

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 18th October 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. Mrs. Anu Chatrath
3. Shri Ashok Goyal
4. Professor A.K. Bhandari
5. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
6. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
7. Shri Jarnail Singh
8. Professor Karamjeet Singh
9. Shri Naresh Gaur
10. Professor Navdeep Goyal
11. Principal (Mrs.) Parveen Kaur Chawla
12. Professor Rajesh Gill
13. Professor Ronki Ram
14. Professor Yog Raj Angrish
15. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)
Registrar

Principal (Dr.) Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora, Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, and Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the honourable members of the Syndicate that –

- (1) His Excellency Governor of Haryana and Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar, has appointed Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, UGC Professor of Physics, Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, as Vice-Chancellor of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar for a period of three years.
- (2) Dr. Balram K. Gupta, former Professor and Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, has joined as Director at the Chandigarh Judicial Academy, Sector 43, Chandigarh.
- (3) His Excellency, the Governor of Punjab has appointed Professor B.S. Ghuman of the Department of Public Administration, P.U., as Chief Finance and Economic Adviser to Government of Punjab with immediate effect. It is an honorary position.
- (4) University Grants Commission has awarded Emeritus Fellowship to Professor Suman Bala Beri of the Department of Physics for a period of two years (2015-17). This fellowship carries an honorarium of Rs. 31,000/-p.m. (fixed) and contingency grant (Non-lapsable) of Rs. 50,000 p.a.

- (5) Professor Archana R. Singh, School of Communication Studies has won the Best Research Paper Award for her paper entitled 'Semiotic analysis of tweets: A study of 'Nirbhaya and Delhi gangrape' at the 4th Annual International Conference on Journalism and Mass Communications (JMComm 2015) held at Singapore on 5th and 6th October, 2015.
- (6) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has received UGC Research Award and a research grant of Rs.3 lakh for a period of two years.
- (7) Dr. Neha Miglani Vadhera, who completed her Ph.D. from the school of Communication Studies (SCS), has been awarded 'Post Doctoral Fellowship for Women' for the year 2015-16 by UGC to pursue higher research.
- (8) Five students, viz., Ms. Sandeep Kaur, Ms. Kiranpreet Kaur Saggu, Mr. Gagandeep Goyal, Ms. Richu and Ms. Harjot Kaur from PU's 'Centre for IAS & Other Competitive Examinations' have qualified in the Haryana Civil Services (HCS) (Judicial Branch)-2015.
- (9) In pursuance of the discussion in the Senate meeting held on 27.9.2015, a 'Think Tank' for Panjab University has been constituted. It comprises the following members:
 - (i) Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Chairperson
Vice-Chancellor
 - (ii) Shri Satya Pal Jain
 - (iii) Professor D.V.S. Jain
 - (iv) Shri Ashok Goyal
 - (v) Professor Pam Rajput
 - (vi) Professor B.S. Brar
 - (vii) Professor A.K. Bhandari
 - (viii) Professor Dinesh Gupta
 - (ix) Professor Ronki Ram
 - (x) Professor Akshaya Kumar
 - (xi) Professor Rajiv Lochan
 - (xii) Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Convener
Registrar

The Vice-Chancellor said that this Think-Tank would discuss a variety of things which were discussed in the meeting of the Senate. It would invite distinguished members from other faculties as and when required. Right now, this Think Tank has to see how the University in equilibrium situation has to conduct the business in the framework of shrinking commitment from the Centre and income not rising commensurate with the needs of the University. The needs are salary, development and other needs as pointed out by NAAC like infrastructure of hostels, capacity building, etc. The University needs money to pay salaries, for development activities and to see that the University remains competitive in the field. If the University has got 143 odd acres of land earmarked in the U.T. Master Plan- 2031, and the U.T. Administration is saying that they have given it as an important agenda of the U.T. Administration, how to develop that campus. In this background, the whole gamut of things needs to be thought about and we have to have some strategy in place so that some proposal could be made on the basis of which they could

approach the U.T. Administration, Central Government, civil society and our alumni. The Central Government, Ministry of Human Resource Development and the Chancellor are happy that the University is thinking on these lines. Everyone is looking as to what the University would project. This is an experiment which according to him is the tried and tested one in the history of the University. This is how the University came and continued to progress. In fact, the University had introduced its USP the Honours Schools in the 1920s. Once again the people met in Shimla immediately after the partition and started thinking as to how the University is to start functioning in independent India. As such, thinking has continued to happen on behalf of the University, as the departments assembled and the present campus started. Formally and informally, there have been people who have thought about it. They are just giving it a format. The governing body of the University also continuously thought about it as to how the University has to progress. Time has come to do this once again. Only last week, there was a meeting in Delhi where there was a higher education agenda, the agenda which is related to skill development and sports. Now the Government says the sports related education also has to be embedded in the higher education. Several Vice-Chancellors, including him, had attended the meeting. The meeting of the Committee was headed by a former Chief Justice of Punjab & Haryana High Court, who had also been a member of the P.U. Senate. He had asked him (Vice-Chancellor) to provide proposals pertaining to the University and has also agreed to come to the University. In fact, the task has been given to him to give a proposal to incorporate sports education in higher education. Central Government has an agenda that the sports facilities on behalf of the society must be created, maintained and utilized in the Universities. They are particularly looking at the Universities which have won MAKA trophy in the last decade like Punjabi University, Patiala, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and Panjab University and perhaps also Kurukshetra University. Justice Mukul Mudgal is very keen that the Universities of this region give something and that recommendation should not remain on the paper but be implemented. He has offered to come and visit the University. All these things have also to be thought of by the Think Tank.

On a query by Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla, the Vice-Chancellor said that eventually, the Colleges issues would also come before the Think-Tank. But right now, it is in the background of the financial crunch that is being faced by the University and is just related to campus salaries and activities. It is just a beginning and more people would be associated with the Think-Tank. Right now, it is indeed campus (issues) specific. It is just a beginning and not the end.

RESOLVED: That-

(1) Felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –

- (i) Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, UGC Professor of Physics, Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on his appointment as Vice-Chancellor of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar for a period of three years;
- (ii) Dr. Balram K. Gupta, former Professor and Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on his joining as Director, Chandigarh Judicial Academy, Sector 43, Chandigarh;

- (iii) Professor B.S. Ghuman of the Department of Public Administration, P.U., on his appointment as Chief Finance and Economic Adviser to Government of Punjab;
 - (iv) Professor Suman Bala Beri of the Department of Physics for having been awarded Emeritus Fellowship by the University Grants Commission for a period of two years (2015-17);
 - (v) Professor Archana R. Singh, School of Communication Studies on winning the Best Research Paper Award for her paper entitled 'Semiotic analysis of tweets: A study of 'Nirbhaya and Delhi gangrape' at the 4th Annual International Conference on Journalism and Mass Communications (JMComm 2015) held at Singapore on 5th and 6th October, 2015;
 - (vi) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on receiving UGC Research Award and a research grant of Rs.3 lakh for a period of two years; and
 - (vii) Dr. Neha Miglani Vadhera, who completed her Ph.D. from the School of Communication Studies (SCS), on having been awarded 'Post Doctoral Fellowship for Women for the year 2015-16 by UGC.
 - (viii) Five students, viz., Ms. Sandeep Kaur, Ms. Kiranpreet Kaur Saggu, Mr. Gagandeep Goyal, Ms. Richu and Ms. Harjot Kaur from PU's 'Centre for IAS & Other Competitive Examinations' have qualified in the Haryana Civil Services (HCS) (Judicial Branch)-2015.
- (1) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. 8, be noted;
 - (2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. 9, be noted and approved; and
 - (3) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 30.08.2015, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Before considering the Item 2, the Vice-Chancellor said that the minutes of the Selection Committees are before the members for consideration except Item No. 2(xv) in which the Court had directed not to declare the result.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the process of inducting faculty at the level of Associate Professor and Professor is now receiving adequate attention and as and when the files are received in his office, without losing much time, he would commence the process. He is trying to hold the interviews within a month of the receipt of the files. All the minutes of the Selection Committees have already been provided to the members barring one item which related to the recommendation of the Selection Committee for appointment in the Department of Education. There was a directive from the Hon'ble

Punjab and Haryana High Court that the result of a given person be sealed. There were eight candidates called for the interview, the ninth candidate was called for the interview on the directive of the Hon'ble Court. In view of that directive, the result of eight candidates has been sealed in an envelope and the result of one candidate has been sealed in a separate envelope. There are two separate envelopes in which the results are sealed. The total result which would be there on the basis of eight and nine candidates, it would be clear from these two things. Since the Court directive which is difficult for him to understand was "her Lordship was pleased to permit her to participate in the interview which is going to be held on 13.10.2015 on provisional basis and further directed the University not to declare the result and keep the result in a sealed cover and further directed that no right shall accrue to the petitioner on the basis of interim orders. Copy of the order is enclosed. The result of the petitioner be not declared till further orders kept in a sealed cover". He had got prepared separate envelopes of the result of the eight candidates for the members. If the members wished, he could provide the envelopes to them. In view of the ambiguity, he had done all this.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if they could move an application in the High Court for clarification, they could bring the correct facts whether the candidate was eligible or not. A day before, she was talking to Ms. Alka Chatrath who was representing the University, as per the instructions given by the University, the candidate was not eligible. If they could move an application to the Court, the Court could clarify the facts.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the next date of hearing is not far away. If the members wished, he could provide the envelopes of the result to the members.

The members said that they should wait for the outcome of the Court decision.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they could not open the results.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that both the envelopes could be taken to the Court and Court could take a decision on the next date of hearing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as the Vice-Chancellor has said that as and when a file is received in his office, within a month, he tries to complete the process. That, in fact, is the right spirit also. But, at the same time, the University is trying to take into account that interviews in a particular department are held in one go like with the open posts also. There is a long process for open posts which, at times, may take 6-7 months also and in the process somebody who is eligible for CAS, the candidate has to wait for 6-7 months because the interviews are held in one go.

The Vice-Chancellor said that consciously, he is not delaying any promotions under CAS. He has to call the experts.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then it is okay.

The Vice-Chancellor said he is not delaying the promotions under CAS, because if there is some delay, there may be issues of seniority, increment, etc. He protects all these things. He said that appointment letters to all other persons would be issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the appointments are approved. He had 2-3 observations regarding the selection process when a Selection Committee did not find any suitable candidate in the interview.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as Professor Karamjeet Singh had said that an algorithm be made. A table would be prepared in which it would be written if a candidate is found unsuitable because of lack of some papers which was not provided or the candidate had not provided the proof of the book. He was contacting all those persons so that due to some technicality, no person is denied the opportunity to attend the interview. Since the members had demanded it, he had accepted the same. The members would be provided a list of the candidates who had applied.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that while filling up the *pro forma*, in the interview aspect having teaching skill and other score, that *pro forma* is filled up what the candidate claims.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are doing what Professor Karamjeet Singh had suggested that what a person claimed, what the Screening Committee thought valid and what was the shortfall. The shortfall, if any, he is having examined by the office again and again. Like a person who had a shortfall of 10 marks, which was due to the reason that the candidate had not attached the proof of four papers, he would definitely go to the court. As a preventive measure, before the court gives a directive, it is better for us to contact the person and ask them to bring the proof of the deficiencies pointed out so that the same could be considered at the time of interview. Nobody should be denied the opportunity to appear in the interview only for such shortfall that the candidate did not provide the documentary proof like that the candidate had mentioned the ISBN No, etc., but did not attach the copy of the front cover of the book. The Screening Committee verifies all the things, like, name of the author, publisher, etc. and does not give the marks in the absence of such details.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that in case of those candidates appearing in the interview and in the opinion of the Selection Committee, candidates were not suitable, there is a *pro forma* and a template, some marks are there for the API score and some for the teaching skills and other parameters. Since interview was not good and appropriate, the points would be reduced to that level. The column which is there still gives the base also why the candidate was rejected.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at some point of time, the rejection formula was that someone getting marks less than 1/3rd out of 40 would be rejected. But it is not so. A Professor of this University is a very coveted position. There is no definition of a Professor in every department. When you say that he is inducting a direct Professor, he should not induct a direct Professor who is not comparable to the Professor's definition in a given department. If they started giving marks, the marks could be more than 13 out of 40, i.e. more than 1/3rd. That is not the criteria. He gave two examples. One example was none of the candidates was found suitable for Gurdial Singh Chair in the Department of Laws. At that time, none found suitable was in the sense that their record was not comparable to the senior people in the Department. They have faced the difficulty, if someone is appointed as Chair Professor and there are other more eminent persons in the Department than that person is seen to prove

an edge over those who are already Professors. If a Chair Professor had been advertised at a given point of time, the existing Professors would be having anxiety that if not selected, they would feel hurt, would not apply. But they did not find that the candidates, who came, were not at par with the Professors already working. There are variations. Take the example of Nano-Science, the new persons who have been applying are not fitting into that category. Those candidates neither have the publications and nor the experience of the level of a Professor. The same candidate was there for the post of Associate Professor and Professor. The Selection Committee finds that candidate suitable for the post of Associate Professor and gives less mark for Professor and suddenly not found suitable. So this is a tricky situation. But this is to protect the interest of the University that no person with lesser merit is appointed.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he was talking about sub item (xiv) related with CAS promotions. For becoming a Professor, 50% marks are for academic performance, 30% are for teaching skills and 20% for interview. 15 marks are given because the papers are to be evaluated. A *pro forma* of 40 marks has been prepared that one candidate having API score, is given 50% marks out of 40. But in the present case, the marks given for interview are 10 and for teaching skills 15. For 50% marks of contribution to research, formula for open selection has been prepared as to how marks are to be given. But for the promotion under CAS, no formula has been prepared. He said that is it possible to examine this case. He was of the view that whatever marks had been awarded by the Committee is fine. His point is regarding the first aspect. He said that if there is a formula and this case falls under that formula, this case may be got re-examined. He said that the person who scores the minimum requirement of the API, he/she should be given higher marks hence the said case may be examined again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he spent more than one hour with the person concerned. The candidate herself has admitted that the research paper which she has possessed, did not relate to that subject in which she wanted to become a Professor. The candidate could not defend herself on quality of research which she had done. He said that the person who is coming as a Professor, teaching experience and domain knowledge has come in the last stage. How could it be said that he/she has no teaching skills whereas the person concerned has been teaching for the last about 20 years. As per UGC guidelines, it would not be possible for doing this exercise if 50% marks towards contribution to research is by default. Already there is very low threshold. Since the time, he started interviewing the candidates, only two candidates had not been recommended by the Committee. In one case, the template had not been filled and due to this technicality, they had to conduct the interview again, and in other case, the performance of the candidate was very poor and the Dean was also present during the course of interview who happened to be a member of the Syndicate. Incidentally, in this case also, one member of the Syndicate was also present in the interview. In the first case, the performance was very awful and in the other case the candidate could not defend the research work which she had done. That is why, they had introduced an algorithm, viz., giving write up, papers, seminars etc., so that by the time a person comes for interview, shortcomings are taken care of. Unfortunately, in the instant case, shortcomings did not get attended.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that, leaving aside this case, he has raised another pertinent issue. Whatever algorithm they have

created 30% marks for Assessment of Domain Knowledge and Teaching Practices. What is there that out of 50% marks for academic performance, five papers are to be written by the candidate and evaluated by outside expert. He suggested that there should be some mechanism that if the members agree, the decision of the interview board should be to give judgement out of 100 marks. What they had been doing, for the open selection for the post of Reader, Associate Professor and in colleges also, they had been awarding different marks for particular area and award 30/40 marks for interview. Referring to a judgment of Hon'ble Court, he said that the interview marks should be reduced. He suggested that a mechanism for awarding marks for the interview should be framed.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that interview marks should not exceed 50%.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this template has come from the UGC. The UGC has given template for open selection but with regard to CAS, there is no directive from the UGC as to how to award out of 50% marks.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that 50% marks are in the hands of Selection Committee, there is no algorithm for that.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that as per law, if there is large number of candidates, the criteria to shortlist the candidates, is to conduct written test. If there is no written test, 100% marks could be by way of interview.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that different committees in different departments are being constituted but there is no set formula for API score. They could not develop the parameters. He said that a candidate got different marks as API score by different committees. Citing an example, he said that a candidate was not called by the Department of Chemistry on the basis of API score awarded to him for his Ph.D., but he was called for interview by the Department of Nano-Sciences. There could be a possibility that large number of candidates are called for interview by the department of Chemistry with the different scores, however, there should be no discrepancy in the marks awarded by two different departments to the same candidate. There should be uniformity. He suggested that a Committee should be constituted for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that typically DUI remains in every interview committee, he can normalize the things. This is in the interest of the University and these things should be normalized.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that there is no harm in looking at it and to normalize these things.

Professor Rajesh Gill endorsed the view point put forth by Professor Karamjeet Singh. She said that rejection is a very important issue and after a long time, somebody has been rejected at this level. Screening has been done and API score is calculated so that a person is eligible. There is a point in the instant case where the candidate has been awarded 13 marks out of a total mark of 50. After all, the Selection Committees vary from one committee to another they are also human beings. There is some subjectivity involved. They could play a very important role. She suggested that there should be some yardstick, some criteria, some parameters because it is question of rejection of a candidate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a transparency in the sense that the Committee has so many members, a Dean was sitting there and also a Syndicate member was also there. It is the unanimous decision of the Committee taken after a very long interaction with the candidate and the candidate had admitted that she is short on research contribution related to the subject.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that too many cases come for selections. It is selection by the experts and they have given their opinion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Chancellor's nominee, Dean of the Faculty and Syndicate member are members of the Selection Committee. He personally feels that no injustice has been done to the candidate. He had gone out of the way to see that if somebody had scored only 45, sometimes he had pleaded with the experts that the marks of the candidate should be stretched to 50. So far as the instant case is concerned, the performance of the candidate was very bad.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he was not talking about this case. As a policy matter, the minimum requirement of marks should be reduced from 50. But the marks should be given as per the criteria.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the criteria are for the Screening Committee, but there is no evaluation. If somebody had published a paper, marks are awarded accordingly. If one has become eligible, he/she has to defend his/her candidature before the experts who are senior and eminent Professors. Everyone has some assessment of the candidate. Since people have higher expectations from the Professors of this University, it is difficult to defend a weak candidate. The list of experts is provided by the Head of the Departments which comprised of senior and eminent persons in the subject concerned and he only invited the experts from the list. In the instant case, the Chancellor's nominee is also a very senior person, who had been coming to the University for the purpose for the last so many years. As such, they have a much longer assessment of this University than the given Vice-Chancellor. People remembered iconic Professors only, e.g., Professor D.V.S. Jain, Professor Kesar Singh Kesar, Professor Gurdev Singh, Professor P.N. Mehra, etc. who had their own different yardsticks. It becomes a problem when people start measuring the candidates, taking their yardstick. In the long run, it is good to be stringent. But the system of the University is not so stringent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the simple question which has been asked is what are the criteria on the basis of which the candidate has been awarded 13 marks out of 50?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the quality of research work of the candidate was very poor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that means the papers sent to the evaluators and, their judgments are not be relied upon.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the judgments of the evaluators are to be relied upon. In most of the cases where the experts are convince they ensure that the candidates get maximum possible benefit. The candidates are asked for a list of referees and to that list few extra names are added. He is not adding the extra names on his own because he did not know all the subjects. He is having a list of

experts since the year 2000. He is typically having 4-5 such lists of each subject and out of these lists and after looking at the expertise of the candidates, accordingly he select 2-3 names from such lists. This is what he is doing and nothing else. Then the assessment comes. Some people write 2 lines of assessment with the recommendation that desired papers are there, hence, the candidate concerned be promoted. The experts often do not provide the detailed comments. The kind of recommendation that he typically receives in Panjab University, if such kinds of recommendations are there in the interview at the Institute from where he came, interviews for promotion would never be conducted. It is not proper that they should judge the University teacher/s purely on the basis of research. Here, in Panjab University, they have been working as teacher –cum-researcher and they should have to have slightly different criterion for a Professor as compared to those having in the Research Institute. That is why he devised this method that till the time the case comes to the Committee, and the Committee has some assessment in the form of that report and on the basis of that report expert asks the question to the candidate. In this case also, the same thing was done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not questioning the judgement of the Selection Committee but only pointing out that as he (Vice-Chancellor) has explained the inherent defects in the evaluation process in which papers are sent to outside experts that is what they are trying to say.

On this, he (Vice-Chancellor) said that he did not mean defects, but inadequacies.

When Shri Ashok Goyal said that either they have to depend on the evaluation, the Vice-Chancellor said that there is no directive from the UGC that they have to depend only on the evaluators. He said that all he has been doing is to help and satisfying the candidates. It is after two and a half years that a case has come where the candidate has not proved herself up to the mark.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not questioning the judgment of the Selection Committee but it was he (Vice-Chancellor) who came up with this innovative idea that candidates may not feel as if some excess has been committed on them and he is ready to ask them to provide a list of referees and they would send the papers for evaluation so that on the basis of that they could be called for interview. Now if the evaluation of those papers or research work is also to be done by the Selection Committee that probably is not known to anybody in the University. They (candidates) feel that once they have cleared that, now it was only because he (Vice-Chancellor) has referred to the case of 2012 that a person was not recommended by the Selection Committee, there they had not awarded any marks as far as domain knowledge is concerned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the pro forma is filled up consciously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that here, the position is other way round.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the assessment of domain knowledge and interview, the same Selection Committee has given 50% marks.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as far as domain knowledge is concerned, it means that a person is teaching that subject and if one is asked questions, he/she is supposed to give the answer which is 50% and not 75%. The people, who are good in the subject of his/her teaching and the subject of research, score very high. In this case, the person is not good as he/she should be. The domain knowledge is related to some aspects that is expected of a Professor. The candidate was interviewed and the interaction lasted for 70 minutes. The person has the ability to converse and engage with the high experts. It is not that the person does not give satisfactory answer and the experts would give zero marks. A candidate knows what to do to cover up the deficiency. The candidate has guided M.Phil. theses. She has to take that work to completion, have those papers written, jointly co-author the papers with the candidate and could come back and cover up the deficiency. The score of 50% would be secured easily.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he (Vice-Chancellor) is satisfied that it is not going to create problems for the University as he has just pointed that it is in the interest of transparency.

The Vice-Chancellor said he valued whatever Shri Ashok Goyal was saying and all this is going to be recorded and whatever is going to be recorded has to be part of the minutes and to be put in the public domain. The University community is also free to discuss.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that generally they have no reasons to disbelieve or differ with the recommendation of the Selection Committee because it is presumed that Selection Committee has examined the candidate and the bio-data. Then there is nothing for Syndicate to go into details. But there is a case which, Mrs. Anu Chatrath would be able to tell better whether the University can appoint a foreign national as Associate Professor or Professor or Assistant Professor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has been checked thoroughly and Government of India guidelines at the moment permit Persons of Indian Origin to be inducted as members of the faculty in the academic institutions all over India. There are several examples of that and there are so many directives.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice-Chancellor had already checked, it is okay, because as far as Article 16 of the Constitution of India is concerned, foreign nationals are not covered under the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are various categories of people. There are people who have OIC card, others who go abroad, accept citizenship and come back. There are only a few cases, except in the defence, who can come in all the academic institutions.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to get it checked again. If the Vice-Chancellor had got it checked, it is alright. But he felt that it needs to be cross checked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get it legally checked and show the records to Mrs. Anu Chatrath. This is the first case of its kind.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor could associate Mrs. Anu Chatrath and Shri Ashok Goyal in the process.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Dinesh Kumar is also there who has legal background and he would provide the papers available with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is the same candidate who says that he has claimed zero marks for research guidance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the candidate was a Research Officer in an Institute and was not permitted to register candidates. But they have obtained the letters from that Institute wherein they have informed that the people were working under him but it was a kind of arrangement.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the additional information provided by the candidate as Annexure-8 it is written as informal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that but formally registration is with a faculty member of the University. He was not a faculty member and the letter has been received from the Institute.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Article 16(1) relates Right to Employment for citizens of India.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she has understood the query made by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no doubt on the candidate. But if any candidate does not fulfill the basic criteria, that could not be allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would not create a wrong precedence.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as far as selections are concerned, he is not opposing these. In most of the cases, the candidates have claimed some particular marks and the Screening Committee has awarded 30, 40 or 50 marks less than what the candidates had claimed. His submission is that from wherever the marks have been deducted, at least in the form which is being circulated to the Syndicate members, it should be mentioned from which part the Screening Committee has deducted the marks.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this would increase the work. However, there is no harm in doing it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that screening is done at two levels, one at the departmental level and the other at University level. So many things are involved in this process as per the UGC guidelines. They have clear-cut guidelines from the UGC that mentioning of journals/ ISSN/ISBN No. is not the only criteria for assessing the quality. In fact, it is for the Committee to assess the quality of research. He has been a member of the Screening Committees of Jawaharlal Nehru University for so many years where the criterion is that at the departmental level, the candidate is called before the Committee, which asked the candidate concerned to justify his/her claims. If the Screening Committees say that a particular journal does not deserve so much marks, then there is opposition from the candidates. The UGC has written a letter to all the Universities to select a list of journals and send the same to the UGC. Only those papers published in such journals would be considered for evaluation. This is a process which has been started by the UGC for API capping.

Since API did not serve the purpose, the capping was started. This is a good intention of the UGC to bring uniformity. When the papers are got evaluated from the experts and at the time of interview the experts ask the question to the candidates from the specialization. Whatever marks are given to the candidate should be given in the presence of the candidate and the candidate's signature should be obtained on that. There is no dissent on that and it is a consensus.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that what Professor Ronki Ram is saying, is not being done in every department. The candidates are invited at the time of screening and made to sit outside. It depends on the discretion of the Screening Committee, whether to invite the candidate inside or not. In one of the case, the candidate claimed 713 marks and the Committee awarded 693 marks, i.e. 20 marks less than claimed by the candidate. It was nowhere mentioned in the forms circulated to the Syndicate members how 20 marks had been deducted. His submission is that these details should be mentioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members would be provided whatever information they require. It is the system that is very transparent. If the members wanted that it should be more transparent. There is no limit to that transparency.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he had just given the suggestion. In case it is possible, the same could be adopted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he welcomes the suggestions.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that being a member of the Syndicate, people would come to him to see the format and ask him as to how the marks have been deducted.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to bring to the notice of the House that nowhere it is mentioned that the agenda of the Syndicate is confidential. He would like to be enlightened how it is confidential. There was a time about 12 years back when on the title of the Syndicate Agenda, it was mentioned confidential and from where it was introduced nobody knew. The then Vice-Chancellor in one of the meetings of the Syndicate blamed all the members of the Syndicate that before the agenda reached the office of the Vice-Chancellor, it has reached the newspapers and all the members were responsible. Dr. Dinesh Kumar is trying to be very honest. How can the members tell the media that they would not show the agenda. At that time it was said that unless and until, the members were sure that it is confidential by way of Regulation, how they were sure that it was confidential. It was resolved that the confidential words would not be mentioned. That is why it is also a fact that so many times, the agenda has not reached the members and the queries start pouring in whether the members had read the item No. so and so. They are living in the era of RTI. The Vice-Chancellor had also said that to bring transparency, it is okay.

The Vice-Chancellor said that so many colleagues are participating who are their own colleagues. Then there is no point in trying to keep it secret. When a person has become Professor, he/she is joining the same department. How can a Professor say that he is just screening the applications and screening means just validating the claim of a candidate. It is expected that they all understand that the difference between what is claimed and what is validated. Wherever the difference is very large, as the Governing body, the members could ask. They could access and see and if large difference

is there, and there is some fault in screening. Or in order to minimize the difference, they can give a directive to the colleagues to be careful while putting a claim.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at the time of the screening of the applications under CAS, the candidates should be invited.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as Professor Ronki Ram has given an example of his experience at Jawaharlal Nehru University. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) had no experience of this kind, but had come to know from Professor Ronki Ram. There are so many central Universities of which Professor Ronki Ram has experience, where the API score is put on the website and objections are called from the candidates, even for the open category, that this is score claimed by the candidate and this is the score that has been awarded and if the candidates had any objection, they could get it corrected. The Vice-Chancellor has also said about bringing transparency.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in University of Delhi while filling up the form, the computer generates the API score automatically. There is no need to fill up the score by the candidates.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University of Delhi has that kind of software, which the Panjab University could also have.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the interest of the candidates, before the advertisement of the post is issued, a software could be borrowed from University of Delhi and the process of inviting applications, should be made on-line. He is saying so because in one of the cases, a candidate claimed 367 marks while the Committee is awarding 703 marks. If other candidates would ask how so many marks were awarded to a candidate, it could be known that for a particular category, the candidate had claimed less marks whereas actually he/she was entitled for more marks.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she shared the concern shown by Dr. Dinesh Kumar and whatever Professor Ronki Ram has described is really true. This is how something is done. But practically, it is too simplistic. The things did not take place in such a simplistic manner. For instance, in social sciences, a candidate says that the title of the journal is 'international referred journal', the pre-screening gives the marks as claimed by the candidate and another committee says no, it is not up to the mark. In reality, things did not take place in this manner. It varies from Committee to Committee. So, they need to streamline the whole system.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Dean of University Instruction is the Chairman of the Committee. The Deans of the Faculties are also there in the Selection Committees. There is a system in the University that Dean is made part of the evaluation for promotion as well as selection.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there should be uniformity.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that he strongly differed with the suggestion made by Professor Rajesh Gill that there should be uniformity as there could not be uniformity amongst different subjects. However, there could be uniformity within a given subject.

The Vice-Chancellor, closing the discussion, said that the concerns shown by the members have been recorded. He would sit

with Professor A.K. Bhandari and ponder over as to how they could address their concerns. He requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to see that all the relevant cases (at least pertaining to CAS) are discussed in the next meeting of the Chairpersons. To be transparent, the decisions would be conveyed to the candidates.

Re-advertisement of the Post

2(i). Considered minutes dated 22.09.2015 of the Selection Committee for appointment of Professor in Inorganic/ Analytical Chemistry-1 (Gen) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That since none of the candidates was found suitable, the post of Professor in Inorganic/Analytical Chemistry-1 (General), be re-advertised.

Appointment of Associate Professor in Inorganic Chemistry in the Department of Chemistry

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 22.09.2015 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor in Inorganic Chemistry-1 (Gen) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Ms.) Sonal Singhal be appointed Associate Professor in Inorganic Chemistry (General), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

The recruitment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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. norms.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. Gurjaspreet Singh (SC), 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 wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professor in Analytical/ Industrial Chemistry in the Department of Chemistry

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 22.09.2015 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor in Analytical/Industrial Chemistry-1 (General) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur be appointed Associate Professor in Analytical/Industrial Chemistry (General), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

The recruitment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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. norms.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. (Ms.) Sonal Singhal, 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 wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professor in Physical Chemistry in the Department of Chemistry

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 22.09.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor in Physical Chemistry-1 (Gen) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary (SC) be appointed Associate Professor in Physical Chemistry (General), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

The recruitment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. Vikas, 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 wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professor in Organic Chemistry in the Department of Chemistry

2(v). Considered minutes dated 22.09.2015 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor in Organic Chemistry-1 (Gen) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur be appointed Associate Professor in Organic Chemistry (General), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

The recruitment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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. norms.

- 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 candidate enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidate fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professors-3(Gen.) in the Department of Physics

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 23.09.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professors-3 (Gen) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Associate Professors (General), in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar
2. Dr. Bivash Ranjan Behera
3. Dr. Sunil Kumar Arora.

The recruitments would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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

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

1. Dr. Ashok Kumar s/o Sh. Ranjeet Singh
2. Dr. (Ms.) Sunita Srivastava.

- 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 wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Professors (General) in the Department of Physics

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 29.09.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Professors-2 (General) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Professors (General), in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.10000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Bivash Ranjan Behera
2. Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar.

The recruitments would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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

- NOTE:**
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 candidates enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professors in Computer Science & Engineering (General), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 12.10.2015 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor in Computer Science & Engineering-2 (Gen) (Advt. No.4/2014), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Associate Professors in Computer Science & Engineering (General), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Naveen Aggarwal
2. Dr. Ajay Mittal.

The recruitments would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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

- NOTE:**
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 candidates enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professor at Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 12.10.2015 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No.4/2014), at Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sunil Kumar Arora be appointed Associate Professor (General), at Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

The recruitment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. (Ms.) Navneet 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 wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Re-advertisement of the post

2(x). Considered minutes dated 12.10.2015 of the Selection Committee for appointment of Professor (General) (Advt. No.4/2014), at Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That since none of the candidate was found suitable, the post be re-advertised.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Zoology

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 13.10.2015 (**Appendix-X**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Upma Bagai be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **30.06.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professors (Gen), in the Department of Zoology

2(xii). Considered minutes dated 13.10.2015 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor-2 (General) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Mrs.) Harpreet Kaur be appointed Associate Professor (General), in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

The recruitment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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. norms.

- 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 candidate enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidate fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Education

2(xiii). Considered minutes dated 13.10.2015 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------|---|-------------|
| 1. | Dr. Kirandeep Singh | : | 20.12.2014 |
| 2. | Dr. Latika Sharma | : | 11.06.2012. |

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

2. It had been certified that the selection of Dr. Kirandeep Singh has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies

2(xiv). Considered minutes dated 13.10.2015 of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Navleen Kaur was not found suitable for promotion from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme.

In view of the statement of the Vice-Chancellor, the following item was deferred:

Deferred Item

2(xv). To consider minutes dated 13.10.2015 of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professors-2 (Gen) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letters of appointment/promotion to the persons appointed/ promoted under Items **C-2(ii) to (ix) and C-2(xi) to (xiii)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Recommendations dated 10.07.2015 of Research Promotion Cell

3. Considered the recommendations (1 to 4) dated 10.07.2015 of the Research Promotion Cell constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for promotion of Research in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The DCDC has observed that:

- (i) The issue of conducting the pre-Ph.D. Course of 105 hours in one semester needs to be reviewed and reconsidered in the light of the immediate fall outs of the setbacks to the cited effective teaching programmes, and to the studies of the students if teachers were to proceed on leave for the purpose, and as also of the factum of continuous research evaluation of book reviews/ term papers and its presentations, seminars etc. as are important qualifying components of the other two paper necessary for clearing the Pre-Ph.D. course work.
- (ii) A holistic view of the Pre-Ph.D. course work needs to be taken in the light of the factum of its being restricted to one semester of 105 hours and spanning it to one full year by scheduling it from the first day of summer vacation to the end of the winter break during the session

therefore the immediate cited fall outs can also be taken care of.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that as regards the decision taken by the Committee regarding Ph.D. course work, she would like to make some suggestions. It is right that for the convenience of certain teachers, they wanted to help them who cannot attend the six monthly course work at a particular centralized place. The provision that is being made to conduct the course work at Colleges or a cluster of 3-4 Colleges is fine. But she thought something needed to be taken care of such as uniformity of course content. The course content is formalized by the Department and is taken up by Centres. These things need to be specified very clearly because the UGC Guidelines say that the examination, evaluation, course content will be finalized at the Department. There has to be parity between the Department and the Centres. The course structure will be formalized at the Department. When the examination is being conducted, paper setting will be done by the Department. That means that the timing of the course work should coincide.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they can have papers at two different times.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said that if a Centre is conducting the course work, the detailed programme schedule that has to be undertaken has to be published and sent to the Dean College Development Council or to the University in some form or the other so that the people know about it because sometimes the course has been conducted in 10 hours. These things should be avoided. The way the internal assessment and continuous assessment is done has to be made transparent. They need to take preventive measures and it should not be such that when something happens and they start taking decision at that time. Let a mechanism be evolved for the same. Although it has been defined that a minimum of 10 candidates are required, but there have been cases when the number of candidates were less than that. Is this economically viable? Is the course running periodically? In some of the courses, it has been seen that one resource person has practically taken up almost 80% of the classes. There has to be some limit as to how many sessions a person could take. This has practically happened not in the Colleges but also in the University. She cited the example of courses run by Academic Staff College where a limit has been imposed as to how many sessions a resource person could take up. In the case of pre-Ph.D. course, it has become an internal arrangement that a single person has been assigned the job and in this way, that person gets all the money. Some measures needed to be taken to check this kind of thing. She enquired whether a non-Ph.D. teacher could sit in the Committee to interview a candidate for Ph.D. and can non-Ph.D. take the class of Ph.D. course work. It is happening in the University. She suggested that instructions should be given to the Chairpersons that non-Ph.D. teachers should not sit in the Committees at the time when the candidates appear for Ph.D. interview even if they happen to be members of the academic and administrative committees of the department. This is a technical error.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there will be occasions when one will find that once in a while people who are at the level of Associate Professor and even Professor who never complete Ph.D. but have research work to their credit. Ph.D. is just a degree. Research or subject knowledge is something else. There was a Professor in the Institute from where he (Vice-Chancellor) came who was a member of

the UGC and Head of an important wing, was a non-Ph.D. He was the only recognized Theoretical Physicist from TIFR as a guide for Bombay University for a long time. He (Vice-Chancellor) knew several people in the Indian academic world who are just old time B.A., and they are Professors. There are hundreds of such examples that the people are having so many *honoris causa* degrees, but having the basic degree. He cited the example of N.F. Mott, a Nobel Laureate, who just had only a basic graduation degree.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she was talking of Assistant Professors who have no research work.

The Vice-Chancellor said that people who are teaching are experienced enough.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had seen that people who are sitting as members to interview the candidates for Ph.D., they are raising objections on Ph.D. of other candidates.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that a simple solution could be that only those faculty members who are eligible to become Supervisors as per the laid down guidelines, even if one has lots of research work, he/she could become a member of the Committee to interview the candidates for Ph.D.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that becoming research guide is a different thing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the guidelines should be such that either one should be Ph.D. or having research work.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a sorry state of affairs is that at one point of time somebody who was a Ph.D. was a bus conductor. The other person remarked why he had become a bus conductor was that some Ph.Ds deserve to become conductors. Let them hope that such a situation never comes in the University. They were producing such Ph.D. students who are not able to write a single page. There should be no such consideration, a person's contribution to research work should be the consideration. As Professor Bhandari suggested that anybody who can become a guide as per the guidelines, could be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in social sciences, literary arts, performing arts, members could find people who are not having research work to their credit but have such a knowledge which a person having a Ph.D. or research work, could not impart. Some people could ask whether Hazari Prasad Dwivedi or Gurdial Singh were Ph.D. There are so many examples. Could the eminent scholars, authors be separated from the academics? In financial institutions and banks, people are not Ph.D. but are expert in financial matters.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that on page 8, it is mentioned that if a candidate failed to clear two papers, he/she be asked to do the entire course work again. He suggested that if due to some unavoidable circumstances one is not able to clear the papers, he/she should be given a chance to clear only those papers and not the entire course work.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that he would like to point out something connected with the Ph.D. programmes. They were facing

lot of problems. There are some RTI and legal notices and there are complaints also against the University which have been sent to the UGC, Chancellor's office and some other places also regarding the Ph.D. programmes. Previously, the Ph.D. programme of the University was governed by the Regulations of Panjab University Calendar Volume-II and various Faculties had their own regulations for Ph.D. In most of the major Faculties like Science, Arts, Language there was a minimum stay of 36 weeks in the University or research Centre and in Law Faculty, it was throughout the tenure, in Pharmacy, it was for one year and so. The UGC does not allow Ph.D. by distance mode. Suppose there is a school teacher, who is employed and clears the entrance test and whose guide is a teacher employed in one of the affiliated Colleges and does the course work in some other College, he/she never visits the University or the Department, will it be called Ph.D. by distance mode or not? The other Universities are calling as study centres, the University is calling research centres. People are doing course work there and getting Ph.D. degree. The Research Centres of Panjab University are equated with those study centres. It is a serious problem. Until and unless, they resolve the issue of a minimum stay in the University, it is going to create a big problem in future. In this connection, he had called a meeting of the Deans of all the Faculties which was not attended by many of the Deans, Professor Ronki Ram was present though. It is a very serious issue. People should come forward with suggestions. There should be a minimum period of stay in the University for Ph.D. Previously, a minimum stay of 36 weeks was there. But in the new guidelines, there is no mention of minimum stay. People do not visit the University even for a single day and getting the Ph.D. degree, is not the Ph.D. by distance mode.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he had no objection if the UGC guidelines are followed. Research Centres were given to the Colleges. The candidate would go to the Research Centre for six months. If by chance, a candidate fails, it does not mean that he would again go to the Research Centre for six months. It should be made compulsory by the University for the Colleges to relieve the teachers. If there is any loss to the teacher, then it is said that it is as per the UGC guidelines. If they wanted the teachers to come forward for research work, then leave should be given to the teachers.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that as said by Professor A.K. Bhandari, it is a valid point as and should be taken into account. Referring to recommendation (3) of the Committee, he said that the pre-Ph.D. course work for two hours after 3.00 p.m. for a period of one semester would be organized. It gives a message that one could study for two hours, complete the hours and take the degree. The teachers are not getting leave. The Colleges do not relieve the teachers. He suggested that in addition to those two hours in the Research Centres, those teachers be required to come to the University during summer and winter vacation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the teachers could come here only if a programme is running.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that no teacher could come from Abohar, Fazilka in Punjabi Department. He cited the example of a teacher from DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh. The College says that they have no problem in organizing the course work as per the convenience. But since the Punjabi Department is the nodal agency, the Department says that they would organize the course work as per the schedule of the Department, i.e. from 10.00 a.m. onwards. If a

local teacher is finding it difficult to undergo the course work due to these problems, how could they expect the teachers from Abohar or Ferozpur to undergo the course work under these situations? He had suggested to organize the course work in Social Sciences and Languages. He had been requesting for the last two years to organize the course work during the vacation period for at least 10-15 days in one go. It would benefit the teachers. It has to be done if they want that the Research Centres in the Colleges could run smoothly. The University is the nodal agency and the Colleges have to look towards the University. But nothing has been done. It meant that the Research Centres in the Colleges should close down. In the first instance, he would like to regret if it pinches the members. But it is a reality that the students of the Research Centres of the Colleges are being failed intentionally by the nodal agencies. The University does not want that the Colleges should run the Research Centres. He had already regretted before saying so.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that an alternative could be that the experts should be identified and the evaluation should be got done through the secrecy branch.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that nodal agency should not evaluate the answer sheets of the pre-Ph.D. course work, instead the examination branch should be assigned this job. The UGC had allowed the Research Centres in the Colleges. Since the students of the Research Centres are being failed intentionally, it would automatically mean the closure of the Research Centres in the Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there are two issues. As Professor A.K. Bhandari has said that the UGC guidelines are to be followed. Dr. I.S. Sandhu is also saying rightly. Based on the guidelines of the UGC, some universities have drafted certain guidelines. For example, University of Delhi has made a minimum stay of 2 years compulsory for Ph.D. The candidates staying there would visit the libraries in University of Delhi or other universities.

On a point of order, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the Colleges of University of Delhi have no problem.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they would liberalize the guidelines.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, a candidate would have to prove that he/she has been staying at the place where he is pursuing Ph.D. This certificate of residence would prove that the candidate has been visiting the guide and the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter could not be resolved in the Syndicate because many aspects are involved in it. He would have to form a Committee of the Syndics to reconcile two things - (1) that they should not be seen violating the UGC guidelines. Concurrently, they have also to take into account the practical situation as it exists on the ground that teachers are not getting leave. They have, anyways, resolved that in order to get College teachers they should have Research Centres in the Colleges. But those Research Centres in the College need to adhere to the same kind of Regulations and discipline as of the University. They do not want to change the current examination system and it should continue as such. But the Colleges have a genuine concern. There is some kind of competitiveness existing between the University and the Colleges for a long time. It will take a long time to bridge that. But the

immediate concern is that candidates coming out of the Research Centre in the Colleges created in the College face more severe conditions than their counterparts. Let them not do anything which gives a wrong example. They should try to address the concerns so that they do not have apprehension that there is any kind of discrimination. Let there be papers which are set on behalf of the Controller of Examinations so that this apprehension is taken care of. But there are many more issues related to it. He is not saying that what he said is resolved. He would form a Committee to suggest changes in the light of this discussion. Let them put things in place which are more satisfactory and which can be adhered to. There are more practical ways to do it. As the suggestions are coming that instead of forcing the students to come to the University, and if the things are delayed, the purpose would be defeated. It is better to find a way that some Research Centres which are a part of the Colleges are given enhanced status. The Committee would suggest all such things.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he wanted to point out a very serious issue. As mentioned on page 8, the students who have done equivalent course work in M.Phil and those having LL.M. and M.Tech degrees have been exempted from undergoing the pre-Ph.D. Course work. They are already facing problems in the case of grant of increments for Ph.D.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that it should be examined by a Committee. Dr. I.S. Sandhu may be associated with the Committee and if need, he is ready to offer his services.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee would be formed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the course work could be started in one of the Colleges at Ludhiana or in the Panjab University Regional Centre. A proposal of Shri Naresh Gaur in this regard would also come up for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they appreciate the inputs and a Committee would be formed which can re-concise without compromising any of the UGC directives and re-concise the issues what Dr. I.S. Sandhu and other members have raised that how to attend to the concerns of the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what decision they have taken in the item under consideration?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the recommendations of the Committee are not being approved as such; rather, the item is being referred to a Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the concern of Professor A.K. Bhandari is very serious. What is the definition of the University campus according to UGC? That is to be taken care of. Dr. I.S. Sandhu is right that the problem has risen because earlier most of the subjects did not have mandatory course work and the College teachers could do their Ph.D. even without availing leave. There were some subjects where course work was there and the College teachers had to avail his/her leave if the Colleges were not granting the leave. But now when the UGC has made one semester course work mandatory, the College teachers have no option but to apply for leave and the managements of the Colleges do not grant leave. That is why this problem arose and the University should take care of it by creating Research Centres in the Colleges. Subsequently, the UGC

sends the letter and said that the course work has to be done in the main campus. That is the main concern. All these things should be referred to the Committee. Dr. Sandhu is right that the University should evolve a mechanism to direct the managements that they could not operate on their whims and fancies and deny the leave to the teachers who want to pursue Ph.D. All these things, of course, should be taken care of.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had a talk with the Chairperson of NAAC Peer Team which visited the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that this should be resolved only after having discussion with the UGC keeping in mind the character of the University that there are so many postgraduate Colleges, with infrastructure and facilities in the Colleges also. Accordingly, the Research Centres in the Colleges have been created. It may not create problems later on. Prior permission from the UGC may be taken.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired about the decision taken in the evaluation of Ph.D. candidates.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that only those faculty members who are Ph.D. or eligible to become Supervisors as per the laid down guideline could become a member of the Committee to interview the candidates for Ph.D.

RESOLVED: That the item under consideration, along with the observations of the members, be referred to a Committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.

Re-appointment of faculty on temporary basis at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital

4. Considered if, the following faculty members, be re-appointed afresh purely on temporary basis for the period mentioned against each (with one day break as usual) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., under Regulation 5 (b) at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIII**) was also taken into consideration

Sr. No.	Name	Designation	Proposed date of Break in 2015 & 2016	Proposed Extension	
				From	To
1.	Dr. Amandeep Kaur	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
2.	Dr. Prabhjot Kaur	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
3.	Dr. Amrita Rawla	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
4.	Dr. Vandana Gupta	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
5.	Dr. Rajni Jain	Assistant	11.10.2015	13.10.2015	11 months

		Professor	(Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)		i.e. upto 12.09.2016
6.	Dr. Monika Nagpal	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
7.	Dr. Manjot Kaur	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
8.	Dr. M.K. Chhabra	Reader	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
9.	Dr. Rajiv Rattan	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.09.2016
10.	Dr. Ruchi Singla	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.10.2016
11.	Dr. Rosy Arora	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.10.2016
12.	Dr. Prabhleen Brar	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.10.2016
13.	Dr. Vivek Kapoor	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. upto 12.10.2016

NOTE: 1. Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

“5. Notwithstanding anything contained in these Regulations –

(a) xxx xxx xxx

(b) Syndicate shall have the authority to make emergent temporary appointment on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor

(i) For a period exceeding one year, or on contract basis for a limited period.

- (ii) Allow higher starting salary within the grade of the post.

An appointment made under this Regulation shall be reported to Senate.”

2. The present term of contractual appointment of above faculty members enlisted at Sr. No.1 to 9 is going to expire on 10.10.2015 and Sr. No. 10 to 13 is going to expire on 09.11.2015.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath enquired when the University had regular sanctioned posts, why the University is not filling up these posts on regular basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to fill up the posts on regular basis but it would take some time for the reason that he has to chair a number of selection committees.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that as per the judgment in Uma Devi's case, if any person completed 10 years of service, he/she would get a right to be absorbed on regular basis.

Professor Karamjeet Singh and Professor A.K. Bhandari were of the view that the judgment would not be applicable to the persons who had completed 10 years after the year 2010.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that normally the courts granted relief in such cases.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that when the vacancies for such posts are existing in the College, why the appointments are not being made on regular basis.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath was of the view that since the University has been paying full salary to these contractual teachers in the Dental Institute, regular appointments should be made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in professional colleges, full salary has to be given to the faculty members. He was taking their concern and requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to give the advertisement for these posts along with the advertisement of constituent colleges.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the matter got diverted in the meeting of the Syndicate due to the judgment in the case of P. Sushila. If the qualifications had been cleared, they would follow the Supreme Court guidelines and would fill up the posts as early as possible.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the posts of Regional Centres at Sri Muktsar Sahib and Kauni should also be advertised with these posts.

RESOLVED: That following faculty members, be re-appointed afresh purely on temporary basis for the period mentioned against each (with one day break as usual) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., under

Regulation 5 (b) at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation	Proposed date of Break in 2015 & 2016	Proposed Extension	
				From	To
1.	Dr. Amandeep Kaur	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.09.2016
2.	Dr. Prabhjot Kaur	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.09.2016
3.	Dr. Amrita Rawla	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.09.2016
4.	Dr. Vandana Gupta	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.09.2016
5.	Dr. Rajni Jain	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.09.2016
6.	Dr. Monika Nagpal	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.09.2016
7.	Dr. Manjot Kaur	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.09.2016
8.	Dr. M.K. Chhabra	Reader	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.09.2016
9.	Dr. Rajiv Rattan	Assistant Professor	11.10.2015 (Sunday) 12.10.2015 (Break Day)	13.10.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.09.2016
10.	Dr. Ruchi Singla	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.10.2016
11.	Dr. Rosy Arora	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.10.2016
12.	Dr. Prabhleen Brar	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.10.2016

13.	Dr. Vivek Kapoor	Senior Lecturer	10.11.2015 (Holiday) 11.11.2015 (Holiday) 12.11.2015 (Break Day)	13.11.2015	11 months i.e. up to 12.10.2016
-----	------------------	-----------------	---	------------	---------------------------------------

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (1) the process for filling up the faculty positions at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital on regular basis, be initiated;
- (2) at the same time, the process for filling up the faculty positions at P.U. Constituent Colleges, be also initiated; and
- (3) similarly, the process for filling up the faculty positions at P.U. Regional Centre at Sri Muktsar Sahib and P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, be also initiated.

Withdrawn Item

5. Considered if the rule of Punjab Government, as mentioned in the notification dated 15.03.2015 for promotion of senior Assistant and Stenographer, be adopted. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Rule 4 available at page No. 76-77 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 relating to promotion of Senior Assistant is reproduced below:

(i) Assistant: The post of Assistants shall be filled by promotion from amongst the clerk.

(ii) xxx xxx xxx

(iii) xxx xxx xxx

2. The University is an autonomous body and it has its own rules and regulations. The rule of Punjab Government are not directly applicable to University unless and until these are adopted by P.U.
3. The post of Senior Assistant is a promotional post in the Panjab University but whereas in Punjab Government, the post of Senior Assistant is filled in direct recruitment as well as by promotion.
4. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 30.8.2015 vide Para 14 has amended the existing rule as mentioned in the office note, in respect of filling up the post of Stenographer.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she had one query regarding the adoption of notification of Punjab Government dated 15th March 2015,

namely Punjab Civil Services (General and Common Conditions of Services) (Second Amendment) Rules, 2015. Whether the University had adopted the basic 1994 rules as well as the first amendment? They could talk about adoption of these rules only if they had adopted the basic rules and the first amendment. The agenda should not be brought in such a way because as per condition (2) of the second amendment, the person so appointed as Senior Assistant in terms of the Provisions of sub-rule (1), shall have, before his appointment, qualified a test in Punjabi typewriting. In the Punjab Government, since Punjabi is the official language, this conditions is mandatory. As far as the language for communication in Panjab University is concerned, Punjabi is not an official language. They were talking about adopting the second amendment. As per her knowledge, the basic rules of 1994 have not been adopted by the Panjab University. Since the first amendment had not been adopted, how could they adopt the second amendment? Therefore, the item needs reconsideration if the members agree.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Jarnail Singh said that it should be legally examined by a Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is okay. It could be examined.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the Committee would say about bringing the item again, the same could come to the Syndicate and if the Committee does not say so, the item should not be brought to the Syndicate.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that first of all they should themselves examine whether the first amendment had been adopted or not as said by Mrs. Anu Chatrath. The constitution of the Committee is a secondary one. The items should be withdrawn.

It was clarified that the item which had been brought was basically not adopting the rules for direct appointment, promotion to the post of Senior Assistant in the University is 100% internal. For quite some time, there were no promotions because the recruitment was not made. Now with the recruitment of 308 Clerks, they would be due for promotion. To avoid the earlier situation, the policy for promotion has to be corrected to allow promotion to the Clerks. At Panjab University, as far as, non teaching employees are concerned, Punjab Government rules are being followed whereas for teaching positions, UGC rules are followed. Therefore, it was for the Syndicate to decide and in case, the Clerks are due for promotion, should the promotion policy be adopted or not and if the members wanted to form a Committee to examine the issue, they could do so.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that as per the rules of Panjab University Calendar Volume-III, direct recruitment to the post of Senior Assistant is not a source of appointment. In the first instance, they would have to amend the regulations. The rules could not be amended retrospectively. They could constitute a Committee to consider the item because in the absence of amendment of rules, they could not adopt the notification.

It was clarified that they were not considering the rules for direct appointment, but only for promotion.

The Vice-Chancellor said in addition to five years condition, it has to be seen whether the old rules are to be followed or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item should be withdrawn and should be examined by a Committee.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the item should be withdrawn and a Committee be constituted to examine the same. Since the recruitments had been made after a long period, some of the persons would not be able to get promotion to the post of Superintendent even up to the year 2024.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for the fresh appointees, the conditions of five years service could be considered.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said the item should be withdrawn and it needed to be taken to the Board of Finance

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item may not be withdrawn but it could be deferred so that it remains alive and a policy could be made so that some progress is made.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a Committee be constituted and the item should be deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he entirely agreed with what Mrs. Anu Chatrath has said that the way the items are being introduced in the agenda, he was having very serious reservations. To overcome a particular problem as explained by the Registrar, the item is to adopt the rules of Punjab Government. They were lucky to have Mrs. Anu Chatrath, an expert of law, who pointed out that since the first amendment had not been adopted by the University, how could they adopt the second amendment? Had she not pointed, they were under the impression that they had adopted the first amendment and had no option but to accept the second amendment. Probably, that was not in good taste. The members of the Syndicate should not be tested as far as their knowledge is concerned. Such issues earlier used to come to the Syndicate after getting examined from 2-3 Committees and subsequently legally examined and satisfaction from all aspects. However, for the last 10 years, it has become a practice to endorse an office note without knowing the background/history of the case and what has been done in the past in the similar cases, an office note is given and on the basis of the note, the Vice-Chancellor marked the same to the Syndicate and the Syndicate approves the item. It is only before some time that they started this practice. If it is only for the promotion of Stenographers, then why so many other things have been mentioned here. The process could have cut short with the mention of only one line for promotion only and that the item should have been to take care of the practical problems being faced by the University for consideration of the Syndicate to review its own rules. Why to refer to the Punjab Government as the University has its own requirements and practices as well as they have their own promotion policy as far as the Senior Assistants are concerned. They should not refer to the Punjab Government as they had not adopted the first amendment at all as rightly pointed by Mrs. Anu Chatrath. Had Mrs. Anu not been here, they could have adopted the second amendment. He simply suggested that before any item is introduced to the Syndicate, it should be examined from all angles, including the existing practice so that the Syndicate could take a conscious decision. Items in this form cannot be and should not be considered by the Syndicate. It would be better that looking at the practical difficulties, a Committee be constituted and Committee should look into those difficulties and come out with suggestions to take care of the rules and requirements of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is well taken. The item as such is withdrawn and a new item would come.

RESOLVED: That the item be treated as withdrawn. In the meanwhile, a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the whole issue.

Items 6 and 7 on the agenda were taken up together.

Condonation of delay in submission of Ph.D. thesis

6. Considered if delay of 3 years, 3 months and 9 days beyond eight years, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Mr. Harbans Singh, a Research Scholar, enrolled on 18.05.2006 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Geography, be condoned and be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to following reasons.

- (i) Problems faced in data collection coupled with my professional assignments as teaching faculty and Registrar House Examinations at SCD Govt. College, Ludhiana.
- (ii) I remained hospitalized for considerable time and underwent surgery for kidney problem. This slowed down the pace of my research work.

The information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIV**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. Request of Shri Harbans Singh dated 22.06.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).
 2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled. **However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded.** The relevant regulations be amended accordingly”.

Condonation of delay in submission of Ph.D. thesis

7. Considered if, delay of 3 years, 9 months and 6 days beyond eight years, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Ms. Navita Sharma, research scholar enrolled on 11.12.2003 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Geography, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the date of communication of the

decision, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to following reasons:

“that the amount of field work involved in collecting primary data for research work was enormous. It included remote villages of Una District (Himachal Pradesh) and consultation of revenue records of 863 villages available with the Revenue Department at district Una. She had to visit selected villages to have first hand information from the Panchayats and interviewed many Sarpanches, Panches and Villagers. Secondly, compilation of data and preparation of village-wise base map also took time. Thirdly, she is serving as an Assistant Professor and was posted initially at Government College, Dharamshala (H.P.) in December 2009. Presently, she is teaching at Una since 2013. Her job is very demanding due to which she could not frequently visit her supervisor at Chandigarh.”

Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XV**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. Request of Ms. Navita Sharma dated 27.08.2015 is enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).
 2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled. **However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded.** The relevant regulations be amended accordingly”

While referring to Item No. 6, Professor Karamjeet Singh said that Professor Surya Kant, the Supervisor had recommended the application of the candidate who sought 15 days time to submit the thesis in the month of June and now the month of October has arrived but till date the case has not been decided. He suggested that administrative process could be speeded up to clear such cases.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the power to condone the delay up to six months could be delegated to the Vice-Chancellor

The Vice-Chancellor said that this power should be delegated to the Dean of University Instruction.

Some of the members also suggested that this power could be delegated to the Dean of University Instruction.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that the condonation of delay sought by the candidates is not 15 days, but more than 3 years. Therefore, the item has rightly been placed before the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the delay of 3 years, 3 months and 9 days beyond eight years, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Mr. Harbans Singh, a Research Scholar, enrolled on 18.05.2006 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Geography, be condoned and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision, and
- (2) the delay of 3 years, 9 months and 6 days beyond eight years, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Ms. Navita Sharma, research scholar enrolled on 11.12.2003 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Geography, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the date of communication of the decision.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the power to condone the delay up to six months beyond the period of eight years, under exceptional circumstances, on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded, be delegated to the Dean of University Instruction. If need be, the relevant Regulations/Rules/Guidelines be amended accordingly.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 10.08.2015 for concession at Community Centre to Class ‘C’ employees

8. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 10.08.2015 (**Appendix-XVI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that 50% concession in Rent for the booking of Community Centre, South Campus, Panjab University, Sector-25, Chandigarh, be given to the Class ‘C’ employees of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that instead of placing this item before the Syndicate, it should have been done either by the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar. There was no need of unnecessary representations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since any amendment in the decision of the Syndicate has to be made by the Syndicate, that was the reason why the item had been placed before the Syndicate. It could have been placed under ratification.

RESOLVED: That recommendation of the Committee dated 10.08.2015 that 50% concession in Rent for the booking of Community Centre, South Campus, Panjab University, Sector-25, Chandigarh, be given to the Class ‘C’ employees of the University, be approved.

Changes in Policy Against Sexual Harassment (Rules and Procedures) of Panjab University

9. Considered if, the necessary changes in the existing Policy Against Sexual Harassment (Rules and Procedures) of Panjab University, be incorporated, in the light of the observations made by PUCASH in its meeting dated 18.9.2015 (**Appendix-XVII**) and in the letter dated 18.09.2015 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Under Secretary, Govt. of India, MHRD, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi, to make it in consonance with the “The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace” (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

- NOTE:**
1. All observations/ communication from PUCASH enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).
 2. Policy Against Sexual Harassment (Rules & Procedures) along with proceedings of the Syndicate dated 24.08.2013 (Para 4) vide which said policy was approved/adopted (**Appendix-XVII**).
 3. A copy of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).
 4. A copy of DOPT guidelines enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that as far as this item was concerned, he is a member of PUCASH and was aware of the discussion held in the meeting. The University had already taken care of two issues. One issue was the constitution of the Committee by the employer which had been taken care as the Committee now stands endorsed by the Syndicate and Senate of the University. Secondly, there is no student member on the Committee. As per the Government of India Act, there should be no student member on the Committee, the same has also been taken care of now. There was another issue relating to the Apex Committee, ACASH. In the said Act, there is no provision of an Apex Appellate authority. They have to, therefore, do away with that in the P.U. System. Some of the members of PUCASH were of the opinion that the policy needed to be reframed. It would be better if Syndicate could tell the PUCASH, which now consists of some outside members also who are well versed with the Act, as to what would be the policy, and then the same can be approved by the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the situation at the moment was that a policy which had already been approved by the Syndicate needed certain revisions. These revision relate to two aspects. One is the constitution of PUCASH itself, which as per the current Syndicate approved policy requires ACASH. ACASH ought not to doing its assigned task, the same job is meant to be done by Government of the University itself. They put the names of the existing Committee before the Syndicate and Senate and there were no objections to that. As for future, the constitution of the Committee would be the job of the Syndicate and Senate. As and when the current Committee would approach its concluding term in July 2017, it would be the responsibility of the Vice-Chancellor to consult the Syndicate to form a sub-Committee of the Syndicate well before July, 31, 2017. Such a Committee would suggest names for the PUCASH and those names would be approved by the Syndicate before July, 2017.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that as per the Act, the term of the Committee could be for three years, instead of two years, as stipulated for the present PUCASH.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they could leave the matter to the PUCASH to give some suggestions or leave to the Sub-Committee of the Syndicate. The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to have an interface with the current Chairperson of the PUCASH and come out with a proposal as to what changes could be incorporated in the PUCASH. This could also include how to proceed with the constitution of the Committee in the future and how its

outcome could be processed by the Governing Body of the University and also to which quarter the reports of PUCASH would have to be sent. For the Central Act, the reports of a given Committee of a given Department have to be sent to somebody in the Government of India. But in case of the Panjab University, the reports of our Committee would have to be submitted to the employer, i.e., the Syndicate, because for most of the employees, Syndicate/Senate is the employer. But in case of the Vice-Chancellor, the appointing authority in P.U. System is the Chancellor.

Professor A.K. Bhandari suggested that some members of the PUCASH, like Chairperson, could also be added to the Sub-Committee of the Syndicate, entrusted to suggest changes. It should not be seen that PUCASH is doing all the things. The help of PUCASH could also be taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the term of the present Committee is up to July 2017.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item was to consider the proceedings of the meeting of PUCASH convened by the Registrar to deliberate upon the clarifications/ corrections suggested by PUCASH. The corrections and suggestions have already been made by the PUCASH after thorough deliberations. The first suggestion was to bring the composition of the Committee in accordance with the Act. If they feel that if the existing Committee is not in consonance with the Act, should they take the decision that if the Committee was not in accordance with the Act, the same could be allowed to continue up to 2017. As Professor A.K. Bhandari said that there was no need to make changes in the present Committee. They were trying to correct something else. As far as the proceedings of the Committee were concerned, the Committee meeting had been attended by the Dean of University Instruction and Registrar and that was why the item had come to the Syndicate that immediate corrective measures needed to be taken as far as PUCASH is concerned which was not in consonance with the Act. Another aspect which has been given by the Vice-Chancellor and the Dean of University Instruction is that they had to take a decision for constitution of a Committee which is to be constituted after 2017. Until and unless, they were clear whether it is connected to the existing Committee or for the Committee which has to be constituted after July 2017, how the Syndicate could take a decision? The Committee had been constituted by the ACASH. As per the Act, the Committee has to be constituted by the employer that meant for all practical purposes, the Committee which is in existence in spite of the fact that it has been approved by the Syndicate and Senate, probably is not in accordance with the Act.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the existing Committee is now in consonance with the Act. There was no provision for student representation and the problem was that the designation of one of the members was wrongly written. The designation was written as Research Scholar whereas the designation of the member was Research Officer. The designation was corrected by the Syndicate. That is why there is no other problem, the only problem was that it has to be constituted by the Syndicate and Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that merely constitution of the Committee by the Syndicate and Senate does not mean that it has been constituted in consonance with the Act. The constitution of the Committee has to be literally in terms of what has been prescribed in

the Act. If it is so, then why they have said that it was not in consonance with the Act.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it so happened by chance that the student member so called who was put in the Committee happened to be a Research Officer. So there would have no need to change the Committee. Had that student been a real student, then there could have been a need to change. That is one aspect. There is no need to change this part of the policy immediately. The existing PUCASH constituted by the Syndicate for two years ago could be modified later.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that after getting the PUCASH modified, the same should be brought before the Syndicate because there are so many things which are to be added. Secondly, apart from the above resolution of the minutes of the PUCASH, the PUCASH brought to the notice of the DUI was that one of the major difficulties arises when police investigation is required in a particular complaint against sexual harassment and police does not give any report. It was decided to authorize Professor Navdeep Goyal, DSW to take up this matter with the police authorities. He was not able to comprehend.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that there was one complaint lying with the PUCASH, where outsiders were involved and they could not punish the outsiders. Since it was a case of eve teasing, a police complaint was lodged not in one case but in fact the complaint was lodged in two cases. The police investigated the complaint and finally some compromise was reached between the parties. But no report was submitted by the police to the Panjab University.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about the provisions under which police is supposed to submit the report to the Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as per provisions of the Act, if a complaint is received by the PUCASH or internal committee, the same has to be decided within 90 days. On receipt of a complaint, the PUCASH had taken any action and they wrote to the Chief of University Security to file a police complaint. But until and unless after that the report is submitted by the police to PUCASH, no decision could be taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the police could say that they are not under any obligation to submit the report, then what would be the reply of the University. He was of the view that PUCASH has not to go so far that on behalf of the Committee, somebody has been authorized to approach the Police. Probably, where outsiders are involved, the complaint could be filed before the Local Committee or the District Officer. They cannot assume that the police was subordinate to them. All these things need to be taken care of.

Professor Navdeep Goyal agreed to the suggestions put forth by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that probably it means that the University has been pursuing and following the case with the police, the PUCASH should not become a direct party. Secondly, unfortunately what is happening is that if a complaint is to be lodged with the police, the same is being routed through Chief of University Security. Chief of University Security ought to file a complaint which is related to security aspects only. He was surprised to see that even in the fraud in the pension case unearthed by the University, the

complaint has been filed by the Chief of University Security which has nothing to do with security aspect. In fact, being an executive head, it is the Registrar who has to represent the University with the police. Not that he was trying to raise the issue why it was happening. They have to be wiser every day. In case problem is created by student/s or law and order problem, the complaint could be filed by the Chief of University Security/DSW. Why this practice has started because the Chief of University Security, whosoever he may be, used to remain in constant touch with the police. That was why they used to say that the Chief of University Security has to file the police complaint. But for each and every problem, the complaints are being filed through Chief of University Security. This practice must be corrected.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that with regard to the fraud case, he himself had gone to meet with higher authorities of the police. Even when the cases are filed on behalf of the University, the Chief of University Security is only a person who has gone to the Police Station.

Shri Ashok Goyal said all this could create problems in future.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that Panjab University is the complainant and the Registrar is the competent person to file the complaint. In such cases, the Panjab University could not be treated as the complainant.

The members pointed out that the Registrar could not delegate such powers.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that whenever a case is to be filed by the University or any case is filed against the University, that has to be in the name of the Registrar.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath was of the view that any complaint filed by the University on behalf of the Registrar could not withstand in the eyes of the law.

It was informed that Chief of University Security was authorized by the Registrar to file the complaint in the case.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that from the legal point of view, the Registrar cannot delegate the powers. He further stated that the University can hire the services of an Advocate who could represent the University because if the Registrar is the complainant, nobody could file the complaint on his behalf.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the complaint in every case has to be signed and filed by the Registrar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a decision to this effect may be taken by the Syndicate, but the Syndicate cannot authorize the Chief of University Security or the Dean Student Welfare to file. It is inbuilt that whatever decision had been taken by the Syndicate that has to be carried out by the Registrar under his signature as per the Panjab University Act. Unless and until there is a specific provision in the Act, they cannot delegate their powers to someone else. The University has to be represented by the Registrar only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would examine it and if they have defaulted, the same would be corrected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had not raised the issue in Syndicate and Senate earlier because of certain reasons.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the resolved report of PUCASH has been approved. However, apart from the resolved part, the other three points mentioned in the report could be part of the discussion only.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the University could not have faced such a problem had the post of Chief Vigilance Officer been filled by the University. Everything is coming to the office of the Vice-Chancellor or Registrar. New issues, academic and non-academic, were cropping up because the University is expanding at a rapid pace. The Registrar office had to look into all these issues in the absence of any other officer which is designated to look into such issues.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the points made by the members were well taken and they would examine that the complaints of that serious nature as that of recent fraud have to be filed by the Registrar and if necessary, changes would be made. The necessity of post of Chief Vigilance Officer is there and they were attending to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as pointed out by Professor Karamjeet Singh, PUCASH is not an ordinary committee which is functioning under the normal circumstances and the normal rules and regulations, but is supposed to act under the statutory provisions of the Act of Government of India.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they were continuously learning from experiences.

RESOLVED: That keeping in view the recommendations of PUCASH dated 18.9.2015 (**Appendix**) and letter of Under Secretary, Govt. of India, MHRD, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi dated 18.09.2015 (**Appendix**), necessary changes in the existing Policy Against Sexual Harassment (Rules and Procedures) of Panjab University, be incorporated.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Sub-Committee of Syndics, including a couple of members of PUCASH, be constituted to recommend changes to be incorporated in the PUCASH ensuring that PUCASH is in consonance with the Central Act.

Letters of Professor Rajesh Gill to Chancellor

10. Considered the letters dated 14.09.2015, 19.9.2015 and 22.9.2015 addressed to the Chancellor by Professor Rajesh Gill in light of the directions given by the Chancellor's office that the University may examine the issue raised in the letter and take appropriate action in this regard as required.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the matter under reference was discussed at length in the Syndicate and the Syndicate had already taken cognizance of it. In the meantime, some more documents relating to it have arrived. A Committee of the Syndicate is looking into the matter. If anybody has any comment, he/she could share; otherwise they could wait for the outcome of the Committee(s). Professor A.K. Bhandari is looking into the matter and as soon as his Committee(s) come up with inputs, they could attend to that. Whatever outcome would come from the wisdom of the Committee, the same would be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that in the last meeting, it was decided that a Committee would be constituted, whether the same had been constituted or not.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the Minutes of the last Syndicate meeting are still awaited. However, a Committee of the Syndics was proposed to be formed in the Syndicate itself.

There were some general remarks on the delay in the drafting of the previous Syndicate meeting. Professor Bhandari desired that Minutes relating to the particular item be finalized preferentially and be submitted to him to proceed further.

To this, the Vice-Chancellor stated that some of the colleagues namely Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Professor Ronki Ram had volunteered to be members of the Committee to resolve the matter and other issues had been left to their discretion. Professor Karamjeet Singh said more volunteers could add to this process.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that Mrs. Anu Chatrath should also be made a member of that Committee. Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that Professor Karamjeet Singh should also join in resolving the matter informally.

The Vice-Chancellor agreed to it.

However, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he understands things a little late. Therefore, he would like to point out that the item brought to the present Syndicate meeting is not as was brought in the last meeting of the Syndicate. In the last meeting, he had specifically asked as to what was the issue which needed to be discussed. It is a legal and technical matter as far as an individual is concerned, and another is a policy matter. The item at that time was to consider an issue arising out of. It was not to consider on the basis of any complaint. It was explained in detail by the Vice-Chancellor that it is only the arising out of issue because probably they did not have a proper mechanism to deal with the situation which arises in future qua the highest authority of the University. That was the only thing. Thereafter, he said that they should leave the matter to the members of the Syndicate who will be able to sort out also the particular issue. He continued to recall that he might have stated few more things as well, to which the Vice-Chancellor then had responded by saying not to criticize him. But, when as a matter of claim/right, Shri Ashok Goyal said that as a head of the family, they would not allow him to run away from the responsibility. Thereafter, he remembered that he talked to Professor A.K. Bhandari and Dr. I.S. Sandhu also spoke to him (Shri Goyal) that let us resolve the particular issue. When he spoke, he was given to understand that the Committee had been constituted not for any individual case/s but only for the generic cases. In the next day's newspapers also, it was specifically mentioned that the Committee was not to look into the particular case but to frame a policy. In the light of that, of course his friend, who was sitting there with him, must have been accused that what these people had been doing all these days. It was Dr. I.S. Sandhu who said that the matter would be resolved within a week. What did they do? Why the Dean of University Instruction (Professor A.K. Bhandari) had not done anything when he was the Chairman of the Committee. In the light of that, it was not possible for the Syndicate members to explain, as the Vice-Chancellor had also said that the Committee was not to look into individual case, it was only for taking generic decision

as per the situation which may arise in future. However, today's item is to consider letters dated 14.09.2015, 19.09.2015 and 22.09.2015 and another letter which has been placed on the table today in the morning, meaning thereby that the item today is completely different from the item which was brought in the last Syndicate meeting. If at all, the Committee had been constituted for a particular purpose in the last meeting, let it be decided in this meeting what are the terms of reference of that Committee so that they may not go beyond and leave those things uncovered which are mandated by the Syndicate. In the light of that, they must take a conscious decision that while notifying the Committee, the terms of reference may also be included in that.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that last time it was very clear that generic issue had to be addressed if a complaint is filed by a senior person against a very senior officer or functionary of the University, then how this had to be handled, in the light of Johl Committee recommendations. It was also suggested to look into the individual issues. In this context, it is necessary to look into the Minutes of the previous Syndicate meeting. If these were not resolved in that meeting; whether it was generic or both, since the Minutes of that meeting are still awaited, the same could be decided in today's Syndicate meeting.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that in the last meeting of the Syndicate some of the members had volunteered to offer their services to resolve the particular issue in an informal manner. Today, the members could define the terms of reference of the Committee for the generic matter. He emphasized that informal attempt was not a part of the resolved part.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they could see the DVDs of the last meeting of the Syndicate, which stand sent to all the Syndicate members already. If he remembered correctly, there were two issues. One matter was to be resolved in an informal manner and the other in a formal manner. A formal Committee headed by Professor Bhandari is looking into the generic issue. With regard to an informal manner, some members of the Syndicate were to look into it. The Vice-Chancellor added that the members of the Syndicate have known each other for long and since some of the members were more experienced of the University system than him, the matter was left to the individual members to make efforts so that the particular matter does not escalate continuously, and the matter ought to get resolved. The matter at hand between two individuals also has connotations for such matters arising in future. They need to have some policy to handle such situations, at the moment, no policy seems to be in place. It was in that context that a Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Bhandari was to deliberate. This could see if there were some provisions as far as Johl Committee's recommendations were concerned, some additions needed can be made in the Standing Committee, which the Johl Committee considered adequate to address an issue. When Johl Committee gave the recommendations, the particular matter had not escalated to a stage, as it has today. The recommendations of Johl Committee came in May, 2015. At that time, the matter was an incident, after that the matter had become a series of incidents. Something was to happen in an informal manner and something in a formal manner to address it in a generic way. The idea was such that the things ought to be contained and resolved as early as possible on behalf of the government of the University, so that first, the government should be seen as the competent body which can handle any difficult situation

howsoever complex that could be. After all, the continuation of the particular matter was not in the interest of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as he understood, the Committee constituted by the Syndicate is to take care of generic issues. As far as the issue at hand is concerned, that is not to be taken care of by that Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members were expected to discuss in an informal manner and they could also come out with a generic algorithm. It is quite possible that the generic algorithm could be self consuming that it could handle any situation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be seen whether it was within the purview of that Committee to look into the allegations leveled in the letters.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee had to give some framework which had to be considered by the Syndicate later.

Responding back, Shri Ashok Goyal added that the framework was already self contained in the Act and rules of the Government and probably one cannot go out of that. The Syndicate, Senate or any governing body cannot go beyond the Act. If they have to do anything, they have to act only within the purview of the Act. Another matter is to be handled informally, unofficially or out of the official forum, that is completely different. Officially, they have to take care of such similar problems which might arise in future. The issue at present was to consider a particular complaint, which had been mentioned in the letter. If that has to be done by the Syndicate Committee or any particular Committee, this had to be seen whether the Syndicate is empowered to consider these letters (of the complainant) or if the Committee, so suggested, is empowered to deal with such situations. If not, then, what is the course of action left with the University. So it could be mandated to the Committee to look into this case also as to how and under what provisions this case could be dealt with and ensuring that minimum damage is done to the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor A.K. Bhandari requested that Minutes of this particular item of today's meeting should be provided at the earliest to enable him to proceed further in the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Mrs. Anu Chatrath would be able to guide them in the matter under reference. They have to define as to what is covered under section 16 of the Act. Now, we as normal person think that anything which is printed in the press is public. It was not so. Publication is anything which by any mode reaches to a person who is not supposed to know. The correspondence or documents to the members of the Syndicate, which is the Executive Body of the University, are sent in a sealed cover. Merely sending something in a closed sealed cover does not automatically mean that it is not a public document. This was his personal opinion. So they have to see it from that point of view also that they have sent the papers only to that quarter where it has been mandated by the Act where those papers have to go. If they had sent the papers to anybody other than specified in the Act, that probably is nothing but publication of the information or the content of the complaint of the complainant or contents of the proceedings of the Sexual Harassment

Committee. But then again he was open to correction. One has to see if such an issue needs to be legally examined, not administratively, the reason being that there is no inbuilt mechanism in the University at present. The Act has come much after the Regulations of the University had been framed. They could not go beyond the Act and have to see what are the limitations as far as the Act is concerned and what were the *dos* and *don'ts*. That could probably be done with the help of a legal luminary because this Act was the latest one and latest judgments were coming everyday through which they were becoming wiser every day. In the light of that, he thought that Panjab University should take a conscious decision as to what was mentioned in different sections, i.e., 16, 17 and 26 of the Act. All these things should be taken into account and the Committee can also be asked to look into this aspect.

RESOLVED: That Mrs. Anu Chatrath be also appointed a member of the Committee on generic issue, which has already been mandated to be constituted by the Syndicate dated 20.09.2015.

Proposal of Professor Akshaya Kumar, President, PUTA and Fellow 11. Considered the proposal dated 8.10.2015 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of Professor Akshaya Kumar, President PUTA, and Fellow.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the letter of the President, PUTA mentions about one thing in the light of NAAC report and on the basis of general feedback of the fellow teachers. He has proposed two amendments. It is good to discuss the NAAC report and the consequences of that report. When the NAAC Committee members were discussing the report, he (Professor Goyal) was present there as also the Vice-Chancellor. One of the issues raised was about the appointment of the Dean which has not been mentioned in the letter. Now, the situation is that a person can be appointed as Dean of Faculty even if that person is not a teacher or has nothing to do with that Faculty professionally. Such kind of things were probably not liked by the NAAC Peer Team, and there were many other issues too. Some of the issues which have been raised by the President, PUTA were not, in fact, raised by the NAAC Team. They need to discuss this because ultimately they have to talk about the Act or the Regulations which are very old, as far as structure of the University is concerned. They need to talk about those and deliberate on the issues, and one could form a Committee of Senate members, covering all the constituencies in the composition of the Senate. He added that a Committee should be made, which should look into this letter as well as matters arising out of the recommendations of the NAAC Team, and, also whatever are the needs at the current moment.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired for his knowledge as to under which provisions, this letter has been placed before the Syndicate. They had already discussed that the way the items are being introduced has completely changed the scenario. Anything or everything can be placed before the Syndicate under some provisions, which are contained in the Calendar. He inquired that under which provision, this letter has been placed before the Syndicate, just that the President, PUTA has written the letter and that too on the basis of some document which is not in the possession of the Syndicate members and they were considering this letter?. As Professor Navdeep Goyal has said that there were so many issues which were not pointed out by NAAC and have been introduced, and there is one particular pertinent issue which had been pointed out by NAAC that has not been mentioned in the letter. He added that Syndicate members did not have access to that document which had been referred to in the letter. In his opinion, there was no such

provision under which the letter could have been put up to the Syndicate. He felt that way, anybody would write any letter and the Syndicate members would start getting hundreds of such letters. Would it be possible for the office of the Vice-Chancellor to place each and every letter before the Syndicate, unless it is covered under the specific provision(s) contained in the Calendar? He could not understand the content of the letter mentioning the proposal for amendments in Senate and Syndicate.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that he would not talk about the legality whether the letter could be placed before the Syndicate or not. The President, PUTA has given the NAAC reference and mentioned five points. He would agree with 2-3 points. For example, point No.2 that a Senate member be allowed to become member of Syndicate for not more than two terms during his term as a member of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they were not discussing the details but discussing generic issue first.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that in the light of what NAAC had talked about, for structural changes, a Committee of broader agreement should be formed to see what structural changes could be made in the interest of the University and for the betterment of the University. Like, the Dean of the Languages should be strictly from that subject or Faculty. It was asked by NAAC 3-4 times, how the Deans are elected in Panjab University. This needed to be changed. Though this time, the representation of the teaching community in the Senate by way of nominated members is good in numbers, but, earlier it was not so. He pointed out that on the University campus, election for only 6 seats has been taking place since 1992. His suggestion was that representation of the teachers should be enhanced by curtailing the nominated members. The representation of the teachers should be enhanced to the level of 10 members by way of election.

While referring to point No. 1 of the letter of President, PUTA, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that before writing this letter, President, PUTA himself should have set an example as he has opted for Arts and Science Faculties whereas he belongs to the Language Faculty. The President, PUTA has raised this issue, just for raising the issue. With regard to point No.2, Dr. Sandhu said that Syndicate is an elected body, and if the Senate members were satisfied with performance of a given Syndicate member, he/she gets repeated in this (Syndicate) House. Citing the example of Shri Ashok Goyal and late Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, who had been elected repeatedly to the Syndicate, he said that even Mrs. Anu Chatrath could be repeated, and nobody should have any objection as he/she is elected. The President, PUTA has become a member of the Senate by way of proxy. He pointed out that Professor Akshay Kumar had lost the election twice, whereas the members of the Senate are elected. He disagreed with Professor Yog Raj, as six members of the present Syndicate are from the Panjab University campus, whereas, the total strength of the Senate is 92 members. It is just like talking in the air. If they talk in terms of principle, the Dean should be the Professor of the University. In principle, so many things could be considered. All the members are responsible and could think. The work of the Dean is very important. He said that the issues raised by President, PUTA are baseless. The Senate is an elected body, having elected members. The rules had been framed after thorough deliberations. Though there were 188 Affiliated Colleges but only 8 seats are for the teachers of the Colleges. Out of lacs of students, only 15 members are elected through the

constituency of Registered Graduates. Perhaps, from the letter it seems that the representation on the Syndicate and Senate should be from the campus treating it as University, and the Affiliated Colleges should be disassociated from the campus.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that, had Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath been present here, he might have paraphrased reply by recalling an anecdotal saying in Punjabi. Though the President, PUTA has been referring to the NAAC, but nobody knows what the NAAC has said. The elections of the Fellows for the Senate are held as per the provisions of the Panjab University Act. The Syndicate is not the competent body to amend the Act but could only recommend change in the Regulations. The proposal should be rejected out rightly and the President, PUTA could be asked to write a letter to the Government of India for making any proposals for amendments in the Act.

On this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was completely in agreement with what Shri Jarnail Singh has said. The item in this form should not be considered by the Syndicate. It would be better if the item is withdrawn, if not withdrawn, should be rejected.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he agreed with Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Jarnail Singh. First of all, how the things are brought to the Syndicate, it is not a good system to consider the proposal directly. Referring to the NAAC report, he said that neither they were aware of the NAAC report nor the same had been provided to the members. They were not aware of the contents of the NAAC report. If at all, the report had been given to Professor Akshay Kumar, why the same had not been given to other members? It would be better if the item is withdrawn instead of rejecting it because it is not as per the spirit of the Act. As Dr. Sandhu has rightly said that there is a provision for representation to the Syndicate from all the constituencies. The present system is very good. With regard to election to the Syndicate, there should be no binding of term/s as the members are elected. All the members are elected or nominated except ex-officio members. He emphasized that this item should be out rightly withdrawn instead of rejecting it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that NAAC report is not a property of few people. It had been given to almost everyone in the University and had become a public document. He did not remember whether NAAC report had been given to all the members of the Syndicate and Senate or not. It is a public document and is also supposed to be uploaded on the web page of IQAC of Panjab University. The NAAC reports are also typically put on the NAAC website. It is mandatory for the NAAC to put all reports on its website. Not all reports may be available on the website, but most of reports are available.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that he did not receive a copy of the NAAC report.

To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that the report would be sent to all the members of the Syndicate and Senate. It is not an issue at all. He clarified that he had been told repeatedly by many of them that anything proposed by a Senate member should be brought to the attention of the Syndicate members. It is in that spirit the letter had been placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whosoever had told the Vice-Chancellor was completely mistaken. There is a provision about

what could be brought to the Syndicate which is proposed by a Fellow or proposed by someone else. There is a set procedure. It is not that somebody writes a letter and that the same is put up before the Syndicate; because they were not clear about this, they started discussing like that they agree with one point and disagree with other point. That is why he raised a point of order whether such a letter straightaway can be placed before the Syndicate or not, that should be seen.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was for the members to consider it in any way. But it was his understanding and it had happened many times in the past also that the Senate members send the proposal and he puts the same before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal proposed that the item should be rejected.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu also favoured for the rejection of the item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let other members also express their viewpoints.

Professor Ronki Ram said that every time it had been said that every item to the Syndicate should be placed through a proper procedure and it had not come like that. There could be some discussion on it what procedures and what matters were important. A matter would be placed before the Syndicate through some procedure. How this matter had come, who brought this matter, because the person is not an elected member and just President of PUTA and nominated for a year or so. Without taking into account the very writings of this letter, the President, PUTA comes to the Senate as representative of entire teaching community of the University. So when he makes a statement in the Senate, or gives anything in writing, he is not doing so on his own. He has given the letter on the PUTA letterhead. It means that this letter is representing all the teachers of the University and he is representing their will and trying to bring this matter to the Senate. The letter has been given in the capacity of President, PUTA and not in a personal capacity. When one President completes the term, the new one takes over. Of course, this has to be communicated to the office of the Chancellor. Whether at this moment, the letter should be brought to the Syndicate or not, it is for the members to discuss. But he felt that when President, PUTA makes a statement, that must be brought to the governing body that the teachers body wants this thing. It was for the governing body to accept the matter or not or appoint a Committee or not. Secondly, when we say that change should be brought, because this is the body of Syndicate and body of Senators and they sit here as members of the Syndicate, as also of the Senate. Now it comes that the letter comes, which still wants to make the change in the Senate, it is placed before the Senate. Is that a proper body to pass it or withdraw because it is questioning some of the provisions of the Senate itself. They had often said whenever a complaint against a person is made, that person should withdraw from that body. Similar is the condition here. The matter comes to the Syndicate and Senate and if the members of the Syndicate and Senate say that they would not discuss the same. It is okay. But somewhere, Panjab University was founded in 1882. The governing body is there in which some changes were needed. If NAAC had told them at one point of time that they need certain changes in governing bodies, they have to start the process. PUTA has started it. It does not matter who has taken the initiative. The thing is that this body is a large body where they could talk. They could say that these things are required. It is time to test the matter.

They should be liberal enough that if certain changes are required, let those changes be made because nobody is going to change the very structure of the Senate. He is in the Syndicate up to December, 2015. If something is got right here, they should accept the same. There could be arguments why the required changes are to be accepted or not. The purpose is that this body is responsible for the entire set up of the society. This is a governing body and the people would look towards them. They should not take it for and against. They should look into the proper spirit. His humble submission was that the issue is very important and has come at the right moment. As Shri Jarnail Singh, the senior most member, said that it should be addressed to the Parliament, then someone would say that it should go to the Prime Minister or Chancellor and it would be well and good if it goes to the Parliament through the Syndicate. They should not take it as offence that it has started raising fingers towards the Syndicate and they should say no, withdraw or reject the item. It was for the members to discuss.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as a point of order debate has been started by many of the members in spite of the fact that he has not touched any of the point raised and he has not discussed the points on merit, as if he has been opposing the same. He has simply said that is it not the duty of the Syndicate to ensure that proper procedure has been followed as per the Act and the Regulation has been followed for bringing such letters for consideration. Dr. Ronki Ram is right that it is not only Prof. Akshay Kumar who is speaking; it is the entire Panjab University Teachers Association is speaking. He said that in the particular term starting 2012, it is in his knowledge that Panjab University Staff Association (Non-Teaching) had written about 50 letters, he enquired which of the letters has been placed before the Syndicate and Senate and they have also written the letters in the capacity of the President and also as a member of the Senate on the plea that, that did not cover the process that had been explained. Whether it is process or no process, they should rise to the occasion, he could also deliver lectures. He simply said that, maybe he agreed with him (President, PUTA), but he did not agree with the way the item had been introduced in the Syndicate, he had every right to raise objection. Tomorrow, as Dr. Ronki Ram said, if somebody writes a letter to the Speaker of the Parliament, could the Speaker place the same in the agenda of the Parliament that it related to the amendment in the constitution of the Panjab University Act. Could it be done? There has to be a proper procedure, it has to go through various committees, as per, whatever procedure has been laid down. That was why he said that the item should be straightaway rejected. As far as the requirement for amendment in the Regulations is concerned, it is not for the first time, they had been doing the same on ongoing basis. The Regulations have been amended by the Senate and if the Senate can take care of amending the Regulations enhancing the retirement age of teachers from 60 years to 65 years, it was the Senate which did that. The Senate was very much aware of the requirements to be made. As a member of the Senate, he (President, PUTA) could raise it in the Senate, make a proposal in the Senate, or could bring it by any other mode and explain in the Senate. But this is not the way. That meant that it is purely the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor as to which letter is to be taken before the Syndicate and which letter is not to be taken in the Syndicate. Probably, the Vice-Chancellor would not like to be defended like that what he feels is important is there and which is not important, he would not place the same before the Syndicate. He was simply saying on a point of order about the procedure that let they not start discussing the issue on merits. In his view, this letter in this form should not be considered at all.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that as per the University Calendar provisions, Regulations after approval by the Senate are sent to the Parliament for final approval. So first the elected two bodies, i.e., Syndicate and Senate, should consider it. As Dr. Ronki Ram has rightly pointed out that once President, PUTA writes a letter, that should be treated as voice of the entire teaching community, the Vice-Chancellor has taken a right decision to place the same before the Syndicate for consideration. She further said that the principle Act of Panjab University was enacted way back in 1947 and it needed certain changes. For that, she suggested that a bigger committee could be constituted to recommend not only in the Syndicate and Senate but also wherever they feel the changes required in the Regulations of principle Act of the University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there was no dispute that changes should be done not only in the Syndicate and Senate but in other bodies also like Board of Studies as sometimes members of the Board of Studies are 30, whereas the students in a department itself are 40 in number. Therefore, changes are required; but the only dispute is that, for example, if tomorrow he gives a representation as Assistant Professor and requests to take the same to the Syndicate and Senate. So, a technical gap is there. Therefore, he suggested that a Committee could be constituted having representatives of all the constituencies which would suggest the required changes.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she also agreed that like anything, provisions of the Act get obsolete and required structural changes. But she was not very comfortable with the argument that since this letter has been written on the letterhead of PUTA, it was the voice of the teaching community. She enquired on which forum, the PUTA had discussed this issue. She said that about 10 days back, a meeting of the General Body of PUTA was held, but the issue was not discussed.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that as suggested, a Committee should be constituted to suggest holistic view of the changes in the amendment wherever required.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this item stands withdrawn. He would give a feedback of today's discussions to the President, PUTA and if permitted, the recording of today's discussion would be given to him. In the meanwhile, in consultation with Professor A.K. Bhandari, he would try to form a Committee of all the stakeholders in the University. From time immemorial, first the Graduate constituency which is a representative of the civil society in the University and representation from the Principals of the Affiliated Colleges, representation from the College teachers, representation from people who have long served in the Syndicate and Senate. He would like to have inputs from Shri Ashok Goyal and Mrs. Anu Chatrath and some nominated members who have known the University so that a broad based Committee could be there. Only when they have some concrete thing, the same would be circulated to the members of Syndicate, and then after having informal consultation with all of them, only then the matter would be taken to the forum of Syndicate or Senate. If everybody feels that after consultation, the matter is to be taken to the Senate, only then it would be placed before the Senate. They were not in a hurry. There is a process which could take time up to six months. The item as such stands withdrawn. He would take the help of Professor A.K. Bhandari to proceed further.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to add another thing that it is not in good taste that he did not want to consider this issue as voice of PUTA as explained by President, PUTA and Professor Ronki Ram. It is not in good taste as he (President, PUTA) has given the statement in the newspaper accusing and raising finger on a particular person. He has given the statement as President PUTA that one teacher who has taught Punjabi throughout his life has become a member of Syndicate from another Faculty. Could that be considered as the voice of the teaching community? Rather they should consider it as personal opinion of President, PUTA. Secondly, he would like to know what was the date of notification in the Gazette of Government of India notifying President, PUTA as a member of the Senate? Thereafter, they had taken the approval of the Chancellor notifying him to be a member of the Senate. The letter under reference has been written by Professor Akshay Kumar on 8.10.2015.

The Vice-Chancellor said that before President, PUTA attended the Senate meeting, there was a communication (SMS) that it had been approved by the Chancellor. He, therefore, asked him to attend the meeting of Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is very clear and law of the land says that until and unless, it is notified in the Gazette, the same cannot be enforced. Meaning thereby, slowly, they had been compromising with the procedures laid down in the Act of Panjab University by the Government of India for all practical purposes for all the bodies.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that Professor Akshay Kumar has written this letter in the capacity of a Fellow, whereas he should have written the same as President, PUTA.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was on 23.9.2015 that a SMS was received from the Chancellor's office that a formal letter would be sent tomorrow. He did remember the date of Gazette notification.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at the first instance, the office should see the exact date of notification in the gazette.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that one of the Presidents, PUTA (old/new) had to attend the meeting of Senate on September 27. The communication received from the Chancellor's office was that the proposal had been cleared, and on the basis of that communication, the President, PUTA (Professor Akshay Kumar) attended the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had this meeting been fixed in the month of December, when the Syndicate were to be elected, nobody would have allowed him to cast his vote in the absence of notification.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is the purpose of having President, PUTA as a member of the governing body?

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that he (President, PUTA) has been casting aspersions on the persons who have been elected as per provisions and on the contrary, he had done it against the provisions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that highlighting these things would not serve any purpose.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it was very good that they were constituting a Committee for the purpose by taking members from the

Senate. The members of this body who belonged to a particular constituency, but were not elected from that constituency, should also be associated though they might not be attached with the University, belonged to the constituencies who represent the society.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he understood the spirit of the members and would like to associate former members who have served the University in different capacities.

RESOLVED: That the item be withdrawn and a Committee be constituted to look into the issues arising out of letter of President, PUTA.

Deferred Item

12. Considered if, the seniority of the store-keepers be fixed after last confirmed clerk or after the last appointed clerk. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. Sarv Shri Charandeep Singh, Abhijeet Singla, Gurbawandeep Singh, Ms. Vandana and Shri Kuldeep Singh were appointed as store keeper in the pay-scale of Rs.5910-20200+GP1900, in P.U. construction office, UIET, Dental and UIHMT in September, 2010 and they were subsequently confirmed as such in September, 2011.
 2. The representation of the store-keeper for fixation of their seniority after last confirmed clerk is enclosed.
 3. On the persistent demand of the store-keepers the Senate at its meeting held on 29.09.2013 (Para LX (8)) approved the recommendations of the BOF dated 19.07.2013 and Syndicate dated 24.08.2013 that the post of Store-Keepers held by the employees be converted/merged in the strength of Clerks and accordingly their pay band be changed from Rs.5910-20200+GP1900 to Rs.10300-34800+GP 3200 in the following conditions:
 - (i) They will continue to perform the duty as Store-Keepers.
 - (ii) They will not claim for seniority from back dates.
 - (iii) They will be given seniority in the Clerical cadre after the last confirmed Clerk.
 - (iv) Their inter-se-seniority will remain the same as Store-Keepers.
 - (v) They will be given pay-scale & all other benefits as are applicable to Clerks from the date on which their cadre is merged.

- (vi) The implementation of merger into Clerical cadre will be effective w.e.f the date of decision of BOF.
- 4. The Clerks appointed against Advt. No.14/2008 have submitted representation received in the office on 21.08.2015, that the store-keepers merged in the cadre of clerk may be tagged in the strength of clerks after the confirmation of the clerks.
- 5. A statement containing the brief contents of the representation of the store-keepers and clerks as also the relevant rule 15.1 at page 82 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 and Punjab Civil Services Rule 8 available at pages 66-67 is enclosed.
- 6. Legal opinion of the Legal Retainer is as under:

“Seniority has to be strictly as per the decision of the Senate dated 29.09.2013 which is conformity with Rule 15.1 at page 82 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009. Nothing else need be done in my opinion. Employee in the cadre who is confirmed earlier will rank senior”.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in some sense, they could argue in favour of both the parties because the Store-Keepers and the Clerks have their own points.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired about the legal opinion on the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would talk only about the provisions. It is a meeting of the Syndicate not of a Panchayat. Panchayati decisions could not be taken in this meeting. Whatever decisions are taken here, these are all as per the law and provisions of the Panjab University. This item had been brought to the Syndicate. If he remembered, a Committee was also constituted to look into this issue probably two years back. He thought that he was the Chairman of the Committee and the Committee had given some recommendations. He wondered when the formal agenda is being introduced in the Syndicate, the proceedings of that Committee have not been annexed with the item. In those proceedings, it was clearly mentioned that the seniority cannot be given.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that it is approved by the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate. After the approval, the Store-Keepers were issued letters that they have to be placed after the last confirmed Clerk. Once action had already been completed, the Syndicate could not reconsider the decision. It was mentioned on page 130 Note 3(iii). Now they were trying to get the decision of the Syndicate and the Senate modified after two years since the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate have already approved that they have to be placed after the last confirmed Clerk. On the representation of a few persons, to give them benefit, the item has been again placed before the Syndicate. The Rule 15.1 appearing at page 82 contained in Panjab University Calendar Volume-III is clear about this. The legal opinion

had also been sought and legal opinion is that it could not be done. After implementation of the Senate decision, it could not be reopened. The Board of Finance decided to merge the Store-Keepers in the Clerical cadre in July 2013 and subsequently approved by the Syndicate on 24.8.2013 and Senate on 29.9.2013. Once the Syndicate decision has been taken and it has been acted upon and the letters have been given, could they reopen the case. It would have legal complications.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that first of all they could reopen it. The office is not doing anything on its own. Once the Syndicate and Senate have taken a decision, the same bodies could reconsider also. He would like to bring to the notice that in a similar case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has said that confirmation is one of the inglorious uncertainty and hence determination of seniority on the basis of confirmation is not a sound position of law in the case of direct recruitment class II Union vs State of Maharashtra in 1990 and in a similar case, they have given the reverse judgment. In the case of Rashmi Yadav vs Panjab University and others similar decision reverse to that was taken why he was telling that these Store Keepers were in a lower scale. When they were merged, technically they were moving to a higher scale of Clerks. There they are not confirmed. They were confirmed as Store Keepers. Similarly, Lecturers are confirmed as Lectures and when move to Reader, they are confirmed as Reader. In that case they have to again examine the issue. It was for the members whether to correct the mistake or not.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that after the approval of the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate, the letters had been issued.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for the time being, the item be deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they need to correct the provisions of the Panjab University Calendar also and Mrs. Anu Chatrath would agree with him that what was the definition of confirmation. The definition of confirmation is not that a person is confirmed after completing one year of probation but that till the person is on probation, the Provident Fund (PF) is not deducted. But the moment, the person is confirmed, the PF is deducted from the date of joining which meant that the person is confirmed from the date of joining itself. Either this should be the formula or as Professor Bhandari said the persons coming from the lower scale to higher should be placed on one year probation.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that in the case of Store Keepers, they were merged/absorbed in the cadre of Clerks w.e.f. the date of decision of the Board of Finance dated 19.7.2013 and approved by Syndicate on 24.8.2013 and Senate on 29.9.2013 and they had been issued letters that they would be placed after the last confirmed Clerk.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the judgment of the Supreme Court those who joined prior to their merger but were confirmed subsequently with retrospective date what would be the position then.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that confirmation is from the date of joining. She was talking to Professor Navdeep Goyal that as per the decision, the Store-Keepers are to be placed after the last confirmed Clerk.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said the Store-Keepers were not confirmed as Clerks.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that every person is confirmed from the date of joining.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item be deferred.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the Store-Keepers could not claim seniority from the back date.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Store-Keepers should have agreed to where they were placed in the seniority.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had no hesitation in saying that everything was done at his behest. The Store-Keepers had said that they did not want anything but just to merge into the Clerical cadre.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the Store-Keepers were confirmed in the year 2011 and they were getting their confirmation benefits for two years. This case could be legally examined.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it is a difficult matter. There is also a judgment of the Supreme Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would try to find out a compromise through the formation of a Committee comprising Mrs. Anu Chatrath, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Shri Naresh Gaur and Registrar and the recommendations of the Committee would come to the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred and, in the meanwhile, a Committee comprising Mrs. Anu Chatrath, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Shri Naresh Gaur and Registrar, be constituted to examine the issue and make recommendations, which be placed before the Syndicate.

Appointment of a person to prepare note in pursuant of Enquiry Report

13. Considered appointment of someone in place of Shri G.K. Chatrath to prepare a note in pursuant to Enquiry Report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Enquiry officer in the case of Shri P.K. Ghai, Junior Engineer, P.U. Construction office. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIX**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.09.2012/ 06.10.2012 vide Para 21 (**Appendix-XIX**) has decided that the matter be examined and a note be prepared by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, who would be provided all kind of help, including relevant records by the Law Officer. Thereafter the matter be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to appoint someone in place of late Shri G.K. Chatrath to prepare a note as decided by the Syndicate dated 08.09.2012/ 06.10.2012 (Para 21).

Proposal dated 07.10.2015 of Shri Naresh Gaur, Syndic and Fellow

14. Considered the proposal dated 7.10.2015 (**Appendix-XX**) received through e-mail from Shri Naresh Gaur, Syndic and Fellow.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the proposal is very good. He does agree that the Refresher Course should be organized at the Regional Centres. But, there was a technical problem as had happened in a case at Jodhpur University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the Academic Staff Colleges are instituted by the University Grants Commission and not by the University, they could not take a decision on their own. It would be better if they could write a letter to the UGC to seek clarification/approval.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired whether the first proposal about the enquiry should come in the form of a proposal?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Naresh Gaur says that he raised it in the meeting of the Senate and the Vice-Chancellor had said that the issues which were being raised in the Senate, the same should be sent to the Vice-Chancellor in writing so that the same could be included in the agenda of the Syndicate. Otherwise, he would have been the first person to object to the proposal.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he never proposes anything like that. It was for the first time and only because the Vice-Chancellor had desired to submit any proposal in writing that was the reason he had submitted the proposal.

With regard to enquiry against the Managing Committee of Gobindgarh College of Education, Alour, the Vice-Chancellor said that the matter needed to be followed up by the Registrar or by office of the DR (General).

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the pre-Ph.D Course work should be allowed to be conducted at the Regional Centres because it would facilitate the faculty especially the women faculty who could not come to Chandigarh.

Shri Naresh Gaur pointed that a Refresher Course was conducted at Ludhiana in the year 2002 which was inaugurated by the then Vice-Chancellor, Professor K.N. Pathak. However, as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal, a letter could be written to the UGC to seek clarification/approval for organizing Refresher Courses at Regional Centres.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the Registrar and the office of the Deputy Registrar (General) would follow up the matter with regard to action to be taken against the Managing Committee of Gobindgarh College of Education, Alour, which has acted against the provisions of the University Calendar; and
- (2) a clarification be sought from the UGC whether Refresher Course/Orientation Course could be organized/held at the Regional Centres.

Proposal dated 08.10.2015 of Professor Rajesh Gill, Syndic and Fellow

15. Considered the proposal dated 8.10.2015 (**Appendix-XXI**) received through e-mail from Professor Rajesh Gill, Syndic and Fellow.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Committee could be constituted to look into the issue.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this was the problem which she had discussed in the Senate. She knew that the detailed information should have come from the office of the Finance and Development Officer about the existing rates since it related to the whole of the University. A proper Committee could be constituted. She had also discussed the same with the Resident Audit Officer who told to get the DA enhanced from the governing bodies.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the DA could not be fixed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since research scholars also visit the field for field work and get the grant from the Central Government, their rates are separately notified by the Central Government which the University would have to adopt.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Central Government requested to provide the University rules for DA for the grants provided by the Central Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that research scholars in government organizations are considered as Class I Officer. They are not treated as students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a small Committee could be constituted in which the Finance and Development Officer should also be associated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to bring one thing to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor without specifying someone. Some honorarium or DA is paid to the research staff and field workers. There were some teachers who were using their students only to exploit them for their personal academic work saying that all those who were interested in research, must contact him/her and he/she gives them the questionnaire to go the field, get the same filled up and thereafter they say that they would issue a certificate. Who would issue such a certificate, it is neither the Department nor the University. On the basis of the work done by the students, research work is published in the name of the teacher without any acknowledgement of the name of the students. No money is paid to the students. If there are such cases, this kind of exploitation should be stopped. He was saying so on the basis of concrete evidence with him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Director, Research would be asked to see all such things. He asked Shri Ashok Goyal to give a small note in this regard which would be placed in the next meeting of the Chairpersons.

RESOLVED: That a Committee be constituted to look into the issue of enhancement of DA to the research staff.

Nomination of two eminent jurists on the Research Degree Committee

16. Considered to nominate two eminent jurists on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years i.e. 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017, under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U., Calendar, Volume-II, 2007. Information contained in office note (Appendix-) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U., Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, reads as under:

“2. A Research Degree Committee in Law shall be appointed by the Syndicate consisting of (i) the Dean of the Law Faculty (ii) two eminent Jurists nominated by the Syndicate and (iii) Chairperson/ Head of the Department of Laws. The term of the Committee will be for a period of two years and the appointment of the members shall be made in time, so that the Committee can function from January following. Any vacancy occurring during the course of the term, shall be filled by the Syndicate for the remaining term of the Committee.”

2. The present term of Research Degree Committee, is going to expire on 31.12.2015.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested the name of Professor Virendra Kumar on the Research Degree Committee in Law.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath, Professor Yog Raj Angrish and Shri Jarnail Singh said the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to be nominate the two eminent jurists.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to nominate two eminent jurists on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years i.e. 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017, under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U., Calendar, Volume-II, 2007.

Withdrawn Item

17. Considered if, the Syndicate decision dated 04.12.2009 (Para 33 (viii)) be modified that the appointment of Secretary for the meeting of the Faculty of Science, be made through election or consensus from amongst the members of the Faculty of Science, instead of Deputy Registrar (General) as suggested by Dr. Dalip Kumar, Fellow in the initiating discussion in the meeting of the Faculty of Science held on 27.03.2015. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 04.12.2009 vide Para 33 (viii) has ratified the appointment of Deputy Registrars to act as Secretaries of the following Faculties, as mentioned against each:

1. Faculty of Science: Deputy Registrar (General)
2. Faculty of Arts : Deputy Registrar (Estt.)
3. Faculty of Languages : Deputy Registrar (Colleges)

2. Regulation 6.2 at page 49 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under

“The Syndicate may from time to time determine the Faculties of which

Deputy Registrar or an Assistant Registrar shall act as Secretary. The other Faculties shall elect the Secretary for the year at the time of electing the Dean.”

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the item has not been recommended by the Faculty of Science. There was some discussion in the Faculty where Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested something and the office prepared the item. It was something which was being done in terms of Regulations approved by the Government of India. He suggested that the item should be routed through the Faculties concerned so that they could have some input from the Faculties. In the meanwhile, the item should be treated as withdrawn.

Professor A.K. Bhandari observed that a Committee could also be constituted to look into the issue.

RESOLVED: That in order to have input from the Faculties, the matter be placed before the Faculties concerned. In the meanwhile, the item be treated as withdrawn.

Minutes of Interest Committee dated 05.10.2015

18. Considered recommendation of the Interest Committee dated 05.10.2015 (**Appendix-XXII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the rate of interest @ 8.70% p.a. as declared by Government of India for the financial year 2015-16 vide Notification No. F.No. 5(1)-B(PD)/2005 dated 20th April, 2015, be adopted for the University also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per Government of India notification, neither they could make higher rate of interest than declared by the Government of India nor they could give lesser.

The Vice-Chancellor said the Fact Finding Committee has fixed 21st October as the final meeting to be attended by the Registrar, Dean Student Welfare and Finance & Development Officer to present their case and on the basis of that final recommendations would be made by the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to make a suggestion in this connection that it had been highlighted in the newspapers that President, PUTA got two telephone calls, one each from the Registrar and the other from the Vice-Chancellor updating what had happened there and about the promise that the grant was being released. President, PUTA has gone to newspapers highlighting all this. It is very good. It is participatory management. He appreciated it. But does it not allow a heart burning in the minds of the non-teaching staff. They should have also informed to the President, non-teaching employees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he spoke to the Registrar from Delhi asking him to inform both the Presidents, teaching and non-teaching and assure them that the grants would be released shortly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they could see the newspapers where it was written that he (President, PUTA) received the call from the Vice-Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the President, PUSA had not gone to the newspapers.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that had President, PUSA gone to the Press, he might have said that he received phone calls from the Registrar and Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as said by the Vice-Chancellor, he had not made a call to the President, PUTA whereas President, PUTA said that he was conveyed telephonically by the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor reiterated his earlier statement that he had called the Registrar from Delhi to inform both the Presidents.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that President, PUTA should have said that he has got a message from the Vice-Chancellor through Registrar whereas he has specifically mentioned that he has received two phone calls one in the morning from the Registrar and one in the evening from the Vice-Chancellor.

Principal Mrs. Parveen Kaur Chawla said that it might be that the newspaper has published his statement by distorting the facts.

On this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is aware how the newspaper published the news.

RESOLVED: That recommendation of the Interest Committee dated 05.10.2015 (**Appendix-XXII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the rate of interest @ 8.70% p.a. as declared by Government of India for the financial year 2015-16 vide Notification No. F.No. 5(1)-B(PD)/2005 dated 20th April, 2015, be approved.

Assignment of Fellow to the Faculties

19. Considered and

RESOLVED: That the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate:

Professor Akshaya Kumar Department of English & Cultural Studies Panjab University, Chandigarh	1. Arts 2. Science 3. Design & Fine Arts 4. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture
---	--

Election for 3 vacant seats of Senate

20. Considered if, an election for the 3 seats of Senate (i.e. two from the Heads of affiliated Arts Colleges and one from the Faculty of Law) vacated by the members of the Senate is to be conducted for the remaining term of the Senate of 8-months i.e. up to 31.10.2016. If so, the Returning Officer, be appointed, under Regulation 10.1, Page 64 of Calendar, Volume I, 2007. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXIII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The detail of the seats vacated is as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Member	Constituency	Reason
1.	Dr. (Mrs) Puneet Bedi Principal MCM DAV College Chandigarh	Heads of the affiliated Arts Colleges	Retired as Principal
2.	Shri Hardiljit Singh Gosal Principal	Heads of the affiliated Arts	Retired as Principal

	Govind National College Narangwal (Ludhiana)	Colleges	
3.	Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath	Various faculties of Panjab University (Faculty of Law)	Expired on 11.09.2015

The Vice-Chancellor said that the election for all the three vacancies could be conducted as early as possible and asked the members to guide him how it could be conducted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as the election of Syndicate and the Deans are concerned, it was clearly mentioned in the Regulations/Rules that the election had to be conducted but in the case of any vacancy in Senate, it was not written so. For election to vacant seat in the Senate, if need be, the election could be conducted. As per office note, the election is to be conducted for the remaining term of 8 months only, especially, for the two vacancies of Heads of Affiliated Arts Colleges because the process for the election is lengthy. First, necessity should be ascertained. Also it needs to be ascertained if it is mandatory to fill up all vacant members' places.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have no option but not to differ on such matters in the interest of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the Panjab University Act 'once in every year on such dates as the Chancellor may appoint in this behalf, there shall, if necessary be an election to fill any vacancy amongst the Ordinary Fellows elected by the categories mentioned under clauses (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (h) of Sub-Section(1) of Section 13'. How could they define the necessity? Another thing is that if there is any vacancy, the proceedings of the Senate would not be nullified on that account.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the necessity of filling was that the persons of the constituencies, to whom those people represented, could say that they were unrepresented in the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there were so many constituencies which remained unrepresented because of one reason or the other.

The Vice-Chancellor said that till now it so happened that no vacancy arose.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that necessity did not mean that anybody knew that the member/s would expire before the completion of the tenure. She cited the example of Municipal Corporation where the term of the members is five years and after a period of about three years and seven months, one of the counsellors expired, the by-election was held because vacancy could not be kept vacant for the remaining term.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the by-election to Municipal Corporation was conducted because it was provided in the Act. As per section 11 of Panjab University Act, 'no act done by the University shall be deemed to be invalid merely by reasons of any vacancy among either class of elected Ordinary Fellows or by reason of the total number of Ordinary Fellows'.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that this was written only because if somebody goes to the Court and challenges the proceedings of the

Senate, the proceedings would not be invalid. She said that the by-election should be conducted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the members thought, the election could be conducted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members should take a rational decision. His personal view was that in order that all the constituencies to which those people represented, they should not be having a complaint that they were unrepresented. There could be practical difficulties about the resources involved, resources in terms of efforts and time of the officials involved. Time is also involved. If not much efforts are involved, then the by-election should be conducted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the constituency of the Principals is getting depleted, and it was the seat of Law Faculty, therefore, by-election should be conducted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor was saying that if one by-election is to be conducted, then the by-elections should be conducted for all the three vacancies.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the procedure for the election from the Principal constituency is lengthy.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they could conduct the by-election by making a booth at Chandigarh.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they had conducted a by-election for the Principal constituency by setting up the booths.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the booths could be set up in the 3-4 Regional Centres.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the regulations should be seen about where the booths could be set up.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the by-election could be conducted by setting up booths at 4 Centres in Punjab and one in Chandigarh, it should be conducted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that everywhere the seats remain vacant and if the term is left only six months, is there any necessity.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the necessity is that if somebody is elected as a member of the Senate, it would also be reflected in his/her CV.

Some of the members, including Mrs. Anu Chatrath, Professor Yog Raj Angrish and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the by-election should be conducted and it should be seen how to curtail the expenditure.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that since the election is to be conducted, the Returning Officer also needed to be appointed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Registrar be appointed as Returning Officer and for all other related matters, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was written in the office note that during this period of 08 months, only 2-3 Senate meetings are expected to be held.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a meeting of the Senate would be held in March and in the month of September, meeting would be needed to be held because the revised budget estimates have to be sent to the Government of India.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the justification to be given to the Chancellor is that since the budget and revised budget estimates are to be approved by the Senate, the by-election is being conducted.

RESOLVED: That by-election for the 3 vacant seats of Senate, (i.e. two from the Heads of affiliated Arts Colleges and one from the Faculty of Law) which fell vacant recently, be conducted for the remaining term of the present Senate, i.e., up to 31.10.2016.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Registrar be appointed as Returning Officer and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized for other by-election related issues, if any.

Minutes of Committee dated 06.10.2015

21. Considered minutes dated 6.10.2015 (**Appendix-XXIV**), of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.7.2015 (Para 17), to suggest guidelines for making appointments for Principals and Faculty in different subjects in the four Constituent Colleges of the Panjab University.

Referring to recommendation (4) of the Committee, Professor Ronki Ram said that as a Principal retired from an affiliated College of Panjab University can be appointed on contract basis in the P.U. Constituent Colleges. The same should be the case for appointment in the unaided Colleges also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Panjab University is making appointments in the Regional Centres and Constituent Colleges and not in the unaided Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar supported what Professor Ronki Ram said that a decision to grant extension to the Principals was taken in the last meeting of the Syndicate, the same benefit could be extended to the unaided Colleges also to bring parity.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was not the agenda of the item under consideration. If any changes needed to be made, the same could be brought in next meeting. A long debate had taken place in the last meeting of the Syndicate and since the minutes have not been prepared yet, how could they revise the same.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that as per the recommendation of the Committee that in case of non-availability of suitable candidates for the post of Principals, retired Principals from the Affiliated Colleges can be appointed on contract basis in the Panjab University Constituent Colleges. In the same manner, unaided Colleges not finding suitable persons for the post of Principal, may be allowed to make appointment on contract basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that would mean opening the chapter that was decided in the last meeting of the Syndicate. If the members so desired, the clause (4) could be deleted. Right now, they have to advertise the posts in the hope that they would be able to get

suitable candidates. In case of non-availability of suitable candidates, a decision was taken to re-appoint the existing Principals for one year.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that since Dr. I.S. Sandhu, who is not present at this time, was referring to some point, his suggestions should be kept in mind before taking a decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that recommendation (4) could be left out.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as per recommendation (5) of the Committee the Principal/teaching faculty appointed in the Constituent Colleges can be transferred to any other Constituent College or Panjab University Regional Centre. As far as the transfer of the Principal/teaching faculty/non-teaching from one Constituent College to the other is concerned, there should be no problem. But if the transfer is made from the Constituent College to the Regional Centres, it would totally change the composition.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Regional Centre at Kauni is like a Constituent College at the moment.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that any kind of permission for the Regional Centres is granted by the University, record of the service books is maintained in the University whereas in the case of the Constituent Colleges, the same has to be done by the Principals of these Colleges.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there is a post of Director at the Rural Centre, Kauni, and not that of a Principal.

The Vice-Chancellor said the part of recommendation (5) of the Committee regarding transfer from the Constituent Colleges to Panjab University Regional Centres be deleted and all other recommendations be approved.

Majority of the members agreed with the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to talk about the Principals of the Constituent Colleges. He wanted this to bring to the notice of the Dean College Development Council (DCDC). An impression has been created as if there has been no transparent system in selecting the Principals. They have prepared the template for Professors, Associate Professors in the University and also API score system for appointment of Lecturers in the Colleges. But in the case of selection for the post of Principal, it is believed as if it has been left at the discretion of the Selection Committee to say whether a candidate is found suitable or unsuitable. He had been telling from time to time that the DCDC should inform the nominees of the Vice-Chancellor about the dos and don'ts because they might not be aware about all the regulations of UGC. He read out the UGC Regulations-2009 where it is very clearly mentioned that how much weightage is to be given for different activities. They were, in fact, trying to convey to the Colleges that once somebody has 400 API score, he/she is eligible and thereafter it was left to the Colleges. But the Regulations say otherwise. If somebody has more API score, he/she has to be given weightage. If one has got 400 API score and the other one 1000, it is 40% of the total API score.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that in the case of College Principals, they have done like total 'x' minus 400 divided by something.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is part of the UGC Regulations but he has been given to understand that it is not being followed by any of the Colleges.

It was informed that the template for selection to the post of Principals has been approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the template had been approved, could somebody tell him even a single College where that template had been followed. The template could not be in violation of the UGC Regulations. Ultimately, it is the University which has to be a party and in the absence of the template, at least the UGC Regulations should be followed. There is lot of resentment amongst the Principals those who are already working as Principals. They say what are these conditions which have been imposed by the UGC. How could they acquire 400 API score? They have no time as they work from morning to evening whereas the teachers of the Colleges have sufficient time as they take the classes and go and can acquire the required API score. The University says that they need not worry because besides API, weightage of experience as Principal would be given to them. UGC clearly says the weightage is given. He did not know what was happening in other Universities but in our University in any of the Affiliated Colleges, no weightage is given for any administrative experience or for any membership of various Committees. Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla is a member of the Syndicate and Senate and she could say that she has the experience of designing curriculum development and planning education. But for that she is not going to get any weightage. So it is in contrary to what UGC says. It should be ensured that this kind of template is followed by the Colleges from today onwards so that nobody could say that the Colleges neither follow the UGC nor the University takes care to ensuring that the Colleges follow the UGC.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the template which is given by the UGC, they could make improvements in the same but could not go below the same.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they have developed a template and there is some weightage for administrative experience.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is said that they have the criteria for appointment to the post of Lecturer and no criteria is there for the post of Principal and anybody can be appointed as Principal.

Professor Ronki Ram supported what Shri Ashok Goyal said. Similarly, there are different criteria to join Ph.D. Those who are permanent Lecturers in Colleges they can join the Ph.D. without qualifying the entrance test.

RESOLVED: That recommendations of the Committee dated 6.10.2015 (as per Appendix), be approved with the modification that recommendation (5) of the Committee be approved as under:

“From now onwards, whenever an advertisement is given for the appointment in the P.U. Constituent Colleges, it may be mentioned in the advertisement that the Principal/teaching faculty appointed in the Constituent Colleges can be

transferred to any other Constituent College by the competent authority.”

Routine and formal matters

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

(i) In partial modification to office order No.14072-75/Estt. dated 04.07.2014 (**Appendix-XXV**), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, Director, Computer Centre (on leave) to retain his lien against the post of Director, Computer Centre by remaining on Extra Ordinary Leave without pay already granted to him w.e.f. 22.07.2014 to 21.07.2017 for serving as UGC Professor in Discipline of Physics under Faculty Recharge Programme in the Panjab University and further granted Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 22.07.2017 to 12.10.2018 for serving as Vice-Chancellor of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hissar w.e.f. 13.10.2015 for a period of three years.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of following persons as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara w.e.f. the date they started work as such for the session 2015-16:

Sr. No.	Name	Branch/Subject
1.	Shri Kanwalpreet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE
3.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	CSE
4.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
5.	Ms. Monika	ECE
6.	Shri Anish Sharma	ECE
7.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
8.	Shri Gurbinder Singh	IT
9.	Ms. Divya Sharma	IT
10.	Ms. Ritika Arora	IT
11.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	IT
12.	Shri Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
13.	Shri Gurwinder Singh	Mech.
14.	Shri Ramandeep Singh	Mech.

(iii) In continuation to the office order No. Est./15/7568-71/Est. dated 20.08.2015, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved appointment (afresh) of the following Associate Professors/Readers and Senior Lecturers/Assistant Professors at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 02.07.2015 to 01.06.2016 with one day break on 01.07.2015 or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

(i) Associate Professors/Readers

1. Dr. Shipra Gupta
2. Dr. Lalit Kumar
3. Dr. Vishakha Grover

(ii) Senior Lecturer/Assistant Professor

1. Dr. Poonam Sood
2. Dr. Neha Bansal
3. Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal
4. Dr. Sunint Singh
5. Dr. Puneet
6. Dr. Rose Kanwaljeet Kaur.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed afresh the following persons as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biotechnology, P.U., for next academic session 2015-16 w.e.f. 06.07.2015 to 30.04.2016, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

1. Dr. Monika Sharma
2. Dr. Baljinder Singh Gill.

(v) In continuation to this office order No. Estt./15/6277 dated 16.07.2015, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis at Centre for Public Health, IEAST in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP of Rs.6000/- plus two increments (allowed during the academic session 2014-15) plus allowances as per University rules w.e.f. the start of classes for academic session 2015-16 or till the regular posts are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he was working during the academic session 2014-15.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the name of Dr. Bharat Bhushan Parsoon, former Judge of Punjab and Haryana High Court, as Consultant (Gratis) by including his name in the panel under the head "Consultant (Gratis)".

NOTE: 1. A copy of letter No.VPS/15/1/2015 dated 19.08.2015 of Shri Anshuman Gaur, Officer on Special Duty to the Vice-President of India, New Delhi is enclosed **(Appendix-XXVI)**.

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

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 03.08.2015 **(Appendix-XXVII)** regarding amendment of Rule 2(B)(vii) appearing at page 219 of PU Handbook of Information, 2015 for the current session i.e. 2015-16 only as under:

Existing Rule	Proposed Rule
2% for sons/daughters/husband/wife/brothers/sisters of persons killed/	2% for sons/ grandsons /daughters/ granddaughters /husband/wife/brothers/

<p>incapacitated in November, 1984 riots and of persons killed/ incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh. A certificate from the District Magistrate to this effect must be submitted by the candidate. Migration Card alone is not enough.</p> <p>Note: In case there will be any amendment/change in the existing clause, the same shall be notified and communicated to all concerned departments by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges).</p>	<p>sisters of persons killed/ incapacitated in November, 1984 riots and of persons killed/incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh. A certificate from the District Magistrate to this effect must be submitted by the candidate. Migration Card alone is not enough.</p> <p>Note: In case there will be any amendment/change in the existing clause, the same shall be notified and communicated to all concerned departments by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges).</p>
---	---

NOTE: The Principals of the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University and the Chairpersons/ Heads of the Departments of P.U., Chandigarh have been requested vide No.Misc/A-6/69958-70158 dated 14.08.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) to implement the above decision by giving a fresh admission notice giving at least one week's time to the students from the date of notification so that the candidates who could not apply earlier under the said category can apply now. The above decision is applicable only where the seats are lying vacant under this category for the current session only.

- (viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Shri Jagan Nath Dhiman, Senior Scientific Officer (Cartographer) (G-1), University School of Open Learning, P.U. (retired from University services on 31.07.2014) on contract basis for three months or till the post is filled up on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on fixed emoluments i.e. half of the salary last drawn (excluding HRA, CCA & Other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100 irrespective of the fact whether he has opted for pension or not w.e.f. the date he reports for duty. His salary be charged/ paid against the post of Senior Scientific Assistant/Scientific Officer (Cartographer) (G-1), USOL vacated by him on his retirement.
- (ix)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has approved the proposed fee structure (**Appendix-XXVIII**) for Foreign National/NRI candidates, seeking admission to M.Phil. course in Economics, in the Department of Economics for the session 2015-16.
- (x)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed that the No Objection Certificate, be issued to the following Colleges in respect of subjects/courses mentioned against each 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:

Sr. No.	Name of the College	Subject/courses
1.	G.H.G. Khalsa College, Ludhiana	(i) Software Technology (ii) Banking, Finance & Insurance (iii) Tourism & Hospitality
2.	DAV College for Women, Ferozepur Cantt.	B.Voc. Degree Programme in Beauty and wellness
3.	Devki Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana	(i) Banking & Insurance (ii) Retail Management & IT (iii) Beauty Aesthetics & Wellness (iv) Hospital Administration & Management
4.	R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City	(i) Bachelor of Retail Management and Information Technology (ii) Bachelor of Computer Hardware and Networking

NOTE: 1. Earlier too, 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) 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) in the certain subjects during XII Plan period and also ratified by the Syndicate dated 08.03.2015 (Para 47 (ix)) **(Appendix-XXIX).**

2. In addition to above, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed that the No Objection Certificate, be issued to certain Colleges 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) in the certain subjects during XII Plan period and also ratified by the Syndicate dated 20.09.2015 (Para 33 (vii)) **(Appendix-XXIX).**

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accorded sanction for payment of honorarium to Committee members (other than University officers/officials) by enhancing the existing amount/rate @ 15% i.e. Rs.1725/- per sitting (minimum to be paid Rs.23,000/- and maximum to be paid Rs.46000/-) plus TA/DA as admissible, to investigate the extent of misappropriation of funds by scrutinizing all the previous records of Pension Section and also ascertain the involvement of other employees and audit staff accomplices.

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor has constituted a Committee comprising of following members to investigate the extent of misappropriation of funds by scrutinizing all the previous records of Pension Section and also ascertain the involvement of other employees and audit staff accomplices, if any. The Committee would after findings loopholes, if any, in existing system of checks and balance suggest suitable measures to make P.U. accounts management a foolproof system in future:

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. Shri Amrik Singh Bhatia, IAAS
Accountant General (Retd.) | Chairperson |
| 2. Shri B.L. Gupta, Ex-F.D.O./Ex-Registrar, P.U. | |
| 3. Professor Karamjit Singh, Fellow, P.U. | |
| 4. Professor Sanjay Kaushik, UBS, P.U. | |
| 5. Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, Ex-F.D.O., P.U. | Special Invitee |
| 6. Deputy Registrar (Estt.) | Convener |

2. The existing amount/rates of honorarium/remuneration approved by the Senate at its meeting held on 11.6.2009 (Para XLI) are as under:

ENQUIRY OFFICERS

Category	Per-Sitting	Minimum to be paid	Maximum to be paid
Retired/working Judges & Secretary of the Govt. & above. Any other person so appointed, other than University Officials	Rs.1500/-	Rs.20000/-	Rs.40000/-

PRESENTING OFFICERS

Advocates	Rs.1000/-	Rs.5,000/-	Rs.10,000/-
-----------	-----------	------------	-------------

- (xii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has enhanced the following proposed rates @ 15% for remuneration/payment to the Enquiry Officers/ Presenting Officers other than University Officers/Officials who engaged from time to time to conduct enquiries in the various cases of the University:

ENQUIRY OFFICERS

Category	Per-Sitting	Minimum to be paid	Maximum to be paid
Retired/working Judges & Secretary of the Govt. & above. Any other person so appointed, other than University Officials	Rs.1725/-	Rs.23,000/-	Rs.46,000/-

PRESENTING OFFICERS

Category	Per Sitting	Minimum to be paid	Maximum to be paid
Advocates	Rs.1150/-	Rs.5,700/-	Rs.11,500/-

NOTE: The existing amount/rates of honorarium/ remuneration approved by the Senate at its meeting held on 11.6.2009 (Para XLI) (**Appendix-XXX**) are as under:

ENQUIRY OFFICERS

Category	Per-Sitting	Minimum to be paid	Maximum to be paid
Retired/working Judges & Secretary of the Govt. & above. Any other person so appointed, other than University Officials	Rs.1500/-	Rs.20000/-	Rs.40000/-

PRESENTING OFFICERS

Advocates	Rs.1000/-	Rs.5,000/-	Rs.10,000/-
-----------	-----------	------------	-------------

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accorded sanction for payment of honorarium to Justice Mr. Harbans Lal, Former Judge, Punjab & Haryana High Court appointed as Enquiry Officer and Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, Ex-F.D.O. appointed as Presenting Officer as mentioned below against their names, in the case of misappropriation of funds by Ms. Pooja Bagga, Daily Wages Clerk in Pension Cell of the Accounts Branch, P.U.:

1.	Enquiry Officer	Justice Mr. Harbans Lal, Former Judge, Punjab & Haryana High Court	Rs.80,000/- + TA/DA as admissible to a person of his stature (This amount is enhanced one, from Rs.70000/- + TA/DA already paid to Enquiry Officer Justice Garg, as admissible to Judge of the High Court, on account of enquiry pertaining to College Branch)
2.	Presenting Officer	Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, Ex-F.D.O.	Rs.11,500/- per sitting (minimum to be paid Rs.5700/- and maximum to be paid Rs.11500/- + TA/DA as admissible (This amount/ rate of honorarium has been increased @ 15%)

NOTE: The existing amount/rates of honorarium/ remuneration approved by the Senate at its meeting held on 11.6.2009 (Para XLI) (**Appendix-XXXI**) are as under:

ENQUIRY OFFICERS

Category	Per-Sitting	Minimum to be paid	Maximum to be paid
Retired/working Judges & Secretary of the Govt. & above. Any other person so appointed, other than University Officials	Rs.1500/-	Rs.20000/-	Rs.40000/-

PRESENTING OFFICERS

Advocates	Rs.1000/-	Rs.5,000/-	Rs.10,000/-
-----------	-----------	------------	-------------

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Tulika Gupta, Senior Lecturer in Anatomy, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U. with immediate effect, by waiving off the condition of three months notice, as a special case.

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the Regulations/Rules and course structure (**Appendix-XXXII**) for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences w.e.f. the academic session 2015-2016, as per authorization given by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.7.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVII**).

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXII**)

Referring to **Sub-Item (R-ii)**, Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that in the second last line the words 'started work' should be replaced with 'joined'.

Referring to **Sub-Item R(x)**, Shri Naresh Gaur said that as they were giving NOC to the Colleges for KAUSHAL Kendras, he wanted to know who approves the fee of these courses. Do the Colleges design the fee on their own? They have been issuing NOC to the Colleges without any checks and balances. In this way, the Colleges would earn money and close the courses. There are no criteria for fixing the fee, etc. The Colleges are looting the students.

It was clarified that the fees for the B.Voc. courses had been approved about a year ago and the Colleges were charging the same accordingly.

Referring to **Sub-Item R(xi)**, Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the honorarium to be paid to the Enquiry Officers could be revised @ 15% from Rs. 1500/- per sitting to Rs.1725/- per sitting but the minimum honorarium to be paid be not revised from Rs. 20000/- to Rs. 23000/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired if the letters had been issued to the members of the Committee informing about the revised rates. In case the letters had been issued, then there is no issue. In such cases, decision in haste should not be taken. Two rates had been mentioned, one for the Enquiry Officers and the other for Presenting

Officers (Advocates). That means that Presenting Officer can only be an Advocate. He further said that he could not find any difference between Sub-Item R(xi) and R(xii). It seems that both the items have the same contents. Sub-Item R(xi) has no meaning.

It was clarified that Sub-Item R(xi) is a part of R(xii).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since Sub-Item R(xi) has no meaning, Sub-Item R(xii) has to be approved. The rate of Presenting Officer has been increased from Rs.1000/- to Rs.1150/- and the Presenting Officer has to be an Advocate. As per this item, it is straightaway implied only an Advocate can be appointed as the Presenting Officer or it is again implied that if any non Advocate is appointed as a Presenting Officer, he/she would not be getting any honorarium. He did not think that it is the spirit of the item.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be mentioned as Presenting Officer and Advocate should be deleted.

It was clarified that there is no bar on appointing an officer as Presenting Officer. Generally, an Advocate is appointed as Presenting Officer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the instant case as shown in item (R-xi), somebody who is neither an Advocate nor an employee of Panjab University has been appointed as Presenting Officer.

It was informed that Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, Ex-FDO is an Advocate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the same should have been mentioned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be mentioned as Presenting Officer and not an Advocate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to examine it from legal point of view. In departmental enquiries, generally, there is a bar on appointing Advocate as Presenting Officer. It is only in peculiar circumstances that some lawyer is appointed as Presenting Officer. If Presenting Officer is an Advocate then the delinquent employee is to be represented by an Advocate. If they were writing here Advocate, that means then they have to take the decision once and for all that Presenting Officer would be an Advocate for all cases which is not provided for in the law. They should try level best that the Presenting Officer should be a person from within the system. Otherwise they were admitting that they did not have the human resource even to represent their cause. They were hiring somebody. It is only in the Courts where they could not be represented other than an Advocate. But in departmental enquiries, whosoever is handling the office, he/she is the best person to be the Presenting Officer. Even in the best of the financial institutions, the banking industry, Presenting Officer is never from outside the system because they feel that even if somebody comes from the office of Chief Vigilance Commissioner, CBI or any other investigating agency, he/she could not be better than the person from the University. In the University also, a person, who is dealing on day-to-day basis, nobody can be better than him/her howsoever expert the person from outside the system may be.

It was informed that the Presenting Officer has to present the case to the Enquiry Officer.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that a small Committee could be formed, the rates should be enhanced and the item be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the Presenting Officer is not just to inform the procedure but has to act as prosecution lawyer. The University is such a large system in its own. Did it mean that they had no person from within the system who can assist the Enquiry Officer?

It was informed that it was recommended so as to have transparency in the system.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be examined that to appoint the Presenting Officer from outside the system is very embarrassing. It is just by chance that the Presenting Officer happens to be an ex-employee of the University. What is the justification of not having anybody in the University who can present the case? It means that there is total collapse of the University system.

It was informed that since the person who has been appointed as Presenting Officer, had a long association with the University and having the knowledge of the system. The Presenting Officer could also have been chosen from within the system also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should try to find out someone from within the system and appoint that person as Presenting Officer.

The members suggested that the word Advocates from the category of Presenting Officer should be deleted from Sub-Items R(xi) and R(xii) and Sub-Item R(xi) be treated as withdrawn as the same is part of Sub-Item R(xii).

This was agreed to.

Referring to **Sub-Item (R-xiii)**, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that at point No. 2, the honorarium to be paid to the Presenting Officer should be corrected as Rs.1150/- per sitting instead of Rs.11,500/- per sitting.

Referring to **Sub-Item (R-xv)**, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the examination system proposed (page 4) for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences is very lengthy. He explained that a student failing in 1st, 3rd, 5th, 7th or 9th semester examination in December would be given a chance to re-appear in the next examination to be conducted in May with other semester examinations. Ultimately, it would result into that the University would have to conduct papers for all the semesters in one go from 1st semester to 10th semester as is the case in the Department of Laws. In the months of December and March, the Department of Laws conducts the semester papers from 1st to 6th semesters. Due to this, the examinations are being continuously conducted for about 50 days. He pointed out that at page 5 it is mentioned that a student who fails in the second semester in April/May, a special examination would be held in August. How many times the University would conduct the examination? There is a set procedure in the University that a student failing in even semester would re-appear at the

examination of even semester and similar is the case for odd semester.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that when the Coordinator, PUISSER came to him for approval, he suggested that as pointed out by Dr. Dinesh Kumar it is not feasible to conduct the examinations as proposed. The University is following some system in the Honours Schools. In fact, the Coordinator, PUISSER, was asked to follow that system since that is a time tested one. She had agreed to the suggestions but he did not know why the suggestions have not been carried out and the relevant provisions of the Regulations amended. He suggested that the Regulations should be got modified so that the examination system of the Honours School could be followed.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in **Sub-Items R-(i), R-(iii) to (x) and R-(xiv)** on the agenda, be ratified;
- (2) the information contained in **Sub-Item R-(ii)**, be ratified with the modification that the words 'started work' be replaced with 'joined';
- (3) **Sub-Item R-(xi)** on the agenda be treated as withdrawn;
- (4) the information contained in **Sub-Item R-(xii)** on the agenda be ratified, with the stipulation that the word 'Advocate' under the category 'Presenting Officer', be deleted;
- (5) the information contained in **Sub-Item R-(xiii)** on the agenda, be ratified with the modification that the honorarium to the Presenting Officer be read as Rs.1150/- instead of Rs. 11500/- per sitting and;
- (6) so far as **Sub-Item R-(xv)** is concerned, the Regulations/Rules and course structure (Appendix) for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences w.e.f. academic session 2015-16, be approved with the stipulation that the system of examination prevalent in Honours School courses be followed, and the relevant provision/s of Regulation/s be amended accordingly.

Routine and formal matters

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

- (i) Since the interim orders dated 30.06.2014, passed by the 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 No. (18228 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 28.10.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Pankaj Mala Sharma, Department of Music be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.
- (ii) Since the interim orders dated 30.06.2014, passed by the 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 No. (19389 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 28.10.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Dharam Bir Rishi, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.
- (iii) To note the Legal Notice dated 26.09.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) received from Shri Raghav Sharma, Advocate, Chamber No.10, District Court Complex, Hoshiarpur (Punjab), on behalf of his clients Major Bakhtawar Singh S/o Shri Jaswant Singh, VPO Bhullewal Rathan, Tehsil and District Hoshiarpur and Shri Harbans Rai S/o Shri Bhagat Ram Chauhan, Shahidan Road, House No.53, Ward No.2, Mahilpur, Tehsil Garhshankar with regard to the issues against SGGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur, District Hoshiarpur (Punjab).
- (iv) 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 Rajinder Pal Singh Assistant Registrar University School of Open Learning	20.05.1978	31.10.2015	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.

2.	Shri Sant Lal Painter (Technician G-II) P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	31.10.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
3.	Shri Dev Raj Plumber (Tech. G-I) P.U. Construction Office	01.10.1986	31.10.2015	
4.	Shri Agya Ram Cycle-Shed- Chowkidar A.C. Joshi Library	01.09.1976	31.10.2015	

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

- (v) Since, the interim orders dated 07.08.2015, passed by the 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 No. (16311 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 02.09.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Karan Vasisht, Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

NOTE: The next date of hearing has been fixed for 28.10.2015.

- (vi) As authorized by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 30.08.2015 (Para No. 28), the C.O.E. has approved the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) to the following candidates:

Roll No.	Name of the candidates	Father's Name	Faculty / Subject	Title of thesis
3177	Sartaj Singh	S/o Hakim Singh	Science/ Botany	CHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION AND ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY OF ESSENTIAL OILS FROM WILDLY OCCURRING PLANTS OF FAMILY LAMIACEAE IN MORNH HILLS (HARYANA)
3178	Pranshuta Manjul	D/o Roshan Lal	Science/ Env. Science	GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF DIATOMS IN RIVER RAVI
3179	Sumit Goyal	S/o Sheashpal Goyal	Science/ Anthropology	DISSOLUTION OF CULTURAL ENTITIES AS A POST 20TH CENTURY PARADIGM SHIFT: THE CASE STUDY OF METALCRAFTS OF JANDIALA GURU AMRITSAR

3180	Sumeha Arora	D/o Rajiv Kumar Arora	Science/ Microbiology	DEVELOPMENT OF EPIGALLOCATECHIN GALLATE- PROBIOTIC BASED THERAPEUTIC SYSTEM FOR ALCOHOL INDUCED LIVER DISEASE
3181	Taranpreet Kaur	D/o Jasbir Singh	Science/ Anthropology	PREVALENCE AND PREDICTORS OF OBESITY AND HYPERTENSION IN PUNJABI POPULATION OF CHANDIGARH: A BIO-SOCIAL STUDY
3182	Aanchal Aggarwal	D/o Subhash Chander Aggarwal	Science/ Biochemistry	STUDIES ON ALTERED BLOOD BRAIN BARRIER PERMEABILITY ASSOCIATED WITH HYPERGLYCEMIA INDUCED COGNITIVE DEFICITS IN EXPERIMENTAL DIABETES
3183	Anamika Agarwal	D/o M.K. Agarwal	Science/ Env. Science	CHROMIUM REMOVAL FROM TANNERY EFFLUENT CONTAMINATED SOIL EMPLOYING INTEGRATED BIOREMEDIATION
3184	Kriti Kuthiala	D/o Kapil Kumar Kuthiala	Languages/ English	TRANSFORMATION OF THE VAMPIRE AS A CULTURAL METAPHOR: A STUDY OF <i>CARMILLA</i> , <i>DRACULA</i> , <i>INTERVIEW WITH THE VAMPIRE</i> <i>AND THE VAMPIRE LESTAT</i>
3185	Sonia Dahiya	D/o Ranbir Singh	Languages/ Hindi	PREMCHAND KE UPANYASON KE PATRA: BHASHA AUR SAMAJ KA ANTARSAMBANDH
3186	Ramesh Kumar	S/o Amar Singh	Languages/ Sanskrit	SARASVATĪKANTHĀBHARANA KĪ 'RATNADARPANA' TĪKA KĀ SAMĀLOCANĀTMAKA ADHYAYANA
3187	Anish Kumar	S/o Ashok Kumar	Languages/ Hindi	NARENDRA KOHLI KE RAMKTHATMAK UPNAYASON MEIN SAMAJIK CHETNA
3188	Jaya Chawla	D/o Sukhdev Raj	Education/ Education	EFFECT OF CONCEPT MAPPING STRATEGY ON ACHIEVEMENT IN CHEMISTRY OF IX GRADERS IN RELATION TO ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND STUDY HABITS
3189	Suresh Kumar	S/o Nikka Ram	Education/ Physical Education	A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELF-ACTUALIZATION, PARENTAL ENCOURAGEMENT AND RISK TAKING BEHAVIOR AMONG PLAYERS OF TEAM AND INDIVIDUAL GAMES

3190	Bani Narula	D/o N. K. Narula	Arts/ Psychology	EVALUATING THE EFFICACY OF STRENGTH BUILDING PROGRAM OF GRATITUDE AND FORGIVENESS AND STUDY ITS EFFECT ON HAPPINESS
3191	Jay Prakash Singh	S/o Sharada Prasad	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	POLITICS AND JOURNALISM: A STUDY IN A GANDHIAN PERSPECTIVE
3192	Pooja Thakur	D/o Kuldeep Singh	Arts/ Psychology	A STUDY OF ORGANISATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CORRELATES OF WORKAHOLISM
3193	Chhavi Garg	D/o Onkar Nath Garg	Arts/ Mass Comm.	USAGE OF MOBILE PHONE AND ITS EFFECTS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF URBAN AND RURAL YOUTH
3194	Amit Juneja	S/o Kharait Lal Juneja	Arts/ Economics	EVALUATION OF CUSTOMERS' SATISFACTION IN e-BANKING - AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR BANKS IN PUNJAB
3195	Amandeep Kaur	D/o Sukhbir Singh	Arts/ Economics	AGRICULTURAL PERFORMANCE IN UTTAR PRADESH: A DISTRICT LEVEL STUDY
3196	Sucheta Singh	D/o Dharamendra Singh	Arts/ Sociology	INDUSTRIAL STRUCTURE AND NATURE OF WORKING CLASS: A STUDY OF HOSIERY INDUSTRY IN LUDHIANA (PUNJAB)
3197	Har Kaur	D/o Dharm Singh	Arts/ Library Science	A SCIENTOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF MEDICAL RESEARCH OUTPUT IN INDIA

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.8.2015 (Para 28) has resolved that, in order to avoid delay, the power to approve the award of Ph.D. degrees, be delegated to the Controller of Examinations, and if need be, the information be given to the Syndicate.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 22.9.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) constituted, in view of the discussion in the Syndicate meeting dated 20.9.2015 (Para 33 (ix)) (**Appendix-XXXIV**), in order to determine the suitability and feasibility of offering MBA (Business (Economics)) at the P.U. Campus for the session 2015-2017.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the teachers have stopped going to the High Court for enhancing the age from 60 years to 65 years. An item had come last time. Again there is an item from which it seems that as if they have not retired a particular person in spite of

not going to the Court. Referring to some similar items, that since the interim orders passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP have now been adjourned to 02.09.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the teachers be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP and other CWPs tagged with it. Nowhere, it is mentioned that the orders passed in CWP was for a particular person.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it should have been clearly mentioned that the CWP was for a particular case. Everyone has to go to the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee has been constituted and the same is looking into the matter.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Sub-Items I-(i) to I-(vii)** on the agenda, be noted.

After decisions on the agenda items were taken, the members started general discussion.

1. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they had taken a decision to provide the DVDs of the proceedings of the Syndicate to all the members. But now after a period of two months, he felt that it was complete wastage of resources. The DVDs should only be given to those members who demands for the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said the earlier decision should not be revised. Those members, who did not want to have the DVDs, may send a communication in this regard. On receipt of the communication, the DVDs would not be sent to him/her till the time, he/she again asks for the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that till eight years ago, all the result gazettes of the Panjab University were being sent to the members of the Syndicate because the same needed the approval. Some of the members pointed out that they did not need the gazettes and the members were requested to give in writing. But nobody gave in writing and the gazettes were not provided. However, when one of the members needed a result gazette, he asked for the same from the University. It was replied that printing of the result gazettes has been stopped. Now the gazettes are not provided to the members. He said that the Vice-Chancellor is right that those who did not require the DVDs, he/she may give in writing. Now, the relevancy of the result gazettes is no more as the results are uploaded on the website itself and anybody can access the same at any time.

2. Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he thought that the agenda of the Senate could be reduced. Only the decision could be provided. The part of the discussion could be reduced. They have been getting so heavy bundles of the agenda/proceedings. Those members, who needed the complete agenda/proceedings, could be given on demand. The CDs of the minutes could be sent to the members instead of providing hard copies.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the minutes of the Selection Committees from the agenda are taken out, it could reduce at least 60% weight of the agenda as had been done in the case of Ph.D.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since for the approval of the appointment, Senate is the competent authority, the minutes of the Selection Committees have to go the Senate members. This could be reduced only in the case of the minutes of the meeting. He further stated that these things have already been discussed so many times. He had seen all these years that a member says that whatever would be the decision, his/her viewpoints should be noted in the proceedings so that in the times to come, the member could say that he had said a certain thing.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to prepare and submit a note in this regard.

3. Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Dean College Development Council (DCDC) had been performing well. However, two cases of Pallavi and Raj Kumar from DAV College, Hoshiarpur are pending for approval with the DCDC office. A comparative of the template has been prepared, but it was not in practice at that time. The nominee of the Vice-Chancellor was also appointed. He did not know what was the report? There is no fault of the persons who have been selected 100% on merit. He had been requesting the DCDC and the reply is given that the meeting has been scheduled with the Vice-Chancellor. Earlier, there was no template. There was a case of Lecturer in English, DAV College, Chandigarh. He did not know from where the template had been prepared afterwards. To prepare the template at a later stage is also illegal. When the nominee of the Vice-Chancellor and the Selection Committee had gone to the College, how one could say that the selections had not been made on merit. The cases could be rejected, let the candidates go to the court. It is very serious.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu cited the similar case of Guru Nanak College, Muktsar. The Colleges of SGPC have prepared a separate format and they did not follow the format of the University. On his persuasion and with the help of DCDC, those colleges have followed the format of the Panjab University and have issued the appointment letters. Some teachers who have been appointed by the Selection Committees having the Vice-Chancellor nominee, subject expert, the proceedings of the Committee are also available. For the last two years nobody checked that for the reason that the format had not been given, approval was not given. The file is pending for the last two years. There were 4-5 cases in which the Vice-Chancellor nominee did not fill up the template and the template was not provided. Only the marks of B.A., M.A. were shown and not of the interview. His request was that all such cases should be approved as all the proceedings of the Selection Committees were available.

The Vice-Chancellor said either a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate should be formed and authorized so that all such cases could be brought to the next Syndicate. Only one time exception should be given and it should not become a rule. He

requested Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean College Development Council, Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Shri Jarnail Singh and Mrs. Anu Chatrath to hold a meeting and bring a summary to be placed before the next Syndicate meeting.

4. Shri Naresh Gaur requested that the dates for inter college migration used to be December. But due to semester system, it has been advanced. The date for submission of college returns has been extended up to 8th October. He requested that the date for inter college migration should be extended up to 25th October.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Shri Jarnail Singh and Professor Yog Raj Angrish also requested that it should be extended up to the end of October.

When Mrs. Anu Chatrath enquired whether the last date for inter college migration has been extended for all the students or for a specific category of students, it was clarified that the date has been extended for all categories.

RESOLVED: That the last date for inter college migration be extended up to 31st October, 2015.

5. Shri Ashok Goyal said that the status report of financial fraud had been provided to the members. However, a copy of the FIR had not been provided. It was not known from the documents as the same had not been mentioned, but it seems that the Clerk had been charge sheeted.

It was informed that the Clerk in question has not been charge sheeted but only the statement of allegations has been prepared.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how the statement of allegations has been made when the office has constituted a Committee to frame the charges.

It was informed that the Committee had been constituted to frame the charges. It was further informed that as some concrete things had already been proved and on the basis of that statement of allegations has been prepared.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why all these things had been done in haste. The office has been investigating the matter as to what was the modus operandi, whether other persons are also involved and what is quantum of misappropriated money.

It was informed that it was already proved that approximately an amount of Rs. 2 crores, which was a very huge amount, had been misappropriated by the persons concerned. The Enquiry Officer has to dig out whether any further amount has been misappropriated.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked that would the Committee start enquiry on the basis of statement of allegations made by the office? If a supplementary statement of allegations has to be given, it is interlinked with the first charge. How these charges are to be framed and the Enquiry Officer cannot frame the charges and would keep on give sittings. The Presenting

Officer does not know what he/she has to present because it is yet to be asserted. The Presenting Officer has also been made a member of the Committee which has been looking into the matter. It is for the first time that Presenting Officer has been associated as special invitee with the investigation team.

It was informed that the special invitee is to assist the investigating team with regard to the information/documents.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the special invitee has to assist the investigating team and the Enquiry Officer also. With the Enquiry Officer, he/she has to assist as Presenting Officer and with the investigation team in what capacity.

It was informed that as a special invitee he/she has to assist as to what was the modus operandi.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for the purpose of assistance, the Finance and Development Officer or any other officer could provide the same. Enquiry Officer or investigating team do not need anybody's help and could go and ask anybody. A copy of related documents should be provided to the members. It was clarified that in order to maintain better transparency this was adopted.

6. The Vice-Chancellor requested all the members to attend the Panjab University Foundation Day Function on 19th October at University Auditorium.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR