis up to 30.6.2013 for all the candidates enrolled under old/new Regulations. On the same pattern, they should give him a special chance to submit the thesis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the suggestion put forth by Dr. I.S. Sandhu is out of context.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the officer was working on special assignment as member of 'Go Team' for investigation of aircraft accidents in IAF from 25th July 2011 to 31st August 2014. They should consider his case on the basis of this assignment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 'Go Team' is not such a vast engagement. If he had enrolled for Ph.D., then he has to be serious towards his research work. Being an exceptional case though violative of Regulations, but it should not be made a precedent. Considering that he is an Air Force Officer and was on foreign assignment, they should constitute a three member Committee comprising one each from the University, NITTTR and from Punjab Engineering College to examine whether the thesis submitted by him is still relevant. If necessary, the Committee would have a Seminar by the candidate to assess whether the thesis has any research value. If found that the thesis has no research value, the thesis of the candidate would not be processed.

Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Karamjeet Singh said that they took serious note of the mis-representation made by the candidate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the U.G.C. Regulations, they could not allow him beyond eight years. If they allow him, it would be violation of U.G.C. as well as University Regulations. He was not against this candidate. The Committee should also be informed about these things so that they could also keep in mind whether they are empowered to do so or not. If they are bent upon to violate the Regulations of the U.G.C., then there is no problem.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the Committee constituted under the Chairmanship of Professor Brar suggested that on the pattern of J.N.U., they should give him one additional chance, if he submits his thesis in that period then it is okay; otherwise, not.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that as per the New Regulations, they could not allow him to submit thesis beyond eight years. However, the candidate in question was Registered for Ph.D. under Old Regulations, the Syndicate has to power to allow him under Old Regulations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate has power to allow him to submit his Ph.D. thesis under Old Regulations, but only if the candidate asks for extension. So far as he knew, he did not seek any extension.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they should examine this case under Old Regulations.

Professor Ronki Ram said that firstly they had to abide by the conditions of the UGC but in Central Universities if the candidate is registered he/she has to submit his/her thesis within a maximum period of five years, including one year of extension. He was of the view that a Committee should be constituted and examine his case, if the Committee consider his research worth, then he should be allowed; otherwise, not.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a three members Committee comprising Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, one member each from NITTTR and Punjab Engineering College to examine the case of Shri Prem Singh and If found that the thesis has no research value, the thesis of the candidate would not be processed.

Increase in number of seats

14. Considered the recommendation of the Academic & Administrative Committee dated 19.12.2014 (**Appendix-XIV**) 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:

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

The Vice-Chancellor said that the NAAC team also suggested that the seats in various courses should be as per the Demand-Ratio.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that the Department of Chinese & Tibetan Languages has requested to enhance seats in Diploma and Advance Diploma in Chinese from the academic session 2015-16. She was of the view that before enhancing the seats, they should seek how many applications they had actually received for these Diplomas last year.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that for enhancing seats in any course of the University, the requirement of Demand-Ratio is right, but there should some other parameters also as to how the demand-ratio is calculated. Citing an example, he said that in various M.A. Classes, the admissions are without any entrance test. The students fill forms for more than two subjects for seeking admission to M.A. Classes. So, there should be some demand-ratio criteria before enhancing seats.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would have to maintain the quality of students admitted in various courses.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the courses where there are only 12 seats, initially, all the seats are filled and the students kept on the waiting list after that is also exhausted, later some of the students leave the course, thus only 2-3 students remain. To avoid such things, demand-ratio should be adhered to.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Convener highlighted the importance of Chinese language and the increasing number of students taking admission in Chinese. If these courses are so popular and there is so much demand by the students, then it should be examined.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that they should authorize the Vice-Chancellor to approve the item, on behalf of the Syndicate after taking feedback from the Department. He further said that it is not a degree and only question of enhancing seats in Diploma and Advance Diploma in Chinese, there should not be any problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor A.K. Bandari with the help of two-three senior faculty members would look into the whole issue.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the number of seats in the following courses in the Department of Chinese and Tibetan Languages, P.U., be increased w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16, without financial liability, with the stipulation that Professor A.K. Bhandari with the help of 2-3 senior faculty members would see as to how many applications had been received by the Department for these courses during the session 2014-15:

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

Recommendation of the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce for approval of Regulations for MBA (Executive) at University School of Open Learning for the Session 2014-15

15. Considered if, the recommendation dated 16.12.2014 (Item 9) (**Appendix-XV**) of the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce that the Regulations for MBA (Executive) at USOL, be approved for the admission made during the session 2014-15 only, as per **appendix-XV**.

NOTE: The P.G. Board of studies in its meeting held on 01.12.2014 (**Appendix-XV**) has decided that the Regulations, and structure with detailed course curriculum of the program for admissions from the session 2015-16 shall be made in due course.

Professor Rajesh Gill, referring to amendment in Regulation 8.1, Page 65 of the Appendix, pointed out that there is written word 'press' instead of pass in both the existing as well as proposed Regulation. It should be corrected.

RESOLVED: That the Regulations for MBA (Executive) at USOL for the admissions made during the session 2014-15 only, as per **Appendix-XV**, be approved.

Issue regarding representations sent to the Hon'ble Chancellor by certain Faculty Members

16. Considered the representations (**Appendices-XVI**) sent to the Hon'ble Chancellor by the following faculty members:

1. Dr. Ashu Khosla
Department of Geology
2. Professor Alok Srivastava
Department of Chemistry
3. Dr. Neelam Paul
Associate Professor
Department of Music
4. Dr. Madhurima
Department of Sociology (USOL)

NOTE: 1. A Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in its meeting held on 19.01.2015 examined the representations/complaints dated 19.09.2014 and 09.11.2014 made by Dr. Ashu Khosla and was of the view that there is no substance in the complaints. The minutes of the meeting of the Committee are enclosed(**Appendix- XVI**).

2. The Vice-Chancellor has written a letter (**Appendix-XVI**) on 01.01.2015 to Shri Nagesh Singh, Joint Secretary and OSD to Vice-President of India in response to the representation of Professor Alok Srivastava. The minutes of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor dated 18.11.2014 (**Appendix- XVI**).

3. In response to the representations made by Dr. Neelam Paul, Department of Music, the Vice-Chancellor vide letters dated 10.12.2014 and 24.2.2015 (**Appendix-XVI**) has clarified the position to Shri Nagesh Singh, Joint Secretary and OSD to Vice-President of India. The minutes of a Grievance Committee dated 16.2.2015 and minutes of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor dated 30.10.2014 (**Appendix-XVI**).

4. In response to complaint of Professor Madhurima, Department of Sociology, USOL, the Vice-Chancellor, has sent a letter on 1.1.2015 (**Appendix-XVI**) to Shri Nagesh Singh, and on 16.01.2015 to the Vice-Chairperson, Punjab State Women Commission, Chandigarh

(Appendix-XVI). A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 9.2.2015 held under the Chairmanship of Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Chairperson, PUCASH is enclosed **(Appendix-XVI)**. The minutes of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor dated 08.12.2014 **(Appendix-XVI)**.

5. Rule 1 appearing at page 68 and Rule 12(b) at page 109-10 of PU Calendar Volume-III, 2009, reads as under:

Rule 1

“No member of the staff - University deals, in connection with any official work, except with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor. If a member of the staff wishes to address any official communication to any of them, it must be sent through the Vice-Chancellor.

Rule 12(b)

“Direct communication to or a personal interview with a higher authority and/or members of the Syndicate/Senate without permission of the Vice-Chancellor shall be treated as contravention of the discipline of the University.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that these are four cases. He added that it is very unfortunate that though the University has Grievance Redressal Cell for the teaching as well as for the non-teaching staff, the faculty members had to approach to the Chancellor, he wanted to know as to what the Grievance Cell has done to address their grievances. As far as provisions in the Calendar are concerned, they could not approach even the members of the Syndicate and Senate. The Vice-Chancellor responded that papers related to these cases are attached. Dr. Dinesh stated that as per agenda papers attached, out of four cases only one contained minutes of the meeting of the Grievance Committee, if he is correct. All the four complaints pertain to different aspects.

The Vice-Chancellor said that so far as first person's complaint is concerned, he could have an issue for not having been provided an opportunity to apply and get selected to the higher post in the hierarchy via an advertised position. As far as Career Advancement Scheme/Personal Promotion Scheme is concerned, nobody has come in his way. Had he presented all his papers and completed requirements for CAS, he would have definitely got an opportunity to get promoted to the higher post. If a post was advertised and the

same did not get filled, nobody had control over it. The way, the recruitments are made in the University, only a fraction of the posts are advertised at a time, of these only a section of them eventually got filled up. The issue is that somebody was looking for a promotion via selection against an advertised post. However, the post did not get filled up. But no applicant can make a claim that had the advertised post been filled up, a given applicant would have definitely got selected. Though he (Vice-Chancellor) did not know the old history of posts (in Geology) in the University, he had asked Professor A.K. Bhandari (DUI) to brief Dr. Khosla. Professor Bhandari had explained to him that for the posts that have now been advertised, there is a clause that for the post of Associate Professor one should have as an evidence of guiding research. It was a Syndicate decision that the evidence of research should be in the form of such and such thing and the same has been approved by the Senate, and it applies to all subjects/fields. As such, it is not that somebody is working against someone's personal interest. Professor Bhandari has clarified to him repeatedly. He did not know how and why Dr. Ashu Khosla is not satisfied. He had represented to the Chancellor. The Chancellor's Office forwarded all these things to Vice-Chancellor's office. He once again asked Professor Bhandari to have a meeting with Dr. Khosla. Later his grievance was also forwarded to a Committee chaired by the Dean of University Instruction. The D.U.I. Committee called Dr. Ashu Khosla to its meeting as a Special Invitee on 19.1.2015. The minutes of the Committee has been appended with the item. The Committee also observed that his promotion under Career Advancement Scheme from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3 is due w.e.f. 7.11.2014 provided he is otherwise eligible. He is yet to apply for consideration for the same.

Professor Bhandari reiterated that for the promotion under Career Advancement Scheme from Assistant Professor to Associated Professor, the evidence of guiding Ph.D. students is a must. The then D.U.I. had chaired the meeting of the Committee and according to their guidelines, the evidence meant, the Research Scholar's Synopsis should have been submitted. The University is following the same norms for everybody, but Dr. Ashu Khosla was not reconciled with this answer. His plea instead was that he was assigned a Research Scholar very late, and this has caused delay in submission of synopsis by his student and consequently delayed the consideration for his promotion under CAS.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it pained him when grievances of teaching and non-teaching staff do not get addressed at the level of the Grievance Committee(s). One of their teachers (viz. Dr. Khosla) had written 2-3 pages letter on 9.11.2014 to the Chancellor in which he has highlighted many things. He further said that though Dr. Ashu Khosla was a scholar par excellence and had published 8-10 books, even then they can not call him Professor. Referring to page 72 of the appendix, Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that 'the Vice-Chancellor and Finance & Development Officer had kindly sanctioned Rs.20,000/- for the field work. However, the Chairman refused to issue the equipments to the students'. He was of the view that when the money had been sanctioned by the F.D.O. and the Vice-Chancellor, how the Chairman could refuse to provide the sanctioned amount. University could not even see where the hurdle was created. This is unfortunate.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that the reply of the Chairperson of Geology Department was not there in the agenda papers. They had obtained a detailed reply of the Chairperson on the complaints of Dr. Ashu Khosla. But somehow, it does not stand appended here. Had the papers been there, then Dr. Dinesh Kumar could not have raised this issue in the manner that he did.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired when this complaint was marked to the Grievance Committee. Whether any Grievance Committee existed in the University?

The Vice-Chancellor said that, as such, Standing Grievance Committee has not been functional in the University. However, as and when such complaints had been received, he had constituted Committees to resolve the issues. Following a pattern, the Vice-Chancellor constituted each time a Committee as a complaint arrived, under the Chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction. The minutes of such Committees stand appended with the different items and they could see the compositions of the Committees in each case. In a meeting of the Chairpersons, issue of composition of Grievance Committees was discussed and it was agreed that Vice-Chancellor ought to refer concerns of the faculty members to such Committees, and this has been practiced.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that for this year a University level Committee to consider all grievances also stands constituted under the Chairmanship of Professor Ronki Ram.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for the first time when Dr. Ashu Khosla's case came, Professor Bhandari had talked to him personally. He further said that it is not correct that they had not spoken to him. They had spoken to him at every stage.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that when he met Dr. Ashu Khosla, he was told that rule is uniform for everyone for promotion under Career Advancement Scheme.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that proper documentation has not been provided with the item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that documentation could be provided.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Dr. Ashu Khosla has many apprehensions. He had talked with him many times about promotion under Career Advancement Scheme, but these were informal meetings. He added that after his talk to Dr. Khosla, he was relaxed to some extent.

The Vice-Chancellor intervened to state that the matter for consideration at the moment is whether there should be a norm that faculty members can write to the Chancellor repeatedly. Did they think that Faculty members should write repeatedly to the Chancellor? If it is okay, he had no issue at all. It is for them to take a call as they are the Government of the University. They had to worry whether a norm emerges that Chancellor gets subjected to pressures that he has to give hearing to the complainants in his office.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that norms are very much clear in the University Calendar that “No member of the staff - University deals, in connection with any official work, except with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor. If a member of the staff wishes to address any official communication to any of them, it must be sent through the Vice-Chancellor. Direct communication to or a personal interview with a higher authority and/or members of the Syndicate/Senate without permission of the Vice-Chancellor shall be treated as contravention of the discipline of the University”.

The Vice-Chancellor responded by stating that if Dr. Ashu Khosla's case was an isolated one, he would have continued to engage with him. However, the number of such cases have increased. He added that one of these four cases has reached a level that a legal notice has been served to the Chancellor few days ago. A complainant's purpose is not being served that is why she has served a legal notice to the Chancellor for a particular kind of answer she wants from the University. The Vice-Chancellor received a copy of legal notice on 5th March 2015, the last date of stay of NAAC peer team.

Shri Jarnail Singh opined that in the past organizations like PUTA had been writing/meeting the Chancellor, individuals did not do so. There are thousands of employees in the University and if every one of them starts approaching the Chancellor, it would not be a good tradition and the same should not be encouraged. He suggested that Syndicate members from amongst the teachers of the University should explain to the complainants and attempt to resolve the matter.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that since they had violated the Calendar, at the minimum displeasure of the Syndicate should be conveyed to them or else they should be censured or warned

Dr. Dinesh Kumar was not in favour of issuance of a warning.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is here for a small fraction of tenure of teaching faculty and if the people, who have to do the job here for life, feel remorse for what they had done and do not repeat it again, then it is okay. Referring to the legal notice, he said the Syndicate should advise as to what is to be done.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that he had read these cases and one should attend to them one by one. In one case, the posts were not advertised and in another case, the promotion had not been given. The first one is not a grievance, the second one could be called a grievance. Since they are their colleagues, they should be asked to explain the circumstances politely. It should also be conveyed to them that the House did not appreciate their actions and they should not repeat the same.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she appreciated the concern of senior people here. She is well aware that the Vice-Chancellor had boosted the research endeavour and quality of research in the University. She was of the view that if a child has a complaint, then why the child had gone to the neighbours, to the higher level or outside, it meant that something is wrong in our system and we have to introspect. Saying time and again that the Dean of University Instruction had looked after all these things, it is not right. As a head of the Institution, the Vice-Chancellor has to look after all these

things. There are two types of people in the society as well as in the University, the ordinary people who had no access to the Head of the Institution. She as a Senator could not access the Vice-Chancellor easily. One day she had to wait for one and a half hour to meet him. She was told that she could talk to him on phone, but she had decided that today she would go only after meeting the Vice-Chancellor. If she had to wait for such a long time to meet the Head of the Institution, what would be the fate of an ordinary man? If the Head of the Department asked the faculty member what is your problem, the problem would be settled. She was of the view that as per U.G.C. guidelines, Grievance Committee is mandatory. The Vice-Chancellor has said that there is no Standing Committee and the Committee is formed as and when the complaint is received by the University. She observed that right from the beginning the complaints were being shabbily handled.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he objects to surmise of shabby handling.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill stated that there is no mechanism for addressing the grievances as mandated by U.G.C. Secondly, it is not very easy to file/make a complaint to the higher authority. Here though the complaints are filed, no action is being taken. Right from the beginning, the Committees are formed in such a manner that people who are close to the authorities are preferred. There is psychology rationale attached to it. So far as the item is concerned, only a few selected documents have been appended with the item, especially in the case of Professor Madhurima.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath intervened to enquire whether the first two cases had been settled as Professor Rajesh Gill has jumped to the last case, the case of Professor Madhurima. In fact, each case should be taken up for consideration separately.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that since it would take some time to resolve these cases, they should first disperse for lunch.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it would take more than an hour to discuss and resolve these cases, therefore, they should first take lunch.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar also echoed the same.

At this stage, it was decided that the lunch should be taken and a middle ground be explored.

When the meeting resumed after the lunch, the Vice-Chancellor stated that second case is that of Professor Alok Srivastava who wrote a letter to the Vice-Chancellor on 14th July 2014, the title of which was "Technically Inappropriate Handling of UGC Startup Grant by DST Inspire Faculty Fellowship holders of the University". The matter was referred to the Dean of University Instruction to attend to it and also to the Chairperson of Department of Chemistry. Professor Srivastava without waiting for any action at our end, on 23rd July he wrote a letter to the Chancellor titled "Request for inquiry related to Inappropriate Handling of Public Fund in PU". Ultimately, the case was referred to a Committee chaired by Professor A.K. Bhandari, the Dean of University Instruction. Third is the case of Head of Department of Music regarding her long standing

promotion. Several reports stand filed relating her promotion issue and other matters. Now, on 5th March 2015, she has served a legal notice to the Chancellor and copy of the same was forwarded to him (the Vice-Chancellor) in parallel. A copy of the legal notice has been supplied to all of them today. Fourth case is that of Professor Madhurima. Though she came to meet him in his office, but she could not meet him as he was out of station. Instead of waiting any further, she preferred to write a letter to the Chancellor. She also distributed the copies of the complaint to the members of the Syndicate and Senate. Besides, she also filed complaints to various bodies which look into the complaints of women, i.e., Women Commission, etc. At some stage, in the meeting of the Chairpersons, when the minutes of the Committee which looked into her case, were made available to all the Chairpersons, she objected to that saying that it amounted to sexual harassment. Ultimately, the matter was referred to the Sexual Harassment Committee. However, the details are not important. For him, the important issue now is whether one should approach the Chancellor, without waiting for the outcome of the internal system/enquiry. At least sometime should be given to the University authorities to resolve the issue/s. The University System needs sometime to resolve such issues. The four cases are before them. In one particular case, things have reached a stage that he had no option but to speak to the Chancellor's Secretary on urgent basis. University has also to file a Caveat as the Chancellor's Office has to be defended. The Senate meeting is due in a couple of weeks' time, and whatever decision Syndics take, he (the Vice-Chancellor) would abide the same. The Vice-Chancellor added that he is a transient and occupying the chair of Vice-Chancellor for a limited period. Though he (Vice-Chancellor) presides over the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, the Syndicate is the Government of the University and things here have to be decided by numbers as and when there is difference of opinion, but he as Vice-Chancellor could not dictate the numbers. Since the numbers are all of them, they have to take a call on these issues.

Professor Yograj Angrish stated that out of these four cases, two cases of Dr. Ashu Khosla, Department of Geology and Dr. Neelam Paul, Department of Music were of academic nature and they had made representations regarding their promotions. He agreed with those friends, who say that there should not have been any violation of University Calendar by the persons by writing letters directly to the Chancellor. Professor Madhurima and Professor Alok Srivastava's cases are of personal as well as academic nature also. At one stage, the case of Professor Madhurima was amicably sorted out in a Committee meeting held on 8.12.2014. Professor Ronki Ram in that meeting said that he was not having any intention to hurt the sentiments of Professor. Madhurima. However, he did not use any derogatory words about her on the day of RDC. But if still Professor Madhurima felt hurt of any of his words, he is ready to withdraw his words. He (Prof. Yograj Angrish) was a member of the Sexual Harassment Committee, which comprised certain members of NGOs also, where they had examined the entire case and found that it was not a case of such a nature, but of academic nature. If anybody has any grudge, it could be sorted out amicably. He had gone through all the four cases and even though all the related documents have not been appended with the item. He had also gone through the minutes of different Committees, which were constituted to examine these cases, and did not find anything on the basis of which the Syndicate could arrive at any definite decision. One thing could be advised to

the faculty members that if they had any problem, they should first exhaust all the options, (internal system), e.g., approach the D.U.I., DSW, Vice-Chancellor, etc. and not approach the Chancellor directly without exhausting all the channels. He suggested that a Committee from this august House, comprising legal luminaries and at least two female members should be constituted to examine and sort out these cases in a time bound manner. So far as the case of Dr. Neelam Paul is concerned, since he had gone through the entire case, it needed to be clinched immediately and the Committee should contemplate as to what could be done in this case and what reply could be filed to the legal notice. So far as the promotion of Dr. Ashu Kholsa is concerned, Dr. Ashu Kholsa called him up yesterday. He was told that Vice-Chancellor had helped Dr. Kholsa on academic matters. Though he did not know the entire background of his promotion case, his case should be considered keeping in view the promotion policy approved by the University/UGC within a specific period. In the end, he reiterated that an advisory should be circulated to the colleagues that the internal matters should be got sorted out first by exhausting the internal mechanism and they should not make complaints to the Chancellor directly. The Vice-Chancellor had already said that he had no personal grudge against anybody and as a head of the Institution, he should not have any personal grudge against anybody. He did not think that these cases are of such a nature that these could not be sorted out. If need be, they could take the help of the lady members while forming a committee. Some seniors from Grievance Cell could also be form of the Committee to be constituted.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the suggestion put forth by Professor Yograj Angrish is very good. The item has been placed before the Syndicate to consider the representations sent to the Chancellor and the rules quoted therein have been violated by writing directly to the Chancellor. However, it is to be seen whether rules have been violated. He was surprised to know that Dr. Ashu Khosla had called up Professor Angrish on phone to express his grievance/s. In that way, Dr. Khosla had also violated one of the rules because the rules did not permit anyone to approach to the members of the Syndicate/Senate. But as he had rightly stated that this is not something new, which had happened for the first time. In fact, such things had happened earlier also. However, they had to introspect as to why these people approached the Chancellor directly. Probably, he was not sure that the internal mechanism has not worked properly or it could not satisfy them, which forced them to approach the Chancellor out of anxiety or over excitement or presuming that they are not getting the solution. He endorsed the suggestion put forth by Professor Yograj Angrish that instead of flaring up the matter, they should sort out these cases through a small Committee of the Syndics. As far as legal notice served by one of the teachers of the University to the Chancellor is concerned, that also probably would not be fair to discuss and decided here today because the para-wise reply to the legal notice has to first come from the (PU) office. Since the office of the Chancellor is also involved, it is their (Syndics) responsibility to ensure that the dignity of the office of the Chancellor is maintained. If somebody has served a legal notice, there are two ways – one that they should allow her go to the Court; and the other is that the things could be settled out of the Court without embarrassing the University and the office of the Chancellor. Otherwise, the general feeling amongst the teachers is that if they do not get their grievances redressed by the University and they approach the Chancellor, penalizing them would be an inappropriate option. Citing an example,

he said that Dr. Ashu Khosla started making representations from the year 2004. The (vacant) posts (in Geology) had been advertised 4-5 times, but interviews were never conducted. The Dean of University Instruction had said that whatever had happened, had happened and they could not do anything. If they think from the point of view of Dr. Khosla, a very serious excess had been committed against him (Dr. Khosla), not by any individual, but by the system. Had justice been meted out to him, he would have been a Professor in the year 2011, but he is still representing his case in 2014 as an Assistant Professor. If they put themselves in his shoes, what would they have done? Though he had never met Dr. Khosla nor does he personally know him, the Vice-Chancellor has said that he is a good man.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had not evaluated his work in any detail, however, Dr. Khosla has published several papers in journals, where good works are generally accepted. He had also tried to help him in other ways and met him personally as well. He cannot make headway in his promotion case. He is just following the promotion guidelines/ regulations, which say that there should be an evidence of guiding Ph.D. Such stipulations have not been imposed by him, but have been passed by the Syndicate and Senate. He had asked Professor Bhandari to talk to Dr. Khosla several times in this regard and also got the meetings conducted to address to his concern.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had not held anybody, including the present Vice-Chancellor, responsible for this.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar shared that Dr. Khosla appreciates the efforts made by the Vice-Chancellor to address his case.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he had never tried to come in the way of promotion of anybody. He had not stopped the promotion of Dr. Neelam Paul as well. His predecessor had deferred her promotion due to eligibility. When he (Vice-Chancellor) wanted to check her case himself and asked her to provide those 5 published papers on the basis of which her eligibility was to be determined, she refused to give the same. Wherever she said that her papers had been published, he checked and found that the two of the papers had not been published in the stated proceedings. He personally checked and found in one case that no such proceedings existed. The other manuscript was found published in a Souvenir, but the Editor of that Souvenir said that though Dr. Paul's contribution had been included as an Abstract in the souvenir, she did not come to make a presentation on behalf of the Abstract. As such, at least two out of five publications, which Dr. Paul had claimed, did not exist at the time of her first interview in 2011. If his predecessor wrote in 2011 that her case be deferred due to her ineligibility, he did not think that his predecessor had done anything wrong. He told her to submit the documents again for her CAS promotion, which she deposited. He referred her manuscripts to the referees/experts for comments. On the basis of the report of the referees, he asked her to give him the reprints of the publications from the journals where the papers had been published. Her manuscripts have not been published in scientific journals, from where he could fish them out himself. He asked her to provide him the proof, but instead of doing so she said that her eligibility had already been cleared by Professor Brar's Committee in 2009. He marked her case to another Committee and the Committee found that Professor Brar's Committee did not physically check the authenticity of the five papers. He had written to

the Chancellor that two out of these five papers did not exist. Therefore, whatever Professor Sobti did, was not incorrect. Since he (Professor Sobti) did not want to use harsh words, he only wrote "her case is deferred due to ineligibility," instead of writing that she had supplied information, which is false. She had supplied information, which could not be authenticated and she also refuses to authenticate now. He had started to process her case by sending her documents made available to him to new referees. To take her case to the next stage of convening the interview, he needs proofs of her publications so that the same could be supplied to the members of the Interview Committee. She has not been cooperating, which can be confirmed by DUI, Professor Bhandari. How many reminders (at least 6-7-8) had been sent to her, which are available in the proceedings of the Committee/s. looking into her grievances. She is not supplying all these things, and instead is bringing nefarious things into the picture. For instance, a given Syndicate member said that somebody had failed in paper of Music eleven students in a given class of a College in Chandigarh and the Vice-Chancellor was forced to get the papers rechecked. When the papers were re-checked, it was found that Dr. Neelam Paul as the examiner had given marks between 9 and 11 to eleven students in a row in a given semester. After re-evaluating by second examiner, marks were found to be in the range of 23 to 39. Ultimately, the papers were rechecked by a 3rd examiner whose evaluation was closer to that of the 2nd examiner. The Controller of Examinations is sitting here, who got result prepared after adopting the proper procedure. So the later two evaluations were found to be true and the marks awarded by Dr. Neelam Paul were found to be wrong. As such, he had no option but to debar her from evaluation of the answerbooks, and also revise the result. They could not fail people consciously and could also not play with the future/career of the students. If he had debarred her from evaluation, what wrong he had done. Thereafter, as everybody knows that numerous RTI applications have been filed with the University. Sometimes the papers pertaining to proceedings of the Committee/s reach the RTI activist overnight and in turn, the RTI activist complains to the Chancellor. As such, too much is going on. At the end of it, a legal notice was served to the Chancellor a copy of which was sent to him. He had tried to supply all the documents to the house. It is possible that few documents are missing. He could fish out all those documents from those hundreds and hundreds of pages. If they want these, he could provide the same. If they want, they could also appoint a Judicial Commission to probe all this. He pleaded that he should be spared from the ordeal of handling such cases. He added that since he had to respond to the Chancellor's office, he desired to be guided by the Syndicate.

On a point of order, Shri Jarnail Singh enquired whether Dr. Ashu Khosla approached the Vice-Chancellor personally.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 'Yes' Dr. Ashu Khosla did approach him many times. He added that he had known Dr. Khosla for a long time.

Professor Alok Srivastava had not given sufficient time to the University system to respond, however he lodged a complaint implying serious implications on the office of the Vice-Chancellor. The University had not made any false statement in the case of Inspire Faculty members. He further stated that all the facts have been made available to the house. After all the U.G.C. has given research grants

to the faculty members to carry out research, and the same is not personal money/property of anyone. After carrying out the research, the Investigators have to submit the utilization certificate in the form what came out of that research grant. In that way is the University or the office of the Vice-Chancellor involved in misappropriation of public funds.

In Professor Madhurima's case also, the Vice-Chancellor stated that he is unable to understand what wrong he had committed. Professor Madhurima came to his office and he was not in the University on that day. She claims that she did not find anybody else in his office to take her complaint, and instead of waiting for the next day, she started distributing copies of her letter to the members of the Syndicate/Senate, and simultaneously sent a copy of the same to the Chancellor's office. What could he do?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the office of the Vice-Chancellor refused to receive her letter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is just a claim made by somebody. If somebody had refused to receive, she could have waited up to the next day. It is not that if something does not happen instantly, within next five minutes, one could approach the Chancellor. They should understand that it is very difficult to handle such circumstances, but in spite of that he still kept his cool and tried to attend to her. He had not let the work of the office of the Vice-Chancellor suffer. He has never allowed to arise a situation that the files keep on piling up and the files of the people do not get cleared for months together. Day in and day out, he clears the files, which his officer Mr. Rajinder Singh could vouch for him as to the urgency with which he clears the files. He continuously keeps on working irrespective of whether it is 8.00 p.m./9.00 p.m. and so on, seven days a week ensuring that the people/employees do not say that their files are pending in the Vice-Chancellor Office. He is doing his level best. He concluded by stating that he had to reply to the Chancellor as to why the legal notice has been served on him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as suggested by Professor Yograj Angrish, they should constitute a Committee of the Syndics, who are legal experts.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that as far as writing letters to the Chancellor is concerned, nobody could write directly to the Chancellor.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as far as legal notice is concerned, it is very serious issue, and even he did not appreciate the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he received the legal notice only today.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that Legal Notice had arrived on March 5 and he had apprised DUI the same day and he was advised that it should be placed before the Syndicate on March 8. Next two days were holiday.

Shri Ashok Goyal added that in the legal notice she had not touched on her promotion. Therefore, they should divide the two things. So far legal notice is concerned, the consequences of the legal notice is with the office of the Vice-Chancellor vis-à-vis with the

Department of Music and the input had to be provided by the office of the Vice-Chancellor as well as by the office of the Dean of University Instruction. How could they expect that Syndicate should take a decision in the absence of reply prepared by the office to the legal notice? If the Vice-Chancellor wanted, the Syndicate could say that nothing is there in the legal notice and let the Chancellor's Office be told that the Syndicate reiterated what has been told by the Chancellor. However, he cautioned that ultimately the Chancellor's Office has to reply to the legal notice. As such, the reply to the legal notice has to be based on the contents of the reply supplied by the offices of the Vice-Chancellor and the Dean of University Instruction. That was why, he is suggesting that a Committee should be constituted to examine two issues separately. Another Committee of Syndics should be constituted to deal with this case (Dr. Neelam Paul) on priority basis so that a reply to the legal notice could be prepared in consultation with Vice-Chancellor and the Dean of University Instruction and the same would be the best solution.

Endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Professor Yograj Angrish, Shri Naresh Gaur said that a Committee of the Syndics should be constituted to resolve the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nobody appreciates if the office of the Chancellor is put to any embarrassment. But they should not take decision in haste, which ultimately embarrasses them also. He, therefore, suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should write a letter to the Chancellor stating that the legal notice was placed before the Syndicate, which decided to constitute a Committee to look into the same and the reply would be submitted to him in due course.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in the meantime, an advisory should be issued to all these persons that they should not approach the Chancellor directly.

To this, some of the members suggested that instead of issuing an advisory to these persons, a general circular should be issued that nobody should approach directly to the Chancellor.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla however added that advisory should go to the four persons.

Many members started to speak simultaneously and Vice-Chancellor requested them to speak one by one so that minutes can be recorded clearly.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Senate meeting is scheduled for 29th March 2015, wherein it could be decided that a circular be issued that that nobody should approach the Chancellor directly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as issuance of advisory to these persons is concerned, it should be left to the Committee proposed to be constituted.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that he was of the firm opinion that when it comes to governance and indiscipline, we should not go by emotions and take a lenient view, we should definitely tell them that this is not in good taste. Minimum is that they should be conveyed displeasure of the Syndicate or else warned or censured.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that nobody ought to go to the Chancellor directly. In fact, they should have got their issues placed before the Syndicate or the Senate and if their cases were not resolved to their satisfaction, only then they should have approached the Chancellor, but that too, with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor. She, therefore, suggested that they should give warning to these persons; otherwise, every employee would start contacting the Chancellor's Office directly. She endorsed the viewpoint of Principal Gurdip Sharma.

Shri Sandeep Arora and Dr. I.S. Sandhu jointly said that they endorse the viewpoints expressed by Principal Parveen Chawla.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that it should be written to them that the Syndicate did not appreciate their act.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that a Committee should be constituted to examine all the cases.

Professor Yograj Angrish said that they authorize the Vice-Chancellor to constitute the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was not against the conveying of displeasure of the Syndicate, but that is not so simple. If the displeasure is to be conveyed then the whole process of natural justice has to be followed, which they wanted to avoid. If ultimately, the things are not sorted out, they are free to take action as per the regulations/rules. Their endeavour should be to streamline the system to ensure that such things did not recur in future and at the same time none of the persons, including the office of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate or the Senate should be embarrassed. But if they felt that since it had come to them, they should take some action this way or that way. According to him, the Syndicate had no power. Let the Vice-Chancellor issue the charge-sheet or show-cause notice to these persons. If the punishment is to be given for minor misconduct, let the same be given. If the punishment is to be given for major misconduct, then Departmental Enquiry has to be conducted by the Vice-Chancellor. He said that Syndicate has no power to do anything in the absence of proper feedback. That was why, the suggestion given by Professor Yog Raj is very good and they should constitute a Committee and in the meantime, Chancellor's office should be informed about reply to be given to the legal notice. It should also be informed that they are sorting it out with their collective efforts and to the best satisfaction of all the members of the Syndicate and Vice-Chancellor. If it is not sorted out, they must go for the extreme step. Why they were taking such an extreme step now?

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Syndics whether they think the displeasure of the Syndicate is an extreme step!

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that conveying of displeasure to these people is not an extreme step, but a minimum.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is an extreme step as these persons have not been heard. They could not hurt them by conveying the displeasure of the Syndicate. If at all displeasure of the Syndicate is to be conveyed to them, it should be conveyed only after giving proper opportunity.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that displeasure of the Syndicate is not any kind of punishment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these issues were placed before the Committee headed by the Dean of University Instruction, wherein the members expressed their views in the proceedings and the same were placed before the Syndicate. In the case of Dr. Ashu Khosla, the concluding lines are "the Committee was of the view that there is no substance in the complaints made by him. In the case of Dr. Alok Srivastava, "the Committee expressed immense displeasure over Professor Alok Srivastava's act of writing the letter about this issue, to the office of the Vice-President of India using misleading wording as inappropriate handling of public funds at PU" etc. without routing it through authorities of the Panjab University." On the basis of findings of the Committees, displeasure could be conveyed to them.

Principal Gurdip Sharma reiterated that conveying displeasure should be the minimum response of Syndicate. However, Mr. Ashok Goyal disagreed and stated it can be done only after giving an opportunity to these persons.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that it meant they did not want to resolve the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that either they should decide to discuss each and every case on merit itself. Just because the Committee had given the recommendation, it does not mean that whatever recommended by the Committee is right.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that whether they wanted that one should write to the Chancellor directly. If not, should they appreciate the same?

The Vice-Chancellor interjected by stating that all Committees were headed by D.U.I., who is also a member of the present Syndicate. The Committee comprised President PUTA, Dean of Faculty, etc.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that Vice-President as Chancellor has a special position.

Shri Ashok Goyal responded by stating that there is nothing special about the office of Vice-President. In jest he told Mr. Chatrath that he was also a mafia don.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked that did the Vice-Chancellor want that non-teaching staff should approach him directly. He could debar them to do so, as the rules demand this as well.

The Vice-Chancellor brought to the attention of the house that the Chancellor of Panjab University was a Vice-Chancellor earlier of another University. The Chancellor did not want to precipitate the things and that was why he gave an audience to Dr. Ashu Khosla and his mother. When a (retired) teacher having long standing wished to meet the Chancellor, he gave her the audience. Thus, it is not right that Chancellor is not giving any audience to teachers. Chancellor also wanted to resolve the issues and he did not want to take any harsh decision in respect of the teachers. Therefore, it is inappropriate to say that the Chancellor did not want to resolve the issues. Chancellor is chairing the senior house of the Parliament,

which is divided into different parts, where no single party has the majority. He is always ready to move forward to resolve the issues. The Chancellor had himself headed a very complex University, i.e., Aligarh Muslim University which has a larger faculty than us. Thus, he knows each and everything about the issues relating to the teaching faculty. Aligarh Muslim University is producing 600-700 Ph.D.s every year, whereas Panjab University produces only about 300 Ph.D.s in a year. It is not that the Chancellor does not want to resolve the issues. He only wants that the number of complaints from the Panjab University, which *prima facie* is a good institution, should be less.

The issue here is how to send a message to the community so that just at a drop of the hat people should not approach the office of the Chancellor. When a Head of a given Department makes a complaint and that too, to the Chancellor directly and follow up with a legal notice to that office, and the Governing Body of the University does not take any cognizance of it, what message would go to the society?

If they want that the Chancellor should be informed that the matter was placed before the Syndicate and the Syndicate has taken cognizance of the same and has decided to constitute a Committee, he was okay with it.

Some of the members said that a Committee should be constituted to examine the issue and in the meantime, a circular should be issued to all the Departments stating that nobody should approach/write to the Chancellor directly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not issue any such circular.

The members suggested that circular should be issued by the Dean of University Instruction.

Shri Naresh Gaur said such circulars are issued to bank employees every year, however, one can wait for Committee's recommendation on the issuance of an appropriate circular.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a Committee constituted to examine and resolve the issue might recommend the issuance of above-said circular. It is not necessary that a circular be sent now, we can wait for a month.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Committee should be constituted with a free mind and not on the basis of pre-determined notion.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath enquired is there any need for constituting a Committee, which should recommend that no faculty member should write to the Chancellor directly.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that these are not good practices and nobody should write to the Chancellor directly. Let us not promote indiscipline.

A din continued.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that if they are not agreeing to the suggestions put forth by some of the members that the displeasure of the Syndicate should be conveyed to these persons, Syndicate should pass a resolution that they appreciate the act of these persons.

Professor Rajesh Gill inquired whether two extreme positions displeasure or appreciation are the only options.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that they should find a solution of the problem, and in the meantime, the Vice-Chancellor should write a letter to the Chancellor. At the same time the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a Committee of any members to look into all aspects.

Shri Ashok Goyal said there is another suggestion whose details he is hesitant to describe here. After going through the papers, he finds that there are some lacunae on our part as well. If they convey the displeasure of the Syndicate to these persons, and tomorrow if their claim proves to be right, what would the Syndicate do? Therefore, they should try to sort out the problem by plugging those lacunae. Mr. Ashok Goyal offered to share with the Vice-Chancellor (later) what the lacunae are.

Professor Yog Raj Angish said that since the matter is clinched, they should take up the next item for consideration.

However, some members continued to speak in the din.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar read out the abstract from the proceedings of the Committee constituted under the Chairmanship of Professor A.K. Bhandari to look into the complaint of Dr. Alok Srivastava, which reads "it was observed that since the grant was sanctioned by the U.G.C. after following the due procedure, the issue of inappropriate handling of public funds by the University does not arise." Could they write so in such a manner, as the whole grant to the University is received from the U.G.C?

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he does not understand what Dr. Dinesh Kumar is trying to convey.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they wish to appoint a Judicial Commission to probe all this, they could and he would have no problem with that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that alright the Vice-Chancellor should suggest something or let him do what he wants.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not the Government of the University.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that what they are proposed, he (VC) is opposing the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is telling him that there is nothing in it, which meant, he (Shri Goyal) had a pre-judgement on the issue.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Vice-Chancellor had also a pre-judgement on the issue as it had been written on one of the papers that the matter be placed before the Grievance Committee and show-cause notice be issued to the concerned persons. Is it not pre-determined? Even though the matter was supposed to be placed before the Grievance Committee, orders have been passed to issue show-cause notices.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when somebody has violated the Regulations/Rules of the University, show-cause notice has to be issued.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired then what was idea of placing the matter before the Grievance Committee?

Shri Naresh Gaur said that show-cause notice/s has/have to be issued after the issue is considered by the Grievance Committee.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that he did not know who is misguiding/instigating these persons.

The Vice-Chancellor, after examining the said document, clarified that, in fact, he had ordered that "Place it before the Grievance Committee, and issue a show-cause notice to Dr. Neelam Paul for continuing to write to the Chancellor directly".

Professor Rajesh Gill said that when the matter was ordered to be placed before the Grievance Committee, why the issuance of show-cause notice has been ordered, which is also a kind of pre-judgement.

Principal Gurdip Sharma responded by stating violation of calendar cannot be construed as a pre-judgement.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that so far as the particular grievance of Dr. Neelam Paul is concerned, the Vice-Chancellor has referred the matter to the Grievance Committee, and so far as her writing to the Chancellor directly (in violation of the Calendar) is concerned, the issuance of show-cause notice has been ordered.

Din ensued.

The Vice-Chancellor at that stage suggested that let there be a (Judicial) Committee to look into these cases and recommend what action has to be taken. However, the Committee would not comprise the Syndicate members.

Some of the members agreed to it.

Amongst further din, Professor Karamjeet Singh emerged to state that now they had two options – first that a Committee as proposed by Professor Yog Raj Angrish should be constituted because whatever had been stated by Professor Yog Raj Ji, that are the feelings of the majority of the members of the faculty of members of Languages that Professor Yog Raj represents. Secondly, Syndicate had earlier got an e-mail from PUTA member stating that PUTA executive members felt that due to lack of proper mechanism of redressal of grievances, the teachers have been driven to such an extreme. Keeping in view the academic contributions of the teachers, it would be prudent and morally graceful that the item pertaining to four faculty members be

withdrawn from the forthcoming Syndicate meeting. Though he himself is not for withdrawing the item, he is simply saying that what had been articulated by Professor Yog Raj on behalf of the Language Faculty, they should respect that. At the same time, they are authorizing the Vice-Chancellor to constitute any Committee comprising four-five members and let them suggest whatever action is to be taken.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that there are two separate issues, i.e., (i) grievance/s of the faculty members and (ii) writing to the Chancellor directly. If the Syndicate does not say that they should be warned or condemned, then it amounts to only saying that Syndicate is appreciable of it.

Professor Ronki Ram stated leaving aside the first two cases, he would like to speak on the third case as he was a member of that Committee, and they met several times to resolve the issue of Dr. Neelam Paul, but could not succeed both inside the Committee as well as outside the Committee. They had also requested her to give them all the related documents for her promotion under CAS, but she did not provide. Hence, they had made all the efforts to resolve the issue, not only during the tenure of the present Vice-Chancellor, but also during the tenure of the former Vice-Chancellor/s. Though the issue had not been considered by the Standing Grievance Committee, a Committee of different nomenclature had dealt with her case. When somebody is so adamant and we doubt integrity of one another, how can the matter be resolved? If they always tried to doubt each other, it would not be good for the University. He urged the members to try to understand the real issue.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that when the issue (of Professor Madhurima and Professor Ronki Ram) was resolved amicably on 8.12.2014, as it had been written that there is nothing left; hence, the matter stood closed, even then she decided to approach the Chancellor's Office.

The Vice-Chancellor interjected to clarify that when the minutes of the meeting the Committee dated 8.12.2014 were placed before him, he wrote "URGENT ATTENTION – Dean of University Instruction. Please clarify whether the letter (dated November 29, 2014) sent to the Vice-Chancellor stands withdrawn, or else, I have to forward it to PUCASH within the stipulated period".

A din ensued once again.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that since all are agreeing, the Vice-Chancellor should constitute a Committee. However, so far grievance/s is/are concerned, the same must be redressed, but so far as writings to the Chancellor again and again are concerned, the same should not be appreciated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what for the Committee is to be constituted. In fact, the Committee has to contemplate as to what reply is to be given to the legal notice.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Committee is to be constituted to see all aspects and resolve the issue to advice to the Chancellor's Office on Legal Notice is an exception. At this stage, he (Shri Ashok

Goyal) asked the camera man to switch off the camera. (Discussions off the camera not recorded here).

The Vice-Chancellor said that while replying to the Chancellor, he has to say that it has been decided to file a Caveat.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired is the Syndicate resolving that a Caveat be filed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would have to address this as a Vice-Chancellor, and it would take at least 3-4 days to file the Caveat.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that, in fact, the Caveat would be filed by the Registrar, but the decision is to be taken by the Vice-Chancellor.

Principal Gurdip Sharma enquired whether they appreciate or condemn the act of these persons in approaching the Chancellor directly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he does not think anybody in the Syndicate is saying that these acts of the persons are appreciable.

Some of the members said that nobody is appreciating the act of these persons in approaching the Chancellor directly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if he has to summarize in a very mild manner, the Syndicate expressed its concern and was of the view that such things should not recur.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it should be ensured that necessary steps are taken to keep the redressal system in place.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the redressal of grievance system is already in place.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that when the NAAC visited the Campus, the Grievance Committee was not in place.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari (DUI) to respond whether redressal mechanism is in place.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that the Grievance Committee was there in the years 2013, 2014 and even this year also the Grievance Committee had been constituted.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that nobody is ready to make complaint, but the complaint gets made when he/she is compelled to do so.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested Professor A.K. Bhandari (DUI) to supply the copies of the members of the Grievance Committee for the years 2011 onwards. If the Grievance Committees were there during all these years, he wondered whether any complaint was received (and referred to it).

Professor A.K. Bhandari assured Shri Ashok Goyal that the desired copies of the constitution of the Grievance Committee(s) would be supplied to him.

RESOLVED: That a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the whole issue.

When the Syndicate meeting was concluding after consideration of all the items, Shri Ashok Goyal referred again to this item by stating that he wanted to make a submission that the Committee proposed to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to deal with the four cases of the faculty members, who have written to the Chancellor directly, should comprise Syndics, and the Committee should be balanced one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would constitute a Committee of prominent academicians, particularly those who had dealt with such cases.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had given their consent that the Committee should be constituted as proposed by Professor Yograj Angrish, who in fact, has suggested that a Committee of Syndics should be constituted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had given him the authorization to constitute a Committee. He would put eminent people in the said Committee like Dr. Johl and other prominent academicians, who had experience in such matters.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that what is the definition of prominent academicians. The item is placed before the Syndicate for consideration. Are the members of the Syndicate not so eminent? The statement has been made as if the other people have come from sky and are more competent?

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they had authorized the Vice-Chancellor to constitute a Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever Dr. Yograj Angrish proposed, the same was endorsed by him.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath wondered why he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is threatening them. He added 'Do not compel me to say, as he could prove on record as to who are at the back of these persons. Definitely some persons are at the back of these persons'.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Committee should be of neutral persons.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor had vetoed not to constitute a Committee of the Syndics. Therefore the members of the Syndicate are free to take up the matter at fora, which they deem fit.

Amendment of Regulation 17. Considered the recommendation dated 15.12.2014 (Item No. 8) (**Appendix-XVII**) of Faculty of Medical Sciences that the amendment in Regulation 3.3 at Page 499 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-II, 2007 for the BDS 1st year from the forthcoming examination (i.e. 2015), be approved.

Present Regulation	Proposed Amendment as per the BDS Course Regulation, 2007 of the Dental Council of India
<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 BDS University examination in all subjects within 3 years from the date of admission shall be discharged from the course.</p>

- NOTE:**
1. The minutes of Board of Studies dated 07.11.2014 along with office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).
 2. 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 (**Appendix-XVII**) instead of Regulation 3.3.

Professor Karamjeet Singh pointed out that at Page 131 in the **Appendix**, the Regulation should be 3.2 and not 3.3. It should be corrected.

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

Present Regulation	Proposed Amendment as per the BDS Course Regulation, 2007 of the Dental Council of India
<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 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 (**Appendix-XVII**) instead of Regulation 3.3.

Adoption of D.O. No.F.1-1/2015(CM) dated 08.01.2015 received from Professor Ved Prakash, Chairman, U.G.C. , for introduction of Choice Based Credit System for Skill Development

18. Considered D.O. No. F.1-1/2015 (CM) dated 08.01.2015 (**Appendix-XVIII**) received from Professor Ved Prakash, Chairman, University Grant Commission, 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:

- (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.

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that:

- (i) The letter be circulated to all academicians by the DUI and meeting be called.
- (ii) Meeting of the Principals be called by the Dean, College Development Council.

Referring to Sr. No. (iv), Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that they would have to introduce Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) and adopt the Credit Framework for Skill Development (CFSD) in the University as well as affiliated Colleges from the coming academic session, i.e., 2015-16. Further, they would also have to switch-over from numerical marking system to grading system, but they could do it in a gradual manner.

The Vice-Chancellor said that firstly, it would be implemented in the professional courses and later on in other departments of humanities.

It was clarified that in a meeting with the Education Minister on 29th December 2014, wherein the Education Secretary and Director, Higher Education, Punjab, were also present, it was informed that they would have to implement it in a phased manner as there would be some implications, such as faculty, infrastructure requirements, etc.

Professor Dinesh Kumar stated that Post Graduate courses are running in the University. He suggested that Honours courses should be promoted in the University by starting more and more Honours courses in the Post Graduate courses in various departments of the University as it would be more beneficial for the students. He pointed out that presently problem is occurring whenever the Undergraduate Board and Post Graduate Board make any change in the component of the syllabus, the Colleges which are 300 km. away, their teachers always complained that related material/books are not available. The Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar had already separated the syllabi of the courses running in the University teaching departments from the affiliated Colleges and had started giving two Gold Medals, i.e., one for the topper from the University and another from the

Colleges. In this way, no clash took place between Undergraduate and Postgraduate Boards. Citing an example, he said that if the same course is available to the candidate at Abohar, why would he come to Chandigarh for that purpose. He, therefore, suggested that they should formulate two types of curricula, one for affiliated Colleges (academic) and another for University teaching departments (research oriented), which would be beneficial to both types of students as well as for the University. In this way, clash in the members of the Board of Studies could also be avoided.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the Vice-Chancellor has talked many times about Integrated Courses after 10+2. He informed that Panjab University is already running 5-Year/6-Year Integrated Courses after 10+2, e.g., B.A./B.Ed (Honours), B.A. (Hons.), 5-Year Integrated Course in Economics, etc. So, there is no need to separate the curricula of the P.G. courses of the affiliated Colleges from the University Departments. He was of the view that they should introduce the Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) and adopt the Credit Framework for Skill Development (CFSD) in the University and Colleges from the coming academic session, i.e., 2015-16.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that there are already certain courses, e.g., B.A. (Hons.) in English, B.A. (Hons.) in History, etc. She was of the view that there is no need to separate the curricula of the courses running in the University and its affiliated Colleges.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that in Panjab University, there is a provision that a candidate had to appear in two extra papers to do the honours course and he had to secure 50% marks in the ordinary examination.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that it being an academic issue, Professor A.K. Bhandari and the Dean, College Development Council, should take-up it in the meeting of the Chairpersons as well as in the Principals Conference, respectively as it has to be implemented from the academic session 2015-16. He urged the Syndicate to adopt the directives of the U.G.C. vide their above letter and endorse it so that these could be implemented from 2015-16 though partially.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that if they wanted to raise the standard of the integrated courses, they would have to get top-most teachers from wherever they could and invite them to give lectures to the students at least for two weeks or two/three months. He informed that they had already taken decision relating to inviting prominent faculty members from other Universities/Institutions in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate during the tenure of Professor M.M. Puri, former Vice-Chancellor of this University. He suggested that the said decision should be dug out and a policy should be evolved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a good suggestion. They could call senior faculty members from the neighbouring Peer Institutions as experts. They should identify some teachers and invite them for a period of one or two week/s in a year to give lectures to the postgraduate classes. They should make a module of such persons and make a part of postgraduate education and as far as budget part is concerned, they would set aside separately.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they should start interdisciplinary/integrated courses, such as Law with M.Com., which would definitely enhance the status of their courses. For this purpose, they could call faculty members from U.B.S. to teach the subject.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that U.G.C. had instructed all the Universities to start B.A./B.Ed. in all the Colleges affiliated with them. The Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar has already started exercise to introduce B.A./B.Ed. in all its Colleges from 2015-16. He had read this news a couple of days ago in the newspapers. The last date for applying for these courses is 31st March 2015. They had also sought selection panels for the appointment of teachers. But there is an impression in the Panjab University that these courses are to be started from the academic session 2016-17. They should take inspiration from GNDU; otherwise, the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University would lag behind.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they wanted to create a Cell in the University which would help all the Colleges for seeking NAAC Accreditation. The Cell would also provide consultancy and advisory to such Colleges so that they would not lag behind for NAAC Accreditation.

It was clarified that the Colleges could apply for integrated courses, e.g., B.A./B.Ed., B.Sc./B.Ed., etc. from 1st March to 30th May 2015 and these courses would be started from the academic session 2016-17, the same is written in their Regulation.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if Guru Nanak Dev University is going to start these integrated courses from the session 2015-16, then they should also start from the session 2015-16.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that NAAC booklet should be distributed amongst various Departments of the University so that they could know what are the requirements of the NAAC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have formulated a *pro forma* for the accreditation of Institutions. They would put the requirements as per NAAC on the website of the University.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That D.O. No. F.1-1/2015 (CM) dated 08.01.2015 (**Appendix-XVIII**) received from Professor Ved Prakash, Chairman, University Grants Commission, 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.

Certain Certificate courses kept in abeyance

19. Considered the recommendations dated 16.12.2014 (Para 6(3)) (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Faculty of Arts, that the following Certificate courses be kept on hold from the admission of 2015 due to lack of students:

- (i) Certificate Course in Corporate Security, Safety and Fire Protection Management.
- (ii) Three-months Executive Certificate Course in Disaster Management and Security.

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

RESOLVED: That, due to lack of students, the following Certificate courses be kept on hold from the admission of 2015:

- (i) Certificate Course in Corporate Security, Safety and Fire Protection Management.
- (ii) Three-months Executive Certificate Course in Disaster Management and Security.

Rates/charges for using major equipments at UIPS

20. Considered and

RESOLVED: 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:

Sr. No.	Users	Amount (Rs.) Per Sample/Per Hour (whichever is higher)
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

NOTE: 1. Professor B.S. Bhoop, Coordinator, UGC Centre of Excellence in Applications of Nanomaterials, Nanoparticles & Nanocomposites, P.U., vide request dated 06.01.2015 (**Appendix-XX**) has proposed that the equipment is quite rare and the first installation in Panjab University and frequent requests for extending the facility to research scholars/ scientists of University and even beyond have received in the department. The services of the equipment should be

made available to the neighbouring industrial houses and private institutes as well, besides catering to the needs of the Panjab University scientists.

He also stated that rendering such services may generate an approximate income of Rs.1,00,000/- per annum and used for the smooth functioning and operation of the major equipment item. He requested that the budgetary provision of an amount of Rs.40,000/- each for Equipment Maintenance and Consumables respectively, be set aside for this Centre of Excellence.

2. Being prone to high wear and tear to its optical, electronics and mechanical parts, especially to its lasers, the CLSM equipment requires intensive care and maintenance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the following Item 21 on the agenda be treated as withdrawn:

Withdrawn Item

21. To consider if, the following amendments in rates for reimbursement proposed by CMO vide Note dated 15.01.2015 Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved and the same shall also be applicable to all the pending claims:

	Existing rates	Proposed rates recommended by C.M.O.
1.	Robotic Prostactetomy	
	Rs.17500/- for General ward	CGHS rates
	Rs.20,000/- for private ward	Radical prostactetomy Rs.2,20,000/-
2.	Angioplasty and Stents	
	Angioplasty Rs.85,000/-	No change in angioplasty charges Rs.85,000/-
	Stents: Cyphur Rs.95,000/- Taxus Rs.67,300/- Xience Rs.95,000/- Yukon Rs.55,000/- Bare Metal Stent Rs.50,000/-	Drug Eluting Stents - Rs.95,000/- Non-Drug Eluting Stents - Rs.50,000/-
3.	Ventilator Charges	
	Ventilator charges is a part of ICU charges	1. While obtaining treatment under ICU, ventilator charges will be a part of ICU charges. 2. In other cases Rs.1000/- per day.

NOTE: 1. Professor Jai Narain Sharma, Department of Gandhian Studies submitted his medical bill of Rs.3,85,781.89/- for reimbursement. The Administrative Committee of Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, in its meeting dated 26.11.2014 considered the bill.

2. An office note was enclosed .

Recommendations of the Committee dated 16.01.2015 regarding revision of fee structure of Hostels for the session 2015-16

22. Considered minutes dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXI**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to revision of fee structure of Hostels for the session 2015-16.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that the students who took admission in the University under NRI Quota are paying much higher charges in comparison to other students. The University is taking Rs.6000/- from the NRI students and Rs.4000/- from other students as Hostel Security. He pleaded that as far as hostel facility to the NRI students is concerned, it should be on subsidized rates and not on profit basis. There should be separate hostel fee/charges for NRI students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that accommodation in the International Hostel could not be provided on subsidized rates. As far as girl NRI students are concerned, they are being allotted accommodation in the International Hostel; however, they could not mix boys with girls. For NRI boys, they might discuss it again in the same Committee and bring its recommendations for approval later on.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 16.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXI**) regarding revision of fee structure of Hostels for the session 2015-16, be approved.

Eligibility Criteria under Economically Weaker Section category for admission to all Self-Financing Courses w.e.f. the session 2015-16

23. Considered the recommendation of the Joint Admission Committee (Sr.No.3) dated 22.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXII**) that the eligibility criteria i.e. annual income under Economically Weaker Section category up to Rs.2.5 lac instead of Rs.1 lac for admission to all Self-Financing courses w.e.f. the session 2015-16, be approved and the same be allowed to incorporate in the Hand Book of Information, Rules for admission in the guidelines for freeship and tuition fee concession.

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

RESOLVED: 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.

Modification in the decision of the Syndicate dated 17.08.2015 (Para 10)

24. Considered modification in the decision of the Syndicate dated 17.08.2014 (Para 10) (**Appendix-XXIII**) that the resignation of Dr. Kailash K.K., Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, P.U. 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 (**Appendix-XXIII**). An information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXIII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 17.08.2014 (Para 10) has resolved that the resignation of Dr. Kailash K.K., Assistant

Professor, Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted, w.e.f. 10.04.2014, under Regulation 6, page 118-119, Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and the same was unanimously approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 28.09.2014 (Para XII).

2. Dr. Kailash K.K. was granted Extraordinary Leave without pay for one year w.e.f. **10.04.2013** vide Syndicate Para 3 dated 16.03.2013 under Regulation 11 (G) at pages 139-40, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to enable him to join as Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science, University of Hyderabad.

RESOLVED: 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 (**Appendix-XXIII**).

Issue regarding Pay Protection of Ms. Jasleen Kaur Bains, Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science & Applications

25. Considered if, the pay of Ms. Jasleen Kaur Bains, Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science & Applications, P.U. 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 (**Appendix-XXIV**) by the Officiating Principal, Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector 26, Chandigarh. An information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XXIV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: Regulation 4.1 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, reads as under:

“Save as otherwise provided in the regulation, the fixation of salary, accelerated increments, grant of allowances, etc. shall in case of employees holding permanent post, rests with –

- (a) Senate- in the case of employees of Class A
- (b) & (c) xxx xxx xxx.

RESOLVED: That the pay of Ms. Jasleen Kaur Bains, Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science & Applications, 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 (**Appendix-XXIV**) by the Officiating Principal, Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector 26, Chandigarh.

Issue regarding Pay Protection of Dr. Bhupinder Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi, U.S.O.L. **26.** Considered if, 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 (**Appendix-XXV**) by the Principal, D.M. College, Moga.

NOTE: Regulation 4.1 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, reads as under:

“Save as otherwise provided in the regulation, the fixation of salary, accelerated increments, grant of allowances, etc. shall in case of employees holding permanent post, rests with –

(a) Senate- in the case of employees of Class A

(b)& (c) xxx xxx xxx.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that two advance increments should be given to Dr. Bhupinder Singh.

It was supported by other members present in the House that two advance increments should be given to Dr. Bhupinder Singh keeping in view his outstanding literary work.

RESOLVED: That the pay of Dr. Bhupinder Singh, Assistant Professor of 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 (**Appendix-XXV**) by the Principal, D.M. College, Moga.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Vice-Chancellor be authorized to give two advance increments to Dr. Bhupinder Singh, keeping in view his outstanding literary work.

Extension in the validity of Advt. No.1/2013 for filling up various non-teaching posts up to 18.08.2015

27. Considered if the validity of Advt. No. 1/2013 for filling up various non-teaching posts be extended for six months more i.e. up to 18.08.2015, so that the posts could be filled up.

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has extended the validity of the Advt. No. 1/2013 for six months more from the date of lapse of Advt. i.e. 19.02.2014, ratified vide Syndicate (Para 65 (xvi)) dated 22.02.2014 (**Appendix-XXVI**).

The Syndicate in its meeting dated 12.07.2014 (Para 31) (**Appendix-XXVI**) has again extended the validity of Advt. No. 1/2013 for a further period of six months more from the date of lapse of said Advt.

i.e. 19.08.2014, thus now the validity of the Advt. will expire on 18.02.2015.

2. Statement showing the current status of the post advertised vide Advt. No. 1/2013 (in whose cases of the selection are to be made) **(Appendix-XXVI)**.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had already extended twice the validity of Advt. No.1/2013. He was of the view that fresh advertisement should be issued so that other eligible persons could be able to apply for these posts.

The Vice-Chancellor said that screening in respect of most of the posts advertised vide Advt. No.1/2013 had already been done.

RESOLVED: That the validity of Advt. No. 1/2013 for filling up various non-teaching posts be extended for six months more, i.e., up to 18.08.2015, so that the posts could be filled up.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 29.01.2015 regarding re-designation to certain employees of Construction Office (Without financial benefit)

28. Considered if the following recommendations dated 29.01.2015 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that:

1. the following employees be given re-designation as mentioned against each **(without financial benefit)** as a measure personal to them, with the condition that they will continue to perform their duty as per their substantive posts and on vacation/retirement, their substantive posts will be filled up:
 - (i) Shri R.K. Rai, Executive Engineer-I (Civil) as Superintending Engineer.
 - (ii) Shri Harpreet Singh, Architect as Senior Architect.
 - (iii) Shri Kulwant Singh, Sub Divisional Engineer (Elect.) as Executive Engineer (Electrical)
 - (iv) Shri Anil Thakur, Sub Divisional Engineer (Hort.) as Executive Engineer (Hort.)
2. the Punjab Govt. PWD rules regulating the recruitment for Engineering & Architecture staff framed from time to time as followed by the Chandigarh Administration, be followed in the Panjab University also.
3. The above recommendations will be implemented w.e.f. the date of approval of the Senate.

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that why the re-designation of Superintending Engineer is being proposed to give to Shri R.K. Rai, Senior Architect to Shri Harpreet Singh, Executive Engineer (Electricity) to Shri Kulwant Singh and Executive Engineering (Horticulture) to Shri Anil Thakur of the Construction Office without any financial benefit.

It was clarified that these persons had already been drawing higher pay and that was why it had been written without financial benefit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in case, they are already drawing higher pay then what was the idea of writing without financial benefit?

It was clarified that there was no extra financial burden and it was only to boost the morale that was why it had been written.

Professor Yograj Angrish said that there is no need of mentioning the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal pleaded that if they are giving them designation, then they should be given the financial benefits as well.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that legally for what they are eligible, it should be given to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they are giving them designation and if there is any financial benefit arising out of it, why they are writing without any financial benefit. If there is not any financial benefit, then it is automatically not to be paid and if there is any financial benefit, then it should be given to them.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that there is no provision of the post of Superintending Engineer in the Budget of the University. There are three Departments in the Construction Office, i.e., Electricity, Maintenance and Horticulture. He suggested that instead of giving the designation of Superintending Engineer to one officer and Executive Engineer to two officers of the Construction Office, the problem could only be solved by creating three posts of Executive Engineer, i.e. XEN Maintenance, XEN Electricity and XEN Horticulture. In this way, the line of command would be intact. The Superintending Engineer could sanction up to Rs.30 lacs whereas the Executive Engineer could sanction up to Rs.5 lacs. It is just a proposal and technically it is not possible.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath informed that during the tenure of Professor R.C. Paul, the then Vice-Chancellor, the post of the Executive Engineer was upgraded to Superintending Engineer and at that time Er. Markanda was the XEN in Construction Office.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that if there is a provision of Superintending Engineer Post in the Budget as informed by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, he had no problem.

It was clarified that it was proposed to streamline the hierarchy, they are giving them only designation without any financial benefits. These persons are entitled for financial powers, if they are appointed on these higher posts instead of giving them designation. This would go a long way in motivation of the employees

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that this item is covering only four persons and all others were ignored.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that there is also lack of promotion on other posts of the XEN Office and they have been working on the same post/s for more than 10-15 years. Why these four persons were being designated and all others were being ignored by the office. He was of the view that all such cases should be put together.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should approve this proposal and if similar proposal/s came in future, similar benefit has to be given to other persons.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed that the small Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to explore the possibility of re-designation or up-gradation of existing posts of Executive Engineer-I, Sub-Divisional Engineer (Electrical & Horticulture) respective as measure personal to them. The Committee has no technical person. The Main Committee meeting held on 13.8.2014 has recommended as under:

“The Committee went through the minutes of meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 15.7.2014 and observed that the same should be accepted in toto. The Committee also discussed the issue as to whether a personal promotion can be implemented in the Panjab University whereas there is no such provision in the Punjab Government PWD rules for Engineering & Architecture Staff. The Committee also observed that only when the post is there, the promotion can be considered. Therefore, the Punjab Govt. PWD rules regulating the recruitment for Engineering & Architect Staff, as followed by the Chandigarh Administration should be followed in the Panjab University, also.”

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is very good idea to boost the morale of one section of the employees, but at the same time it would demoralize other section of the employees. He was of the view that no step-motherly treatment should be there with the employees. At par with this case, if any employee having experience of 8-10 years on one particular post, he/she should be designated to the next post irrespective of the cadre they belong to. As per his personal experience, a decision was taken in the Senate meeting of year 2004, that such and such persons are stagnated on a particular post for the last so many years, they be re-designated, i.e., one step above provided further it is categorically mentioned that under any circumstances, at no stage, they would be given any additional increment/financial benefit on account of having been re-designated.

It was further reiterated that they were only being re-designated and not promoted.

The apprehensions were arisen out of this decision that the same was approved emotionally then in spite of the fact that at that time they had no such posts in the budget and they were only re-designated. Afterwards, the representations came from the re-designated persons that since they are discharging the duties of that particular post, they should also be given financial benefit. After 8 years, in the year 2013 the financial benefit was allowed/given to the same persons. He was of the view that a conscious decision should be taken by the House and the signal should not be given that the benefit was allowed to the particular section of non-teaching staff of the construction office and others left. Either they had represented or not. To give a message of goodwill, they had to take a conscious decision that every employee is at par and their cases should be brought together. Secondly, as Registrar is saying that it doesn't matter whether they write it with financial benefit or without financial benefit as they are already drawing the higher pay. There is no salary chart of

these employees that what they are drawing. They should also keep in mind that next Pay Commission is also coming in 2016. What would be done in the next Pay Commission to these designated employees and what salary would be given to them? The University should also bring all such things in a collective manner and thereafter the item should be placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Pay Commission did not look at the nomenclature of the post/s, they only see the Pay Band.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the consideration of **Item C-28**, on the agenda, be deferred.

Enquiry Committee Report

29. Considered the report of an Enquiry Committee in pursuant to a discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 26.4.2014.

- NOTE:**
1. The above item was placed before the Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 under item 44 and it was resolved that, for the time being, the consideration of the item be deferred and the item be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting and all the relevant documents/annexures be supplied to the members in sealed envelopes.
 2. Enquiry Committee Report along with appendix in respect of above item has already been sent to the members vide letter dated 16.2.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that as desired by the members in the last meeting of the Syndicate, they had appended all the relevant papers with this item.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the report which is either against the Senate Member or in favour of them, could either be accepted by the Syndicate or simply forwarded to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should forward the report to the Senate without any discussion.

Principal Gurdeep Sharma enquired that one Mr. Karanbir Singh, whose name did not figure in the enquiry report. He should be reinstated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct that his name did not figure in the Enquiry Report. His name also figures in the report. Justice Garg had told him at personal level that one could give him a chance because of his young age and this being his first mistake.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that his name has not been figured in the report.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the person in question is of B-Category employee of the University, his case would not go to the Senate as Syndicate is the appointing and punishing authority in respect of B-Category employees. He suggested that Vice-Chancellor could study his case and take action accordingly.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the report of an Enquiry Committee, be forwarded to the Senate.

Recommendation of the J.C.M. dated 17.12.2014 to give representation to other non-teaching Associations

30. Considered the recommendation of the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) dated 17.12.2014 (**Appendix- XXVIII**) that the staff belonging to PULTA and other non-teaching cadres who are not the part of JCM, be added so that one representative from every classification of non-teaching cadre can represent his Association. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XXVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: A copy of constitution of Joint Consultative Committee (JCM) approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.07.1990 (Para 20) is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that since the request has been received only from the technical staff of the University, only their representative should be made a member of the Joint Consultative Machinery.

RESOLVED: That a representative of Panjab University Laboratory & Technical Staff Association (PULTA), be included in the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM).

Request of Principal of Post Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh dated 5/11/2014 for grant of temporary affiliation for M.Phil. Physical Education

31. Considered request dated 5.11.2014 (**Appendix-XXIX**) 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.

- NOTE:**
1. The Inspection Committee in its report dated 1.8.2014 (**Appendix-XXIX**) pointed out 50% deficiency in terms of staff. Minimum two regular Assistant Professors required to be appointed before starting the course.
 2. The Inspection Committee has further recommended grant of temporary extension of affiliation in M.Phil. (Physical Education) for admitting 10 students with the condition that the College shall fulfill the requirements by 31.08.2014.
 3. The Principal of P.G. Govt. College has informed the Chairperson of the Inspection Committee that the Inspection Committee might have perceived that the contractual teachers in the Department of Physical Education of the College are not regular

and can be replaced anytime; whereas the fact is that these teachers cannot be replaced as per the direction of the CAT and if in any condition these teachers are replaced by the UPSC then the new teacher will come in place and the vacancy will never fall vacant.

4. As per the norms approved for recognition of Research Centre for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree, the Postgraduate affiliated College/s can be allowed to start M.Phil. course in the subject in which the College/s has/have been recognized as approved centre by the Panjab University.
5. Dr. Dalwinder Singh, Chairperson of the Inspection Committee has opined **(Appendix-XXIX)** as under:

“The Postgraduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh is approved Research Centre in the subject of Physical Education with the facilities to carry out research. M.Phil. being pre-research degree can be started. Further, the inspection committee has put the condition of two Assistant Professors on regular basis. The College in question in its letter No.PGGC-11/M.Phil. inspection/6199 dated 22.10.2014 **(Appendix- XXIX)** explained its position with regard to appointment of Assistant Professors as mentioned under Note-3 above.

6. A comprehensive office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXIX)**.

RESOLVED: That the request dated 5.11.2014 **(Appendix-XXIX)** 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) for the session 2014-2015, be acceded to.

Proposal of Dr. Dalip Kumar, Fellow for extension in time limit to M.Phil. students for joining Ph.D. programme

32. Considered, if the maximum period of two years from the date of declaration of result of Joint Entrance Test conducted for admission M.Phil./Ph.D. Programme for the candidates, who have done M.Phil., be extended from two years to three years as sometimes the whole process of declaration of result of M.Phil. takes more than two years.

NOTE: 1. At present as per guidelines, if someone who has done M.Phil. and wants to join Ph.D. Programme on the basis of Joint University Entrance test for Ph.D./M.Phil. will be eligible within a period of two years of the declaration of result.

2. An Office Note along with E-mail dated 17.12.2014 received from Dr. Dalip Kumar, Fellow is enclosed **(Appendix-XXX)**.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that as per the existing provision, the candidates who had cleared University entrance test for Ph.D./M.Phil. and doing M.Phil. are eligible within a period of two years of the declaration of the result. According to her, two years period is insufficient and it should be three years after the declaration of Ph.D./M.Phil. entrance test.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the candidates who had joined M.Phil after passing Ph.D./M.Phil. Entrance Test, the validity of Entrance Test of such candidates should be three years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if somebody had cleared entrance test for doing M.Phil./Ph.D. and further wanted to join Ph.D. after doing M.Phil., he/she should be exempted from entrance test at par with the candidates who had passed UGC-NET. Secondly, not only the candidates who had cleared M.Phil./Ph.D. entrance test from Panjab University but the candidates who had cleared M.Phil./Ph.D. entrance test from other recognized Universities should also be exempted from entrance test at the time of seeking admission to Ph.D. at the Panjab University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if they enhance the validity of the M.Phil./Ph.D. Entrance Test from two years to three years, there would be difficulty as per the new Ph.D. Guidelines/Regulations.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the candidates who had done M.Phil. and wanted to join Ph.D. Programme on the basis of Joint University Entrance Test for Ph.D. should be eligible within a period of five years of the declaration of result.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the candidates who had done M.Phil., they should be exempted from the Entrance Test of M.Phil./Ph.D.

After some further discussion, it was –

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.

Donation for institution of Endowment

33. Considered if, an Endowment of Rs.4,00,000/- made by Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, IAS (Retd.), Ms. Urvashi Gulati, IAS (Retd.) and Ms. Keshni Anand Arora, IAS, be accepted for holding an Annual Memorial Lecture in the memory of their revered father Late Prof. J.C. Anand (Retd.), from the Department of Political Science, P.U. The investment of Rs.4,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment and the interest of the amount be utilized for holding the said lecture.

- NOTE:**
1. Request dated 13.2.2015 (**Appendix-XXXI**) of Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, IAS (Retd.), Ms. Urvashi Gulati, IAS (Retd.) and Ms. Keshni Anand Arora, IAS, for endowment of Rs.4,00,000/- for holding annual Memorial Lecture in the memory of Late Shri Jagdish Chander Anand (Retd.), Reader from the Department of Political Science.
 2. Brief Profile of Professor J.C. Anand enclosed (**Appendix-XXXI**).
 3. Earlier too, a donation of Rs.1,00,000/- was made by Ms. Keshni Anand Arora, IAS, Additional Secretary, Government of India, for institution of an Endowment 'Professor J.C. Anand Gold Medal' and the same was accepted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.10.2014 vide (Para 36) (**Appendix-XXXI**).

RESOLVED: That an Endowment of Rs.4,00,000/- made by Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhary, IAS (Retd.), Ms. Urvashi Gulati, IAS (Retd.) and Ms. Keshni Anand Arora, IAS, be accepted, for holding an Annual Memorial Lecture in the memory of their revered father Late Professor J.C. Anand, Reader (Retd.), Department of Political Science, Panjab University. The investment of Rs.4,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment and the interest of the amount be utilized for holding the said lecture.

Admissions to M.E./ M.Tech. at U.I.E.T. on the basis of GATE qualified candidates only

34. Considered if, the entrance test be abolished and only GATE qualified candidates be considered for the admission to M.E./M.Tech at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET) for the session 2015-16. However the Entrance test may be conducted for the other courses at NITTTR.

- NOTE:**
1. The details of candidates who appeared in Entrance Test-2014 and GATE qualified candidates applied for the following courses (2014-2015) are as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the course	No. of GATE applicant	No. of NON-GATE applicant
1.	M.E. Mechanical Engineering	84	57
2.	M.E. Electrical Engineering (Power System)	44	45
3.	M.Tech. Material Science & Technology	63	38

Last year no candidate who qualified Entrance test could get admission in any of the above said course at UIET and all seats were filled by GATE applicants. However, one special seat was created in each course for Entrance Test

qualified candidates after considering their representation.

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

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that Entrance Test is only being abolished for admission to M.E./M.Tech. at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, but the same could be conducted by the University for admissions to other courses at NITTTR.

RESOLVED: That the Entrance Test for admissions to M.E./M.Tech at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), be abolished and only GATE qualified candidates be considered for admissions to these courses for the session 2015-16. However the Entrance Test be conducted for the courses being offered at NITTTR.

Minutes of the College Development Council dated 17.01.2015

35. Considered the minutes of the College Development Council dated 17.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

Referring to Item No.2 at page 248, Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that as per the latest guidelines of the Government, the words 'Physically Challenged' should be replaced with 'Physically Disabled'.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the College Development Council dated 17.01.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved, with the stipulation that the words 'Physically Challenged' be replaced with 'Physically Disabled'.

At this stage, Principal Sanjeev Arora said that the University has to implement the latest NCTE Regulations, which Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, had already implemented. The term of the present Dean, College Development Council, is going to expire on 31st March 2015. Since the implementation new NCTE Regulations is in the pipeline, the term of present DCDC should be extended at least for another one year.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested keeping in view the introduction of new courses in the affiliated Colleges, the term of present Dean, College Development Council should be extended up to his superannuation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was not opposed to extending the term of present incumbent until new person can be selected after advertisement. He added that let the term of the present incumbent end first and thereafter something can be thought in this regard.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the present incumbent should be allowed to continue till the post is being filled up. It was told that Professor Naval Kishore would reach the age of 60 years in 2016.

All the members, in one voice, said that the term of Professor Naval Kishore, DCDC, should be extended up to 31.05.2016, i.e., up to the end of the month in which he attain the age of 60 years.

This was agreed to.

Regulations/Rules for B.Com./BBA (Semester System) effective from the session 2014-15

36. Considered the Regulations/Rules for B.Com and BBA (Semester System) (**Appendix-XXXIV**), effective from the session 2014-15.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 13.09.2014 (Para 6 (sub para x)) has:

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Academic Council dated 02.07.2014 contained in Items III, V, VII, VIII, XI, XIII, XIV, XVIII, XIX, XXIII, XXV, XXIX and XXXV, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That recommendation of the Academic Council contained in Item X, be referred back to the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce to **reconsider proposed Regulation 4 for B.Com. and B.B.A. (Semester System) pertaining to criteria for award of internal assessment and redraft the same in tune with the Regulation for award of internal assessment of other undergraduate courses.**

2. The Faculty of Business Management and Commerce dated 16.12.2014 (Item 6) has re-considered and approved the recommendations of Undergraduate Board of Studies in Commerce dated 03.11.2014 (Para 2) in respect of Regulation 4, as per (**Appendix-XXXIV**). Accordingly, amended Regulation has been inserted.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the unit of B.Com. should remain of 70 students.

It was clarified that the unit of B.Com. had already been of 70 students.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that at page 303 of the appendix in Sr. No.4, the internal assessment should be 10% of total marks for B.Com/BBA, instead of 20%.

RESOLVED: That the Regulations/Rules for B.Com and BBA (Semester System) (**Appendix-XXXIV**), effective from the session 2014-15, be approved, with the stipulation that the internal assessment be 10% instead of 20% and necessary correction/s be made in the relevant Regulation/s.

Amendment of Regulation 37. Considered the recommendation dated 16.12.2014 (Para 17) (**Appendix-XXXV**) of Faculty of Arts that the following Regulation 5 of Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation & Networking (Annual System), be amended w.e.f. the academic session 2014-15, in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council:

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.

NOTE: The minutes of Board of Studies in Library & Information Science dated 17.11.2014 along with office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXV**).

RESOLVED: That Regulation 5 of 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:

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.

Amendment of Rules

38. Considered the recommendations dated 27.11.2014 of the Core Committee of the CIIPP (**Appendix-XXXVI**) with regard to modification in Utilization period, existing consultancy rules 4 & 13 appearing at page No. 64-66 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 and Existing Practice in respect of Sanction for release of honorarium and re-appropriation of the budget heads, and

RESOLVED: That Utilization period and the existing consultancy Rules 4 & 13 appearing at page No. 64-66 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 as also the Existing Practice in respect of Sanction for release of honorarium and re-appropriation of the budget heads, be modified/amended as proposed below:

Present Utilization Period	Proposed Utilization Period
The time period to utilize the department share is not mentioned in the consultancy rules.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultant needs to utilize the department share within a period of one

	<p>year after the completion of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In case it is not utilized, the same would be credited to the "CIIPP Corpus Fund" (to be created). The amount generated from this Corpus Fund would be utilized for strengthening the infrastructure of CIIPP, seminars, workshops and promotion of industry/ academic interaction activities organized by the CIIPP.
--	--

Existing Rule as per Clause V, page No. 64-66, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III	Proposed Rule
<p>4. Permission to undertake consultancy work up to Rs.1 lac may be given by the Officer In-Charge of the Liaison Cell (IIPP) on the recommendation of the Head of the Department or by any other person authorized to do so. Consultancy work of above Rs.1 lac shall be approved by the Vice-Chancellor.</p>	<p>4. Permission to undertake consultancy work up to Rs.5 lacs may be given by the Officer In-Charge of the Liaison Cell (IIPP) on the recommendation of the Head of the Department or by any other person authorized to do so. Consultancy work of above Rs.5 lacs shall be approved by the Vice-Chancellor.</p>
<p>13. On the completion of the consultancy project, a copy of the synopsis of the work, keeping in view the confidentiality clause of the project and the audited statement of accounts will be submitted to the University/ IIPP for its records. Any un-utilized amount will be transferred to the "Foundation for Higher Education & Research" of the University.</p> <p>NOTE: "Foundation for Higher Education & Research" has been changed to "Development Fund Account" vide Syndicate (Para 33) dated 29.02.2012 (Appendix-XXXIII), but this change is yet to be incorporated in the PU Calendar, Volume-III new edition as and when</p>	<p>13. On the completion of the consultancy project, a copy of the synopsis of the work, keeping in view the confidentiality clause of the project and the audited statement of accounts will be submitted to the University/IIPP for its records. Any un-utilized amount from the Department share will be transferred to the CIIPP Corpus Fund and any other un-utilized amount of the other budget heads will be transferred to the 'Development Fund' of the University.</p>

printed. Existing Practice	Proposed Practice
Sanction sought from the Vice-Chancellor to release the consultancy fee/honorarium	The Director, CIIPP is competent to accord the financial sanction for the payment of consultancy fee/ honorarium to the consultant, transfer of University share to the PU current account without any limit if the claim/payment is as per rules.
Sanction sought from the Vice-Chancellor for the re-appropriation of the budget heads	The Director, CIIPP is competent to allow re-appropriation of the budget heads in the consultancy projects with the condition that the sponsoring agency has given no objection certificate for the same.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 22.01.2015 regarding terms and conditions to use the sports facilities in the Campus

39. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 22.1.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVII**), to decide the terms and conditions to use the sports facilities in the campus i.e. Swimming Pool, Gymnasium (Men & Women), Badminton, Shooting and Tennis for smooth conduct of sports activities in the Panjab University Campus.

NOTE: Earlier, the recommendations of the committee dated 7.4.2014 with regard to decide the terms and conditions to use the sports facilities in the campus were placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.10.2014 vide Para-17 (**Appendix-XXXVII**). After long discussion on the issue, the Vice-Chancellor made the statement that the matter would be looked into.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 22.02.2015, as per **Appendix-XXXVII**, be approved.

Recommendations of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 12.2.2015

40. Considered and

RESOLVED: That the following recommendations (Item 3, 19 and 33) of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 12.2.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) of Directorate of Sports, be approved and the same to be incorporated in the Official Handbook of PUSC:

Item 3

The Committee has sanctioned and approved to pay @ Rs.400/- per head per day extra to the members of Selection Committee for the selection of P.U. teams if the session continues beyond seven hours at par with the officials deputed for the conduct of Inter-College tournaments as already approved by the Executive Committee, PUSC in its meeting held on 13.12.2013 as the members of the Selection Committee work together in coordination with the officials and the time and duration of both are same.

Item 19

The Committee has sanctioned and approved the amendment of the following rates during Inter-University Competitions:

Sr. No.	Head	Existing rates of Panjab University	Proposed rates of Panjab University
1.	Team leaving Chandigarh after 12.00 Noon	Half DA	Full DA
2.	Incidental Charges to Officials (Manager and Coach) who accompany the P.U. teams for Inter-University competitions	Single fare of III Tier AC of Shatabadi or single Bus fare equal to Volvo whichever is less	Single fare of III Tier AC/AC Chair Car in all Trains including Rajdhani, Shatabadi, Jan Shatabadi, Garib Rath, Duronto and Mail/Express trains or Bus fare Deluxe and Volvo whichever is less

- Justification: 1. The players are neither paid DA of the coaching camp nor of the journey day of the very same day on which the journey is to be performed, hence it is proposed that the players should be paid full DA of the journey day so that they should eat their breakfast, lunch and dinner.
2. III Tier AC of Shatabadi train does not exist.

Item 33

The Committee has approved the request submitted by the CMO, BGJ Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for the enhancement of honorarium/ remuneration that if the tournaments continues beyond seven hours then the doctor/s on duty be paid @ Rs.1000/-+Rs.400/- per head per day extra at par with the officials deputed.

Resolution Proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar and Dr. Hardiljit Singh, Fellows

41. Considered the following Resolutions proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar, and Dr. Hardiljit Singh, Fellows:

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 27th 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 to 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 27th 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: 1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 12.7.2014 (Para 33) has resolved that the above-said Resolution proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar and Dr. Hardiljit Singh, Fellows, along with Explanatory Note, be referred to a Committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for consideration in the **first instance**.

2. The Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, dated 16.01.2015 made its recommendations as per **Appendix-XXXIX**.

RESOLVED: 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 (**Appendix-XXXIX**), be approved.

Conferment of title of Honorary Professor on Mr. Ashok Thakur, IAS (Retd.)

42. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the title of Honorary Professor in the Department of Public Administration, be conferred on Mr. Ashok Thakur IAS (Retd.) former Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, and former Deputy Director at Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Mussourie.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 18 appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

"Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the clause of education, the designation

of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes”.

2. The Joint Meeting of Academic and Administrative Committee dated 18.02.2015, Department of Public Administration (**Appendix-XL**), has recommended that the title of Honorary Professors be conferred on Mr. Ashok Thakur, IAS (Retd.) in the Department of Public Administration .
3. Bio-Data of Mr. Ashok Thakur, IAS (Retd.), former Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, is enclosed (**Appendix-XL**).

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that Syndicate could recommend only recommend conferment of Honorary Professorship on anyone of the University Teaching Departments but could not confer the same itself.

Referring to the minutes of the Academic and Administrative Committees meeting held on 18.2.2015, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is clearly mentioned in the Calendar that any person to be recommended for appointment as Honorary Professor has to be “distinguished teacher” who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education. He remarked that he had no doubt about Mr. Ashok Thakur’s eminence. He could be a best bureaucrat and senior IAS Officer who has been holding the charge of so many Academies and has worked as Secretary Education, Government of India, but he could not be equated with the distinguished teacher as the bureaucrats could be appointed Directors or Deputy Directors of the Academies. His name was recommended to be appointed as Honorary Professor in the Department of Public Administration whereas, he has Masters in History. Since, he had been an Education Secretary, he could have been recommended for appointment as Honorary Professor in the Department of Education or in History. He was of the view that he could be appointed as a Guest Faculty, but he could not be appointed as Honorary Professor. The distinguished teachers could only be appointed as Honorary Professors as per the provision of the Act. There is another provision in the Act to honour eminent persons under which they could be conferred *Honoris Causa* Degrees. One of the members in the joint meeting of the Administrative and Academic Committee had also reiterated her reservation on his appointment as Honorary Professor in the Department of Public Administration. For recommending such Honorary Professorship, the recommendations of the Committee should be unanimous. Keeping in view the recommendations as placed before this House, instead of giving him honour, they are unnecessarily bringing him into controversy. Ultimately, these recommendations would go to the Chancellor. It is the Chancellor who appoints Honorary Professors and it is not the Vice-Chancellor/Syndicate and Senate. They could recommend the name only if they certify themselves that he/she is a distinguished teacher.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is a distinguished teacher of Public Administration subject. He has worked as a faculty member at the Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Mussourie for 3 years and has taught Watershed Development and Dry land Farming, Innovation in Government, Administrative Reforms, Computer Application in Government, etc. Apart from being the Course Director of programs, he has also lectured extensively and also wrote a few papers at the Institution level. He had good experience of formulating and designing the course work and curriculum for the IAS trainees. He had personal experience with him when he had delivered the P.U. colloquium address at the University. There is no precise definition for teacher, a person who has taught for 5 years or 10 years or more anyone who has performed teaching duties can be treated as teacher. Keeping in view his bio-data and the fact that he has taught as a faculty member at Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Mussourie for 3 years and in the light of that, the Department of Public Administration of P.U. has reached to someone and recommended him to be appointed as Honorary Professor in the Department of Public Administration, such a choice is not wrong. To take advantage of his expertise, he is being recommended for appointment as Honorary Professor, one could appoint him for a limited period of 3-5 years to start with, if someone has reservations. His choice would be good thing for the Department of Public Administration as he would interact with the young students here. Somebody of the stature of Mr. Ashok Thakur, who is an alumnus of this University, would be advantageous for the Department of Public Administration of this University. Citing examples, he stated that Dr. Abdul Kalam was approached for appointment as a Chair Professor in TIFR, Mumbai, when he was not the President of India in the field of science without having any served in an academic institution. Dr. Gurdial Singh was also made Professor by Punjabi University, Patiala. When Shri Kailash Satyarthi was selected to be honoured with *Honoris Causa* degree by the University, at that time, queries were also raised whether he had some academic background.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the word 'Confer' should be replaced with 'recommend to the Chancellor' as they are nobody to confer Honorary Professorship on anyone.

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

Professor Ronki Ram said that Mr. Ashok Thakur has professional training at IIM, Ahmadabad; International Institute of Public Administration, Paris, France. Keeping in view that spirit, he should be appointed as Honorary Professor in the Department of Public Administration.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she appreciates the bio-data of Mr. Thakur and the concern shown by Professor Ronki Ram. She had also attended the colloquium delivered by him. As per the Calendar, it is the distinguished teacher who could be appointed as Honorary Professor in the Departments and deliver few lectures every year to the students. They could only recommend for appointing Honorary Professors to the persons who have eminent teaching background in renowned institutions. Hence, there is a technical flaw in it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they ought not to doubt the ability of Mr. Ashok Thakur.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they did not doubt his ability.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they should differentiate between the regular teacher and casual teachers. As per the provision of the Act under Section 18, it had been mentioned that “in addition to the whole-time teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes”.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that as per Regulation, he is totally in agreement with it. He had got an idea from this and he would request the Dean, Faculty of Law, as so many retired Judges of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court are residing in Chandigarh. They could call them to deliver few lectures to the students of University Institute of Legal Studies and Department of Laws. He was of the view that they could not call them Honorary Professors, and instead they could call them as Visiting Professors. He suggested that they should differentiate between Emeritus Professors, Honorary Professor and Visiting Professors. As far as his opinion, the Visiting Professors are not Honorary Professors. By just changing the nomenclature, if they could change the nomenclature of the Honorary Professors as Visiting Professors, it would be more appropriate.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Yog Raj Angish stated that keeping in view his vast experience, they should recommend his appointment as Honorary Professor in the Department of Public Administration. Earlier, they thought that there is some technical problem, but when the Vice-Chancellor read out his bio-data, it was very clear to them. He was of the view that they should recommend his name for appointment as proposed.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that Mr. Ashok Thakur is a person of high stature and young people would definitely learn from him when he would deliver lectures in the Department of Public Administration. They were not appointing him for the whole semester, but to deliver few lectures occasionally in addition to interaction with M.A. students. They could also take advantage of his expertise in designing the course modules of the syllabi of IAS Coaching Centre and students in this Centre could also learn from him. It was in that spirit that he had proposed his name for appointing him as Honorary Professor. Professor Ajit Singh from Cambridge University had also come to deliver two-three lectures in this University during his each visit. He had gone to hear his lectures.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he had gone through the bio-data of Mr. Ashok Thakur. Being a Secretary of Education, he had a vast experience in various fields, such as IITs, NITs and IIMs. He was of the view that his name should be recommended for appointing him as Honorary Professor.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the Department of Public Administration had just proposed the name of Shri Ashok Thakur for conferring the title of Honorary Professor on him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that after having information about him, he had no doubt about his ability. But he wanted to know from where he has been selected to be appointed as Honorary Professor in Public Administration, why not in the Department of Education? His name was proposed to be appointed as Honorary Professor in Public Administration just because he was the Director/Deputy Director of Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy of Public Administration, Mussorie. He had been Secretary Education and might be the best man on the earth, but he could not be treated at par with teachers. As per the provision of University Act, only distinguished teachers could be recommended to be appointed as Honorary Professors. They had also provision for conferring *Honoris Causa* Degrees to any person of eminence and could be awarded *Honoris Causa* Degree under Section 23 of the Act with 2/3 majority of the Syndicate members. Under this section, they could cover each and every section of the society. Now, they are trying to stretch by saying that he has been Secretary Education, he has been Deputy Director of Lal Bahadur Academy of Public Administration, Mussorie, but could not be equated with distinguished teachers under this section.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he differed with them on this point. He had said that as per his bio-data, he had worked as a faculty member at the Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussorie for three years. It was just in that context.

Thereafter, the Vice-Chancellor sought consent of all the members present in the House in the form of voting.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that they are honouring Shri Ashok Thakur, a person of such a high caliber by recommending his name to be appointed as Honorary Professor, he was not in favour of voting. So he wanted to abstain himself from voting.

Twelve members including the Vice-Chancellor voted in favour of recommending the name of Shri Ashok Thakur for appointing him as Honorary Professor in the Department of Public Administration. Three members, namely, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Naresh Gaur were not in favour of appointing him as Honorary Professor. Professor Karamjeet Singh abstained from the voting.

Since majority of the members were in favour of recommending Shri Ashok Thakur to be appointed as Honorary Professor in the Department of Public Administration, it was –

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Chancellor that the title of Honorary Professor in the Department of Public Administration, be conferred on Mr. Ashok Thakur IAS (Retd.), former Education Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, and former Deputy Director at Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Mussorie.

eligible students of teaching departments and USOL for financial assistance, out of Student Aid Fund for the Session 2014-15.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 19.02.2015 of the meeting of the Students Aid Fund Administration Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider the applications of the eligible students of teaching departments and USOL for financial assistance, out of Student Aid Fund for the Session 2014-15, be approved, as per appendix.

At this stage, Referring to the minutes of the meeting of the Students Aid Fund Administration Committee dated 19.2.2015 Chaired by the Dean of University Instruction, Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the funds were available in the Student Aid Fund, he failed to understand that from where this idea came, that financial assistance under this scheme, should not in any case exceed the total tuition fee and monthly charges being deposited by the student annually as per the approved fee structure for all the courses in the University Teaching Departments or subject to the maximum of Rs.10,000/- and Rs.9,000/- in the respective income slabs, whichever is lower. With this idea, the students who had got Rs.8000/- as financial assistance last year, now was reduced to Rs.2200/- in spite of the fact that there is no financial crunch and the funds are available. He pointed out that the issue of financial assistance to the students out of the Students Aid Fund should be looked into.

Issue regarding payment of Rs.11,56,234/- to Dr. (Mrs.) Amrit Tewari

44. Considered if, the payment of Rs.11,56,234/- be made to Dr.(Mrs.) Amrit Tewari W/o Late Dr. V.N. Tewari, Professor, School of Punjabi Studies, (who was killed in terrorist action on 03.04.1984), as special family pension, as a welfare measure, out of the budget head 'Salary of the USOL'.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.10.1992 (Para 13) (**Appendix-XLII**) resolved as under:

“That Punjab Govt. instruction as contained in its letter No.9/7/85-6GE/16530 dated 14.07.1987 be adopted for grant of financial assistant to the families of University employees killed in terrorist action.

Further, resolved that for future instruction issued by the Punjab Govt. be adopted automatically for grant of financial assistant to the families of University employees killed in terrorist action.

2. In term of the above decision of Syndicate and office order issued vide No.728/Estt.I dated 19.03.1993 (**Appendix-XLII**), Dr. (Mrs.) Amrit Tewari w/o Late Professor V.N. Tewari, School of Punjabi Studies who was killed in terrorist action on 3.4.1984 was sanctioned special family pension, on the basis of last pay which was to be drawn

by late Professor Tewari till 31.3.1996 i.e. the date of his superannuation.

3. As per report of the Accounts Branch, neither such payment was claimed by Dr. (Mrs.) Amrit Tewari W/o Late Professor V.N. Tewari nor the office could find any record of such payment.
4. As per clause 5.15 at page 42 of the Accounts Manual 2012, all claims against the University, except TA bills, can be entertained for payment if, received in the Accounts Branch with in a period of three years, from the date of payment become due.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that why money was not given to them for so long. Why it was pending in the University? Did she claim the payment now?

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had received a note from Professor S.K. Sharma, former Dean of University Instruction for this purpose and that was why the payment is being proposed to be made to Dr. (Mrs.) Amrit Tewari.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the decision had been taken by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.10.1992 (Para 13). He was surprised to note why the payment was not made to her.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had asked the office regarding the representation and the office informed him that no representation had been received. A month ago, he had received a telephone call from Mrs. Tewari. She told that she had never received the money. He asked the Finance & Development Officer that why payment is being made after 30 years. He told that being a time bar case, it require the endorsement of the Syndicate for releasing the payment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that where it is written that it is time bar. It is a very serious issue. How the University is making payment without a claim? What about the interest of 17 years? He was of the view that it is to be certified by some competent officer of the University that payment has not been made.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath informed that as per the Punjab Government Rules, if any person killed in a terrorist attack, special family pension equal to the last pay drawn till the date of superannuation and thereafter normal family pension as admissible under the rules be paid to the family of such employee.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that University should depute somebody to get the claim form signed from Mrs. Amrit Tewari and in the meantime it should be ensured that payment was not been made to her on this account. This is something which could be checked from 1993 onwards and not from 1984.

It was clarified that the ECRs of 1996, 1997 and 1998 were checked and it was found that no payment had been made. There was no record of payment made on monthly basis in the ECRs from 1996 onwards.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as the decision was taken in October 1992, they should check the ECRs from 1993 onwards.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that in the meantime, a certificate from the wife of Professor V.N. Tewari be obtained that they had not claimed/received this amount earlier.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That payment of Rs.11,56,234/- be made to Dr. (Mrs.) Amrit Tewari W/o Late Shri V.N. Tewari, Professor, School of Punjabi Studies, (who was killed in terrorist action on 03.04.1984), as special family pension, as a welfare measure, out of the budget head 'Salary of the University School of Open Learning'.

Issue regarding centralized admissions to B.Com. course in the Colleges in District Ludhiana

45. Considered and

RESOLVED: That the following recommendations dated 25.02.2015 (**Appendix-XLIII**) of the Committee constituted in pursuance of decision of the Syndicate dated 25.01.2015 (Item No.39) for Centralized admission to B.Com. course in the affiliated colleges situated in District Ludhiana, be approved:

1. No centralized admission be made for admission to B.Com. course for the colleges of District Ludhiana. The Colleges may make the admissions at their own level for the session 2015-16.
2. The Principals of the colleges be requested to put the merit list of the students for admission to B.Com. course for the session 2015-16 on the web-site of their respective colleges. A copy of the admitted candidates along with merit list be sent to the University.
3. The University may appoint observers to check the admission process in the colleges situated in Ludhiana.

Extension in validity date of Advt. No.1/2014 for filling up posts of Assistant Professors

46. Considered if, the validity date of Advt. No. 1/2014 for filling up the posts of Assistant Professor in Computer Science and Engineering-3 (Gen) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology (UIET), be extended for a period of six months from the date of lapse of the advertisement i.e. 04.03.2015 to complete the process. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XLIV**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That the validity date of Advt. No.1/2014 for filling up the posts of Assistant Professor in Computer Science and Engineering-3 (Gen) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology (UIET), be extended for a period of six months from the date of lapse of the advertisement, i.e., 04.03.2015 to complete the process.

Routine and formal matters

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

- (i) 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: 1. 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.

2. Rule 4.1 appearing at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 reads as under:

“4.1. the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

(ii) In pursuance of office orders No. 557-67/Estt.I dated 20.01.2015 (**Appendix-XLV**) 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
--	--	---------------------

- (iii) 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.
- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation 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.
- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the recommendation dated 19.01.2015 (**Appendix-XLVI**) of Administrative & Academic Committee, UIET, that one post of Professor and two posts of Associate Professors, be transferred to UILS and Centre for Microbial Biotechnology, respectively from the University Institute of Engineering & Technology.
- NOTE:** An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLVI**).
- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Joint Academic and Administrative Committee of the University Centre for Instrumentation & Microelectronics dated 10.12.2014 (**Appendix-XLVII**), that the admission to the M.Tech. (Instrumentation) course be limited to GATE qualified candidates w.e.f. session 2015-16 and the PU-CET (P.G.) for the said course be abolished.
- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation (Item No.6) of the meeting of the Research Promotion Cell dated 23.12.2014 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) with regard to Recognition of CRRID & IDC as approved Research Centre for the purpose of Ph.D. supervision in Social Sciences.
- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in pursuance of the UGC letter No.F.No.1-54/2013 (CC/NVEQF) dated 13.08.2014 (**Appendix-XLIX**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the following provision for the scheme of Community Colleges:

“The College concerned should itself award Diploma/Certificate under its own seal and signature after a written authorization from the affiliating University. However, the College should

mention the name of the affiliating University and the scheme on the award.”

- NOTE:**
1. A circular vide No. 14085-109/AOC dated 11.12.2014 (**Appendix-XLIX**) has been issued by the D.R.(Colleges) to the Principals of all affiliated Colleges of Panjab University.
 2. The Syndicate dated 26.10.2014 (Para 10) (**Appendix-XLIX**) has resolved that:
 1. xxx xxx xxx
 2. xxx xxx xxx
 3. xxx xxx xxx
 4. the paper setting, examination and evaluation shall be done by the University. The details have been approved by the Syndicate in the meeting held on 26.04.2014 vide Para 11 (**Appendix-XLIX**).
 3. During discussion in the Syndicate meeting dated 13.9.2014/ 26.9.2014, under Item 8 (**Appendix-XLIX**), Dr. Dalip Kumar has stated that on 13.08.2014, the UGC had written a special letter pertaining to conduct of examinations and issuance of certificate and according to the letter, run under the Community Colleges Scheme and issue certificate at their own level.
 4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLIX**).

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed that the No Objection Certificate, be issued to A.S. College, Khanna (Ludhiana) Punjab, for forwarding the cases to the Education Officer (NSQF), University Grant Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi, under the UGC scheme of Deen Dayal Upadhyay Centres of Knowledge Acquisition and Up-gradation of Skilled Human Abilities and Livelihood (KAUSHAL KENDRAS) during XII Plan period in the following subjects:

1. M.Voc. (Web Graphics & Animation)
2. M.Voc. (Banking, Insurance & Retailing)
3. PG Diploma in Stock Market (Trading & Operations)

NOTE:1. Letter No. A/M.Voc./1804 dated 27.1.2015 received from Principal, A.S. College, Khanna (Ludhiana) Punjab and NOC issued by D.R. (Colleges) is enclosed (**Appendix-L**).

2. Public notice issued vide No.F.4-10/2014(NSQF) dated 01.01.2015 by Professor (Dr.) Jaspal S. Sandhu, Secretary, University Grants Commission (Ministry of Human Resource Development, Govt. of India), New Delhi, enclosed (**Appendix-L**).

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed, to allot residential accommodation at the P.U. campus to Shri Rakesh Kumar, Physiotherapist, Director of Sports, on priority basis at par with the Paramedical Staff working in the P.U. Health Centre, under the rule 4.7 appearing at page 56 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

NOTE: 1. Rule 4.7 appearing at page 56 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, reproduced below:

“The following shall be provided rent free (un-furnished) residential accommodation at the campus or house rent allowance in lieu thereof as per rules:

1. xxx xxx xxx

2. xxx xxx xxx

3. Medical Officers as also paramedical staff in the University Health Centre.

2. The Physiotherapist provides his services at odd hours early morning to sports persons and also available for emergency services for orthopedic cases of Health Centre. Thus, Physiotherapist is a paramedical staff of P.U.

3. A copy of allotment letter issued by D.R. (Estate) vide No.482-487/D/Estate dated 9.2.2015 to Shri Rakesh Kumar enclosed (**Appendix-LI**).

Referring to Sub-Items R-(iii) and R-(iv), Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that he personally thought that whenever posts for Regional Centres are advertised, very few persons apply. For example,

only 2-3 persons applied out of whom one person is selected, which according to him is a backdoor entry. He was of the considered view that this is an important issue and the same had been discussed by him with 2-3 members. The PUTA had also sent an e-mail to all the members of the Syndicate in this regard. If the persons are so good/intelligent, they could compete openly. Therefore, the persons appointed at Regional Centres should not be transferred to the University Campus at Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the person, who was working at Kauni, is Assistant Professor in the subject of History. He had also appeared in an interview for the post of Assistant Professor in the Department of History. He had displayed an outstanding piece of scholarship during the interview and the members of the Selection Committee were impressed from his single handed work. He could not be appointed as only one position of Assistant Professor advertised, but the Selection Committee did recommended that if he becomes a part of the Department of History here, he would emerge as a tall leader keeping in view his devotion. If any vacancy of Assistant Professor in the Department of History arises later on and the Department represents that a person is required, then this person could be transferred from Kauni to Dept of History, Panjab University, Chandigarh. In another case, a request has been made by an individual. He was told that if transfer is allowed, his seniority could not be restored and he would be placed at the bottom of the hierarchy here. Willingness of the Director, Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, and the Chairperson, University Institute of Legal Studies had been taken. The person concerned had clearly been told that later on his claim for seniority, etc. would not be considered. These are the circumstances under which these two transfers have been made.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that, in future, this should not be quoted as a precedent.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if the person is so intelligent, then he should have been appointed as Assistant Professor in the Department of History when he appeared in the interview.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person appointed as Assistant Professor in History at that time was superior to him. They could look at the proceedings of the Selection Committee.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that a practice is there since long for transferring the teachers to University Campus even prior to the establishment of Regional Centres. He informed that 25 years ago a teacher of Sanskrit had been transferred from Sadhu Ashram, Hoshiarpur to the Department of Sanskrit, Panjab University, Chandigarh. As such, the practice of transfer of teacher/s to the University Campus at Chandigarh is very much there. The teachers of Regional Centres are equivalent to University teachers. Moreover, it is also being mentioned in the appointment letters of the teachers that they could be transferred to any department of the University. Hence, the transfer made should be ratified.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that good teachers are also required at Regional Centres and they should transfer teachers from Chandigarh to Regional Centres.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that if any teacher wanted his/her transfer from the University Campus at Chandigarh to P.U. Regional Centres or vice versa, his/her request should be considered and accepted.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that once a man is appointed, the University could post him/her at any Department of the University at Chandigarh or the Regional Centre of the University. Similarly, they are allowing migration of the students of Regional Centres without any fee.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he wanted to remind them about the decision of the Syndicate and Senate that when the Regional Centres at Sri Muktsar Sahib and Ludhiana were opened, it was decided that no teacher would be transferred from Chandigarh to there. When a teacher was transferred from Sri Muktsar Sahib to Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh and was allotted residential accommodation, he was reverted back at the intervention of the Chancellor. The name of the person was Dr. Vinod Kumar. Now, the Vice-Chancellor is saying that he had not handled any such case during his tenure, which is probably wrong. A brilliant lady (Ms. Savita Grover) is an English teacher at Rural Centre, Kauni. After her engagement, she had requested for transfer against vacant post of English teacher at Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur; however, her request was regretted just 4-6 months back saying that no such transfer could be allowed. He clarified that he should not be misunderstood as he was not against transfers at all. If somebody, who has been working in the Department of Evening Studies, wanted to shift to the Main Department of the University, he/she is not being allowed on the plea that he/she has to face the Selection Committee/appear in the interview. The person is Professor Akshay Kumar, former President, PUTA. Professor Karamjeet Singh is very much right that if the University invites applications for any post and mention in the advertisement that after selection the person could be posted and transferred anywhere, then it is okay, but if the applications are called for a particular place, then it is not right. According to him, most compassionate cases were rejected by this University. Though the vacancies are available in the Departments, several requests for transfer are pending in the University. Let all of them be transferred. In one of the case of transfer from Hoshiarpur to University Institute of Legal Studies, it has been mentioned that his salary would be charged as such against the post of Assistant Professor in Law, Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur. He recalled, in the case of transfer of Dr. Jasbir Singh from Kauni to Chandigarh, in the column, which is made for Wait-listed candidates, the Selection Committee wrote that he should be transferred from Kauni to Chandigarh, which is not within the purview of the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee could only recommend advance increments. If the person is so meritorious, then the post could be advertised in the Department of History and he should compete with other candidates. If found suitable only then he should be appointed; otherwise, Pandora's Box of such cases would be opened. Tomorrow how would they say no to other persons, especially against the vacancies which are yet to be advertised. In the light of that, the University should make a transfer policy. In the absence of that, if University allows transfer to anyone, it would become pick & choose policy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a pick & choose policy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had given the names and the Vice-Chancellor could verify the same.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that they had advertised three posts of Assistant Professors of Law for University Institute of Legal Studies. It was challenged and the Court in its stay order instructed that no person belonging to tribal category be appointed. This man though belongs to ST category, is working against the general post at Hoshiarpur. At Hoshiarpur four persons had already been appointed. Presently, they are facing great difficulty in managing the affairs of the University Institute of Legal Studies. They had requested the Vice-Chancellor that they require the services of this person at University Institute of Legal Studies. Moreover, the wife of this person is also working here and the Vice-Chancellor has acceded to their request and the matter is now before the Syndicate for ratification. A policy decision was taken during the tenure of Professor R.C. Sobti, former Vice-Chancellor, that the persons appointed in the University could be posted anywhere.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was not right. In fact, it is being mentioned in the appointment letter 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.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that with the transfer of this person from Hoshiarpur to Chandigarh, the seniority of anybody here is not disturbed, rather the University Institute of Legal Studies is benefitted with his services.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it is not fair that they had received less number of applications against the posts advertised for Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur. Recently, they had advertised the posts for Law at Hoshiarpur and they received more than 100 applications against 4 posts. They could not say that talented/ competent people did not apply for the posts at Regional Centres.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that, perhaps, he had sent an e-mail to the Vice-Chancellor. In principle, he was in favour of the transfer, but a transfer policy needs to be framed. He informed that the Director of Regional Centre, Ludhiana had issued four NOCs to the faculty members. Secondly, the girl from Kauni who had requested for transfer from there to Hoshiarpur should also been considered as she had married at Hoshiarpur.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the case of that girl for transfer to Kauni to Hoshiarpur would be looked into it. He would not do any pick and choose.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that one of the Engineering Branches at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, had already been closed and two regular faculty members had requested for their transfer from there to University Institute of Engineering & Technology to which the Director, Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, and Dr. Renu Vij, Director, University Institute of Engineering &

Technology, had already given their consent. He pleaded that their transfer should be made.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the members about their consent in respect of **47-R-(iii) and R-(iv)**, to which Professor Karamjeet Singh, Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill in once voice said that if the house decides to ratify these transfers, their dissent should be recorded as they could not adopt any pick and choose policy.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that all other applications for transfer should be considered by framing a transfer policy.

Professor A.K Bhandari said that all transfers should be made together.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that till a transfer policy is framed, no transfer should be made.

Concluding the discussion, the Vice-Chancellor said that majority of the members were in favour of these transfer, therefore, these transfers be treated as ratified.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Item 47 – R-(i) to (R-x)** on the agenda, be ratified.

Routine and formal matters

48. The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(xvii)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

- (i)** The Vice-Chancellor, has allowed
1. that the period of EOL from 30.12.2014 to 4.1.2015 out of the period of E.O.L. without pay (1.10.2013 to 30.09.2015) already sanctioned to Dr. Archana R. Singh, Professor, School of Communication Studies, P.U., in terms of Syndicate decision dated 22.02.2014 (Para 11), be treated as cancelled, on account of her joining as Professor under CAS, on 30.12.2014 under rule 6 and 12 at page 95 of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2009; and
 2. Dr. Archana R. Singh to rejoin the ICSSR, Senior Fellowship w.e.f. 05.01.2015
- (ii)** The Vice-Chancellor has appointed the following as Assistant Professors at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for the Academic Session 2014-15 or till the regular posts are filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the Grade of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible under the University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name/Designation
1.	Dr. Poonam Sood

	(Preventive and Community Dentistry)
2.	Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal (Periodontics)
3.	Dr. Puneet (Prosthodontics)

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to him/her 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 departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed the following as Associate Professors at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for the Academic Session 2014-15 or till the regular posts are filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the Grade of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600/- +NPA plus other allowances as admissible under the University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name/Designation	
1.	Dr. Lalit Kumar (Prosthodontics)	
2.	*Dr. Shipra Gupta (Periodontics)	*Dr. Shipra Gupta will be awarded three increments, in view of high academic achievement and teaching experience in P.U.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to him/her 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 departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Vishakha Grover as Associate Professor in Periodontics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for the Academic Session 2014-15 or till the regular post is filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the Grade of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600/- + NPA plus allowances, admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to him/her 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 departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Rose Kanwaljeet Kaur as Assistant Professor in Periodontics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for the Academic Session 2014-15 or till the regular post is filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the Grade of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances, as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to him/her 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 departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed the following persons as Assistant Professors at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date they start work against the posts lying vacant in the Department, for the Academic session 2014-2015 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP Rs.6000/- plus allowances, under Regulation 5 appearing at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Mr. Amit Katoch (Tourism Management)
2. Mr. Manoj Semwal (Hotel Management).

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to him/her 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 departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

- (vii) To note the information provided by Professor O.P. Katare, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences vide application dated 23.01.2015 (**Appendix-LII**).

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in pursuance of the interim orders dated 30.06.2014, 1.12.2014 and 9.1.2015 passed by Hon'ble

Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs Panjab University and Another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP (617 of 2015), has ordered that the following Faculty members be continued in their service subject to the decision of the writ petitions:

Sr. No.	Name of Faculty member	Department/Centre/Institute
1.	Professor B.S. Ghuman	Department of Public Administration
2.	Professor Amar Nath Gill	Department of Statistics
3.	Professor Sanjay Wadwalkar	School of Communication Studies
4.	Professor L.K. Bansal	University School of Open Learning
5.	Professor Lovelina Singh	Department of English & Cultural Studies
6.	Professor Manju Malhotra	University School of Open Learning
7.	Dr. Bimal Rai	Department of Physics
8.	*Professor (Dr.) A.S. Ahluwalia	Department of Botany
9.	*Professor (Dr.) Sukhdev Singh	School of Punjabi Studies

*The Vice-Chancellor, has further ordered that the retiral benefits already sanctioned and conveyed to the above faculty members vide office order No.687-94/Estt.-I dated 24.01.2015 & No. 695-702/Estt. Dated 24.1.2015 be treated as withdrawn for the time being till the Court Case/s is finalized.

NOTE: The case has now been adjourned to 3.3.2015 by the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana.

(ix) In continuation of office order No. 1488-1638/Estt.I dated 28.02.2014 and 6159-64/Estt.I dated 09.07.2014 (**Appendix-LIII**), the Vice-Chancellor, has extended the term of appointment of Professor Anil Monga, as Dean Alumni Relations for another year w.e.f. 01.03.2015.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 1, page 109 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007 which reads as under:

“The Senate on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate may appoint a Dean of Alumni Relations, such appointment may be made for a year to year but the maximum period for which a person may hold this office shall not exceed five (consecutive) years”.

2. Professor Anil Monga, Centre for Police Administration was appointed as Dean Alumni Relations for one year w.e.f. 01.03.2014 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.03.2014 vide

Para 9 and Senate in its meeting dated 28.09.2014 vide Para IX under above quoted regulation, thus his present term of one year will expire on 28.2.2015.

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the decision dated 19.12.2014 of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 19285 of 2011, has approved the appointment of Dr. Puja Ahuja as Assistant Professor at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, P.U. in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- (subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 17501 of 2011) and she will deemed to have confirmed as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 1.10.2012 i.e. after one year from the deemed date of joining, subject to work and conduct report to be submitted by HOD on completion of her one year service, from the date of actual joining.

- NOTE:**
1. The posts of Assistant Professors-6 (Gen.-5, SC-1) for Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education was advertised vide Advt. No. 11/2010 dated 27.07.2010.
 2. The Selection Committee dated 01.08.2011 had recommended that the following persons appointed as Assistant Professors at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, P.U:

i) Rekha Rani	}	General Category
ii) Kamal Preet Kaur		
iii) Kalpana Thakur		
iv) Amritpal Kaur (SC Category)		
 3. Dr. (Ms.) Puja Ahuja was one of the candidates, who attended the Interview for the post of Assistant Professor, but she was not selected by the Selection Committee and she moved to the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide CWP No. 19285 of 2011 challenging the recommendation of the Selection Committee. However, as per interim orders of the High Court dated 14.10.2011, the Respondent University was directed to keep one post of Assistant Professor as Reserved.
 4. The Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide order dated 19.12.2014 directed the Respondent i.e. Panjab University to appoint Dr. Puja Ahuja as Assistant Professor and the period

of her joining and till the date of her actual joining may be treated as notional since no monetary benefits are to be granted to the petitioner except for other consequential benefits such as seniority etc.

5. A detailed office note along with appointment letter issued to Dr. Puja Ahuja, vide No. 600/Estt.I dated 22.01.2015 is enclosed **(Appendix-LIV)**

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor, has allowed Ms. Ranjana Bhandari, Research Scholar, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), to engage Dr. Jyoti Kumar Paliwal, a senior Scientist/Medical Advisor, Troikaa Pharmaceuticals, Ahmedabad, as Joint-Supervisor, as a special case.

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor (Mrs.) Pushpinder Syal, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U., will work as Advisor & Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor, during the leave period of Professor Madhu Raka, A.S.V.C., with immediate effect, till further orders.

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, has accepted the additional donation of Rs. 1,00,000/- (One lac only) made by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram H.No. 362, Sector-9, Panchkula, for purchase of books/scholarship/ tuition fee, to the needy/poor students, out of Student Aid Fund Account

- NOTE:**
1. The said amount has been deposited in Student Aid Fund Account vide Receipt No.7901 dated 08.01.2015 and credit the same has also been received in the account no. 10444984461 on 13.01.2015 and a copy of income tax Exemption Certificate duly signed by the Registrar, P.U., Chandigarh, has been provided to the donor to avail income tax benefits during the year 2014-15.
 2. The Senate at its meeting dated 28.09.2014 (Para LII) **(Appendix-LV)** has accepted the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Shri Radha Krishan.
 3. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-LV).**

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor has approved the minutes dated 21.11.2014 **(Appendix-LVI)** of the Travel Subsidy Committee for grant of Travel Subsidy to certain Faculty members for attending International Conference outside India out of the UGC 12th Plan grant under 'General Development Assistance Scheme' under the budget head 'Travel Grant'.

NOTE: The Syndicate meeting dated 26.04.2014 (Para-31) while approving the recommendations of the Travel Subsidy Committee dated 03.03.2014 has also authorized the Vice-Chancellor to sanction Travel Subsidy to the teachers on behalf of the Syndicate. Thereafter, item be brought to the Syndicate for information.

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. H.P. Sah Professor Department of Philosophy	01.09.1994	31.01.2015	(i) Gratuity as Admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007.
2.	Dr. Belu Jain Maheshwari Associate Professor Department of History	19.12.1994 (AN)	31.01.2015	(ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of 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.

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Om Parkash Sharma Superintendent Accounts Branch	24.02.1982	28.02.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University
2.	Ms. Shashi Kanta Ahuja Superintendent UIAMS	20.03.1982	28.02.2015	

				Regulations	
3.	Mrs. Sharda Devi Superintendent Examination Branch II	18.03.1982	28.02.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.	
4.	Shri Parmod Kumar Senior Technician G-II Department of Geology	09.05.1984	31.01.2015		
5.	Ms. Shobha Bhandari Senior Assistant UMC	16.11.1983	28.02.2015		
6.	Shri Ajmer Singh Mason (Technician G-II) P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	28.02.2015		
7.	Shri Ajmer Singh Cleaner/Jamadar P.U. Construction Office	22.07.1970	28.02.2015		
8.	Shri Om Parkash Library Restorer Guru Nanak Sikh Studies	08.01.1988	31.03.2015		
9.	Shri Ram Narayan Operator-cum-Restorer University Business School	21.01.1974	28.02.2015		
10.	Shri Pyare Lal Carpenter (Jr. Technician) P.U. Construction Office	11.06.1979	31.01.2015		
11.	Shri Balwant Rai Plumber P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	31.01.2015		
12.	Shri Ranjit Singh Work Inspector (Jr. Technician) P.U. Construction Office	19.12.1973	31.01.2015		
13.	Shri Ashok Kumar Sharma Superintendent Department of Youth Welfare	05.11.1975	28.02.2015		Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
14.	Shri Raje Singh Superintendent Colleges Branch	09.06.1975	28.02.2015		
15.	Shri Shiv Sharma Stenographer Department of Punjabi Lexicography	18.09.1974	28.02.2015		

16.	Shri Som Nath Head Draftsman P.U. Construction Office	05.06.1981	28.02.2015	
-----	---	------------	------------	--

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

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned terminal benefits to the members of the family of the following employees who passed away while in service:

Sr. No.	Name of the deceased employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of death (while in service)	Name of the family member/s to whom the terminal benefits are to be given	Benefits
1.	Late Shri Devinder Singh Senior Assistant SC/ST Cell Panjab University	01.08.1975	22.11.2014	Smt. Gurdeep Kaur (Wife)	Gratuity and Ex-gratia grant as admissible under the University Regulations and Rules
2.	Late Shri Ram Kumar Cleaner P.U. Construction Office	01.07.1984	07.07.2014	Smt. Veena (Wife)	

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

Referring to Sub-Item 48-I-(xii), Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the leave rules of the re-employed teachers needs to be amended. Recently, Dr. Devi Sirohi had got a better opportunity in another Institution. If they give relief to the re-employed teachers after amending the rules, it would be technically better for them.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether Professor Madhu Raka had proceeded on leave as re-employed teacher or as ASVC. How could it be possible that on one hand a person is attending the Department as re-employed teacher and on other hand seeking leave from other assignment, ASVC?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not know whether she is coming to the Department of Mathematics or not as he is not marking attendance in the Departments. In fact, she had telephonically told him that she could not come to the office for three weeks due to some domestic reasons. **However, the matter would be looked into.**

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Item 48-I-(i) to 48-I-(xvii)** on the agenda, be noted.

After decisions on the agenda items were taken, the members started general discussion.

- (1) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that recently Panjab University had granted Golden Chance to the students of annual system examinations to clear their compartments/to improve their performance. He informed that in their College B.Sc. (Agriculture) and some Postgraduate Courses in Semester System had already been running from so long. He suggested that, if need be, the students of such courses in semester system should also be granted Golden Chance to clear their re-appears. He said that he had already talked with the Controller of Examinations in this regard.

It was clarified that B.Sc. (Agriculture) has already been running for long in semester system and some students have re-appears in this course and they have already exhausted both the chances prescribed as per the rules of the University. They need Golden Chance to clear their degree.

The members in one voice suggested that the Controller of Examinations should be authorized to take action in such cases.

This was agreed to.

- (2) Shri Naresh Gaur said that he had already written a letter regarding starting of LL.M. Course at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana. The University had already constituted a Committee, but there is no clear-cut outcome and due to that LL.M Course could not be started from the session 2015-16.
- (3) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the students who are doing B.Sc. (Computer Science). Though they had studied two science subjects at the B.Sc. level, but they could not be allowed to take admission in M.Sc. on the basis of those two subjects. He pleaded that such students should be allowed to take admission in M.Sc. by amending the Regulations/Rules on the pattern of B.A. He informed that the students of B.A. could be allowed to do M.A. in the subject/s which he/she had studied at B.A. level with 45% marks. On the same pattern, the existing Regulations/Rules needs to be amended as the same had come into existence prior to the starting of B.Sc. (Computer Science).

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not close avenues for such students. They should conduct a test at local level for such students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be looked into.

- (4) Shri Naresh Gaur said that recently a judgement had been given by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court regarding Pension in the University. He pleaded that it should be implemented at the earliest.
- (5) Shri Jarnail Singh said that the cases of few teachers, for grant of Ph.D. increments, are pending in the University. It should be looked into.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 8th March 2015

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR