

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 20th September 2015 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover ... (in the Chair)
Vice-Chancellor
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor A.K. Bhandari
4. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
5. Principal (Dr.) Gurdip Kumar Sharma
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. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
15. Professor Yog Raj Angrish
16. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)
Registrar

Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, and Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

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

1. Hon'ble Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath; Senior most Senator and Syndicate member, Dean Faculty of Law and former Advocate General of Punjab on Friday, September 11, 2015. Chatrath ji also served as the President of Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association. He would be particularly remembered for his role in establishing and nurturing of University Institute of Legal Studies (University Institute of Legal Studies) and the governance of Panjab University for long years.
2. Prof. N.K. Oberoi, Professor. (Retd.), Department of English, Panjab University, on September 16, 2015".

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Hon'ble Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath & Professor N.K. Oberoi observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the honorable members that –

- (1) Project Approval Board (PAB) constituted under the scheme National Initiative for setting up of Design Innovative Centres by the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Department of Higher Education has approved the establishment of Design Innovation Centre (DIC) at Panjab University, Chandigarh; for three years. Panjab University is one of the three institutions which have been approved this year, the other two being IIT Kanpur and School of Architecture, New Delhi. This project was submitted by Panjab University with cooperation from several other institutions like Punjab Engineering College and Central Scientific Instruments Organization. A grant of Rs.10 crores has been given for this project.
- (2) MCM DAV College for Women, Chandigarh, has been awarded 'Star Status in the 3rd Expert Committee meeting to review College supported under Star College Scheme of the Department of Biotechnology, Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India on 2nd and 3rd July 2015. The Expert Committee has awarded this status with one-time non-recurring grant of Rs.10 lakhs and recurring grant of Rs.3 lakhs per year for a period of three years.
- (3) Panjab University, Department of Mathematics is organizing a National Seminar on the occasion of 90th Birthday of Professor R.P. Bambah, former Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University on 30th September 2015. Eminent Mathematicians are scheduled to give lectures at Panjab University Campus on that day. All the former Vice-Chancellors are also expected to join in felicitating Professor R.P. Bambah on that day.
- (4) Professor Sudesh Kaur Khanduja, former Professor of Department of Mathematics, Panjab University has been awarded Professor Vishnu Vasudeva Narlikar Memorial Lecture (2015) by the Indian National Science Academy (INSA), New Delhi. This lecture is expected to be hosted at Panjab University Campus.
- (5) Professor Kamaljeet Singh Bawa, Distinguished Professor in Biology at University of Massachusetts, Boston and fellow of Royal Society (FRS) London, will deliver the 4th Panjab University Foundation Day Lecture on October 19, 2015.

Professor Bawa is an alumnus of Panjab University Botany Department. He is also the Founder and Chairman of Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment (ATREE), Bangalore, a non-governmental organization devoted to research, policy analysis and education in India. Professor Bawa has given about half a dozen visits to India and remains here for three months.

- (6) PU alumnus Air Marshal Jagjeet Singh, Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief at Headquarters Maintenance Command, has been appointed as Honorary ADC to the President of India.”

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
1. MCM DAV College for Women, Chandigarh, for having been awarded ‘Star Status in the 3rd Expert Committee meeting to review College supported under Star College Scheme of the Department of Biotechnology, Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India on 2nd and 3rd July 2015;
 2. Professor Sudesh Kaur Khanduja, former Professor of Department of Mathematics, Panjab University on her having been awarded Professor Vishnu Vasudeva Narlikar Memorial Lecture (2015) by the Indian National Science Academy (INSA), New Delhi; and
 3. Air Marshal Jagjeet Singh, Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief at Headquarters Maintenance Command and PU alumnus on his having been appointed as Honorary ADC to the President of India.”
- (2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor’s statement at Sr. Nos. (1), (2), (3), and (5), be noted and approved; and
- (3) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.07.2015, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

At this stage, Shri Jarnail Singh said Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath had made a significant contribution to the field of education and social organizations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members were welcome to express their feelings for a little while.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath was not an institution but a group of institutions. His contribution was really commendable for the University. It would be a tribute to him, if some memorial or building or some hostel could be named after him since the family was ready to contribute a huge amount for the same. They should think over it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have also announced three medals in memory of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath.

The Vice-Chancellor said that many things could be done. He discussed and shared these things on behalf of the Syndicate during the prayer meeting. Some of the discussions might not be a part of the Syndicate proceedings. Those

discussions were useful in the evolving governance of the University. Those people associated with the University governing bodies for long, would be having the knowledge of those discussions. That knowledge remained with them. But they have to compile all such important things. He proposed that few of the colleagues may take the responsibility of compiling such information particularly since April, 2000 when the University character started changing. They had new responsibilities. At least three people, one amongst the members of the Syndicate, one academician who had the knowledge of those things, and somebody whom it will affect, should apply their mind. If two-three people could volunteer, a document could be prepared. Remaining things should remain as a compendium. He suggested the names of Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal. Shri Chatrath used to say something of which there was no record. He wondered, if requested, Shri Ashok Goyal would accept to chair the Committee along with two colleagues.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was always willing to perform any duty. He was not ready to believe that Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath was not here amongst them. He was still not ready to believe about attending a meeting of the Syndicate where Shri Chatrath had not only not come but would never come because till the last meeting he was hoping that Shri Chatrath would recover soon and come back. The only tribute to the departed soul was that thing that he would always miss his presence in the Syndicate and Senate and let God grant peace to the departed soul, the peace he deserved and strengthen us to see to believe that they have to work without him and his wisdom guide them. As far as suggestion made by the Vice-Chancellor, whatever discussions have taken place in the Syndicate and Senate, most of them were those only on record. What was not recorded in the minutes that probably the members were having knowledge. No effort has been made till now because they were concerned only with the resolved part. But they had not learnt any lesson from the discussions that took place in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate in spite of the fact that some decisions that come in the form of resolved part are taken care of and the decisions which were in the form of 'look into' are not considered seriously. Unfortunately, maybe because of so much pressure of work those things could not be done. As far as the constitution of the Committee was concerned, one may not be enough from the Syndicate and Senate because there were so many people who had got different experiences on different issues. He could be one of them. The persons who were going to be affected or feeling affected by the decision of the Syndicate, they should be taken into confidence. As far as academicians are concerned, the members of the Syndicate, except a few like him, were all academicians. They could look towards academicians who were there in the Syndicate and Senate because they would be serving in double capacity as they would be looking into the academic and administrative requirements of the University as well as governing bodies of the University. He thought that the members should be more than one from the Syndicate and Senate. He did not feel that he was capable but if the Vice-Chancellor assigned him any duty, he was ready to accept that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would discuss with him (Shri Ashok Goyal) later on and do this. It would be good thing for the institution. It could in the form of a book.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the proposal which had been made to give a tribute to the family proposal had been received and it should be done at the earliest. This is a very small thing whatever maximum is possible could be done by them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that by the December meeting of the Senate, they should have the compendium ready.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor stated that now they should proceed with the agenda items. He said that he was trying to clear backlog of promotions as efficiently as he could. It is embarrassing to hold meeting of the Selection Committee for interviewing a candidate whose promotion was due years ago. He would like to have a list prepared of all such pending cases and find out the reasons why they were hanging for so long, which might be due to some technical reasons on the part of the University or the individuals might also have lost interest in pursuing them. He would definitely try to get those cleared. It becomes difficult for him to explain to the outside experts why the promotion cases are not settled even after a period of 5 years or so. In the next meeting of the Chairpersons, he would assign the Chairpersons of the respective departments to submit the status of pending promotions of the teachers of their respective departments to the Dean of University Instruction. With the help of Professor A.K. Bhandari, he would try to solve all cases up to 2014 by the end of the year 2015. In fact, he would like to ensure that no promotion of an individual whose promotion is due before June 2013, i.e., before the implementation of the capping, remains pending. He thought it proper to put up this information in the next meeting of the Chairpersons and, thereafter, he would come back to them because many individuals feel aggrieved due to delay in promotion and they also hesitate to contact him for variety of reasons and approach them directly because of proximity and other reasons. He had to see that the system is seen to be in place.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is one more problem. Even though they had made certain promotions and the incumbents were granted increments, the Resident Audit Officer (RAO) has objected to it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had a meeting with the RAO. Now they needed to follow it up. The U.T. Administration had also promoted/appointed certain persons as Professors following the criteria laid down by the University. He already had a meeting with Professor A.K. Bhandari and he plans to have a meeting with the new Director Higher Education (DHE). The RAO is an officer, who has been appointed by the U.T. Administration on the request of the University. They have to find out a practical way to resolve the problem in consultation with the RAO. The RAO should be a facilitator and ensure that nothing is got done against the Rules/Regulations, but should not create hindrance in the way of genuine cases. He had planned to hold a meeting with the DHE and the Audit Department to find out ways to solve. He had some inputs and would persuade the DHE to come to attend the meetings of Syndicate.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that as stated by the Vice-Chancellor so many times, the promotions which are due up to 2014-15, needed to be processed without wasting any further time. However, they should see as to how many persons have applied for promotions and how many cases out of them are yet to be processed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had briefed both Professor Rajat Sandhir, former President, PUTA and Professor Akshay Kumar, the new President, PUTA about the pending cases.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that they should prevail upon the teachers to fulfill the requisite criteria for promotion, i.e., sufficient number of publications, API score, etc. He suggested that a Committee should be formed to examine the cases of the teachers who are short of publications or API score and suggest measures to resolve the cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the previous President, PUTA wanted to have the status of promotions which was given to him and he was asked to share the same with his colleagues. At the moment, it is difficult to get a job in the University, but once one gets the job, he/she could progress easily. The only thing which is needed is a little bit motivation. If they just wanted to sustain their career with seriousness, they would have a smooth sailing.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he was happy that the Vice-Chancellor was taking so much pain in getting the promotion cases cleared. As far as fresh cases are concerned, delay is not on the part of the office of the Vice-Chancellor. The moment a case for promotion reached the Vice-Chancellor's office, that case is processed promptly. The cause of delay is mostly on the part of the Chairpersons of the Departments, who keep the cases pending for months together. When he wrote a letter to the Dean of University Instruction about four months back, the Dean of University Instruction issued a circular and certain Chairpersons processed certain cases of teachers. However, still there are a number of cases which are pending in the departments. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to instruct the Chairpersons to ensure that no case of promotion is pending in the departments.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that he would definitely ask the Chairpersons to send all the pending promotion cases.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Dean of University Instruction to compile the data with the help of President of PUTA.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that a time frame should be fixed; rather all such cases should be sent to the Dean of University Instruction within a period of one month.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as about six months are required to complete the process of a given promotion, the pre-screening should be done within a period of one month.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that though as per the guidelines framed on the basis of decision/s of the Syndicate and Senate the departments are required to send the promotion cases within 10 working days, the departments took months to process the cases.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Dr. Dinesh Kumar is right in saying that rules were already there. However, if they took a decision that the promotion cases should be processed within a period of one month without bothering about the existing decisions, what would be the fate of the decision taken earlier? In any case, they have to ensure that when the rule is already there that the applications should be processed by the department within 10 working days, that should be applied/enforced. Unfortunately, there are no rules for processing such cases in the office of the Dean of University Instruction or the Vice-Chancellor. They also did not have an administrative mechanism that a reminder should be sent after a period of 15-20 days. There are people who are able to get the referee's reports by having telephonic calls made from the Vice-Chancellor's office. But in some cases, until and unless the person concerned approaches the office to know about the status of his/her case, the things remained undone. He, therefore, suggested that a timeframe should be fixed at every level and enforced accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to look into the matter, they could sit together and find a way out.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the information of such type should be put on the Panjab University website.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Dean of University Instruction being the head of the academic administration of the departments, would work on it and the information be put on the University website related to the DUI office.

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

2(i). Considered minutes dated 10.09.2015 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Physical Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Physical Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. the dates mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.10000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

1. Dr. Gurmeet Singh : 20.12.2014
2. Dr. Dalwinder Singh : 07.04.2015.

- 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Physical Education

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 10.09.2015 (**Appendix-III**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Physical Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Thingnam Nandalal Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Physical Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **08.11.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Placement in Lecturer (Senior Scale) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 10.09.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for placement of Lecturer in Senior Scale, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Amrinder Pal Singh, be placed in Lecturer (Senior Scale) (Mechanical Engineering) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (1996), w.e.f. **19.04.2005**, in the pay-scale of Rs.10000-325-15200/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Computer Science & Applications

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 10.09.2015 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sonal Chawla be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **31.12.2014** 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology

2(v). Considered minutes dated 10.09.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Naveen Aggarwal be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) (Computer Science & Engineering) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) (Computer Science & Engineering) at

University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **14.02.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:** 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

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

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 10.09.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ranjan Kumar be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **11.05.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.10000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4) at University Centre for Instrumentation & Microelectronics

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 10.09.2015 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-3 to Associate Professor Stage-4, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Centre for Instrumentation & Microelectronics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Shri Harinder Pal Singh Kang be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) at University Centre for Instrumentation & Microelectronics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **25.05.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

Promotion from Assistant Librarian to Assistant Librarian (Sr. Scale) (Stage-1 to Stage-2) at P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2015 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Librarian to Assistant Librarian (Sr. Scale) (Stage-1 to Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That Shri Chandra Prakash Chaudhary be promoted from Assistant Librarian to Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) **(Stage-1 to Stage-2)** at P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **17.04.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) at VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2015 **(Appendix-X)** of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ritu Bala be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-2)** to Assistant Professor **(Stage-3)**, at VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **03.11.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/-, 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) at University School of Open Learning

2(x). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2015 **(Appendix-XI)** of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sheena Pall be promoted from Associate Professor **(Stage-4)** (History) to Professor **(Stage-5)** (History) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **26.03.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.10000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:** 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

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

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2015 **(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 Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Neena Caplash be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **20.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.10000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:** 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) at University School of Open Learning

2(xii). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2015 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Emanuel Nahar be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) (Political Science) to Professor (**Stage-5**) (Political Science) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **21.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.10000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Chemistry

2(xiii). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2015 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sonal Singhal be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **08.11.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/-, 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Biochemistry

2(xiv). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2015 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Dipti Sareen be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **14.11.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/-, 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 the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC

2(xv). Considered minutes dated 11.09.2015 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rehana Parveen be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) (Urdu) to Professor (**Stage-5**) (Urdu) in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **21.03.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.10000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letters of promotion to the persons promoted under Items **C-2(i) to C-(xv)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Re-fixation of Pay of Dr. Veena Puri, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bio-informatics

3. Considered if, the pay of Dr. Veena Puri, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bio-informatics, be re-fixed at Rs.29070/- (Basic Pay Rs.22070/- +Rs.7000/- AGP) with next date of annual increment on 01.07.2011 i.e. Rs.29950/- (Basic Pay Rs.22950/- + AGP Rs.7000/-) in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.7000/- AGP, as per LPC issued by her previous employer i.e. DAV College, Chandigarh vide letter No. 1432 dated 15.04.2015 (**Appendix-XVII**) consequent upon in the placement of Senior scale. Information contained in office note (Appendix _) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 04.08.2012 (Para 12) (**Appendix-XVII**) has resolved that the pay of Dr. Veena Puri, Assistant Professor at Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics, be fixed at Rs.22070/- + 6000 (AGP) = 28070/- in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP

Rs.6000/- w.e.f. the date of her joining the P.U. service, i.e. 27.10.2011 with next increment on 1.7.2012.

- 2 Dr. (Mrs.) Veena Puri, Assistant Professor in the Centre for System Biology and Bioinformatics vide her application dated 09.06.2015 has stated that she joined the Panjab University on 27.10.2011. Before joining P.U. she was working as Assistant Professor in DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh, on permanent basis (01.09.2006 - 27.10.2011) her joining at P.U. was without any break in her service from her earlier position of Assistant Professor in DAV, College. As per LPC dated 15.04.2015, she has been placed in Senior Scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.7000/- w.e.f. 01.09.2010.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 vide Para-30 has resolved that the consideration of Item 30, on the agenda, be deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per note it was not the question whether opinion of Resident Audit Officer is required or not. The two opinions are required – one from the Assistant Registrar (Accounts) and the other from Resident Audit Officer. From the note, it is not clear who had overruled the proposal of seeking the opinion of the RAO. From the note it appeared that they were giving an opportunity to RAO that in future he would say that his opinion had never been taken.

It was clarified that the opinion of RAO was not required at this stage.

Majority of the members were of the opinion that the instant case was very simple and felt that office note be prepared with more deliberation.

RESOLVED: That, as per LPC issued by her previous employer consequent upon her placement in Senior scale, the pay of Dr. Veena Puri, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bioinformatics, be re-fixed at Rs.29070/- (Basic Pay Rs.22070/- +Rs.7000/- AGP) with next date of annual increment on 01.07.2011 i.e. Rs.29950/- (Basic Pay Rs.22950/- + AGP Rs.7000/-) in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.7000/- AGP.

Promotion of Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar, Department of History

4. Considered if, Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar, Reader (designate as Associate Professor) Department of History, P.U., be promoted as Professor, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS). Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar was appointed as Reader in 1999 in the Department of History. She applied for promotion in the year 2006 from Reader to Professor under UGC, CAS-1996 along with the list of her five publications of Articles and two books.

2. Five research publications are required to be assessed by the experts for promotion from Reader to Professor. The research publications should pertain to the period between her appointment as Reader and the due date on which she became eligible for the promotion as Professor.
3. In case the candidate does not have the requisite number of applications, his/her eligibility is required to be shifted to the such date on which he/she becomes eligible after fulfilling all the requirements.
4. The five publications submitted by Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar were sent to the experts for scrutinization/ evaluation and their reports were positive.
5. In the meanwhile, complaints from Shri Prithi Pal Singh, Fellow, P.U. and Professor Indu Banga (now Retd.), Department of History, P.U., were received on 29.04.2006 and 07.06.2006 wherein it was stated that Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar cannot be considered for promotion as the publications submitted by her pertains to the period prior to her appointment as Reader.
6. A letter was written to Professor Neeladri Bhattacharya, Centre for Historical Studies, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi by the then Vice-Chancellor to examine the material and to intimate whether the candidate in question was eligible for promotion as Professor or it is a case of academic fraud as alleged by the complainant.
7. Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar appeared before the Selection Committee on 10.09.2006 and the Selection Committee recommended that she be promoted as Professor in the Department of History, P.U., Chandigarh, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (subject to fulfillment of UGC conditions) in the pay-scale of Rs.16400-450-20900-500-22400 at a starting of pay to be fixed under the rules of the University.

The recommendations of the said Committee were sent to UGC for approval.

8. The Under Secretary, UGC vide letter dated 15.11.2006, informed the University "to hold the recommendations of the

Selection Committee till further directions”.

9. Dr. Riar filed a CWP No. 2973/7 in the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, against the University and UGC.
10. On 07.10.2013 the Vice-Chancellor constituted a Committee consisting of Professor Navtej Singh, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, Professor Madhu Sharma, Department of History, H.P. University, Shimla and Professor Aditya Mukherjee, Centre for Historical Studies, JNU, New Delhi for finalizing comments on the complainents made by Shri Prithi Pal Singh and Professor Indu Banga. However, Professor Navtej Singh refused to the assignment and the papers sent to Professor Madhu Sharma, received back with the remarks that she has been retired from the University service. Thus, Professor Raghuvendra Tanwar, K.U. (Kurukshetra) and Professor B.B. Yadav, Rohtak, were appointed for the purpose. Professor Raghuvendra Tanwar informed that he is not in a position to spare the time. Anyhow, the comments from other two members have been received and the Vice-Chancellor has observed that two favorable reports have been arrived at and let this be proceed further as the case is already delayed.
11. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.07.2015 vide Para 38 has resolved that the consideration of the item 38 be deferred.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that the agenda items and notes should be prepared carefully. He pointed out some deficiencies in the notes.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to why the promotion of the incumbent was lying pending for so long.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he tried to resolve it earlier also. The whole chronology of the events due to which this case could not be cleared had been mentioned in the note.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know about the status of the CWP No. 2937/7 whether the same was pending or the incumbent had withdrawn.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the CWP was pending.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the whole matter was being tried to be resolved on the strength of an affidavit of the incumbent that she will withdraw the CWP. If the case was still pending, he would like to know what was the stand of the University, what were the

written statements submitted in the Court, what was the relief asked for. Let them not take a decision which could put the University in an embarrassment. If the petition was still pending in the Court, how could they process the case?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the incumbent had offered to withdraw the case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the incumbent had offered to withdraw the case but did not withdraw. If she withdrew the case, her case is solved. If she had not withdrawn the case, it can be taken as either the University should decide her case at their own level or she would get it done through the Court. But they did not know what was the stand of the University in the court. In the court it might be the stand of the University that they were seeking clarification from the UGC whether the incumbent could be given the benefit or not and were waiting for the reply from the UGC. If they were discussing the case contrary to the statements given in the court, what would be their stand in the court?

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that as per regulations, she was to become Professor as she had submitted the list of her five publications and two books. The reports of the evaluators of publications were positive. There was a complaint that the publications submitted by the incumbent did not relate to the eligibility period during which she had applied for promotion and these should be investigated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there was no need to go into the microscopic details as it would not help in resolving the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was not discussing the case on merits of the case, technically it might be wrong.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that the item should be passed subject to the condition of withdrawal of the court case.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the UGC at that time had written to hold the recommendation till further directions. Although they wanted to grant the benefit, could they do it on their own without approaching the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the directions of the UGC might not come for a long time. They could inform the UGC after the approval of the Senate.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they should pass the item positively as the case was pending since the year 2006.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nothing was hidden from the new referees. They were doing it on the basis of the opinion given by the new referees. They could report to the UGC the opinion of the new referees. On the basis of the reports of the new referees, to protect the interest of the candidate, they would try their best possible.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that nobody is opposing the case. They were discussing only about the writ petition which is pending in the court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he along with Professor A.K. Bhandari would speak to the incumbent and ask her to withdraw the case.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar, Reader (designated as Associate Professor) Department of History, P.U., be promoted as Professor, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) from the date she became eligible.

Re-designation of various employees of P.U. Construction Office

5. Considered if –

1. the following employees of the P.U. Construction office, be re-designated as mentioned against each (without financial benefits), as a measure personal to them with the condition that they will continue to perform the duties as per their substantive posts & on vacation/ retirement, their substantive posts will be filled up:
 - (i) Shri R.K. Rai, Executive Engineer-1 (Civil) as 'Superintending Engineer'.
 - (ii) Shri Harpreet Singh, Architect as 'Senior Architect'
 - (iii) Shri Kulwant Singh, Sub Divisional Engineer (Elect.) as 'Executive Engineer (Elect.)'.
 - (iv) Shri Anil Thakur, Sub Divisional Engineer (Hort.) as 'Executive Engineer (Hort.)'
 - (v) Shri Anil Behl, Junior Engineer (Civil) as 'Sub Divisional Engineer (Civil)'.
2. the Punjab Govt. PWD Rules (Notification dated 14.10.2005) regulating the recruitment for Engineering (Civil/ Electrical/ Horticulture Wings) and Architecture Staff (Notification dated 20.12.1999) framed from time to time as followed by the Chandigarh Administration in Panjab University (in toto), be adopted, to decide the promotion cases arises in future.

- NOTE:**
1. The re-designation shall take effect w.e.f. the date of approval of the competent authority i.e. Senate.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 vide Para-28 while considering the recommendations dated 29.01.2015 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to re-designation of employees enlisted at ((i) to (iv)) above has resolved that the

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

3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 vide Para-29 has resolved that the consideration of Item 29, on the agenda, be deferred, till the next meeting.
4. The Committee has recommended the re-designation of the above employees without financial benefits. In case, the said re-designation is considered with financial benefits the financial liability as mentioned in the salary chart (annexure-VIII) is involved.
5. A detailed office note, minutes of the Main Committee dated 13.08.2014, minutes of the Small Committee dated 29.01.2015, service particulars of the incumbents, Salary chart etc. are enclosed as per index.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that last time when the item was discussed, it was observed that a conscious decision should be taken so that it might not seem that a particular section of employees of the Construction Office was being favoured. No work had been done in this regard and that was the reason that the item was deferred. He suggested that a Committee of the Syndicate be constituted which would look into what could really be done and then only they could consider it.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that as per the sentiments expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal that a particular section of employees is being taken into consideration, however, several other non-teaching employees like Laboratory staff have also approached them that their promotion avenues also need to be looked into. Professor Navdeep Goyal is right that they should consider a Committee to look into the case in totality.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee of the Syndics would be formed comprising 5 members including Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Ashok Goyal to be chaired by Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee should frame a policy for other employees also.

RESOLVED: That a Committee of Syndics, comprising Professor Navdeep Goyal, Shri Ashok Goyal to be chaired by Professor A.K. Bhandari, be formed to look into the issue of grant of designations/promotions to all University employees.

Consideration of letter dated 25.08.2015 from Shri Jarnail Singh, Syndic and Fellow

6. Considered the letter dated 25.08.2015 (**Appendix-XIX**) received from Shri Jarnail Singh, Syndic and Fellow, with regard to extension in service beyond 60 years to incumbent principals of affiliated Colleges.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 18.05.2014 (Para 45) (**Appendix-XIX**) has resolved that the recommendations of the Committee dated 6.5.2014, to suggest qualifications and other terms and conditions for appointment of Principals in Constituent Colleges as well as in the affiliated Colleges on contract basis from retired Principals beyond the age of 60 years, be approved, as per **Appendix**, with the modifications that the appointment of Principals on contract basis in the Constituent Colleges as well as affiliated Colleges be made for two years after giving proper advertisement in the leading newspapers.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 12.07.2014 while deferring the consideration of item 6 (**Appendix-XIX**) has resolved that the decision of the Syndicate dated 18.05.2014 (Para 45), be notified to all the affiliated Colleges immediately and implemented from the date of the Syndicate decision, i.e. 15.05.2014.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated the since the recommendation of the Committee, so many people have retired. Since this decision had been done selectively, according to him that it appeared that there were College teachers who had retired at the age of 60. Who was suitable or not suitable in this case, that was why he had written to the Vice-Chancellor and now the case had been put up before the Syndicate for discussion. Now it was for them to deliberate on it or perish it.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said this was a re-employment issue and since they had extended it to the Professors in the Panjab University and justification for those decisions was that there was very shortage of people, qualified Principals, only one or two applications were being received, even in Ludhiana, RSD College Ferozepur, they had advertised the post twice, which is a big institution, however, they did not get any suitable person. So in order to fill that gap and till the people are qualified with score of 400 points, according to him, this resolution of not appointing the Principal beyond the age of 60, should not be accepted, it should be withdrawn.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora stated that this resolution should be withdrawn. Not only this, if there happens to be a talented person and there was no other candidate, the right of the college should not be infringed upon. He stated that there were un-aided Colleges where even after advertising for 3-4 times, no suitable candidates were available. So his submission was that not only in his/her own college, the candidates should be given a chance. This should not only be for the Principals but also for the talented teachers.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma stated that he wanted to point out that a Committee consisting of Shri Ashok Goyal, Dean College Development Council and himself was suggested to be constituted in a Syndicate meeting to extend this facility to even teachers and others, but till date no meeting of that Committee has been convened.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla stated that in one of the meetings held on 6.5.2014, it was in the resolved part that retired Principals of affiliated Colleges could apply for the post of Principals in Constituent Colleges as well as affiliated College but after the applicability of the new API score, there were so many unaided colleges which were lacking Principals. If they have to appoint the retired Principals, the Principals who were already approved Principals, the condition of API score should not be for those Principals. They should be given the chance to be appointed in the unaided Colleges, as has been adopted by Guru Nanak Dev University, because the standard of the education would go down in the Colleges which are not having Principals. She pointed out that in two Colleges in Ludhiana district, the interviews were held but no candidate turned up, the managements of those Colleges were approaching them to help in appointing Principals for their Colleges, as they were running without the heads of the Colleges.

Dr. I.S.Sandhu stated that in the unaided Colleges the problem was that no College was ready to give more than Rs.50000/- to any Principal and those who were already drawing more than Rs. one lac or more, they would not be ready to join. First of all, they should make it sure that the self financing Colleges are giving adequate salary to their teachers and Principals. If they would give adequate salary to their teachers, there was no reason that candidate/s for the position of Principal/s would not be there. Secondly, when they talked about the eligibility and adopting of 400 API score, it was that when the Senate and Syndicate framed rules, so far as he could recall, at that time the eligibility and conditions were the same. But now the conditions have become different. It appeared to him that if the candidate moves to another place, then he/she will have to have an API score of 400. Otherwise, he/she cannot move to other place. If they could relax the API score of 400 going beyond the UGC guidelines, it is only then they could send the candidate to other place. The main reason of the eligible candidate for not joining the post of Principal was that he/she might have been drawing more salary than the offered one and the uncertainty in getting even the due prescribed salary. He further stated that pick and choose policy should not be adopted and not only the Principals and Professors should be given the benefit of extension in service, but the Associate Professors of good repute, in the Colleges, who are about to retire, should also be given that benefit.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the issue of Principals appointment is primarily related to the qualification. The UGC has passed a resolution that only those Ph.D holders should be exempted from the UGC NET who had done Ph.D. before 2009. He further added that whenever the duly approved selection teams did go to College, they were being emphasized that such and such are Ph.D holders for drawing favours from them. Now, the judgment of Supreme Court has come in 2015 stating that the Ph.D. which is of the period before 2009, shall not be admitted.

The Vice-Chancellor intervened, stating that they were discussing the issue of governance and it would be better that they resolve this in such a manner that they were seen discussing the UGC

norms but not enquiring the UGC norms and at the same time, find a practical solution to the effect that the Colleges are not left without Principals. There might be many solutions to the issue, let everything should come out.

Continuing Professor Ronki Ram stated that one could say that due to some problems and shortage of availability of qualified persons, this could be allowed, would that be legally allowed or not. If they pass the proposal only because of certain concerns, like certain Colleges were not getting Principals with appropriate qualifications, the Colleges were providing education which was not up to the mark because the Colleges were not appointing qualified persons.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know through the Vice-Chancellor whether Professor Ronki Ram was in favour of the item or against it.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that it was only for Assistant Professor that those with Ph.D., whether they should be exempted from NET or not. However, it was not such that those having Ph.D. under old Regulations were eligible for the post of Principal or not. The Ph.D. holders are entitled for five increments as on today also.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said two issues were involved in the matter. One was re-employment and the other employment below 60 years. If one had to shift, a score of 400 was compulsory. When they were giving re-employment, there were Professors who were not eligible because of not having the score of 400. So in the cases of re-employment there was no need to see the API score. Since Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University have already done, they should also consider the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what were various issues? One issue was relating to what they have passed already that when somebody retired, the post was advertised and nobody was found suitable. If nobody found suitable, then that person had to continue as existing Principal because he was approved and they allow him/her to continue. Why have they not found anybody, it could be because there were not enough number of eligible applicants. Secondly, that they did not seek the eligible candidates while advertising in a manner that nobody knows that the advertisement had been given. Then it was said that no eligible persons came. Then there was a clause that if once nobody came, then appoint a senior most teacher as the Principal and look for suitable candidate by giving advertisement. This was a related issue. An attempt has to be made. The real issue was that when they wanted to continue a Principal, at that stage, somebody should do efforts that they were going to appoint a retired Principal without bothering about whether he was having API score of 400 or not because once a Principal was approved, he/she was approved for always. Then advertise the post of Principal as a contractual one. The advertisement given regularly and nobody came. The senior teacher was appointed as Principal. Now all the options were exhausted. In the next advertisement, it could be said that they were looking for a Principal on contract, any retired Principal, who was once an approved Principal, could come. In those cases, as stated by Dr. I.S. Sandhu, the management should give a guarantee that the pay should be protected. The management could say that they would pay a fixed salary of Rs.50,000/-. That option was not available with the management. They have to take approval from the University. The Principals have to be given either the full scale or the minimum basic as that of a Principal or a salary to be paid to the contractual Principal should be fixed by the Syndicate so that the

UGC might not say that the Panjab University had violated the Calendars.

Some of the members said that the salary for contractual appointment should be fixed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there could be open competition amongst the re-employed Principals. The salary as per the pay scale had to be given as in the case of the Registrar which is also an appointment for a period of four years.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the two issues must not be mixed. The re-employment of a retired Principal on contractual basis, who was working somewhere else, it was to be seen whether the UGC permitted or not. The same Principal could continue as re-employed Principal as they had been doing in the University. The same could be extended to the College teachers also, feasibility could be seen for that also. Re-employment was something different from making them eligible to be appointed on old qualifications.

Dr. Sanjeev Arora said there were two issues involved in this. One was re-employment. If one Principal, who was working in a College and if the management wanted to re-employ that person, the management should pay the full salary. Secondly, leave aside the salary to the re-employed, most of the managements do not pay the full salaries to the freshly appointed teachers in spite of whatever conditions the University imposed. Now, a new system had been adopted by the managements that the full salary is paid to the teachers which is withdrawn by the management through the ATMs of the concerned teachers. Re-employment to the deserving candidates should be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the University, re-employment is continuing not in the administrative positions, but as a teacher. It happened in MCM DAV College, Chandigarh that the Principal retired as a Principal and the court had allowed to continue as a teacher and the management was giving full salary as a teacher. She could not continue as Principal beyond the age of 60 years. Many teachers in MCM DAV College were given re-employment as in the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it was so, it was only because of some misrepresentation given to them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal Gurdeep Sharma said that Mrs. Meera Modi of Dev Samaj College got the stay as Principal but she resigned.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that contractual appointments of Principals or Lecturers should not be allowed.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it should be made clear that if the Colleges were going to make the appointments, they had to follow the rules. The clause of 2009 guidelines was applicable in the case of new appointments. From Associate Professor to Professor, these guidelines come nowhere. Similarly, in the case of Principals, where they were trying to give him/her a new post, they have to have other things in mind that in case of re-employment, if it was possible then they have to follow the rule that under this clause, the Principal has to be given extension, under special circumstances, provided he/she would get the right scale minus pension or other benefits. Without that it was not possible.

Shri Ashok Goyal thought that they were discussing on the issues which already existed. Probably nobody had gone through the recommendations of the Committee which were duly accepted by the Syndicate with one modification that instead of one year it would be two years. The recommendation of the Committee clearly says that in view of the difficulties faced by the Colleges appointing regular Principals on account of non availability of eligible and suitable candidates, it is recommended that the Principals already working in the same College after attaining the age of superannuation may be re-appointed for one year at a time on contract basis subject to maximum age of 65 years and the minimum salary equal to the last pay drawn and it will be applicable after the Selection Committee finds no suitable candidate from amongst fresh applicants. However, the College will advertise the post. When these recommendations came to the Syndicate, it was increased to two years. Thereafter the post would be re-advertised. What they were discussing had already been approved by the Syndicate in the year 2014. It was discussed at that time also, that why for fresh candidates, the API score of 400 was required and why for the Principal who has superannuated could be appointed without the API score of 400. He said that the condition for appointment of Professor as on today was of having API score of 400. But a Professor who had already been appointed even without API score could he/she be discontinued. That was why the Committee was of the view that as far as continuing of the incumbent Principal was concerned, he/she could continue in spite of the fact that he/she does not have the required API score. Then it would be in the process of continuous appointment and need not fulfill the qualifications. Unfortunately, it seemed that as if this rule had been framed to give benefit to somebody. They had been discussing that a benefit had been given to one or two persons, why not to the others. In fact, this policy had not been framed to give benefit to any individual person but to all the Colleges so that the Colleges could not be left at the mercy of officiating Principals for long. So they should try that the Colleges should not be left unattended by the regular Principals. What was happening that they were taking it in the wrong spirit. It was being said that it was to target a particular Principal who was likely to get re-employment because as has been said that not enough applications were coming. He apprehended that it is to target a particular person, only to deprive him/her the chance, as if the policy had been framed to give the benefits to him/her. The moment, they change their psyche they would be happy that they got Principals who have been excelling for 10 years or so in taking the College upward, as a Principal without 400 API and would be able to make the College successful in future too. The second proposal which had come that the posts be advertised that all such persons who had been approved as Principal, they would also apply. Then that could create legal problem. For a particular one category, he/she was not eligible, and the other category, he/she was eligible and could come. The policy which had already been framed, it was not in our University, but other universities also. When the decision was taken, the persons with 400 API score may not be available. Now the people could be available. In another one or two years, there would be no shortage of eligible persons. As far as re-employment of Lecturer is concerned, if they could take such a decision that in case of not finding suitable person to be appointed as Principal, the same could be the case for teachers also. It could be the possibility that for a particular subject, they could not find eligible candidates. It was decided in principle that those teachers can also be reappointed in the same College if there was non-availability of qualified teachers. Then, probably to prepare the guidelines, a Committee was constituted about which he

was not sure whether he was a member of that Committee. If he was a member of the said Committee, as far as his knowledge, the meeting of that Committee had not taken place. They should only keep the Colleges in focus also and for the benefit of the Colleges whatever they could do, should be done.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it was in the light of the decision of the Syndicate that this letter was written that this needs further deliberations. The issue was that could they do it. If they had to do it, then they have to change the Regulations. When the College teachers are compared with the University Professors, the University Professors are funded by the Government and in the case of Colleges, the funding is done by the managements. The managements, in no case, would allow the extension to the teachers. The teachers would retire after attaining the age of 60 years. The managements could extend this to the Principals only. Sometimes, it was being done. His intention was never to oppose anyone. At least, the Syndicate could not do it. This is the Syndicate of Panjab University and not of any other University. As far as the re-employment was concerned, was there any provision in the Panjab University Calendar for providing re-employment to College teachers and that too only for the Principals. Keeping all such things in view, he requested all the members to continue the discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that probably Shri Jarnail Singh had forgotten that he was the senior most Senate member amongst us. He did not remember one thing that a decision taken by the Syndicate becomes a rule. Just because the same could not be printed in the Panjab University Calendar Volume-III, did not mean that it had not become a part of the Calendar, it became a part of the Calendar. If Shri Jarnail Singh says that if they had to introduce to change the Calendar, it was not the right time to open Pandora's box. The Vice-Chancellor must be remembering that in one of the meetings of the Board of Finance, it was pointed out from where this re-employment has been approved, had it been got approved from any Ministry or any agency. At that time the answer of the Vice-Chancellor was that these were the rules and framed by the Syndicate and they were competent to frame such policies. For the information of the members, if they go by rules, the re-employment scheme of Panjab University teachers automatically goes because the Regulations did not permit it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had taken up this matter at a personal level with the then Minister of Human Resource Development. The Minister wanted the retirement age to be at 65 years. He (Vice-Chancellor) said that they were having re-employment up to the age at 63 years and could it extend up to 65 years. To this, the reply of the Minister was that did they take permission to extend re-employment up to 63 years. If the University asked for extension up to 65 years, the earlier extension up to 63 years would also go. Professor A.K. Bhandari was also with him at that time. He did not talk anything at personal level without the information of the senior functionaries of the University. It was done in the interest of competitiveness of the campus of the University. The campus of the University has to do well because branding of the University was known by the University campus. The grading of the University by NAAC was also done of the campus and not of the Colleges. They did whatever they could do to save the grading of the University. This was where they were at the moment. So from time to time, it was good to discuss the issues. The matter was still in the Court and the Court had to give a judgment. The College teachers had also gone to the

Court. It had come to a complex stage. He had on his own level talked to the Advisor, U.T. Administration that since the teachers of Punjab Engineering College had been allowed up to the age of 62 years, the same could be allowed for the teachers of Medical College. If the U.T. could not permit up to 65 years, at least it could permit up to 62 years. The U.T. Advisor told him that this matter was with the State Higher Education Council. They had made a representation to the U.T. to help in the matter how to enhance the age. This was the status at the moment. Shri Jarnail Singh has also a point in saying that if in a given College, the Principal has to continue beyond 60 years and other teachers are not allowed, the teachers feel aggrieved. In the system, where they had Directors by rotation, but in the Colleges, the Principals were for life. What if a College Principal is appointed for 5 years? Why should the Principal be appointed for life in the College and why not the teachers on seniority be appointed as Principal by rotation.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that now it was for a maximum period of 10 years.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that before the year 1966, persons with M.A. in third division were eligible for appointment in the Colleges. After that it was M.A. with 50% marks but the candidates with 50% marks were not available. Ultimately, the qualification was revised to 55%. When it was revised to 55% marks, so many candidates were available. Some additional qualification was added. Actually it was a transition period. They had done it for two years. The advertisement should be valid for six months. It should not be continued for every six months.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the newspapers should be specified in which the advertisement had to be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said what was being done was that the time given to the candidates to apply in response to an advertisement was 21 days. Since the post of the Principal was an important post, 21 days time was too short.

The members suggested that the advertisement should be given in the national dailies.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a College needing the Principal would inform the Dean College Development Council (DCDC) and the DCDC would put it on the website of DCDC and issue a circular to all the Colleges to ask the teachers to apply and at least two months time should be given to the candidates to apply. Let them not open the Syndicate decision.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the candidates with API score were not available. The decision of the Committee was also that the advertisement should be given every year.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in case the Syndicate decides to grant extension to the Principals, his dissent be recorded.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the advertisement be known to all the teachers of affiliated Colleges and sufficient time be given to them to apply.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that throughout the country, the time given to the candidates to apply for any post was 21 days. They had

to keep in mind the Regulations which are prescribed by the UGC. They could not do beyond that. They had to see that the advertisement was given in the newspapers prescribed by the UGC. The Vice-Chancellor was right that they could add anything like that it be put on the website. If the advertisement was put on the website, then, he thought that a time of 10 days was also sufficient.

The members suggested that the time of 21 days given to the candidates to apply for the post was sufficient time.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a report could be sent to the UGC that the Syndicate took a decision about the qualifications, etc., which was also available on the website.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that as suggested by the Committee, the extension should be for one year. The Syndicate in its earlier meeting wanted to have it at one year, but somehow it was put at two years. Now many people with the essential qualifications were eligible. It should be one year as the Syndicate had already taken a decision in this regard.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that as per the minutes of the Committee, that in the Panjab University Constituent Colleges, any approved regular retired Principal of College was made eligible for the post of Principal. Why the same was not in the case of un-aided Colleges also?

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if they wanted to give extension, they could give keeping in view the need of the Colleges but it should be for one year only and advertisement should be given every year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he wanted that the advertisement should be given wide publicity. Let the DCDC office maintain a data of Principals retiring in a year and it should be known that the post of Principal at a particular place would be vacant after a period of 6 months. The management would provide the deadline in time and the same would be notified on the website.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that the advertisement should be given at least three months before the retirement of an incumbent Principal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the advertisement has to be given at least two times.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the applications could be sought from the eligible candidates because the suitability had to be seen by the management.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Selection Committees comprised very senior persons to find suitable persons for appointment as a Principal of the College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that transparency needed to be such as the Colleges situated in Punjab, affiliated to Guru Nanak Dev University, whenever they advertise a post, they put the names of the applicants on the website so that the candidates, even before the interviews were held, could know about the eligibility of the candidates and no ineligible person was considered later on after manipulations. The University could also do the same in the office of the Dean College Development Council (DCDC) by putting the

applications on the website as the applications were received in the office of DCDC so that if somebody had applied and his name was not included in the list, he could point out the same. As has already been requested a number of times, the DCDC office should give a list of the applications which had been received, to the nominee of the Vice-Chancellor so that the management could not say that they had not received sufficient number of applications. It was in view of what the Vice-Chancellor suggested that list should also be put on the website. It was not fair why the Syndicate revised the extension from one year as recommended by the Committee, of which he was also a member, to two years. If he rightly remembered, it was Principal Gurdip Sharma who suggested that the extension should be for two years. That was not to favour any particular person. Whatever decision they take to discontinue this benefit, if the psyche of benefit was there, it was only to deny the benefit to a right person.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there were three issues involved in the case. Firstly, whatever decision has been resolved by the Syndicate should continue as such. Secondly, for extending the similar kind of benefit to College teachers, a Committee had already been constituted which had held two meetings. They could extend the Committee and could think about that. Thirdly, as Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla has said that if a person wanted to move to some other College, also for that, if they allow appointment on contract basis because this was re-employment beyond 60 years, for that Regulations have to be amended. It could be a possibility that Principal could be employed on contract basis also, he thought that the same Committee should also look into that aspect.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it did not matter whether the extension was being given for one or two years. Ultimately, they would be asked to show their records. The only benefit, this Committee and the Syndicate could decide to give in the case of Principals might be because of the conditions so that the right candidate could be appointed as Principal. The extension should not be more than one year because they would be able to tell the UGC that the suitable candidate could not be found. The idea that the Panjab University was trying to implement in one way or the other, was to support the College teachers. But the status of the University and the governing body was much more important. They should find good reasons to dilute the standards to appoint teachers that qualified teachers were not available. They have to think twice if they wanted to extend the same benefit of appointing Principal on superannuation with lesser qualification to the teachers also.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested the in-between situation. They had decided to give extension for two years last year. Those Principals who had been given two years, their term could not be curtailed now. If they make it for one year from today on the premise that enough number of people with 400 points should be there, but they need to pass the same in the Syndicate also. The situation would be that those who had been given extension of two years, it would stand. But from now onwards, they would not grant extension for more than one year or would not be given beyond 31st December, 2016.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that till date those who had been given extension, that would stand. But from today onwards, the extension would be for one year. But it was not to be approved by the Senate. It is to be approved by the Syndicate. It would come into effect the day it was approved by the Syndicate. If somebody would be

appointed in March 2016, he/she could say that the one year extension would go up to March 2017.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dean College Development Council's office would compile the data. The advertisement should be given two times in the newspapers.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the advertisement should be given in a reputed newspaper.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that let the Committee take a decision on the issue. There should be five members on the Committee.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that it was not known who were the members of that Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there was an old Committee which was to look into the extension issue. The members would suggest the English, Hindi and Punjabi newspapers. The DCDC would decide the newspapers in which the advertisement would be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the DCDC office be instructed to follow the Regulations prescribed by the UGC while deciding the newspapers in which the advertisement should be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the newspaper should be of national character.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired about the resolution on the issue of extension.

The Vice-Chancellor said that those who had been given two years extension, they would not be affected. However, from now onwards, the extension would only be for one year. He asked the members one by one whether the extension should be for one year or two years.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the earlier practice should be continued and let the decision be taken by the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that let the decision be taken by the Committee.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora favoured for extension of two years.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla also favoured for extension of two years.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu was however of the view that the extension should be for one year, but it would be an injustice for the new generation.

The Vice-Chancellor again asked the members whether the extension should be given for one year or two years.

After listening to the members, the Vice-Chancellor said that majority of the members were for extension of one year. Those who had been given extension of two years, they would continue as such. In the meanwhile, the Committee, which has already been

constituted, would look into that no discrimination is done to anybody. Two members, namely Shri Jarnail Singh and Dr. I.S. Sandhu would be added to the Committee.

It was informed that the retirement age of teachers of Colleges of Education had again been fixed by the NCTE at 60 years. The same could be adopted.

RESOLVED: That from now onwards the Principals would be given extension of one year. However, those who had already been given extension of two years, they would continue as such. In the meanwhile, the Committee, which has already been constituted, would look into that there no discrimination is done to anybody. Two members, namely Shri Jarnail Singh and Dr. I.S. Sandhu would be added to the Committee.

**Pre-ponement of promotion of
Dr. Naveen Gupta**

7. Considered if the date of promotion of Dr. Naveen Gupta, Assistant Professor, Department of Microbiology from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) already made under UGC Regulation 2010 (vide Syndicate decision dated 22.02.2014 vide Para 2(viii)), be preponed, to that of Lecturer to Lecturer (Sr. Scale) w.e.f. 17.04.2006 under UGC Regulation, 2000, in terms of orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court in an another case (CWP No.8417 of 2005), by counting his past service at D.A.V. College, Yamunanagar. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The syndicate in its meeting dated 22.02.2014 vide Para 2(viii) has resolved that Dr. Naveen Gupta be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfillment of U.G.C. conditions) w.e.f. 17.04.2010, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.
 2. In a similar case of Dr. Latika Sharma of Department of Education, who moved to Hon'ble High Court against the decision of the University for not counting her past service for promotion under CAS being gap in joining time as is in the instant case of Dr. Naveen Gupta. The court has allowed to count her past service with consequential benefits. As per direction of the Hon'ble court the dates of her promotion as Lecturer (sr. scale), Reader and Associate Professor have been preponed and revised order have been issued.
 3. Chart showing tentative dates of promotion of Dr. Naveen Gupta, Assistant

Professor, Department of Microbiology enclosed.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he had written a letter to the Vice-Chancellor about many cases which were pending for counting of past service due to various reasons such as due to a gap in joining, absence of prior approval, the applications were not routed through proper channel, etc. As Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out, a case was also filed in the Court in this regard. Professor Shelley Walia also filed a case in the court. They could not make rules on the basis of court decisions. A Committee could be constituted to look into all such pending cases and resolve the issues keeping in view the case of Dr. Latika Sharma.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about the court cases, all the cases could not be taken as similar. As far as this particular case was concerned, it was only a question of the fact that the person was relieved from the previous institution and a gap occurred between the relieving and the joining. The decision of the Court in the other case is also that the past service should be considered. Since it was not a break in service why he had been denied the benefit?

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that it was decided that whenever decision in Dr. Latika Sharma's case is taken, a decision in this case would also be taken. Therefore, the benefit should be given.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the incumbent has been appointed as Associate Professor in another Department but he is not joining. He sought extension in joining the new department which was granted by the Vice-Chancellor. There were two issues in this case. One is that his request was kept pending by the orders of the Vice-Chancellor and he was not informed. Secondly, as per a clarification sought from the UGC, obtained by the University while considering such cases, according to which Reader once appointed against a direct post of Professor, cannot be considered for the post of Professor under CAS in the same University later on. The first question is that whether he should join as Associate Professor in the department where he has been selected or not. The reason being that according to note, if he joined within a month or so according to the chart prepared by the Establishment branch, his promotion under CAS as Associate Professor would be due from the year 2014. As and when he joins the new department, the Establishment branch would not process his case on the basis of the clarification received from the UGC he had joined as Associate Professor in direct appointment. As far as protection of pay is concerned, it had already been protected in the year 2006 itself. However, the past service was not counted. If the past service is counted now, then he would be sure that when he would apply for the Associate Professor under CAS, he would get it from the year 2014 in the year 2017, he would be eligible for Professorship.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a practical solution of the problem is that leave the decision to the candidate. The candidate would choose the option which suits him. If he had been selected in another department, allow him to be transferred from a given department to other department and they would not advertise the post of Associate Professor in the Department of Microbial Biotechnology. As the Government of the University, they could do it. He has been considered worth of serving the Department of Microbial Biotechnology on the basis of his background and qualifications.

They have to think in terms of the viewpoint of the candidate. He had been selected and is satisfied with the requirement of the department. If he refused this position in Department of Microbial Biotechnology and gets promotion in Microbiology and they allow his transfer from one to the other department so that he continues to get the benefit of Professor after 3 years from previous promotion as Associate Professor in Microbiology. This is a decision which he could not take as he had no authority. They could take a decision with the guidance of Professor A.K. Bhandari. To his knowledge, such a decision had been taken in the PGIMER, Chandigarh.

Professor Karamjeet Singh clarified that whatever decision they were taking that would be for the benefit of the candidate. What Dr. Dinesh Kumar was saying is absolutely wrong. This clause is there in the UGC because if one is applying for the same post. Citing his example, he said that he is a Professor in UBS and his promotion under CAS is due and wanted to appear against the open post, that is not possible. In the instant case, this is totally wrong for the reason that he has been selected in another department. The Vice-Chancellor is absolutely right. It is very simple. They were giving the lien also. In the previous case if the DAV College could give the benefit of past service, why they could not do so. He was not denying grant of the benefit. There would be a big problem because there are many candidates in the pipeline. Now they had got the judgment. Otherwise also, they have to follow the UGC rules. The UGC rules clearly say that break in service is not allowed. The court has also given a decision. This is a genuine case. When the LPC has been given by the previous employer, the intention is clear that no dues are pending. There would be no harm to the candidate if they constitute a committee on the basis of the decision in Dr. Latika Sharma's case.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he would like to draw the attention of the Vice-Chancellor towards the note of the Establishment branch on page 90 portion marked as 'B' that 'in the instant case as he has been appointed as Associate Professor through open selection and his joining is awaited, it needs to be decided if his request for promotion under CAS on account of past service is to be considered at this stage, for the reason that his case was kept pending as stated above'. Why the Establishment branch is putting the same question before the Vice-Chancellor because they wanted a clarification from his (Vice-Chancellor's) office. If the candidate joins as Associate Professor in Department of Microbial Biotechnology and they approve his case, for example in December and he applies under CAS in January, the Establishment would put the same note that if they allow him to become Associate Professor now, it would be a violation of the UGC rules. Same thing happened in the cases of Professor Ronki Ram and Professor Sanjeev Sharma. Dr. Ronki Ram became Professor in the open selection and when he enquired from the University whether he could apply under CAS. As far as the question of Professor Karamjeet Singh is concerned, the selection was against the Chair in the same Department and not against the vacant post of Professor but a particular Chair.

Professor Ronki Ram said in his case, interview for CAS and open selection happened on the same day and the letters of promotion were received on the same day. He was asked to give option for either of the two. He opted for open selection and not for CAS.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that now his question was that if the candidate joins in Department of Microbial Biotechnology as Associate Professor and afterwards if a Committee is constituted on the basis of

the decision of Dr. Latika Sharma's case and draft a policy that under such and such circumstances, the past service can be counted. Then could they allow him to apply under CAS at a later stage. He cited an example of a teacher who had applied for promotion to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) and in the meanwhile he was selected as Professor. He joined as such and asked for the financial benefit of Assistant Professor (Stage-3) which was due from the year 2014. The Establishment branch put a note to the Vice-Chancellor referring the rule of UGC that since now the candidate had been selected as Professor, he/she could not be given the benefit of Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3). The intention of the candidate was just to get the financial benefit of the period for which he/she had actually worked.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all these cases were kept pending for long time for the reason that whenever the case of Dr. Latika Sharma is decided, the benefit could be given to all such similar cases. Now since the decision in the case of Dr. Latika Sharma had been taken, all other similar cases should be decided accordingly. Syndicate is the body which can take decision in such cases. Therefore, they should approve the case under consideration today itself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the candidate was to become Associate Professor in his previous department and now he had been selected as Associate Professor in other department. There was no change in designation. The benefit that he could have got in his previous department by way of normal process, how could they deny the same. He proposed that a small Committee could be constituted but some of the members did not agree to it and suggested that the case should be approved. He further said that this candidate would get the CAS promotion if he applied for it. If he has applied for Associate Professor in other department, crossed the threshold and something which is a default to him, it would not be correct if the University denies that default to him.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the letter mentioned by the office is just a clarification by the UGC and they should see for which the clarifications was sought. He further added that as Professor Karamjeet Singh pointed out that it was just to prevent in the same post and in the same department and not in different post and they should seek from the office that in what case and in what context the clarification was sought.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that a Committee had already been constituted and the office note itself says that in a similar case of Dr. Arvind Kumar, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, that was brought in the last meeting of the Syndicate, where it was said that all the details to be considered because so many conditions were put by the UGC such as how he was selected on the post in the previous institution and if he was selected through a properly constituted Selection Committee. So in the light of the discussion, the case was referred to a Committee. He enquired that why they wanted to treat the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar differently which was placed at the same level and this case in a different manner. In the case of Dr. Latika Sharma, it is said that she had tried to explain that it was beyond her circumstances to come to Chandigarh and join within the stipulated period of 180 days and she could not join. She joined on the 181st day and that gap was only of one day. They could not, on their own, equate all the cases at par with the case of Dr. Latika Sharma. As Professor Karamjeet Singh has rightly pointed that it is

not the same court but the same Division Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court which, within a few days of granting the relief and stay on retirement to one Professor, refused to accept the application filed by another Professor. The petition was filed by Professor Shashi Sharma that how could the Court discriminate on the same grounds and of the same University. The court said they had granted the relief in one case but could not grant the same relief in that case. Either the candidate could get the benefit through the Court or let they get the case examined by a Committee as had been done in the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar. But still if majority of the members wanted to approve it, he had no problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the case of Dr. Arvind Kumar, if they see the LPC, it showed that he had been given only three increments whereas he was asking for the benefit of five years. Probably, the qualification of the candidate must have been the B.Tech. He was not sure whether a candidate with B.Tech. degree could be appointed as a Lecturer. But in the case of Dr. Naveen Gupta, no ambiguity is there. Once he was relieved from the previous institution, he could not join the next day and there was a gap of several days. .

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that this very Syndicate, of which he is also a member, had granted five increments to a teacher w.e.f. 2007 for the degree of Ph.D. the candidate got in the year 2010. That was why he was saying that they should not take a decision in haste.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the candidate was working as a regular teacher and the time taken for joining could not be treated as break in service. This is also what the Court has decided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they were not progressing in resolving the issue. If they spend so much time on an item, they may not be able to spend a quality time on other items. Let they form a small Committee which would come up with suggestions. He understood that the candidate would get promotion. They have to see whether the gap of 18 days could be regularized. He saw no argument that because of the gap of 18 days, the benefit was being denied. If there were no arguments against the gap of 18 days, then this case is a clear one and let it be approved and also take decision on other cases also. If they delay this case because of other things, then this would be an unnecessary delay. There were more ambiguities in the previous cases.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this should be kept in mind that the College from where the candidate had joined the Panjab University is a private institution. They should see what was the mode of selection, appointment and other terms and conditions?

Some of the members suggested that the item should be approved.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that the Committee be requested to make the recommendations in a time bound manner.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that if they approve the case without conditions, they would be specifically violating the conditions of the UGC. He asked if they wanted to condone the delay of 18 days, if so, why the delay in other cases is not being condoned and what kind of reasons they consider as genuine. He further asked if they

wanted to go ahead violating the UGC rules related with break in service.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want unnecessary representations to be made to the UGC. In order to prevent the delays, let the Committee be time bound in submitting its report to be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate. The overwhelming feeling of the members is that since the delay of 18 days in joining is just a technicality, the Committee has to examine whether the Syndicate has special powers to overcome the technicalities. There is no disagreement that the delay of 18 days is a technicality. In this interest, they were deferring the item and not withdrawing the item with a stipulation that the Committee will take a call on it and not take a call on similar other cases because all other similar cases would take a considerable time. Let the Committee be given a time of 10 days to submit the report before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the Committee be requested to look into the implications of the UGC letter.

RESOLVED: That a Committee comprising of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Karamjeet Singh and Professor Ronki Ram to be chaired by Professor A.K. Bhandari, be constituted to examine the case and submit its recommendations within 10 days to be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Change in date of promotion of Professor Narinder Kumar, Department of Statistics

8. Considered if the date of promotion of Professor Narinder Kumar, Department of Statistics, be treated as 1.1.2009 (instead of 17.8.2009) for the purpose of notionally fixation of his salary at par with Professor S.K. Soni etc. to meet with the audit objection. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XX**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The Audit has again raised the following objection:-

“that the Promotions under CAS are made by the P.U. as per the UGC Regulations duly adopted by the Syndicate & Senate. The UGC Regulations are mandatory in nature and the P.U. Syndicate & Senate has no authority to overrule the same. There is no provision in the UGC Regulations regarding pre-ponement of the promotion under CAS for the purpose of notionally fixation of Salary.”

2. Rule 1(ix) at page 129 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, which is reproduced below:

“1. The seniority of a teacher in a particular cadre shall be determined according to the date of his confirmation.”

3. The Audit had earlier raised the following objection:

“that they could fix their pay w.e.f. 01.01.2009 only if the date of Professor Kumar is deemed to be considered as 01.01.2009 instead of 17.08.2009.”

4. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 26.10.2014 vide Para 3 (**Appendix-XX**) has resolved that the date of promotion of Professor Narinder Kumar, Department of Statistics, for the purpose of notional fixation of his salary at par with Professor S.K. Soni, be treated as 01.01.2009 (instead of 17.8.2009).
5. The Senate in its meeting dated 14.12.2014 vide (Para-V) (**Appendix-XX**), while approving the recommendation of Syndicate dated 26.10.2014 vide (Para 3) **has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Senate.**
6. The Vice-Chancellor, as per authorization on behalf of the Senate dated 14.12.2014 (Para V) vide No.3165/Estt. dated 15.04.2015 (**Appendix-XX**) has allowed that the date of promotion of Professor Narinder Kumar, Department of Statistics, be treated as 01.01.2009 (instead of 17.08.2009) for the purpose of notionally fixation of his salary at par with Professor S.K. Soni.
7. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 vide Para-31 has resolved that the consideration of Item- 31, on the agenda, be deferred.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the date of promotion of Professor Narinder Kumar, Department of Statistics, to be treated as 1.1.2009 (instead of 17.8.2009) for the purpose of notionally fixation of his salary at par with Professor S.K. Soni, etc.

Roster regarding reservation of teaching positions

9. Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 19.08.2015 (**Appendix-XXI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to check the Roster (regarding reservation of teaching positions) and see whether it is in accordance with the guidelines/policies of the Government of India/UGC issued from time to time.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.08.2008 (Para 36) (**Appendix-XXI**) has approved the recommendations of the Standing Committee dated 02.08.2008 for implementation of policies and programmes of Government of India, U.G.C. and State Government for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 06.12.2008 (Para 12) (**Appendix-XXI**) has re-considered the decision of the Syndicate dated 19.08.2008 (Para 36) and Senate dated 28.08.2008 (Para L) (**Appendix-XXI**) has approved that the preparation of roster for appointments under the reserved categories, i.e. SC/STs Department-wise, be approved, in principle.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the recommendation (3) of the Committee says that a candidate, who had applied and selected under open category though he belonged to reserved category, would be considered against general category. He enquired whether a candidate selected in open category and wanted to have any further benefit of roster would get this benefit or not as the Committee had not mentioned anything about this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Government of India wanted that maximum people of SC category join the government service.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there was no other way of promotion under which the candidate of reserved category could ask for the benefit of reservation.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 19.08.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Enhancement of DA and grant of Annual Increment to all the teachers beyond 60 years as per Court orders

10. Considered the enhancement of DA and Annual Increment, be granted to all the teachers continuing beyond the age of 60 years as per the Interim orders in CWP No. 11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman and Panjab University and others) of the Hon'ble Court as a policy, so as to avoid processing individual cases. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXII**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The Resident Audit Officer has advised that a policy in this regard be got framed from the Syndicate & Senate after having the legal opinion of the Counsel defending the University in C.W.P. under reference instead of passing the individual orders to avoid contempt of court.
 2. The Punjab & Haryana High Court in the case of Shri B.S. Ghuman v/s Panjab University (CWP No.11988 of 2014) had granted stay on their retirement and they are continuing in service as per the interim orders passed by the Hon'ble Court.
 3. The Vice-Chancellor has allowed the increment and D.A. vide order No.1525-51/Estt-I dated 24.02.2015 and the same has been noted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.04.2015 vide Para 31-1(vi) (**Appendix-XXII**).

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla enquired whether the grant of DA and annual increment was allowed by the UGC as in all other cases they follow the guidelines of the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that UGC rules permit the retirement age up to 65 years.

Principal Gurdip Sharma pointed out that in the office note, there is mention of seeking the opinion of the University Counsel. It was not clear whether the opinion of the University Counsel had been taken or not as the same had not been appended.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he did not know what would be the final outcome of the court case. The item could be brought after the outcome of the case. The arrears could be paid. Otherwise, he had no objection.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Court had granted the stay and the persons were continuing in service. This item had come before them only because the audit had raised an objection.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said it would be a burden on the University if the DA and increment are granted. As far as the payment of salary on the basis of the last pay drawn is concerned, it is okay. The arrears and other benefits would also have to be paid which would put burden on the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since in the case of Professor Shelley Walia, the increment had been given, why the other teachers are being denied the same. His proposal is that whatever decision University took in the case of Professor Shelley Walia, that should prevail. There was no need to take the legal opinion as they already had a precedence of Professor Shelley Walia.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that if it was so, the note about the legal opinion could be deleted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the note about legal opinion would be deleted. Let they not complicate the matter. When the Vice-Chancellor asked the members whether to follow the precedence of Professor Shelley Walia, some of the members said that they were in favour of following the case. However, Dr. Dinesh Kumar did not favour the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said there were hundreds of other cases also. How would they treat those cases? There was a stage when they could not pay the salaries for 3-4 months to the teachers who had got stay on their retirement. It was only on the directions of the Hon'ble Court that the salaries were released. In fact, they had been taking different decisions in different cases. Why the RAO had written that opinion of the counsel should be taken? The reason behind this could be that at that time the Counsel had told the University that the Hon'ble High Court had said that the teachers getting the stay on retirement would continue on their risk and responsibility. Then ultimately after the pendency of the case for 2 years, the Court said that the salary be paid as the teachers had worked.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since financial liability was involved, they should frame a policy which could include the financial liability also. In the first instance, this policy should be placed before the Board of Finance and only then they could consider the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the teachers are already suffering.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when in the year 2000, a writ petition was filed for stay on retirement the University, in spite of the fact that they had a policy of re-employing the teachers up to the age of 63 years, had asked the counsel to oppose that. Sometimes people ask them what is the stand of the University, then they had to cut a sorry figure that they did not know anything.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would keep the members updated in this regard.

RESOLVED: That enhancement of DA and Annual Increment to all the teachers continuing beyond the age of 60 years as per the Interim orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman and Panjab University and others), be approved as a policy.

Mechanism for Redressal of Grievances of Students

11. Considered if, the Mechanism submitted by Dean Student Welfare, P.U., for Redressal of Grievances of students to ensure transparency in all the activities of students at different stages, be approved.

Professor Karamjeet Singh enquired about what was meant by academic and non-academic grievances.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that non-academic grievance meant that a person says that it was the facility to be given to him but the same had not been given, e.g., allotment of hostel, etc.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that these rules are going to be the part of the Panjab University Calendar. The list of grievances is very ambiguous. Again the Department level Committee will comprise of the Head of the Department and up to 3 faculties, which should be faculty members instead of faculties. It would be sufficient to say that all kinds of grievances such as academic, administrative, etc. as the grievance could be of a fight between the students, behavior of the students, teacher and vice-versa. Apart from that, wherever the word Chairman appeared, it should be replaced with the word Chairperson. For the University Level Committee, she suggested that a trained counsellor should also be appointed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the University had already appointed a counsellor.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the procedure for redressal of grievances, there are a number of errors, which should be corrected. No time limit has been prescribed for the Chairperson of the University Level Committee to consider the appeal of the students and place before the University Level Committee. Therefore, a time limit should be prescribed. In many cases, particularly in the case of research scholars, which they were promoting, a research scholar is interested to publish the thesis, after the viva-voce, seeks the permission of the Chairperson of the Department. The Chairperson sits over the application for a couple of years. A number of cases have also come to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor. In the reports of the examiners, according to the Panjab University Calendar, the examiners' reports are to be seen whether the examiner has recommended the publication of the thesis or not. The Chairpersons

are doing that they copy, paste the weaknesses which include suggestions as to fulfill those, candidate has to go to the field and write the thesis again. In the publication column, the examiner writes that he recommends publication of the thesis after editing. Why the Chairperson copy, paste the weaknesses which would require the candidate to go to the field, collect data and submit the thesis. These grievances are coming to the Dean of University Instruction and the Vice-Chancellor. There has to be some deadline and the Chairpersons should be instructed as to what they are supposed to do. She said that her students are being particularly victimized on this ground.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that a couple of cases have come to his knowledge.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the proposed mechanism for redressal of grievance of students needed to be redrafted in view of the suggestions.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar while proposing these committees, the University Calendar had been ignored. As per Panjab University Calendar, Academic and Administrative Committee in the Departments are authorized to take disciplinary action. When the item is brought again after redrafting, the provisions of the Calendar must be mentioned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the year 2012 some guidelines for grievances redressal mechanism of students were framed by the UGC. However, probably, those were overlooked and nothing could be done in this regard. This deficiency was also pointed out at the time of NAAC inspection. He went through the notification of the UGC and also an RTI application was filed to know whether there is any such grievances redressal mechanism in the University. After going through that document, he found the guidelines which they had not complied with. That was why that a Committee was suggested to prepare these guidelines for redressal of students' grievances. Since this is going to be part of the Calendar Volume-III, whatever little changes have been suggested would be taken care of. As far as Academic and Administrative Committees are concerned, these Committees could not take the role of grievance redressal.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to make necessary changes in consultation with Professor Rajesh Gill and others. The guidelines so framed would be got vetted by Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Director, Research and other persons concerned with the students should also be associated.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that his humble submission as far as the point made by Professor Rajesh Gill is concerned, that in case it is just to see the probability and as there is a possibility, they could frame a rule that if a student or research scholar applies to the department for permission and the said permission is not granted within 30 days, then it should be deemed to be granted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had the office of the Dean of University Instruction to look after all such matters.

RESOLVED: That in view of the suggestions made by the members, the Mechanism submitted by Dean Student Welfare, Panjab University, for redressal of grievances of students, be redrafted and resubmitted for approval again.

Review of Syndicate decision dated 06.07.2002 12. Considered the review of following decision of Syndicate taken in its meeting dated 06.07.2002 vide Para 20:

“that the recommendations of the Board of Finance that all the Assistant Section Officers and Assistant Section Officers (Stenography) as on 01.04.2001 be granted one increment w.e.f. 01.04.2001 was endorsed by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Syndicate and was then approved by the Senate in its meeting held on 29.12.2001. The entire management and Superintendence over the affairs and property of the University vests in the Senate under Section 11 of Panjab University, Act VII of 1947. The Senate is well aware of its responsibilities and it knows best what incentive within the framework of law should be given to its employees which would be in the best interests of efficient functioning of its institutions. Any objection taken by the RAO is misplaced. This house also disagreed with the observation of Finance, Secretary, U.T., Chandigarh, in his D.O. No. F&P06/2k2/5682 as it infringes on the autonomy of the University and is in disregard of Section 11.”

Resolved Further: “that payment of one increment to Assistant Section Officers and Assistant Section Officers (stenography) w.e.f. 01.04.2001 be made forthwith from the University funds and the amount be not shown in the Budget deficit till the Governments agree to it.”

Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:** 1. The Resident Audit Officer did not admit the increment to ASO/ASO (Stenography) and referred the matter to Joint Secretary Finance-cum-Director, Local Self Government, Chandigarh Administration. In response to that, the Finance Department, UT, Chandigarh vide its letter dated 27.03.2002 directed the RAO that the Vice-Chancellor may be requested to seek clarification/ approval from the Government of Punjab for releasing on increment to ASOs. On this, the then Vice-Chancellor had written to the Finance Secretary, UT, Chandigarh, justifying the grant of increment citing the following provisions:-

Section 11 of Panjab University Act, 1947.

The Senate shall have the entire management and superintendence over the affairs and property of the University and shall provide for that management and exercise the superintendence in accordance with the statutes, rules and regulations for the time being in force.

Rule 27 appearing at page 88 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III of 1996.

The Senate/Syndicate, as the case may be, shall have the power to grant

accelerated increment/s to an employee on a time scale of pay.

2. The Resident Audit Officer has observed that the amount concerning to the liability of one increment to ASOs for the period 2009-10 onwards may be reduced from Non-Plan expenditure.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 vide Para-33 has resolved that the consideration of Item-33, on the agenda, be deferred

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that how could the benefit once given be withdrawn after a period of 14 years.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that since it was a decision taken by the Syndicate and Senate to grant the benefit out of the University funds, they have to find a solution to this situation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Yog Raj Angrish suggested that a Committee be formed to examine the case.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that probably this item was brought in the supplementary agenda of the last meeting of the Syndicate. On the request of some of the members, the supplementary agenda was not taken up. Since it had become the record of the University, it had been recorded that the Syndicate in its meeting held on 30.08.2015 had resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred as if they had taken up the matter. Unfortunately, it had been recorded that all the issues in the supplementary agenda which could not be taken up, be deferred. This should be corrected.

RESOLVED: That a Committee be formed to revisit the decision of Syndicate taken in its meeting dated 06.07.2002 vide Para 20.

Minutes of Committee dated 25.05.2015 to determine modalities for implementation of NCTE Regulations

13. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 25.05.2015 (**Appendix-XXIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to determine the modalities for implementation of N.C.T.E. Regulations-2014.

- NOTE:**
1. Minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 07.04.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to determine the modalities for implementation of N.C.T.E. Regulations-2014 enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).
 2. Minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 05.05.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding N.C.T.E. Regulations-2014 are enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that initially the NCTE allotted 2 units of 50 students each to an Education College. But subsequently, the Colleges were allowed to retain the same seats as they were having previously.

It was suggested that while issuing recognition letter to the Colleges, it should be mentioned that the number of seats would be as per the revised NCTE Regulations-2014.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the new NCTE Regulations came in the year 2014. As per the UGC Regulations-2010, some concession was given to the apex bodies like DCI, MCI, NCTE, AICTE to frame the qualifications. Technically and legally, whatever had come in the year 2010, was final unless and until the UGC gave some concession. Whatever qualifications have been laid as per the NCTE-2014 Regulations, could they go beyond that taking the reference of UGC Regulations-2010?

It was clarified that the UGC had informed that for the appointment of Principal, the NCTE Regulations have to be followed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the UGC Regulations-2010 say something else. If subsequent to that a letter had come from the UGC contrary to that, could that letter overrule the UGC Regulations or the Regulations of NCTE. The University would have to face problems for making selection in the Colleges of Education.

It was informed that these NCTE Regulations-2014 came after the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and are in supersession of Regulations-2009 and these would come into force from the date of publication. In fact, service conditions and qualifications are mentioned in these Regulations. Out of the 14 courses, 9 courses have been given to the University and 5 courses have been given to different bodies. In the earlier Regulations, the Universities could impose any conditions over and above the qualifications of NCTE Regulations and the University had put the condition of NET for appointment of Assistant Professors in Colleges of Education.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University could impose any conditions over and above the NCTE Regulations but could not relax or dilute anything. His question was that if the relaxation in Regulations of 2014 keeping in view the Regulations of 2010 was applicable, if so, then in case of those who have their masters degree before the year 1993 with 50% marks instead of 55%, did it stand at 55% as on date. Whether they could keep at 50% now?

It was informed that the candidates with 50% marks in the Bachelor's Degree and/or in the Master's Degree in Science/Social Sciences/Humanities, Bachelor in Engineering/Technology with specialization with 55% marks and any other qualification equivalent thereto shall be eligible. NET is must for higher education institutions. That was what the Committee had recommended.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that most of the Principals are those who have done their postgraduation before the year 1993 and out of them, many including the Lecturers may not be having 55% marks. As per the NCTE Regulations, now it should be 55% marks. As per UGC Regulations-2010, 5% concession could be given to those postgraduates. But as per the NCTE Regulations, it is not so. Therefore, they should be very clear today itself before implementing the NCTE Regulations-2014 so that at a later stage, they may not have to seek clarifications.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the standards laid down by the NCTE Regulations-2014 should not be diluted.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that they should follow the NCTE Regulations-2014.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the UGC Regulations clearly say the NCTE Regulations shall prevail.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Dean College Development Council would focus on the issue whether the marks have to be kept at 55% or not.

It was informed that a letter from the Chairman, UGC dated 2nd January 2014 says that “besides the duration of the integrated programme provided in the NCTE Regulations is also not in line with UGC qualifications and UGC is going to address these issues shortly so as to bring conformity with NCTE Regulations in the overall interest of the teachers training programme. At the end, once again may I request you to take all necessary steps to implement all the provisions of NCTE Regulations-2014 w.e.f. the session 2015-16 in the larger interest of teachers training programmes in the country”.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the letter mentioned about the training programmes and not about the qualifications.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the qualification should be with 55% marks.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would not relax the qualification and keep it at 55%.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that a person was appointed at a particular level. That person had done so much research work. But at the time that person was appointed as a Principal also, the UGC NET was relaxed for the persons before the year 1991. They were not relaxing the basic conditions. A person who is appointed at the age of 50 years, he had done so much work at that time, they could not penalize that person.

It was informed that as per a letter of NCTE, NCTE Regulations-2014 are in supersession of the provisions of the NCTE Regulations-2009. This is to ensure strict compliance of the NCTE regulatory framework prescribed by the NCTE while granting affiliation to the teacher training institutions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that subsequent to the UGC Regulations-2009, new Regulations came in the year 2010 wherein on the first page itself it is written that in the case of Education Colleges, the Regulations of NCTE will prevail. On the third page, it is written that even for Education Colleges, those who have done their postgraduation for the post of Principal before the year 1993, 5% relaxation had been given. Most probably, there would be new regulations in the year 2016 wherein relaxation could also be given. As on today, the present Regulations should prevail. There could be a solution that they should comply with the Regulations-2014. In the meantime, a letter could be written to the UGC that as per UGC Regulations-2010, 5% relaxation was there. Whether they could give the relaxation or not?

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired whether they had any application from any candidates for seeking the relaxation. If they had something in mind, that should be looked into.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they were not diluting the conditions. Let them write a letter to the UGC seeking a clarification in this regard.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) minutes of the Committee dated 25.05.2015 (**Appendix-XXIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to determine the modalities for implementation of N.C.T.E. Regulations-2014 alongwith the minutes dated 05.05.2015 and 07.04.2015, be approved;
- (ii) while issuing recognition letter to the Colleges, it should be mentioned that the number of seats would be as per the revised NCTE Regulations-2014; and
- (iii) write a letter to the UGC seeking a clarification with regard to criteria of 55% marks.

Re-advertisement of the post of Chief Vigilance Officer and Chief of University Security

14. Considered if the post of Chief Vigilance Officer and Chief of University Security, be re-advertised with the earlier qualifications, advertised vide Advt. No. 3/2014 and 4/2014 respectively. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXIV**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The post of Chief Vigilance Officer was advertised vide Advt. No. 3/2014 in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP-8900 plus allowances admissible under University rules with the qualifications, experience, job requirement and other terms & conditions approved by the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations of the Committee dated 07.03.2013.
 2. The post of Chief of University Security was advertised vide Advt. No. 4/2014 in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP-6600 + Conveyance allowance @ 750/- p.m. plus allowances as admissible under University rules with the qualifications approved by the Syndicate meeting dated 26.04.2014 (Para 9).
 3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.04.2015 (Para 2 (i) & 2 (ii)) has approved the appointment of Chief Vigilance Officer and Chief of University Security, accordingly, the appointment letters were issued in anticipation of the approval of the Senate, but the selected/waitlisted candidates for the both posts were failed to join their duties within the stipulated period granted to them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University had advertised the post of Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO) and Chief of University Security (CUS). The persons selected on both these posts could not join. The person selected as CUS could not join as he could not retain

his lien with his previous employer as he had served there for a period of less than five years. Somehow he felt that the post of Chief of University Security would be a difficult job and he would have to retire on probation with his previous employer. The person on the waiting list also did not join because he could not get his service rendered with the previous employer transferred to the University. There were different reasons. They had selected one person as Chief Vigilance Officer. Due to health issues, he did not join and kept on asking for extension and he was given the deadline of 31st August to join the University. The person was asked to reply but he did not reply. So the item before them was re-advertisement of the posts. Now 2-3 days earlier, he again wrote a letter that he would definitely join up to 10th October. It is still not sure whether he would join or not. At the moment, they need the services of a Chief Vigilance Officer and Chief of University Security. That was why the item was before them for consideration – firstly, that the posts be re-advertised with the same qualifications as per the previous advertisement and secondly whether to give extension to the persons selected as CVO till 10th October to join the University.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they understand that the qualifications have been approved by the Syndicate. Secondly, did they specify in the advertisement that the facility of pension was not available in the University. There should be no ambiguity in the advertisements. He suggested that, if possible, they should try to take someone on deputation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be taken care of.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they could not find a person because the service conditions of Panjab University may not be suitable to someone, they should try to take persons on deputation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that earlier they had written to so many organizations to seek persons on deputation. Should they seek deputation from specific organizations like paramilitary forces, police, etc. They could not make it open for all as retired persons would also apply. They could say that these were the qualifications, experience, etc. and on the basis of that candidates could apply on deputation. They could form a Committee which would screen the applications and the candidates could be interviewed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that could they wait for 10 days more to enable the person selected as CVO to join.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that the person could be given the extension.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then it was resolved that they would seek persons on deputation and the Syndicate would form a Committee which would screen the applications and the candidates would be interviewed accordingly.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that as per the note, as far as the qualifications, etc. for the post of Chief Vigilance Officer are concerned, these were approved by the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations of a Committee and not yet passed by the Syndicate. These should be got approved by the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the qualifications, etc. were approved by the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that when this item of appointment came for consideration, Shri Ashok Goyal had also pointed out the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had been shown the file and these were approved. He would get it verified.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that if they see the advertisement given, there were no qualifications prescribed for the post of Chief Vigilance Officer. As such, it was not a matter whether the qualifications were approved or not. If they could consider candidates from civil services that did not mean that the qualifications were framed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could see the things happening in the nearby Universities. He did not know whether this was prevailing in other Universities or not. They were already passing through a financial crunch. Did the neighbouring Universities or the government institutions have a full-time CVO except financial institutions? Probably, it was pointed out there and then in the Syndicate also and a Committee was constituted, the interview for the post of CVO was slated to be held four days after the meeting of the Syndicate and the Syndicate decided that the interview would not be conducted. A Committee was constituted to see whether some senior functionaries of the University could also be appointed as CVO or not. The then DPI, Punjab, when he was a member of the Syndicate, had said that he was the Chief Vigilance Officer of another department where he was holding the post of Director. In Punjab Government, the charge of CVO is given to the senior most or the next senior most person. A Committee was constituted, of which he was also a member. That Committee never met and he was made to understand that Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, who was the Chairman of the Committee, in his own capacity said that they could go ahead with the interview and the interview was conducted. His simple submission under the circumstances was that let them try to find out the feasibility of appointing a CVO from within the University system because the things were not so serious in Panjab University. If the Universities like Guru Nanak Dev University, Punjabi University, Kurukshetra University, Punjab Agriculture University, could have their own CVO drawn from their own cadres, that possibility could be explored. If the Vice-Chancellor wanted that CVO has to be appointed on full time, then he had no objection.

The Vice-Chancellor said that looking at the recent happening, the CVO must be from outside the system. He added that getting a person on deputation is a better option. Since the Government was giving the money, the confidence of the Government needed to be maintained.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to add what Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University is a democratic system. The duties and responsibility of various offices are specified in the Panjab University Calendars. By creating more positions in bureaucracy, were they going to simplify the things or making these more complex? As far as the financial bungling was concerned, they already had a sufficient structure in the University to take care of such things and even then what happens that was the responsibility of the serving persons. Therefore, to have somebody on the CVO post was not going to help much particularly in view of the functions of CVO on page 147. She could not understand what were the objectives of the CVO on page 147 which are reproduced below:

- “1. to get expedited the disposal of cases under investigation with the CBI/courts.
2. to activate the vigilance machinery in the University for investigating complaints.
3. to sensitize the University community against corruption and corrupt practices,
4. to strengthen preventive vigilance by streamlining procedures, and
5. to prevent the possibilities of corruption and encourage a culture of honesty and integrity.”

It is a University where the teachers teach their students to be honest and shun corruption. It was unfortunate that the teachers needed to be sensitized. If thousands of teachers in the University could not do such things, do they expect such things from people from excise, income tax, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in a meeting he had with the Central Vigilance Commissioner (CVC) and three Vigilance Commissioners, the CVC advised that all the central institutions are encouraged to have the Chief Vigilance Officer. It was also recommended that CVOs could be taken on deputation also. It was in that spirit that many central institutions have appointed CVOs.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could explore both the possibilities keeping in view the requirement of the University and the defined objectives. Let them not take the decision in a haste. In spite of the fact what has happened will be taken care of by the CVO. Then definitely they should go ahead. But if there was no mechanism, then if even after the CVO is appointed, he did not know that purpose could be achieved. They might be writing so many things. But practically, the role of CVO is to process the disciplinary procedure in its right form which included investigation, enquiries, processing of the allegations, etc. Then he suggests to that extent that in such and such case what could be the penalty and what are the lacunae. That was why what they preferred that if they had an outside person. If somebody needed a CVO in bank, they would bring banker only so that at least he knows the system. If they wanted to bring some outside person as CVO in the University, then as Professor Rajesh Gill has said, anybody not knowing about the University system would fail to understand the system even in a period of three years. If somebody from some other University is appointed as CVO, at least he knows about the basic academic, financial and administrative matters. That probably might not work. Were they short of such people in the University itself that they could not appoint a CVO? A Committee may be constituted to look into the requirement. If they feel that it is very urgently required, and it was necessary to have a full time CVO, then there was no problem. In the meantime qualifications can also be laid down even for deputation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the CVC had told that they were satisfied even if CVO is appointed on deputation basis.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have mentioned the pay scale. Supposing, if someone from Ministry of Home Affairs wanted to come as CVO, who is drawing lesser scale, he could not come on deputation on the higher scale. So if a suitable man could be found suitable, he could not come because he was getting higher pay scale.

The Vice-Chancellor said that still they could not get a person who is junior in pay scale.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should find out the solution within the system.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could form a Sub Committee of the Syndicate and till then it would be clear whether the person selected as CVO could join up to 10th October.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that in the banks an officer of the rank of Deputy General Manager is appointed as General Manager (CVO) even from other banks also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the banks did not appoint any person as CVO from CBI or any other agencies but only from the banks.

Professor Ronki Ram said that for the last many years, number of complaints from every section of the University, teaching, non-teaching, students were increasing. In such an environment, they needed the office of CVO, the same could be from within or outside. A person from within the system would be more knowledgeable but the kind of investigation, kind of legal speciality which are required, for a person from within it might not be possible because so many committees were there. Even the issues are raised that the Committees are not authorized. Somebody could say that the persons appointed from within the system are not specialist. If they were going to have some adjudication, they should go a step forward. They could get a person from outside. Secondly, they need a person as Chief of University Security in the campus because the campus is growing and spread over two sectors. There are about 17,000 students. The number of teachers is also increasing. They could not run the University on adhoc basis. A person with good qualifications should be there. Then the authority could not say that assign the job to CBI or any other agency. Why could they not have a permanent CVO to take care of all such things? As Chief of University Security, they need a person to provide a safe and secure environment. If a Chief of University Security is properly appointed, he would take care of all these things. Therefore, he suggested that the Chief of University Security may be appointed as early as possible.

The Vice-Chancellor said they would go ahead with the advertisement and form a small Committee of Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) as requested by Mr. Sanjay Sood, who has been selected as Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO), final and last extension in joining time till 10th October 2015, be given to him; and
- (ii) if he did not join by 10th October 2015, the post of CVO be re-advertised after obtaining necessary approval.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the post of Chief of University Security, be re-advertised/person/s be sought on deputation from suitable Government Ministries (Defence, Home, etc.) after obtaining necessary approval.

Standard Operating Procedure for managing funds of Panjab University Hostels

15. Considered if Standard Operating Procedure (**Appendix-XXV**) for Managing Funds of P.U. hostels as proposed by Dean Student Welfare, be approved.

NOTE: The Registrar vide letter No. 2374/R/2S dated 07.09.2015 (**Appendix-XXV**) has informed Ms. Mamta R. Aggarwal, Joint Secretary, UGC, New Delhi, that the Account Manual of Panjab University, Chandigarh, does not include specific delegation of financial powers to the Warden of Hostels. A Proposal to restructure the administrative and financial powers for functioning of the Hostel Wardens is being put up for consideration in the forthcoming Syndicate meeting scheduled on 20.09.2015.

Professor Karamjit Singh stated that there should be two separate Committees, i.e., (i) Purchase Committee; and (ii) Technical Committee, with nominees from outside the hostels. He also suggested certain minor changes in the drafting of the proposal.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the proposed procedure would help in streamlining the functioning of the hostels.

After some discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the following financial and administrative restructuring of Hostels, be approved:

1. Budget of Hostels:

No expenditure shall be made by any Warden unless the budget for the same has been sanctioned by the competent authority, i.e., Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate. All the Wardens shall submit the budget of Hostels through DSW, and Vice-Chancellor for onward submission to the statutory bodies i.e. Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate for final approval

2. Financial Powers

Within the sanctioned budget of each hostel as approved by the Senate, the financial power to approve expenditure will be as given below:

Sr. No.	Subject Matter	Authority	Limit of amount	Remarks
1.	Procurement of Goods and Services	Warden	Rs.15000/-	After following due procedure as per P.U. Accounts Manual
		DSW	Up to Rs.1.00 lac	
		VC	Above Rs.1.00 lac	
2.	Payment of Electricity	Warden	Actuals	As per approved tariff
3.	Payment of mess/ Canteen bills to contractor	Warden	Actuals	As per approved rates
4.	Payment of consumables for mess/canteen contractors e.g. gas payment etc.	Warden	Actuals	-do-
5.	Repair and Maintenance	Warden	Rs.15000/-	After following due procedure as per P.U. Accounts Manual
		DSW	Up to Rs.1.00 lac	
		VC	Above Rs.1.00 lac	
6.	Payment of salary	Warden	Actuals	As per the entitlement approved by the appointing authority

3. Committee:

All the cases of procurement of goods & services, repair & maintenance involving expenditure of more than Rs.15,000/- shall be processed through Committees, i.e., Purchase and Technical Committees, which shall ensure the compliance of all codial formalities, i.e., invitation of tender, comparative analysis, etc., before the case is submitted to the competent authority for financial approval. The composition of the Committees shall be as given below:-

Sr. No.	Purchase Committee	Technical Committee
1.	Dean Student Welfare	Dean Student Welfare
2.	Dean Student Welfare (Women)	Dean Student Welfare (Women)
3.	2 Wardens nominated by the Vice-Chancellor (other than the members of Technical Committee)	Nominee of the Registrar
4.	Nominee of Accounts and Finance Department	2 Wardens nominated by Vice-Chancellor
5.	One member of the Syndicate Nominated by the Vice-Chancellor	Executive Engineer or his nominee

4. Administrative Powers for Appointment of Casual Labour in the Hostels:

The appointment of casual labour in hostels will be routed through Establishment Branch of Panjab University. All the advertisements will be processed through the Establishment branch only. The committee will be appointed for selection consisting of DSW, two Wardens, Registrar/Nominee of the Registrar, Asstt. Registrar (Establishment) and one member each of Syndicate and Senate by the Registrar. The Warden shall be Controlling Officer for all the staff working under him/her.

Request of Directorate, Administrative Reforms (Punjab) RTI Nodal Cell to audit Panjab University

16. Considered if –

(i) the Directorate, Administrative Reforms (Punjab) RTI Nodal Cell, Punjab Civil Secretariat-II be informed that their office is allowed to audit the Panjab University.

Or

(ii) the permission be denied, for auditing the Panjab University website on the sole ground that Panjab University is the Inter State Body Corporate and its appropriate authority is the Central Govt. as interpreted under Section 2 (b) of the Panjab University Act, 1947.

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

NOTE: 1. Deputy Secretary, Directorate Administrative Reforms Punjab (RTI Nodal Cell, Punjab Civil Secretariat-2) vide his

office Memo No.1/7/2015/1RTINC dated 06.07.2015 (**Appendix-XXVI**) for Physical Visit of Departments/ Authorities regarding awareness on *Suo-Motu* Disclosures of RTI Act, 2005 and informed that the Panjab University was listed to visit for audit from 20.07.2015 to 24.07.2015.

2. The Reply of Deputy Registrar (RTI) vide letter No.808-09/RTI dated 21.07.2015 in pursuance of Memo No.1/7/2015/1RTINC of Deputy Secretary, Directorate Administrative Reforms Punjab (RTI Nodel Cell, Punjab Civil Secretariat-2) enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).
3. Deputy Secretary, Directorate Administrative Reforms Punjab (RTI Nodel Cell, Punjab Civil Secretariat-2) vide Memo No.1 / 7 / 2015 / 1RTINC /208 (**Appendix-XXVI**) has informed that their Nodel cell has audited the information uploaded by the Panjab University under section 4(1) (b) of the RTI act is insufficient as per the norms prescribed by the Government.
4. Mr. Vivek, Sr. Assistant, (RTI Nodel Cell, Punjab Civil Secretariat-2) personally visited RTI Cell, Panjab University, Chandigarh and observed that the Punjab Government is financing the Panjab University, therefore the Punjab Government has every right to audit the RTI information uploaded under section 4(b) of the RTI Act by the Panjab University, Chandigarh. But he was informed that the Panjab University is a Inter State Body Corporate and Chancellor of the University is the Vice-President of India. Further, the RTI appeals against the Panjab University are also heard by the Hon'ble Central Information Commission, New Delhi. In such a situation the permission of the Panjab University authority is necessary before auditing the Panjab University website.
5. A division bench of the Hon'ble State Information Commission Punjab, Sector-17, Chandigarh in AC-361 to 367/2010 titled as Dr. Bhupinder Singh Vs. Public Information Officer, O/o the Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh has passed orders dated 10.06.2010 that the Panjab University is an Inter State Body Corporate subjected to the directions to be issued by the Central Government. The State of Punjab and UT, Chandigarh does not have any control over the Panjab

University and cannot be construed to be “appropriate Govt.” within the meaning of section of 2 (a) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 because the State of Punjab and UT, Chandigarh does not exercise any control over the Panjab University. Hence, the Panjab University would be under the control of the Central Govt. and therefore the Central Information Commission, New Delhi as envisaged under section 12 of the RTI Act, 2005 would be competent to deal with the issues raised by the appellant.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that what was the harm if the audit of Panjab University website was allowed.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it was purely an administrative matter. Did they want the Syndicate to take a policy decision? What was their purpose and the administrative possibilities?

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they could negotiate with the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor hoped that it was not impinging upon the autonomy of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first they should sort out and address the issue involved but the auditing should not be allowed.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the issue was what was the appropriate government? Their second appeals are heard by the Central Information Commission. Therefore, they should not allow the auditing by the Punjab Government. It is they who have to introspect and see the complete information under the RTI Act was made available on the website.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that a circular was issued from the Dean of University Instruction and the Vice-Chancellor that each and every information must be on the website. Most of the departments were working on it. Even some of the departments have constituted departmental committees and keep the profile updating.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired about the Chief Information Commissioner in the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the Registrar was the first appellate authority, who was the second appellate authority? In the case of State Government, the State Information Commissioner is the second appellate authority.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that Central Information Commissioner is the second appellate authority.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that on page 156 note 4, it was written that the RTI appeals against the Panjab University are also heard by the Hon’ble Central Information Commission, New Delhi. In

such a situation the permission of the Panjab University authority is necessary before auditing of the Panjab University website.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the note it was written that Punjab Government is financing the Panjab University, therefore, the Punjab Government has every right to audit the RTI information uploaded under section 4(b) of the RTI Act. It was informed that Panjab University is an Inter State Body Corporate created under Panjab University Act. The State Information Commission, Punjab has already decided not to entertain the second appeal against the Panjab University. It was further informed that the second appeal against the Panjab University is heard by the Central Information Commission. On this, Mr. Vivek asked the office to get a decision in this regard solicited from the authority and convey the same to the Directorate Administrative Reforms, Punjab, Chandigarh. In view of the above, Syndicate had to take the decision. This could have been made to understand that the University had no objection but does the Punjab Government have any authority in this regard. Since the Panjab University was an Inter State Body Corporate, the Punjab Government had no authority. If the State Information Commissioner could not hear appeal against the Panjab University, that meant that the Punjab Government had no authority. The Punjab Government had wrongly included the Panjab University in the list. It should be conveyed that the name of the University be deleted from the list as the second appeals are heard by the Central Information Commission.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that on page 158, a letter was received from the Punjab Government. In response to that letter, the DR (RTI), Panjab University wrote a letter that the name of the University be corrected. The Punjab Government replied that the name of Panjab University had been mentioned on the website of Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that so long as the University is named as Panjab University, located in the capital of Punjab, there were about 170 colleges affiliated to the Panjab University and situated in Punjab, the Punjab Government would treat the Panjab University as one of the Universities of Punjab. The Punjab Government wanted to have access to us which the University could say yes or feel as if the Punjab Government is encroaching upon the autonomy of Panjab University. If there is a call from the Central Government also because they were largely funding, there could be a conflict of interests. The Central Government could also say that since funds to a large extent are given, the Central Government should have access for auditing of the website of Panjab University. Who would take the call? This call has to be taken by the Syndicate. What the Registrar should do in this matter. The factual position was before them. Whatever the Syndicate would guide and advise, the office would comply with the same.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that from the letter, they could not understand the intention. The Punjab Government just wanted to see the shortcomings of the website.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since the RTI Nodal Cell had found that the Panjab University had not updated protective disclosures under the jurisdiction of Higher Education and Languages, therefore, the Punjab Government wanted to have physical verification.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could comply with that shortcoming.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that in future the Central Government would also want to do the same thing. They should take a decision in this regard. Since the second appeals of Panjab University are heard by the Central Information Commission, therefore, the Central Government should have the authority for auditing.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that then the Punjab Government should be conveyed about this.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that as per the orders of the State Information Commission, Punjab, the second appeals of Panjab University are heard by the Central Information Commission and the Government for the University meant the Central Government. Therefore, they should allow only the Central Government.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that his reservation was that the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University have a link through the website of Dean College Development Council (DCDC). The Colleges are governed by Punjab Government service rules. According to him, the Punjab Government has the right to audit the information on the link of DCDC related with the colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they need to go through the section 4 (1) B of RTI Act. They should have satisfied themselves that which are the authorities who could audit the website. If it was specifically mentioned, then they could say about it. If they felt that Punjab Government has no right, they could write a letter that for Panjab University, the government is Government of India as specified under section 72 of Punjab Reorganization Act. However, the deficiencies as pointed out, they could take care of removing those deficiencies so that it might not seem that the Panjab University was not doing anything in this regard.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that deficiencies could only be known once the auditing of the website was done. Sometimes, the Panjab University website is not updated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as per the concurrence of the members, they could comply with the deficiencies, if any, pointed out by the Punjab Government as far as the Act is concerned.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that if today Punjab Government has pointed out the deficiencies, tomorrow the Central Government could also point out the same thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per his knowledge, the power of auditing was not there in the RTI Act. If that would have been so, the Central Government would have done the auditing earlier. The University also conducted periodical inspections of the Colleges in the same manner. It was the duty of the Government to ensure that the information under section 4(1)(b) is updated regularly. The Punjab Government must have received complaints. That was why the Punjab Government wanted to have physical verification. The Punjab Government says that the funding and other so many things of the University are done by them. Similarly, the Central Government could also say that funding is done by them and is the Government as specified in section 72 of the Punjab Reorganization Act. In this situation, both the Punjab Government and Central Government could do the auditing. Unless and until it was specifically provided for

in the Act which Government would do the auditing, they could comply with it.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Acts come into existence. One such Act, Legal Services Authority Act came in to existence in the year 1987. For the last 20 years, nothing was done. Now, suddenly when the High Court and the Supreme Court took interest, the Governments started giving money. In the University also, there were three departments which were having Free Legal Aid Cells. It is a part of good governance since the Government says that maximum information which could be obtained under the RTI Act should be disclosed on the website so that the public did not have to seek the information under the RTI Act. Keeping all these things in view, an officer was appointed to cross check the website.

Some of the members pointed out that this all was being done on the basis of complaint only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would check the RTI Act and see whether the auditing authority was defined or not and if defined, which was the authority and then resolve whether they have to give this authority to the Punjab Government or the Central Government or to both. After examining the Act, they could contact the Nodal Cell and talk to them. They would comply with whatever deficiencies were pointed out.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the Colleges were located in the State of Punjab, the deficiencies, if any, related with the Colleges needed to be updated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the first appellate authority is the Registrar against information supplied by the Panjab University. In the case of second appeal, the applicant would have to go to the Central Information Commission even if the information provided by the University was related with Colleges situated in Punjab. Such an applicant could not say that since the information was related with the Colleges situated in Punjab, the second appeal has to be heard by the Punjab State Information Commission.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the Colleges were responsible for the information to be provided to the applicants under RTI. The University could only direct to provide the information. The Public Information Officer in the case of Colleges was the Principal of the concerned college.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the communications in this regard were being made very quickly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could not find anywhere that the Punjab Government had asked for reply. Perhaps Mr. Vivek, Sr. Assistant, RTI Nodal Cell, Punjab has made it an issue. There were two ways to resolve the issue. One was that the RTI Cell may be directed to inform the Punjab Government that the Panjab University does not come under their purview. Secondly, however, if they desired to inspect the University, they could do so.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the State Information Commission, Punjab had already said that they do not entertain the appeal against the Panjab University.

RESOLVED: That the RTI Act be checked and seen whether the auditing authority has been defined or not and if defined, which is the auditing authority. Thereafter it should be legally examined to

whom the auditing authority be given, i.e., whether to the Punjab Government or the Central Government or both. Only thereafter, necessary action be taken.

Item 17 on the agenda was taken to ratification items R-(xv).

Issues arising out of Professor Rajesh Gill's letter dated 24.08.2015

18. Considered the issues arising out of Professor Rajesh Gill's letter dated August 24, 2015 addressed to and forwarded to the Hon'ble Vice President of India and Chancellor, P.U.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the papers concerning this item are in closed covers. He said that leaving aside the individuals involved, the issue was how to handle such situations. There were matters which needed the attention of the members. His suggestion was that they could opine and if deem it proper to appoint a Sub-Committee which could come out with some algorithm on how to handle such situations. Finally, the government of the University has to handle such situations and they could not have external bodies attending to University issues. After placing these things, there were further communications from the Chancellor's office as well as Ministry of Human Resource Development that the University needs to acquire the ability as to how to handle difficult situations?

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a few persons who had some legal background and were familiar with the Sexual Harassment Act should also be included in that Committee. They should reframe their policy and include all those things such as what was situation and what action was needed to be taken. They could include 1-2 persons who were not members of the Syndicate but were experts in the field.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now it might not be the things related to the Sexual Harassment Act. There could be a situation in which some members of the governing body are involved or the Chief Executive Officer was involved or where the administration was involved. How could the system handle that? In a dispassionate impersonal way, all of them as individuals have to think as to how to handle such situations. They could do something and say something else. Finally, nobody has time to help them in handling such situations. They would say that the University is an autonomous body. They were one of the oldest universities and had oldest governing system. The other universities look up to them to set an example on how to handle such situations. It was in that context that the matter with all the facts had been placed before them for consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was obvious that when a situation arises only then one has to think on how to handle that situation. Now they could think about different situation for which no policy had been framed. Since the policy needed to be framed in compliance of the Act, in addition to Syndicate members, they should add 1 -2 members who are expert in that field.

The Vice-Chancellor requested other members to express their views. Then he asked Professor A.K. Bhandari to express his views since he had a long experience.

Professor A.K. Bhandari agreed with what Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor A.K. Bhandari to chair the proposed Committee in which he could associate Syndicate and Senate members and he left it to Professor Bhandari.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested the names of Shri V.K. Sibal and Shri Satya Pal Jain who were senior members and having knowledge of legal matters.

Professor Ronki Ram said that one of the applicants said that the confidentiality of the letter submitted by Professor Rajesh Gill to the UGC had been disclosed. Whether the Committee to be constituted has to look into the same or something else?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that from the item, it was not clear what was the issue that needed to be considered as the item was to consider issue arising of Professor Rajesh Gill's letter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was asked to forward a letter and he had forwarded the same with his comments. The letter went to the Chancellor. A letter from the Chancellor's office also came to take appropriate action. The issue now is that if there was a complaint by a Syndicate or Senate member against the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar or tomorrow it could be against the Dean of University Instruction, how to handle such things. If the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar or the Dean of University Instruction take action on any issue then, who would handle all these things. The Syndicate is the governing body of the University of which he was the Chairman. Therefore, they collectively have to see how to put a mechanism in place that when dispute arises, who would handle that situation and who should be assigned the responsibility. Somebody will look into that, somebody will do fact finding and somebody will write the report. Whether the report has to be put before the Syndicate or go to the Chancellor and the Chancellor gives a direction that this should be handled by the Syndicate. There were many things which were not clearly mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar to handle such type of situations. He was not that much experienced with the Calendar and nobody is able to clearly tell these things on the basis of the descriptions in the Calendar. The Syndicate is a body having people from different walks of life. He has brought the matter to notice of the members. There were issues in which members of the government of the University and the executive could be involved. At the moment, it is the involvement of the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar. Tomorrow there may be involvement of Dean of University Instruction or Dean College Development Council or any other authority. To him, the Dean College Development Council is the extended half of the Vice-Chancellor to handle the issues related with the Colleges. There could be issues between the members of the Syndicate or Senate and the officers of the University. They request the Dean College Development Council and the Controller of Examinations to attend the meetings though they could not take part in the deliberations but sit there and see whatever decisions they could take on the issues arising during the discussions. They have to go through this ordeal so as to provide efficient answers on behalf of the University. No other university in the country, perhaps has a system of governance like ours. There were certain advantages of this system. Let the system be strengthened and suggestions be offered such that the system should have ability to attend to the difficulties. They could continuously think and if there is no such system they could evolve such a system. The purpose of bringing this thing for the consideration was that it is nothing personal between him and any

other person. Leave aside the personal matters for a moment. The purpose is that as Syndicate, this is a right forum, Syndicate members could go back for more homework, discuss and come up with suggestions so that they have a mechanism in place. The society's confidence in this body to handle problems would further enhance if a mechanism is put in place. It was in that spirit that they have to discuss the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first of all he was happy that the Vice-Chancellor said that he does not take it as personal between him and any individual. In fact, that should have been the spirit from the day one when they discussed the issue. He had spoken on this issue in detail when the issue had come up and at that time also he had said that this issue should not have been brought to the Syndicate. Again this issue has been brought by saying to consider the issue arising out of that letter. He could not see what was the issue as the same was not mentioned in the item. That was why Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the issue was related to the formation of a Committee in accordance with the Sexual Harassment Act of Government of India and Professor Ronki Ram said about the confidentiality of the letter. But what the Vice-Chancellor was saying was altogether different. Let them forget about the case and details as per the Act. They have to think how to handle a situation that has happened so that such a situation may not arise in future. His personal opinion was that as he had said in the last meeting also that probably there has been no collective effort to firstly address the problem. This is also the duty of the government of the University as also the stakeholders that sincere efforts have to be put into. He had admitted in the last meeting also and now also that no one has put in sincere efforts to sort out the issue. Once a problem had not been solved, they needed introspection as to why the things have reached such a stage. Time and again, he had been saying that there was no need to bring such an item for discussion which ultimately becomes an issue in the media also. Everyone is a human being and feels pinched. In spite of all that, they had not been able to find out what were the basic causes of the situation having reached at such a stage. Secondly, if they had tried to find out the basic cause and done the homework, what they should have done. In spite of that the things being done, if the matter had gone out of control and they would have been helpless. Then it could have gone to the Chancellor and the Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Syndicate and Senate, etc. In his personal opinion, again as suggested in the last meeting, the item should not have been brought to the Syndicate in the present form. The intention of the Vice-Chancellor may be clear, but that is not important. Important is a public perception. How do they exploit, how do those people exploit to whom the things reach, that what could be the strategy, what could be the intention, what is the mischief. Whether it is really a violation of the Act, as has been complained, or not, as had been justified by the Vice-Chancellor in the letter written; that no, it was imperative on the part of the Registrar to send it, there is no violation of any kind. For that, he thought that instead of bringing this item here, things should have been sorted out by talking unofficially. Despite his suggestion there and then, no effort has been made. He was not blaming anybody. He should have taken the responsibility which he did not take. But this is not only the Vice-Chancellor, they sometimes concentrate on the Vice-Chancellor that at the same time, let them not forget the situation of the complainant also. Nobody would believe that she is happy. She must also be pained while dealing with all these situations coming across the media. Unless and until they have a mechanism, they cannot say who is wrong or who is right. But if

they feel that if it is an ego problem, things can be sorted out, and then they can make a mechanism to deal with the problems arising in future; that could be the best solution. If they feel, and keep on justifying what the Registrar has done is right, if the complainant insists on saying what the Registrar and Vice-Chancellor have done is not right, and then the ball is thrown in the courts of law or MHRD or Vice-Chancellor's office, then also it does not matter, the things will go on. Then probably, we would have to chalk out the issues that have arisen out of this letter or this case. The Vice-Chancellor has rightly posed as to how to address such problems. Syndicate has to discuss and list out those issues which can be placed before the Committee. As suggested by Professor Navdeep Goyal, we have to keep in view the provisions of the Act also. They have some people who have the knowledge of law and who can take care of all such things. Before that an exercise should be done to see that the things are dealt with in a desired and right perspective. That was what he wanted to say and all these things.

He added that he did not think all these things should be recorded. Not that he was saying that it was off the record but he did not think it needed to be recorded because he did not get an opportunity to talk about this issue anywhere else. Syndicate is the only platform where he could discuss the issues officially or unofficially. They need to do introspection at both the ends, and see definitely the things have gone wrong somewhere. It could be on his part or on the part of any other member. The things have gone wrong and that was why this was the situation. If they were able to take care of any wrong thing done, then probably there would be no problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the strength of the body is to recognize the weaknesses and do self introspection and correction. If they could do it, that is what any immune system is. Immune system adjusts itself, whatever is the virus.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that as said by Shri Ashok Goyal, they, as faculty members, governing body, have to see where and how the things had gone wrong. Whether some initiative, some efforts were really made to first exhaust internal, whatever conflict resolution facilities, they have in the campus. Whether the issue was really brought there, and had it been discussed threadbare? Only then they could say that the issue was not discussed. If a situation emerges like that, immediately the issue goes beyond the given mechanism for the conflict resolution. Beyond that, it goes to a higher level, where it did not get resolved. Now, they want to resolve and give answer to the higher level also. The issue is there, as to how to resolve it internally. In future also, they have to see whether they have faith in the system or not. When the issue is involved within the governing body itself, then the University has to discuss it as to how this body would function. In this case, some of them should see how this is still not resolved. The issues have also been confronted earlier. As the Vice-Chancellor said, so also Shri Ashok Goyal, they have to re-introspect as to how the University would be able to make some mechanism which can handle the issues.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he was not going into the merits and demerits of the item under consideration. Why and how the dispute went into the media. Once any item is made a part of the agenda, the media had access to that. His submission was that in future also if there was some difference of opinion on the part of the governing bodies, i.e., Syndicate or Senate, that should not be a part

of the agenda. Secondly, what S.S. Johl Committee had recommended, the governing body members are not covered under those recommendations. As suggested, the Vice-Chancellor could constitute a Committee, and in the very first meeting of the Syndicate, Professor Yog Raj Angrish and he himself had suggested that a committee of the members of the Syndicate could resolve the issue. It was not a good thing that they were discussing the same item again and again.

The Vice-Chancellor responded by recalling that Syndicate is a body elected twelve months at a time. He added he had constituted the Committee comprising very senior members. The Committee was headed by a person who had been the Vice-Chancellor, Chancellor and a Padma Bhushan awardee and who has an aura of his own and is a knowledgeable person.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the Committee simply recommended just to follow some guidelines.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Johl Committee was constituted and the issues had certain evolution up to that time. Since then so many more things have cropped up. The Committee did not anticipate that the things would further have this kind of evolution. The Committee was constituted in the month of May and now it is month of September. Lot more introspection is needed to be done now. There have been system failures. They had no experience of handling such things. They put it as though things will happen in a certain manner, but the matter had gone to the UGC and it was hoped that the UGC would do something. The last time they discussed they left it to see what the UGC would say, and that it has been an evolving thing. Now they were in a situation that everybody says that as an institution, Panjab University is strong enough and mature enough to decide the issues on its own. Panjab University is having 1000 teachers and two Law Schools. Ours is a University which has that this kind of intellectual resource within a small area, whereas in other universities, it is not the same case. At Panjab University, they have about 1000 Professors in a small space of 550 acres. There is no other university in the country which has such a high density of Professors. There was only one more such University, Banaras Hindu University, however, BHU is much bigger in physical size than the Panjab University. Aligarh Muslim University is spread over half of the area of the city. At Panjab University, they are a large community in a closer space, for one to one interaction, the mean free path is small and the time interval between any two interactions is also small. They should be able to handle and evolve a system. They should forget the particular case and go beyond this and think of similar situations. That somebody is aggrieved and the person against whom the complaint has been made, remains unjustified. A situation could arise when the so-called senior functionaries of the University are involved, and the matters have to be resolved by their own colleagues, of course, by chosen colleagues. The Vice-Chancellor added that he wants to contribute to resolve the issue. He desires to contribute to the governance of the University in a manner that he was confronted with the challenge, then he did try to address this challenge. That is the reason why he wanted to get out of this situation, and imagine a situation and that it is not him, it is DUI tomorrow or CoE or DCDC. He was looking it at that way because a conflict could arise anywhere. They sit all in the Syndicate and discuss the issues, some as members and others as ex-officio members. It was in that context that they have to think over it and have an informal meeting, with the Dean of University Instruction

presiding over and attempt to evolve a framework so that a mechanism could be put in place.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he agreed with the Vice-Chancellor's intention that they should evolve some system in times to come and go by Professor Navdeep Goyal's suggestion and let them constitute a Committee to look at the problems which may arise in future also. This is also what Shri Ashok Goyal had said. Second issue was also there regarding this position has arisen that one CEO of an institution has been involved. The Vice-Chancellor was right that tomorrow, there could be any issue between any other authority also. He believed that the Dean of University Instruction would take a lead as Professor Yog Raj Angrish and Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla also suggested earlier that they should work together and efforts could be made by the existing Syndicate members under the chairmanship of DUI, a Committee may be constituted which could deliberate. After all, there are so many disputes in the families also. They should find out some mechanism in an informal way.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he leaves it to the members.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated he felt good with the discussion held today as compared to the earlier occasions. Till now, as said by Shri Ashok Goyal that it is their collective responsibility and not of a particular person. He added that so far they had been escapists. He also felt that such items ought not reach the Syndicate. Ultimately, these things have to be sorted out. As suggested by Professor Navdeep Goyal, a member of Sexual Harassment Committee, he also had been a member of that Committee, that legal experts could be involved in the Sexual Harassment Committee. It also came in their mind when Professor Rajesh Gill had questioned with them about the competency of the PUCASH body. If at some times, the issues could not reach towards a solution, one should not go into technicalities. As discussions held today and earlier also, he had requested that they need to be objective and not get into the technicalities, and they could take the help of some legal experts from outside or senior members who could suggest a solution to the issues under the chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction. He did not know the latest position on the issue. What reply had been given in the UGC and what was the status? Earlier, Sexual Harassment Committee was there. Now, PUCASH has been formed afresh. Leaving aside all these things, he appealed to the House that in general a mechanism should be evolved so that if any of the highest officers or authorities were involved, this situation could also arise in future, the issues could be sorted out in an amicable way. The present issue of Professor Rajesh Gill should also be sorted out. As Professor Karamjeet Singh rightly said that there are disputes in the families also. He would not be able to comment on merits and demerits. He thought the matter should come to the Syndicate in a shape when it looked that all things would be clinched. Again and again, whether the matter should go to the media or not, one letter had been sent and the other had not come, whether the Registrar had the authority or not, all such technicalities would continue to come up. Earlier also when the issue came 3-4 times, it did not come in the form to be clinched. As an individual, he had faith in this august House and the internal mechanism, and it is proved today that they were also expressing faith in this house on the premise that they would be able to sort out the issue. It was not clear whether there was any ego problem or not, he could not comment at this stage. As a man of literature, he could say that there could be some reasons which are aggravated by some technicalities. His suggestion was that

to handle such kind of situations, under the experienced guidance and chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction, experts from social, political, legal and academic field may be involved to suggest some mechanism. He knows that Professor Bhandari is a very experienced person. 5-7 more members could also be associated with this Committee. They should move towards solving the issue. The issues could be sorted out through a dialogue. The letter had come from there and the reply had come or not, these are all technicalities. The purpose of sorting out the issues could not be served by following these technicalities. All of them are aware of the nature of media in exaggerating the things beyond reality.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that Professor Yog Raj had talked much, but he would like to talk in short. He said that as suggested, the Committee could look into the future issues which could be between the authorities and members of the governing bodies, like between him and Dean College Development Council or Controller of Examinations. To handle the situations which might arise in future, a Committee could be formed to look into those issues. But first of all it is necessary that this matter should be solved, as he had been suggesting in the earlier meetings also, he was ready to provide his services. He would also request Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Navdeep Goyal and other members to get involved and try to find a solution to the issue under consideration. This matter should not be stretched too much. It is the responsibility of this House to clinch the issue so that it does not go further. They would take it as their collective responsibility and try to sort out the issue within a week or 10 days. There could be some issues in future also for which a Committee should be constituted. But the present issue could be solved with the cooperation of the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that probably it was not taken in the right spirit, when the Committee was constituted. The context in which the Committee headed by Professor S.S. Johl was constituted, he remembered that he had suggested and also every member of the Syndicate had suggested that a Committee consisting of the Syndicate members be constituted to lay down the guidelines. At that time the situation was different. There were 4-5 teachers who had written letters directly to the Chancellor. But he was not disputing the stature of the members of that Committee that they were Padam Bhushan or Padma Vibhushan, etc. They were eminent persons. But sometimes, there are such high officers that they could not think at such a low level where the day-to-day problems are being faced in day-to-day administration. Anyway that did not find favour with the Vice-Chancellor, the unanimous opinion of the Syndicate that the Committee be constituted of the Syndicate and the Vice-Chancellor took a stand that he would not keep any member of the Syndicate on the Committee and would put eminent members of the Senate in that Committee. The Committee submitted its recommendations. Now today they were feeling that the Committee only gave the recommendations, they were realizing as the internal mechanism that has been explained in the statutes of the University in the Calendar is probably not enough to take care of such situations which are peculiar situations for which they were trying to find out the ways. At that time also, he said that, but somehow rightly or wrongly, almost all believed that they were processing the things rightly as per the mechanism of the University. While the fact is that today they had realized that to deal with such situations, they did not have any mechanism and it is good that this realization has come. Had that realization come on the first day itself, then probably it would not have been possible to submit the report by the Committee within a

day. Then there could have been efforts to see this peculiar problem and in this they had to use some extra efforts to read something out of the Calendar which is not written there, to see that it was the Vice-Chancellor, who was involved, and it is not the Vice-Chancellor who only had got the respect and dignity, and even a Sweeper has so. Whereas at this stage, even a senior Professor and member of the Syndicate and Senate is involved, she is also entitled to the same dignity as the Vice-Chancellor. Probably, at that time they did not realize that, but anyhow sooner or later, they have reached a stage, not that ultimately they had started believing in the internal mechanism. Unfortunately, the internal mechanism to deal with such situations was not there. That was why they had reached such a stage. So besides sorting out the issue under question, they could go in for making a mechanism to take care of such things in future also, hope that such situations might not come.

Shri Ashok Goyal wants to add that why he was saying that Vice-Chancellor was still saying that the Syndicate is (elected) only for one year. The members of the Syndicate, if they had remained for one year, even if they took a decision in 2016, that decision would not be invalidated just because they ceased to be the members of the Syndicate, after all they remained members of the Senate. Even if a member ceases to be the member of the Senate, he at least remains part of the society to give some recommendations. They had been taking help from others also who, at present, were not members of the Senate and appoint the former members of the Senate as members on the Committees. So let them not try to misjudge or undermine the capacity and capability of the Syndicate members as compared to those eminent persons. He thought that all of them are capable but at the same time it must be kept in mind that the dignity of everybody is important and it is equally important. In the last meeting, he was sorry, the atmosphere was not the same as it is today. In the last meeting, it looked as if they had come here to score over each other. The things could have been sorted out earlier also. His stand remained the same as it was in the earlier meetings. But there were some friends who had different opinion on that day, and the Vice-Chancellor was also requested to give the Syndicate a chance to sort out the issue, and the Vice-Chancellor said that he had no comments. He thought that they are as a body here, Syndicate (members) they are afterwards. But, they must think they are a family first, and as a family, it is a bigger responsibility of the head of the family, and if the head of the family says "no, no, no, I will not".

The Vice-Chancellor responded by stating he should not be criticized unnecessarily.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was not criticizing. He was sorry if he (Vice-Chancellor) was taking it like that. First of all, he regretted if he (Vice-Chancellor) had taken it that way.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything is on record.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how could they talk, the camera is on, the proceedings may not be recorded.

At this moment, a din prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything would remain on record, with the cameras on. This is their strength, they should not be afraid of. They were trying to resolve. They are admitting their disease. They were admitting their weaknesses, and how they were

collectively trying to resolve, this is their strength. So that is why, no one can say later on that the cameras were put off at that time. Let the society know what they were doing. There was no another body in the country that can do it the way they were doing and trying to resolve. He thought this was their strength.

Professor Ronki Ram said that even in the last meeting, even before that, what he was trying to say that the internal mechanism was very much there. If they were so much adamant to say that the internal mechanism was not there or inadequate that was the reason why the Committee was constituted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that do not do postmortem of all the past. He told Professor Bhandari that the postmortem would not help in resolving the issue, to which Professor Bhandari agreed. The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Bhandari has been involved in several things, and in this University if Vice-Chancellor goes on leave, then DUI is the one who will preside over.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he appreciated the concern shown by the Vice-Chancellor. Secondly, as the Vice-Chancellor talked about not doing the postmortem, it is right that when postmortem of something is done, it would not end. In the first meeting of this body, as said by Shri Ashok Goyal, every member present here was an expert in his own field. He was also associated with the union, and dealing with his management for the last about 30 years. It would have been better if at that time, a Committee of the Syndicate members had been formed on the issue, and the same could have been solved. The issue is just like a family matter. The University is also like a big family. They work for the University and are attached with it. His request and appeal to all the members is that the issues should not be brought up like this time and again. The issue should be discussed and resolved. The issues should not be brought to the Syndicate. If such issues are brought in the agenda of the Syndicate, it would naturally go the press and everyone would try to shield himself/herself and one would give his/her opinion and the opinion of one member would pinch the other person. The problem is arising only due to the pinching. Therefore, his proposal is that some members of the Syndicate may sit together as a family and resolve the issue.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that his proposal is that he along with Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Navdeep Goyal under the chairmanship of Professor A.K. Bhandari would try to resolve the issue involving individuals informally within a week or so. As for the other generic matter, a Committee could be constituted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are two separate things. He asked Professor A.K. Bhandari to take the videography of the discussions held tomorrow itself so as to see what has to be done and he has to attend to both the matters, i.e., generic matter and a particular matter with full freedom to come out with solution(s).

RESOLVED: That let Committee(s) chaired by Prof. A.K. Bhandari and including other members of the Syndicate be constituted to resolve issues relating to the particular case as well as generic issues pertaining to framing of guidelines for dealing with such matter(s) in future.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 10.1 at page 64 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

10.1 “For elections other than those by the Faculties, the Registrar or the Deputy Registrar, as the Syndicate may decide shall be the Returning Officer.”

2. The Syndicate has to decide the appointment of the Registrar or the Deputy Registrar as “Returning Officer” for the Election of Ordinary Fellows from the following constituencies:

- (i) Registered Graduates.
- (ii) Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University.
- (iii) Readers and Lecturers on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University.
- (iv) Principals of the Technical and Professional Colleges.
- (v) Staff of members of the Technical and Professional Colleges.
- (vi) Heads of the Affiliated Arts Colleges.
- (vii) Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers of the Affiliated Arts Colleges.

In the previous election of 2012 the syndicate appointed the Registrar as Returning Officer for the Election of Ordinary Fellows for the above constituencies.

The members suggested that the Registrar, by name, be appointed as Returning Officer for the election of Ordinary Fellows, 2016.

RESOLVED: That Guljit Singh Chadha (Col. Retd.) Registrar, Panjab University, be appointed as Returning Officer for the election of Ordinary Fellows - 2016.

Budget Provisions for Election of Ordinary Fellows

20. Considered the following special budget provision under the Budget Head “Election of Ordinary Fellows” in order to meet the financial need for conduct of Senate Election in September, 2016 for the financial year 2015-2016 and 2016-2017:

2015-2016	-	Rs.15,00,000/-
2016-2017	-	Rs.1,20,00,000/-.

NOTE: 1. The election of Senate is held every four years under Section 13 (1) of the Panjab University Act read with Regulation-I, given at page-61, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, which reads as under:-

“Election of Ordinary Fellow under Section 13 of the Panjab University Act shall be held every four years. Once in year on such dates as the Chancellor may appoint on this behalf, there shall, if necessary, be an election to fill any vacancy amongst the Ordinary Fellows elected under Section 13 (2) of the Act.”

2. The term of present Senate will expire on 31.10.2016. Thus the election of the next Senate of various constituencies is due.
3. A detailed office note containing the budget provision for the Senate Election 2012 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).
4. Keeping in view the urgency of matter and paucity of time the matter is not placed before BOF. However, after the Syndicate decision it will be got noted by the BOF.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that 50% increase over the expenditure incurred for the election of Ordinary Fellows in 2012 has been proposed for the election to be held in 2016. He enquired about the percentage of increase in the rates of postal service charges. The increase in expenditure on account of increase in number of voters and polling booths is not justified as the number of polling booths is decreasing.

It was clarified that the proposed budget is based on an overall annual increase of 10% in expenditure.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the designation of Reader and Lecturer should be got amended through the Regulation Committee as Associate Professor and Assistant Professor for election of Fellows under these constituencies respectively.

RESOLVED: That following special budget provision, under the Budget Head “Election of Ordinary Fellows”, be made in the budgets for the financial years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017, to meet the financial need for conduct of Senate Election in September 2016:

2015-2016	-	Rs.15,00,000/-
2016-2017	-	Rs.1,20,00,000/-.

Amendment of Regulations relating to widow/family pension

21. Considered amendment in Pension Regulations relating to widow/Family pension appearing at pages 181-187 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, in order to implementation of the decision of the Syndicate dated 04.11.2012 (Para 51) and Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XLIV).

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

RESOLVED: That, in order to implement the decision of the Syndicate dated 04.11.2012 (Para 51) and Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XLIV), steps be initiated to amend the Pension Regulation/s relating to widow/Family pension appearing at pages 181-187 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

Recommendations of Committee dated 10.09.2015 related with Item No. 19 of Board of Finance dated 17.08.2015

22. Considered and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 10.09.2015 as per **Appendix-XXIX**, be approved.

Recommendations of Committee dated 04.09.2015 related with Dean Research

23. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 04.09.2015 (**Appendix-XXX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor:

- (i) to assess issues related to the office of Dean (Research) and Research Promotion Cell (RPC).
- (ii) Proposal (**Appendix-XXX**) with regard to structure of Research Promotion Cell

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that in the composition of the Research Promotion Cell, an eminent Professor, who has made significant contribution to the research even if he/she has been re-employed, should also be included.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that an Advisory Board on the pattern of IQAC should be constituted for the Research Promotion Cell.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the constitution of the board is a different concept. However, a senior Professor or an emeritus Professor or a re-employed faculty member, who has made significant contribution to the research, would be added as a member of Research Promotion Cell.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that if they really wanted the Research Promotion Cell to progress, there should be a person who can devote maximum time as it is the need of the hour. They have already created the mechanism. Earlier, name of next senior-most Professor had come to the Syndicate for the position of Dean Research. Even then the charge of Dean Research has been given to the Dean of University Instruction. In fact, the charge should have been given to that person as nothing is going to happen during the short period, i.e., till the process of appointment new Dean Research is completed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are not going to open that chapter as a lot of discussion in this regard had already taken place in the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not opening of a new chapter; rather, they wish to discuss the issue afresh. At the time of the last meeting of the Syndicate, Professor L.K. Bansal was in position as Dean Research. Now, the Dean Research is not in position, though no information has been provided to them. At a time when the appointment of Director, IAS Study Centre had been brought to the Syndicate, the charge was not given to the Dean of University Instruction. He said that if the earlier Dean Research is not in position and they are in the process of making a policy for

appointment of Dean Research, heavens are not going to fall if as per the previous practice, the next senior-most person is appointed as Dean Research. If they go through the minutes of the Committee, which has recommended the mechanism for appointment, Professor Karamjeet Singh has suggested that the senior-most Professor be appointed as Dean Research and in response to that Professor Naveep Goyal said that in the recently held Syndicate meeting, it was decided that since the post of Dean Research does not exist in the University, hence a decision should be taken immediately on this issue. He had told at that time also that the understanding that the post of Dean Research does not exist in the University, is completely a misunderstanding. University Calendar is not made when it is printed in the printing press. The Calendar meant the rules passed by the Syndicate. If they go through the minutes of the Board of Finance, in the budget part, there is a specific budget for the Dean Research and the staff. The University Calendar has not been printed since 2009 and the decisions taken even prior to that might also not have been incorporated in the Calendar. He was really surprised that the senior-most person has not been considered even for officiating as Dean Research and the charge has been given to someone else. If the Vice-Chancellor did not want to reopen the issue, it is alright, but it will send a signal that the charge has been given to the Dean of University Instruction only to deny a particular person the chance to officiate as Dean Research. Instead of giving additional charge to the Dean of University, it would have been in the fitness of things if the next senior-most person have been appointed as the Dean Research.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to reopen the chapter of appointing a particular person as Dean Research at this stage. The recommendation/s of the Syndicate would be placed before the Senate and the decision of the Senate would be implemented as quickly as possible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could not understand what is the difference between the Director and Dean?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to reopen this chapter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said this is an item which has come for consideration. The Syndicate decided to form a Committee to frame a policy for the appointment of Dean Research and it has come in the form of Director, Research Promotion Cell.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this issue was discussed in the meeting of the Committee that since there is only one post of Dean and that of Dean of University Instruction and as far as nomenclature of the Head of Research Promotion Cell is concerned, that should be Director and Associate Director.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is not a justification as there are other Deans also.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the criterion for the selection of Director (Research Promotion), it is written that a senior Professor having at least 2-3 years of remaining service shall be appointed. If they are going to approve this criterion, they are going to change the criteria of seniority.

The Vice-Chancellor said the criteria for appointment of Director, Research Promotion Cell, is not by seniority, but by selection after inviting applications from faculty members.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that some persons become Professor even at the age of 40. Some persons understood the requirement after at least 2-3, 4-5 years' of service, as meant only for senior persons, they might not apply. Instead of mentioning 2-3 years remaining service, it should be mentioned that those with at 5 years service as Professor are eligible for the post of Director as in the case of Director, IQAC.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the purpose of having 2-3 years of remaining service was that a person appointed as Director should have at least a period of two years to serve. A Professor even of the age of 40 years can also apply.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the service of 2-3 years was mentioned keeping in view the fact that it took some time to process the applications, scrutinize them and hold interview.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this service should be more than two years.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that if for a term, the Director is from Sciences/Engineering/Pharmaceutical Sciences/Medical Science, then the next Director should be from the Arts/Fine Arts/Language/ Social Sciences/Business Management/ Law.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is okay. It will be looked into.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired if a senior-most person applied for the post of Director, what will be the composition of the Selection Committee.

To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the person next below to that person will be on the Selection Committee.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that a junior person will be on the Selection Committee to select the senior-most person. It should be mentioned in the composition of the Committee that three senior-most Professors, provided no one is junior to the person, who has applied.

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

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 04.09.2015, be approved, as per **Appendix**, with the following modifications in the criteria for the selection of Director/Associate Director:

- (1) A senior Professor having more than 2 years of remaining service shall be appointed as Director (Research Promotion). The candidate can be from any of the Faculties.
- (2) If the Director is from Sciences/Engineering/Pharmaceutical Sciences/Medical Science, the Associate Director shall be from Arts/Fine Arts/

Languages/Social Sciences/Business Management/
Law or *vice versa*.

- (3) If, in the first term, Director is from Sciences/Engineering/Pharmaceutical Sciences/Medical Science, the Associate Director shall be from Arts/Fine Arts/Languages/Social Sciences/Business Management/Law, then in the next term, the Director shall be from Arts/Fine Arts/Languages/Social Sciences/Business Management/Law and the Associate Director from Sciences/Engineering/Pharmaceutical Sciences/Medical Science and the process would continue like this.
- (4) The selection will be made by a Committee comprising the Vice-Chancellor, Dean of University Instruction and three senior-most Professors of the University, including Professor Emeritus/re-employed Professor, but none should be junior to the applicant.

Report of Enquiry Committee on the complaint of Dr. Raghbir Singh against Dr. S.S. Randhawa, Principal, SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur

24. Considered Report of the Enquiry Committee (alongwith letter dated 31.8.2015 of Secretary & CVO, UGC) (**Appendix-XXXI**) on the complaint dated 2.2.2012 of Dr. Raghbir Singh, # D-7, 251, Azad Nagar, Kot Khalsa, Amritsar, made against Dr. S.S. Randhawa, Principal, S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur (Punjab) for rampant corruption and misappropriation of public money.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that he had reservations about how the item had been framed. In the item, the subject of the complainant only had been taken.

The Vice-Chancellor apologized that the words rampant corruption and misappropriation of public money should not have been there.

Continuing Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there was no corruption, no undue withdrawal. Giving background of the case, he said that Principal S.S. Randhawa was appointed by a duly constituted Selection Committee and when his case for approval came to the University, there were number of complaints. There were allegations and the case came in the Syndicate and by majority they withdrew his approval even as a Lecturer. The management committee took it very seriously as it was the appointing authority and decided to hold their own enquiry. Justice Gurdial Singh, Retired, Additional Sessions Judge was appointed as Enquiry Officer. Justice Gurdial Singh exonerated Dr. S.S. Randhawa and the court gave him a permanent stay. At one time, the elections came and the University denied him the right to vote. He again went to the Court and the decision of the Court was that for all intent and purposes, he was the Principal. About the present complainant, the background is that his foster daughter, Mandeep Kaur, was terminated by the management committee. Then he started complaining against Dr. S.S. Randhawa and there were number of complaints from him to the Prime Minister, President, Vice-President, Chief Vigilance Commissioner, Central Bureau of Investigation, Vigilance Department, University, Government, etc. Nothing concrete came out of these complaints. In the Garg Committee report, even for the blame of purchasing a car, Dr. Randhawa has been exonerated. So one serious point is that the management committee did not take care to appoint a Professor, 2 Associate Professors and Lecturers because the

Principal is only a recommending authority, the appointing authority is the management as per the Panjab University Calendar Volume-III. There are specific powers and functions of the Principal described in that. The management never cared to appoint the requisite staff. One important fact is that they were allowed 20 seats only but till last year they were filling 40 seats. That must be noticed. The management did not take care to appoint the requisite staff despite the fact they got more than Rs.50 lacs grant. When Dr. S.S. Randhawa left the office, the University sent an important Committee, perhaps headed by Professor Shelley Walia and Dr. Jagwant Singh. They even wrote that this college is unfit even for regular courses. Now the person has left and the courses are still going on. We need to verify all the records of 4-5 courses which they are running funded from the UGC. They had not appointed the requisite staff in gender studies also. Therefore, his submission is that that this report must be rejected and the College should be asked to pay back the balance funds to the UGC with interest.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he had not seen any letter. From the enquiry report submitted by the Enquiry Committee headed by Justice Garg, he could not find the information when the Committee was constituted, when it submitted the report although it had been signed by all the three members. Even the Dean College Development Council had not mentioned the date when the reply was sent to the UGC. He read out some points from the enquiry report and could not find what the specific allegations were made against the particular person or the particular College. Therefore, he could not understand what matter they had to consider.

The Vice-Chancellor said that continuous complaints have been coming against Principal Randhawa. They had discussed the involvement of Principal Randhawa in the College in various capacities. This very Syndicate had resolved at some point of time that he had left the College and like that. They had quasi closed the chapter. In fact, the governing body of the University was not keen to open this chapter and not pursue the matter. When the Secretary, UGC asked about the action taken in the matter, they had no option but to send a report to the UGC on whatever facts they were having. One more letter came that another committee was there, report of which was not made available. During the last 2-3 days, the report of that committee had also been received, the same had also been sent. This was all about where the matter was. Prima facie, the report has been sent to the UGC. Whatever they were doing on behalf of the University responding to the call of somebody who was as important as Secretary of the UGC, he hoped that it would be better to put on record so that nobody could say that the matter was not brought to their knowledge and the UGC's letter were not responded to.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that then the item should have been that to consider the reply submitted to the UGC.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the College was running the Industrial Chemistry course and had received the grant from the UGC.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there was one lacuna in the report. Professor Sarwan Singh gave the statement that he was nowhere involved, but if they see page 56 in the interface meeting he was there and that was not checked by Justice Garg Committee. His signatures are there. But in the report nowhere it was

counterchecked. He gave the statement that he was nowhere involved.

Professor Karamjeet Singh enquired why the UGC was asking the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that every week, there are letters from the UGC.

It was informed that since this matter related to the year 2013, after every 2-3 days, they had been receiving complaints. They were having the report of Justice Garg Committee. Their main concern was about the course in Industrial Chemistry.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that probably what he understood from the item that they had submitted reports to the UGC. In the past para it was written the action which is to be taken by the University is yet to be finalized by the appropriate bodies of the University. Needless to say, that the University is taking the complaint very seriously.

It was informed that the affiliation of the College for Industrial Chemistry from the session 2015-16 had been withdrawn. The recommendations of Justice Garg Committee would be considered by the Syndicate. The College had got a grant of Rs. 54 lac from the UGC. The teachers as per the requirement had not been appointed. No proper procedure had been adopted for the purchase of the material.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the letter of the Secretary, UGC says that 'this has reference to letter dated 14th September. I am directed to enclose a copy of letter dated 2.2.12'. Basically, they had to ensure to reply to the complaint of 2.2.2012.

It was informed that Justice Garg Committee was formed on the basis of that complaint itself. The action that was to be taken by the University to withdraw the affiliation for Industrial Chemistry, has been taken. The balance amount out of the grant of Rs.54 lacs has to be refunded by the College to the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was not mentioned that the University had closed the case against Dr. S.S. Randhawa. The action to be taken by the University was to be finalized. As far as Industrial Chemistry is concerned, the decision has been taken. The action on the grant of Rs.54 lacs was being taken. After considering the committee report, as far as Dr. S.S. Randhawa is concerned, Senate is not involved in it. Though he had not read the report, but it seemed that all were together. Should they write to the UGC that Senate is the supreme body of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that about the Industrial Chemistry, no decision had been taken by the Senate.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that Justice Garg had submitted the report. Now it was for the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have not taken a call of punishing anybody. In the meantime that person has resigned. There were many complaints also. Let them not worry about that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then why they were discussing about Dr. S.S. Randhawa.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that other cases could also come. The College was running other courses. The College had not appointed teachers for these courses also. It needed to be verified by constituting a Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the grant was received by the College and the College had to return the money.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the College had given NOC to Dr. S.S. Randhawa.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired why this item had come to the Syndicate.

It was informed that the item before the Syndicate came for the reason that the report of the Enquiry Committee was to be placed before the Syndicate. The report was submitted on 24 February 2015.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the report had come about 1-1½ years back. It came after 13.10.2013. As the report came in a sealed cover, there is no date on it. It has been dealt with by the Dean College Development Council office on 23.02.2015. It was sent to ASVC on 2nd March and remarks by the ASVC on 31st March and he said to plan a visit to the College, which was discussed on 1st April, then vacation. Then the report was given after vacation. The Enquiry Committee report must have come sometime in 2014.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the letter of the Secretary, UGC it was written that it is disheartening to note that even after a lapse of three years, reply of the University has not received. Did the Enquiry Officer not know that the dates are to be mentioned in the report? Nowhere in the report, they have written that they visited the College on such and such date, when the enquiry was started, when the statements were recorded. They have no justification to write to the UGC why the matter had been delayed as they did not know when the enquiry committee report was submitted. They could reply to the UGC that an Enquiry Committee, headed by a retired Judge of the High Court, was constituted and he had submitted the report.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would find out the dates of the submission of the enquiry report.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the UGC had asked for the comments on the complaint. The UGC had not asked what action the University had taken. As far as withdrawal of affiliation is concerned, if it had been withdrawn, a reply in this regard could be sent to the UGC.

Most of the members said that since the College had received the grant from the UGC, the UGC should ask the College to refund the money. Why the University should be a party in this matter.

It was informed that the orders of the Vice-Chancellor were that the UGC be also written to take necessary action on other findings of the Committee.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that a Committee of the Syndicate members be sent to the College to see whether requisite staff had been appointed for other courses or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that their final decision was that they should write to the UGC that Vice-Chancellor has ordered that a Committee would visit the College which were duly endorsed by the Syndicate

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur be asked to refund the money to the UGC;
- (2) the affiliation granted to the College for Industrial Chemistry course, be withdrawn, if not already withdrawn; and
- (3) a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to visit the College to verify whether the College has the requisite faculty and infrastructure for running the courses offered by it.

Recommendations of Committee dated 25.8.2015 regarding modalities/ means to fill various Chairs and Chair Professorships

25. Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 25.08.2015 (**Appendix-XXXII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the modalities/ means to fill various Chairs and Chair Professorships in the University.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that there were three categories of Chairs. One category is already existing in the University. The second category is to invite suitable persons to interact with the faculty and the students of the concerned department. The third category is University Chairs to be named after eminent persons. In his opinion, these Chairs are very important positions and they should be made functional by providing proper infrastructure and facilities. According to him, the senior and eminent Professors should be appointed on the Chairs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the responsibility of Chair Professor has been assigned to the senior-most Professor of the respective department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that all the Chairs are occupied.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired about the Chairs related to the subject of Sociology, which are already occupied.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there would be no change and the existing arrangement would continue.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 25.08.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Fee Structure for LL.M (1-Year Course) at Department of Laws and 2-Year course at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana

26. Considered and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 31.08.2015 as per **Appendix-XXXIII**, be approved.

Amendment of Regulation

27. Considered if, the Regulation 11 (D) (ii) at page 138 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007 in Chapter VI (B) (revised Regulation for teachers of the University), be amended as proposed below:

Existing Regulation	Amendment already approved in Regulation 11.(D) (ii)	Proposed
<p>11.(D) Earned Leave</p> <p>(i) xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>(ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not accumulate <u>beyond 180 days</u>. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside of India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement, if it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>(ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall be accumulated and leave encashment be allowed as prescribed by the Syndicate/ Senate from time to time. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement. If it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>(ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not accumulate beyond 300 days. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside of India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement, if it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p>

NOTE: 1. The amendment mentioned in column No.2 has already been approved by the Syndicate/Senate in its meetings held on 08.09.2012/06.10.2012 (Para 3) and 22.12.2012 (Para XXXV) respectively and has also been sent to Government of India for approval, which is still awaited.

2. Various State Governments, Central and State Universities and the Central Government have allowed accumulation of Earned Leave to their employees up to 300 days

Professor A.K. Bhandari suggested that the information contained in column No. 2 should be deleted from the table and be put under the notes.

Shri Ashok Goyal endorsed the views expressed by Professor A.K. Bhandari. He further said that Note 1 should be amended as 'the amendment duly recommended by the Syndicate and Senate was sent to the Government of India.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That the Regulation 11 (D) (ii) at page 138 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007 in Chapter VI (B) (revised Regulation for teachers of the University), be amended as under:

Existing Regulation	Proposed
<p>11.(D) Earned Leave</p> <p>(i) xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>(ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not accumulate <u>beyond 180 days</u>. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside of India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement, if it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>(ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not accumulate beyond 300 days. The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside of India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement, if it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p>

NOTE: 1. That the following amendment in Regulation 11 (D)(ii) has already been recommended by the Syndicate/Senate in their meetings held on 08.09.2012/06.10.2012 (Para 3) and 22.12.2012 (Para XXXV), respectively and has also been sent to Government of India for approval, which is still awaited:

“Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall be accumulated and leave encashment be allowed as prescribed by the Syndicate/ Senate from time to time. The maximum

earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement. If it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.”

Recommendations of Research Promotion Cell (RPC) dated 17.08.2015

28. Considered and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Research Promotion Cell (RPC) dated 17.08.2015 as per **Appendix-XXXIV**, be approved.

Appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry on notional basis without monetary

29. Considered if, the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, be approved w.e.f. 29.06.2010 (i.e. retrospectively) on notional basis up to 14.01.2014 without monetary benefits on the directions of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and financial benefit, be given from actual date of joining i.e. 15.01.2014. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXXV**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate and Senate in their meetings vide dated 29.6.2010 Para 2(xxxix) and 10.10.2010 vide (Para III) respectively (**Appendix-XXXV**) has approved the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor. But the appointment letter was not issued as he was not NET qualified.
 2. In term of the decision dated 12.11.2013 of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.2974 of 2012, the Vice-Chancellor has approved the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biochemistry in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/-.
 3. The salary of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura was protected by the Syndicate and Senate dated 12.07.2014 (Para 36(i) and 28.09.2014 (Para I-13) (**Appendix-XXXV**).
 4. The observation of the audit is reproduced below:

“This is not a case of pay protection as already mentioned rather it is a case of appointment to be effective from

29.06.2010 (i.e. retrospectively) on the directions of Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana with financial benefit from actual date of joining i.e. 15.01.2014. Hence, the approval of the Syndicate & Senate is required for his appointment w.e.f. 29.06.2010 on notional basis upto 14.01.2014, if the Hon'ble High Court has issued any such directions".

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all the benefits should be given to the candidate from the date when he got the appointment letter except monetary benefit.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that as per the note No. 4 the audit has raised the objection that the appointment be got approved from the Syndicate and Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether it was the direction of the Punjab and Haryana High Court?

It was clarified that there was a direction of the Court in this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the orders of the Court should have been mentioned in the note. As the RAO was mentioning about any such directions of the Punjab and Haryana High Court, it meant that there was a gap in the directions of the Court also. If the appointment is approved from the year 2010, it would not mean it is without monetary benefit as the notional pay fixation from the year 2010 to 2014 has to be done. It only meant that no arrear would be paid. If that candidate had been working somewhere else between the year 2010 to 2014 and they give him four increments for this period, it is clearly a monetary benefit. What was the status of the person during this period whether he was working somewhere or not? He thought that the case is justified. But the orders of the High Court should be clearly seen.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the candidate was drawing a fellowship which was much higher than the salary he would have drawn as Assistant Professor.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said if the candidate was working, how could they give the increments?

Shri Ashok Goyal and some other members said that the item should be approved in principle as they were taking a conscious decision.

RESOLVED: That the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, as Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, be approved w.e.f. 29.06.2010 (i.e. retrospectively) on notional basis up to 14.01.2014 without monetary benefits on the directions of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and financial benefit, be given from actual date of joining i.e. 15.01.2014.

Report of the Fact-Finding Committee

30. Considered the report of the Fact-Finding Committee dated 08.08.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) with regard to complaint (**Appendix-XXXVI**) received from teachers of GMT College of Education, Ludhiana for their termination from the College without

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

NOTE: The President, Governing Body, G.M.T. College of Education, has been informed to comply with the recommendations of the Fact-Finding Committee (report of visit dated 08.08.2015) and send the compliance within 3 days i.e. up to 16.09.2015 vide letter dated 14.09.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that it was a very important issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said they had discussed the issue earlier also and had come to the conclusion that the College Management should not terminate the services of the teachers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was about 12.30 p.m. when the issue relating to the College was being discussed, but the College issued the letters to the teachers at 11.40 a.m.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that earlier also they had invited the management of a College at Gurusar Sadhar to sort out the issue, if any, but the management did not come.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that when for the first time the Committee visited the College, it was found that they had admitted lesser students, and the situation at that time also was tense. The Committee decided to visit the College again to sort out the matter without claiming the DA, and visited the College again after having prior appointment from the Principal. The Committee tried to convince at every level in the presence of the Principal. However, the management said that they would prefer to close the College, but would not take the teachers back. The allegations of character assassination were also levelled against the Principal. The management was adamant and said that they will appoint new teachers. He suggested that the University should not give the panel/s for making the appointment of new teachers. It has been learnt that the management of the College is saying that if the University did not allow them to make new appointments and also did not give panels, they would approach the Court and get the appointments made. The Committee offered to the Management that they might not pay the salary to the teachers for three months, but the notices issued must be withdrawn.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that, keeping in view the decision of the Syndicate, they should write to the College again.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that a strong signal should be given to the College.

Shri Naresh Gaur, endorsing the viewpoint of Professor Karamjeet Singh, said that a strong signal needed to be given to the College so that other Colleges should follow the directions given by the University from time to time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the management should comply with the decision taken by the Syndicate on the enquiry committee report.

It was clarified that the University asked the College to submit reply within three days, but no reply was received.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since it is a case of disaffiliation, they have to issue show cause notice to the College under the relevant Panjab University Regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Dean College Development Council to send a reminder to the management that the Syndicate had taken a serious view of the matter. The College be also written that the recommendations of the Enquiry Committee should be complied with and if the College had any issue, they could come and meet the University authorities once again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as reported, a letter had already been written to the management giving it the time up to 16th September 2015, but the management had not submitted the reply so far. Now, they should send another letter to the College giving a week's time to respond and it should be clearly told that if the College failed to respond within the stipulated time, the University would be compelled to take action against the College as per the provisions of the Calendar. In case the management did not comply with the instructions by the date fixed, a show cause notice under Regulations should be issued.

It was clarified that the Dean College Development Council had requested the Principal of the College to resolve the issue and at that time, the Principal had assured that the issue would be resolved.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, a unanimous decision was taken to call the management of a College which is appointing the teachers on a fixed salary of Rs.21600/- per month, but the decision has not been implemented. Certain self-financing Colleges are also issuing appointment letters mentioning full salary therein. He added that certain Colleges are also not fulfilling the other conditions. Despite pointing out on several occasions, no progress has been made.

The Vice-Chancellor remarked that it did not relate to the item under consideration.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the report of the Fact-Finding Committee dated 8.8.2015, as per **Appendix**, be accepted; and
2. the College should be written to that the Syndicate has taken a serious view of the matter; hence, it should comply with the recommendations of the Fact-Finding Committee within a week's time and respond, failing which the University would be compelled/forced to take action against it as per the provisions of the University Calendar.

Issue regarding withholding of confirmation of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Training-cum-placement Officer, UIAMS

31. Considered if, the confirmation of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Training-cum-placement Officer, UIAMS, be withheld by extending his period of probation beyond 02 years in P.U., till 25.10.2015 (i.e. the date upto which his parental department (Punjabi University, Patiala) has extended his Extra-ordinary leave without

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

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha was appointed as Training-cum-Placement Officer at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + GP Rs.9000/- p.m. plus allowances admissible under the University rules, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.05.2013 vide Para 38 (**Appendix-XXXVII**).
 2. The extension in probation period of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha for one year more i.e. upto 30.05.2015 was ratified by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 12.07.2014 vide Para 35 R (vii) (**Appendix-XXXVII**).
 3. Punjabi University, Patiala, vide letter No. 34157 dated 31.10.2014 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) has extended the Extra Ordinary Leave without pay already granted to Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, for one year w.e.f. 25.10.2014.
 4. The Rule 13.2 appearing at page 82 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 is reproduced below:-

The Head of the Department under whom an employee is working shall send to the Registrar, before the expiry of the period of probation, a report on his work. On receipt of the report, the competent authority, as far as possible before the completion of the probationary period, may

- (a) confirm the employee in service,
OR
- (b) extend his probationary period to the extent that the period of probation including extension shall not exceed two years.
OR
- (c) revert him to the post already held previous to his appointment, if any,
OR
- (d) dispense with his services without notice.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that in the year 2014 he had suggested the amendment in rule regarding confirmation. There were

four options available with them under which they could extend the probation period. For extending the probation of the teachers, there was no provision in the University Calendar. As such, they could not extend the probation. If the candidate would seek extension in probation period for two more years, they could not grant the extension.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there are precedents when probation was extended. One such example was of Director, Mr. Grewal whose probation was extended on his request.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could extend the probation in this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had been committing illegalities after illegalities and thereafter they say that there were precedents.

The Vice-Chancellor cited his example that he wanted his probation to be extended from his parent Department in Mumbai, then the Institute said that it was no problem for them.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Dr. Panda asked for extension of one year, he had to resign and go back. In some cases, they had been extending the probation period.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a provision to extend the probation period up to two years. Now, there is another case where a man came here. There are lot of precedents. A Professor came in the University. He remained here for more than five years as confirmed Professor and his University wanted him back and asked him to forget all these things, resign and come back and join. The Professor came to him and asked if it was possible to which he said that it was the University. They are nobody to interfere in that matter. He did not want to hide anything. That Professor was taken back by the University. Probation, in fact, is the prerogative of the employer that the employee is on probation and subject to his/her satisfactory work and conduct, he/she could be confirmed after one year and the probation is extendable by another year. After completion of two years, either the employee has to be confirmed, relieve him or demote if appointed by promotion. But there was no such provision not in the University but nowhere on the earth where the probation of the employee could be extended on his/her request. It was only the Panjab University where they had been extending the probation period. That was why he was saying that let they not see the face and make the rule. If Professor Grover was not given the extension for more than one year though there is a provision to extend the probation period up to two years. Why Mr. Grewal was given the extension in probation. There were precedents that they gave extension in probation to one person and not to the other person. The employer could waive this condition. The employer could confirm an employee on the first day of joining itself. There were so many persons, he could cite 20 names who were appointed on the first day and confirmed on the second day. There were other reasons like just to take care of the seniority. It was not so that they were given the favour. In this case, the person was requesting that his probation period be extended. He was not against this fellow. But the question was how to justify it except that there were precedents. But who created those precedents. It did not mean that they did not an opportunity to correct the precedents. The person asking for extension in probation up to October 2015, the problem which he has

cited would not be solved. The extension to the person should not be given and he be made to understand that he should take a decision accordingly. At the most after 15th he could be sent a reply that his request cannot be acceded to.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor A.K. Bhandari if whatever they were saying was right.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it was right.

RESOLVED: That the request of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Training-cum-placement Officer, UIAMS, for extension of his probation period beyond 02 years, i.e. up to 25.10.2015, be **not** acceded to.

Continuation of certain University Teachers beyond the age of 60 years

32. Considered the issue of continuance/non-continuance of service of the University teachers, who have crossed the age of 60 years, in pursuance of the letter dated 17.09.2015 of Shri Anupam Gupta, Senior Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court.

- NOTE:** 1. The Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court has passed interim orders 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 that the petitioners be allowed to continue till the stay order granted by Hon'ble Court remains in force.

The petitions filed by Dr. Amar Nath Gill, Professor, Department of Statistics, Dr. Sanjay Wadwalkar, Professor, School of Communication Studies, Dr. L.K. Bansal, Professor, University School of Open Learning, Professor Lovelina Singh, Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies, Dr. Manju Malhotra, Professor, University School of Open Learning, Dr. Bimal Rai, Assistant Professor, Department of Physics, Dr. A.S. Ahluwalia, Professor, Department of Botany, Dr. Sukhdev Singh, Professor, School of Punjabi Studies, Dr. P.K. Sharma, Associate Professor in Economics, Department of Evening Studies and Dr. Reena Bhasin, Professor of Economics, University School of Open Learning have been tagged with the CWP No. 11988 of 2014 file by Dr. B.S. Ghuman V/s Panjab University.

2. The above said case has now been adjourned to 28.10.2015.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the table agenda item related to the case going on regarding the retirement age from 60 to 65 years. There was an issue which the Judge had pointed that some people were continuing in executive positions beyond the age of 60 years whereas they were not allowing any person in executive position

beyond the age of 60 years. They took a conscious decision and apprised their compulsion to the people who had crossed the age of 60 years. As of today, no one beyond the age of 60 years was on the executive position. The court wanted that the Syndicate should take cognizance of it. The Syndicate had to take a decision whether the persons should continue on the executive positions or not. A Committee could be constituted. If they wanted time, they could form a Committee which could take a decision and come back to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever decision had already been taken, that should be final.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that let the position remain the same as had been decided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that was some discussion between the Advocate and the Judge.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he understood that the Advocate General wrote a letter that he was not the defending counsel for those who had been denied the executive position. Naturally, he had to go and defend. The only defence was that as per Calendar Volume-III, it was written that nobody could continue on executive position after the age of superannuation. As per Regulations which are superior to these rules, one superannuates at the age of 60 and when that superannuation by Regulation had been stayed by the Court did they think that the rules would be operative. When the operation of the Regulation had been stayed, the operation of the rule is automatically stayed. But the Advocate of the University will definitely highlight what goes in favor of the University as defence. Technically, there was no such defence because on one hand under the orders of the Court the person who had crossed the age of 60 years were allowed to continue but they had allowed just two hours ago them the increments also. So if how on what ground they could say that after 60 years, the teachers could not be allowed. As earlier, under the orders of the Court, those Professors who were serving as Chairperson, they were allowed to continue as the Chairpersons. But those who were having any other position, like Dean of University Instruction, if he got the stay then he would not be allowed to continue as Dean of University Instruction. When Professor Shelley Walia got the stay from the Supreme Court, he was not allowed to continue as Director of Academic Staff College whereas other Professors were allowed to continue as Chairpersons. He never knew that a situation would come in the year 2015, when the Dean Research would be allowed to continue beyond the age of 60 years and the Chairpersons would not be allowed. That meant that there were precedents. How contradictory decisions had been taken. If they had already taken a decision, his personal opinion was that if somebody is continuing after the age of 60 years under the orders of the Court then probably they had no discretion to deny anything. But if they had taken conscious decision that because of these reasons, nobody would be allowed to hold the position of Chairperson or Head of the Department, then let them make a policy that nobody beyond 60 years would be allowed to continue in executive position. They were taking the plea that the Regulations had been stayed and not the Rules. They allowed the persons to continue as per the Rules whereas Rules are subordinate to Regulations. He was sure that the Judge must have asked to show him the decision where it had been decided. The Advocate said to take it to the Syndicate and the matter had been put up to the Syndicate. The Court had not given any such direction.

Now on the next date he has to tell the Court. Since the item had been brought, a Committee of the Syndicate be formed and the Court be given the reply that the matter was under consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee be formed to discuss the issue in detail.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to a Committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for examining the issue and make recommendations.

Routine and formal matters

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

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors (already working on temporary basis) up to 30.06.2015, at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U. Chandigarh:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation
1.	Ms. Twinkle Bedi	Assistant Professor in Computer Engineering
2.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Assistant Professor in Mathematics

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Board of Studies in Chemical Engineering, Food Technology & Energy Studies dated 19.08.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the regulations (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) for Bachelor of Vocational (B.Voc.) (Food Processing and Preservation) under National Skills Qualification Programme of UGC, w.e.f. 2014-15.

NOTE: 1. The Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 28.03.2015 has authorized the Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology to take appropriate action on behalf of the Faculty on the recommendations of the Board of Studies/Board of Control regarding left-out item/s, if any.

Accordingly, the Dean, Engineering & Technology has approved the minutes of the Board of Studies in Chemical Engineering, Food Technology & Energy Studies dated 19.08.2015 on behalf of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology.

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

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor at Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue

Engineering and Excellence Biomedical Science, for the academic session 2015-16 w.e.f. 06.07.2015 to 30.04.2016, purely on temporary basis, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, on the same term and conditions, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Shri Raghbir Singh, Junior Technician (G-III) (Retired on 30.04.2015), Department of Psychology on contractual basis on fixed remuneration of Rs.20,000/- p.m. for a period of two months w.e.f. the date he reports for duty after issue of this office order. His salary be charged/paid from the post of Junior Technician (G-III) vacated by him on his retirement.

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor, has also ordered to complete the process of filling up the post of Jr. Technician (G-III) vacated by Shri Raghbir Singh on his retirement in the Department of Psychology after following the prescribed procedure under clause 2.5 of the relevant rules and no further extension will be given to Mr. Raghbir Singh. The Chairperson has been informed accordingly.

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has sanctioned study leave to Dr. Meenu Aggarwal nee Gupta, Assistant Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies, for a period of two years, w.e.f. 08.01.2016 instead of 15.07.2015, already sanctioned vide Syndicate decision dated 31.05.2015 (Para 5) conveyed vide letter dated 15.07.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIX**).

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the contractual appointment of Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Additional C.M.O., Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, P.U., after his retirement (30.09.2015), initially for the period of six months with one day break on 01.10.2015 or till the post of 'Medical Officer' is filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on fixed emoluments on the basis of half of salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA & any other special allowance) rounded off to nearest lower 100, as was done in the case of re-employment (on contract) of Dr. B.S. Lal.

- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval/ adoption 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.	Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana	(i) B.Voc.(Banking, Insurance and Retailing) (ii) B.Voc. (Fashion Designing and Information Technology)
2.	G.G.D.S.D. College, Hariana, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Voc. Programme in Banking Insurance & Retailing and Software Development
3.	D.A.V. College, Chandigarh	(i) Bachelor of Vocational in Medical Lab Technology (ii) Bachelor of Vocational in Organic Farming and Post graduate Diploma/ Degree in Organic Farming (iii) Bachelor of Vocational in Cosmetology and Beauty Care (iv) Bachelor of Vocational in Software Development and Web Technology (v) Bachelor of Vocational in Computer Hardware and Networking (vi) Bachelor of Vocational in Food Services operations and housekeeping (vii) Bachelor of Vocational in Health nutrition and adolescent care
4.	Dev Samaj College for Women, Sector 45-B, Chandigarh	(i) Fashion Designing & Visual Merchandising (ii) Banking & Financial Service (iii) Beauty & Wellness
5.	Guru Nanak National College, Doraha, Ludhiana	1 B.Voc Programme in (i) Auto Electricals and Electronics (ii) Fashion Technology 2. Community College Programme in (i) Compute Hardware and Networking (ii) Milk Processing
6.	R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City	(i) Bachelor of Retail Management and Information (ii) Bachelor of Computer Hardware and Networking
7.	Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City	(i) Global Professional in Beauty & Aesthetics (ii) Textile & Fashion Technology (iii) Software Development (iv) Hospital Administration & Management
8.	Khalsa College, Gardhiwala, Hoshiarpur	(i) Mechanic Agricultural Machinery Certificate Course (ii) Mechanic Agricultural Machinery Diploma Course 1st year (iii) Mechanic Agricultural machinery Diploma Course 2 nd year
9.	Swami Ganga Giri Janta Girls, Raekot, Ludhiana	(i) B.Voc. Degree in Fashion Technology (ii) B.Voc. Degree in Retail Marketing
10.	S.C.D. Govt. College, Ludhiana	(i) Bachelors/Masters in Microbiology (Hons) (ii) Bachelor/Masters in ITES

NOTE: 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-XL)**.

(viii) In accordance with the “Panjab University Policy against Sexual Harassment” approved by the Syndicate dated 24.08.2013 (Para-4) **(Appendix-XLI)**, the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation dated 31.07.2015 **(Appendix-XLI)** of APEX Committee Against Sexual Harassment (ACASH) and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following members of Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) for the term of two years w.e.f. 01.08.2015 to 31.07.2017:

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------|
| 1. | Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh | Chairperson |
| 2. | Professor Navdeep Goyal, D.S.W., P.U., Chandigarh | Member |
| 3. | Dr. Vishal Sharma, Warden, Boys Hostel No.6, P.U., Chandigarh | Member |
| 4. | Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur, Warden, Girls Hostel No.9, P.U., Chandigarh | Member |
| 5. | Ms. Puneet Kaur, Research Scholar, Department of Women Studies, P.U., Chandigarh | Member |
| 6. | Dr. Upneet Lalli, Deputy Director, Institute of Correctional Administration, Sector-26, Chandigarh | Member |
| 7. | Mr. Amar Kulwant Singh, Member, NGO, #3229, Sector-15, Chandigarh | Member |
| 8. | Mrs. Sabina Salim, Associate Professor, UILS, P.U., Chandigarh | Member |
| 9. | Mrs. Suraksha Sobti, Assistant Registrar (Secrecy), P.U., Chandigarh | Member |
| 10. | Mrs. Neelam Kumari, Assistant Registrar, Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh | Convener |

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following recommendations of the Committee dated 07.09.2015 with regard to change of nomenclature of MBE to M.A./M.Com./MBA (Business Economics), as per gazette notification of Government of India:

1. The students should be given option to shift to M.A. (Economics) or M.Com. Courses in the Colleges.

2. Colleges be allowed to start M.Com. (Business Economics) or M.Com. in lieu of MBE, if they wish, for the session 2015-17 and those students, who wish to join M.Com. (Business Economics) be allowed to do so.
3. Those students, who wish to join any other courses in a University Department/College and have merit above the cut off marks of the last student admitted in that course (in that category), be allowed to do so.
4. In case UIAMS, Panjab University, Chandigarh is able to run the course of MBA (Business Economics) for the session 2015-17, then the students be also given an option to join this course by paying the fee already prescribed for other running MBA courses in UIAMS. To run the course as MBA (Business Economics) in UIAMS the first semester syllabus will remain unchanged and restructuring from second semester onwards be done on priority basis.
5. Wherever, student(s) shift, additional seat(s) in the course will be created to accommodate student(s).

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Hira Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College Guru Har Sahai (Ferozepur) w.e.f. 25.07.2015 and due amount be paid to him after deducting one month salary from the period he has worked in the College in lieu of one month notice under rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

NOTE: Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, reads as under:

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

(xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has constituted the IQAC Cell for a period of two years with the following members:

Teachers	1. Rajiv Lochan 2. Archana Bhatnagar 3. Tankeshwar Kumar 4. Akshaya Kumar 5. Dinesh Khurana 6. Anil Kumar 7. Gunmala Suri	Director, IQAC Cell Associate Director, IQAC Cell Professor, Department of Physics Professor, Department of English Professor, Department of Mathematics Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences Professor, University Business School
Administrative/ Technical Staff	1. Col. G.S. Chadha 2. Guldeep Singh 3. Ravinder Kumar	Registrar System, Manager, MIS Cell ASO, DUI Office
Students	1. Vineet Keshwa 2. Ms. Prinka Garg	Ph.D. Scholar, History M.Sc. Biochemistry
Management Representatives	1. Ronki Ram 2. Karamjit Singh	Member Senate Member Senate
Alumni	1. Satya P Gautam	Professor, Centre for Philosophy, JNU, New Delhi
Stakeholder/ Representative of Community	1. Pawan Kumar Bansal 2. Satyapal Jain	Prominent Citizen Prominent Citizen
Employers of University Product/ Industrialists	1. R.M. Khanna	Former President, CII, Chandigarh
External Expert	1. Jai Rup Singh 2. Paramjit S. Judge	Former Vice-Chancellor, Central University of Bhatinda, Punjab Professor, Sociology, GNDU and Dean and i/c IQAC Cell

- (xii) To ratify the following decision of the Syndicate dated 31.05.2015 (Para 3) that the words 'Branch' and 'Registrar', be added in the resolved part (modification/addition) of Syndicate decision dated for channel of referring the grievances/ complaint of any aggrieved members of the staff (Teaching and Non-teaching):

Decision of the Syndicate dated 31.05.2015 (Para 3)	Ratified Decision
<p>RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Johl Committee dated 15.5.2015, be approved, as per Appendix, with the following additions/modifications to strengthen the internal grievance redressal mechanism to the satisfaction of all:</p> <p>1. Before the Chancellor is approached, the issue must be attempted to be addressed within the University system. Firstly, the issue be addressed at the department level and the Head of the Department should try to resolve the issue within 15 days time. If the issue could not be addressed at the Departmental level, it be referred to the Dean of University Instruction, who should resolved the issue within 1 month's</p>	<p>RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Johl Committee dated 15.5.2015, be approved, as per Appendix, with the following additions/modifications to strengthen the internal grievance redressal mechanism to the satisfaction of all:</p> <p>1. Before the Chancellor is approached, the issue must be attempted to be addressed within the University system. Firstly, the issue be addressed at the Department/Branch level and the Head of the Department/Branch should try to resolve the issue within 15 days time. If the issue could not be addressed at the Departmental/Branch level, it be referred to the Dean of University Instruction/Registrar, who should resolve the</p>

<p>time. In case the issue is still not resolved, the matter be referred to the Standing Committee, for which the upper limit of the time is 2 months. However, if the matter still did not get addressed, the Syndicate has to take a call on the same in its subsequent meeting.</p> <p>2. xxx xxx xxx 3. xxx xxx xxx 4. xxx xxx xxx</p>	<p>issue within 1 month's time. In case the issue is still not resolved, the matter be referred to the Standing Committee, for which the upper limit of the time is 2 months. However, if the matter still did not get addressed, the Syndicate has to take a call on the same in its subsequent meeting.</p> <p>2. xxx xxx xxx 3. xxx xxx xxx 4. xxx xxx xxx</p>
--	---

NOTE: A comparative statement showing difference between the recommendations of Professor Johl Committee dated 15.05.2015 and the recommendations approved by the Syndicate meeting dated 31.05.2015 are enclosed (**Appendix-XLII**).

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the validity of Advertisement No. 4/2014 for six months from the date of lapse of the validity of the advertisement i.e. 30.10.2015 for filling up of various teaching posts.

NOTE: 1. A copy of advertisement No. 4/2014 along with status report of each post advertised vide No. 4/2014 is enclosed (**Appendix-XLIII**).

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

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of contractual appointment of Shri Rishi Kaushal (A.R., Retd. on 31.01.2012), for another six months i.e. from 04.09.2015 (with one day break on 03.09.2015), as O.S.D. (Exam.) @ half of the salary last paid (excluding HRA,CCA and other special allowance) rounded off to nearest lower 100, out of the Budget Head "General Administration-Sub Head-Hiring Services/ Outsourcing Contractual/ Casual or Seasonal Worker".

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the implementation of Double Entry Accounting System in the University from 1st April 2015, onwards.

NOTE: 1. The work of rewriting/ reprocessing of the vouchers from 1st April 2015 onwards has already been started through Tally Software.

2. The office has prepared the Balance Sheet as on 31.03.2015 (provisional) on the format as prescribed by the MHRD for other

Central institutions
(**Appendix-XLIV**).

3. The significant accounting policy adopted for the preparation of accounts for Double Entry System has been given in Schedule 20 of the Balance Sheet.
4. The University has already submitted the above Balance Sheet to the UGC for presenting it before the Fact-Finding Committee.
5. The above Balance Sheet is subject to audit/ verification, the final report of which shall be submitted in due course.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(viii), Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the designation of member of PUCASH at Sr. No. 5 should be corrected and mentioned as **Research Officer** in place of Research Scholar.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(ix), Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was decided that the UIAMS would offer MBA (Business Economics) course, whereas at point 4, it is written as 'in case UIAMS, Panjab University, Chandigarh, is able to run the course of MBA (Business Economics)'.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that as the Committee could not take a final decision as the feasibility of running the course was to be seen.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Syndicate had only taken the decision to constitute a Committee, and had never decided that the course would be run in the University. Rather he had cautioned that a stage might come that they would have to shift the students to the University Campus as had happened in the case of MCA students, who were admitted in College/s, but were later on shifted to the University. They should also not forget the heart burning of those students, who wanted to take admission to M.Com. course, but could not get the admission. The students, who got admission to M.Com. course were, in fact, much more meritorious and remained admitted to M.Com., and the lesser meritorious students joined M.B.E. Now, in current scenario, the students of M.B.E., who are lesser meritorious, would get the degree of M.B.A., whereas those having high merit and wanted to take admission to MBA course as it was their first option, have to opt M.Com. (second option), would get M.Com. degree. Meaning thereby, the students having high merit would be on disadvantage and the MBE students, who had lesser merit, would be advantageous. Therefore, the University should see which category of students they are going to award MBA degree. He further stated that it was never apprehended that certain members of the Committee would suggest that such type of students might be adjusted in his/her Institute/Department. The situation has been made to reach to such a stage, where it has become compulsion for the University to adjust such students as a welcome measure. He pointed out that after threadbare discussion, the Syndicate had allowed only one of the options. One of the other workable options was that whatever

decision is applicable to the students of MBE 2014, would also be applicable to student of MBE 2015. He suggested that consequent upon the option given to the students for MBA, no request of the Institute/Department for providing additional resources/infrastructure, faculty, etc. should be entertained. However, the Colleges might be given additional seats for M.A./M.Com./MBA (Business Economics). According to him, the only fault on the part of the University is that the letter received from the UGC in the year 2014, could not be communicated to the Colleges, though the Colleges might be aware of it. The Colleges made admissions to MBE course on the pretext that the letter has been received by them in the year 2015 only, whereas the letter was very much in place on the website of the UGC in the year 2014. Although both the University and Colleges were aware of the letter, the University conducted the examination of a course in 2014 that did not exist in the list of UGC recognized courses. Even in the year 2015, the University conducted the Entrance Test (OCET) for admission to MBE course. It seemed that the University is trying to accommodate certain students who are very highly meritorious and they are suffering because of one or the other reason, whereas the actual position is otherwise. It has also been mentioned that to run the course as MBA (Business Economics) at UIAMS, the first semester syllabus would remain unchanged and restructuring would be done from second semester onwards on priority basis. It meant that they are trying to find out ways to accommodate the students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was suggested by Professor Sanjeev Sharma, Director, UIAMS, that 70% of the changed syllabus would be of management and 30% of other related subject/s.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even in the year 2014, they had violated the UGC Regulations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was not possible to follow the new UGC Regulations in the year 2014 as the admissions had already been made. But this year, the University could have avoided the admissions to MBE course.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that if GNDU is continuing with the MBE and violating the UGC regulations, it does not mean that the University should also do so.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that one chance should be given to the students.

The Vice-Chancellor cited the example of students of B.E.M.B.A. (Chemical Engineering) course, who had secured much less marks than those who took admission to B.Tech. course, but now they are pressurizing the University to split the integrated course and allow them to exit in-between, and award them the degree of B.E.

The members said that it is not possible to split the integrated course and award the degree of B.E.

Professor A.K. Bhandari informed that till date the M.B.E. students have not been admitted to the MBA at UIAMS.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that one week's more time should be taken to take a final decision in the matter, and in the meantime, the Vice-Chancellor might be requested to look into the all pros and cons. He remarked that decisions on such important matters are

being taken on the basis of resolutions made at lower level (Committees, etc.). He further stated that he would like to inform that out of the members present, the maximum pressure is on him that under any circumstances, MBA should be allowed. These students would get admission comfortably without having appeared in any Entrance Test or group discussion, interview, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has received representations from the Colleges situated at Ludhiana that their students are suffering.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that as per his knowledge, about 24 students have shown interest in MBA course at UIAMS. The University would be getting approximate Rs.1.25 crore from the fee of these students. Therefore, economically, the University would not be at a loss.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be seen that the students who have got admission to M.A Economics in the Colleges, if their merit is higher than those students who have been admitted to MBE and are now getting admission to MBA at UIAMS, they must also be given an option to opt for MBA at UIAMS.

Majority of the members authorized the Vice-Chancellor and Dean of University Instruction to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should take such a decision so that no problems arise in future. If the University is going to earn some money from this course, it meant they are seeing it in economic terms only and not academically.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in **Items R-(i) to R-(vii) and R-(x) to R-(xiv)** on the agenda, be ratified;
- (2) the information contained in **Item R-(viii)** on the agenda, be approved with the modification that the designation of member of PUCASH at Sr. No.5 be corrected and mentioned as **Research Officer**;
- (3) So far as **Item R-(ix)** on the agenda is concerned, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate in consultation with the Dean of University Instruction; and
- (4) the implementation of Double Entry Accounting System in the University from 1st April 2015 onwards **Item R-(xv)**, be ratified, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

Routine and formal matters

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

- (i) To note Status Report (**Appendix-XLV**) of misappropriation of pension corpus fund of the University to tune of Rs.2,08,74,993/- during the last three years.

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor has:
- (i) accepted the resignation of Dr. Rupinder Tiwari as Honorary Director, Central Instrumentation Laboratory w.e.f. 09.09.2015.
 - (ii) ordered that Professor S.K. Mehta, Department of Chemistry is to assume charge as Director, Central Instrumentation Laboratory from Dr. Rupinder Tiwari with immediate effect and discharge this duty until further orders on the earlier terms and conditions.
- (iii) 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 Shiv Lal Yadav Security Officer Security Staff Panjab University	28.12.1977	30.09.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
2.	Shri Raj Mal Rahi Assistant Technical Officer (G-II) University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology	03.10.1977	30.09.2015	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.

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

- (iv) Since, the interim orders dated 28.05.2015 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 (16977 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 02.09.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Reena Bhasin, Professor of Economics, University School of Open Learning be allowed to continue 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: CWP (16977 of 2015) has further been adjourned to 28.10.2015.

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor has given the additional charge of Director (Hony.), Coaching Centre for I.A.S. & Other Competitive Examinations for SC/ST & Other Categories, P.U., to Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean University Instruction, P.U., with immediate effect till further orders.
- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed Principal Gurdip Sharma, GGSDS College, Haryana, Hoshiarpur, to continue as

Chairperson of Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) till 31.12.2015.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.01.2015 vide Para 20 has formed the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) for one year, commencing w.e.f. 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 (Para I (viii)) has appointed Principal Gurdip Sharma as acting Chairman of Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) in place of Shri G.K. Chatrath.

- (vii) To note the notification No. 8/19/2013-4C1/576065/3-10 dated 28.08.2015 (**Appendix-XLVI**) received from Special Secretary, Higher Education, Government of Punjab, with regard to implementation of the orders passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 2891-2900 of 2015 (arising out of SLP (CIVIL) NOS 36023-36032 of 2010) P. Susheela & Ors. V/s University Grant Commission & Ors., regarding requisite qualifications of the Lecturers/Assistant Professor, in Govt./Non-Govt. College and Universities.

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

- (1) Shri Jarnail Singh said that in one of the previous meetings of the Syndicate, a special/golden chance to the candidates of both graduation and postgraduation (under the Semester System) was given to clear their compartments/re-appears. He pleaded that on the same pattern, a special/golden chance should be given to the UG/PG students (under annual system) so that they could complete their degrees or improve their performances.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that this chance should also be given to the students of B.Sc. Agriculture.

It was informed that this could only be possible in the month of April.

- (2) Shri Jarnail Singh said that hundreds of cases of Assistant Professors for grant of Ph.D. increments are pending. He pleaded that those cases should be resolved at the earliest. However, if at the moment, it was not possible to grant 3 and 5 increments for Ph.D. under new Regulations. Till the issue is finally resolved, at least 2 and 4 increments should be given to the concerned teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in this regard, they have to talk to the Resident Audit Officer, the Finance Secretary and the Director Higher Education (DHE), U.T., Chandigarh.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that about 80-90% of the cases had already been resolved. Those teachers, who have

done their Ph.D. as per Regulations, 2009, would get five increments. At the moment they were trying to resolve the matter on their own.

- (3) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that as per new UGC Regulations, the candidates who have done Ph.D. under UGC Regulations, 2009 are exempted from NET. So far as increments for Ph.D. are concerned, the same should be given to them as per UGC Regulations as nowhere it has been written that the Ph.D. should be under UGC Regulations 2009.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the purpose of granting five increments was that it takes five years to complete the Ph.D. degree. If one was eligible for appointment as Assistant Professor, it was just to compensate a person for those five years. The spirit of granting Ph.D. increments had been lost somewhere between the 2009 and other guidelines. They had not been able to move ahead due to wrong interpretation of the rules. Those cases which are not disputed should at least be given cleared. Still they were facing problems and would have to set up a meeting with the Resident Audit Officer.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that a solution could be found after having a meeting with the DHE. In the first instance, the increments could be given as per the old regulations.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that a teacher appointed in February 2006 would also be eligible for five Ph.D. increments at par with that appointed after 31.12.2008.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there was a small category because of some interpretation of those things by the Supreme Court. He wanted to have all the statistics of pending cases in the next Chairpersons Meeting.

- (4) Principal Gurdip Sharma said that since the fee of Rs.5,000/- and Rs.10,000/- prescribed for special/golden chance is on the higher side, it should be checked whether the Syndicate has determined the same.
- (5) Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had given two cases to the Establishment Branch, including one relating to SGGS College, wherein an ineligible candidate was selected and the letter had been issued from the University.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that it should be decided by the Syndicate that if any appointment had been wrongly made, the same should be treated as withdrawn and person on the waiting list should be offered the appointment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the previous meeting of Syndicate was held on 30.08.2015. It was a very short period between the two meetings. They were occupied with so many other things.

- (6) Professor Ronki Ram said that he wanted to bring to their notice the two properties at Shimla. These properties are very good properties. These should be renovated and could be also used as a Community Hall. By using these buildings, the

University could also earn some money. He suggested that a Committee could be formed to explore the feasibility.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee could be formed for the purpose.

- (7) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the result of B.Com. B.B.A. had been changed due to some amendments in Regulations/Rules. Earlier, 50% subjects were compulsory for passing the examination, due to which some of the students could not pass. He pleaded that all such students should be also considered under the amended Regulations/Rules so that they could get admission to the next higher classes.
- (8) Professor Yog Raj Angrish pointed out that in the last meeting of the Syndicate leave asked for by Professor Nahar Singh was up to 31.03.2016 whereas it had been mentioned as 5.10.2015. It needed to be corrected.
- (9) Shri Ashok Goyal said that two different templates are being used for recruitment of teachers. For the recruitment being made against 1925 posts, the interview marks were 15, whereas in unaided posts, the interview is of 40 marks. Could there be two templates for the same category? There is a confusion because they had adopted the template prepared by the Government. Once they adopted that template, the earlier template was automatically superseded. He suggested that same template should be used for all categories, i.e., 15% marks for interview or the University should not accept the template of the Government, because the Colleges are affiliated to Panjab University. At one point of time, there was confrontation with the U.T. Administration also as the Syndicate has to form the template in order to maintain academic excellence. On one hand, they had adopted the criteria of Punjab Government, and on the other hand, for other posts, it would continue 40%, which might create problems in future. It was the order of the Supreme Court to cut down the interview marks and the government has already started working on it.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the posts of teachers to be filled up by the Punjab Government are related with various Colleges affiliated to Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University. Therefore, it was their compulsion to adopt the template.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the interview marks are being cut down so that the Interview Committee may have the minimum say.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the criteria would have an impact on the University.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the template by the University is far better than others.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could ask the Government to review the template.

The Vice-Chancellor said the Government would be requested to review the template.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the government should consider the decision of the University.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that a justification should be given that the template adopted by the University is far better.

- (10) It was informed that as per the authorization given by the Syndicate dated 30.08.2015 (Para 28), the reports of examiners of certain candidates on the theses, including viva-voce reports, for the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) were approved and they were awarded the Ph.D. degrees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had the meeting in the absence of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath. He hoped to commemorate his long service. They would carry forward this project as Shri Ashok Goyal has agreed to work on it.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR