

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 30th August 2015 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice-Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
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. Professor Navdeep Goyal
10. Principal (Mrs.) Parveen Kaur Chawla
11. Professor Rajesh Gill
12. Professor Ronki Ram
13. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
14. Professor Yog Raj Angrish
15. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) Registrar ... (Secretary)

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, Shri Naresh Gaur, Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

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

1. Mrs. Manjeet Kaur, spouse of Principal Jaspal Singh, Fellow, Panjab University, on August 7, 2015;
2. A P.U. alumna and Eminent Scientist Professor S.S. Bir, F.N.A., father of Professor Upinder Sawhney of Department of Economics, on August 25, 2015. Dr. Bir was the founder Head of the Department of Botany and Emeritus Professor at Punjabi University, Patiala. Earlier, he also served as a Faculty member at P.U. Campus, Chandigarh;
3. Dr. Rajinderjit Kaur Dhindsa on July 28, 2015. She was Patron Member and Member of Executive Council of P.U. Alumni Association. She had superannuated as Principal from Guru Nanak Khalsa College for Women, Sang Dhesian, Jalandhar; and
4. Shri Hoshiar Singh ji, father-in-law of Professor Nandita Singh, Dean of Student Welfare (Women) and Fellow, Panjab University, on August 11, 2015."

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Mrs. Manjeet Kaur, Professor S.S. Bir, Dr. Rajinderjit Kaur Dhindsa and Shri Hoshiar Singh ji and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- (1) Panjab University Institute of Social Sciences Education and Research (Panjab University-ISSER), was inaugurated by Shri Vijay Dev, IAS, Advisor to the Administrator, UT, Chandigarh at Guru Teg Bahadur Bhawan on August 11, 2015;
- (2) Recipient of Panjab University Vigyan Rattan Award and P.U. alumnus, Dr. Girish Sahni, Director, CSIR-Institute of Microbial Technology (IMTECH), Chandigarh, has been appointed Director General (DG) of Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), New Delhi. He did his graduation (1973-76) and postgraduation (1976-78) from the Department of Microbiology, Panjab University;
- (3) University Grant Commission has approved the establishment of Dean Dayal Upadhyay Kaushal Kendra at Dev Samaj Postgraduate College for Women at Ferozepur City to start the vocational courses, viz. B.Voc. in (i) Global Professionals in Beauty and Aesthetics, (ii) Textile & Fashion Technology, and (iii) Hospital Administration and Management with an intake of 50 (Each Programme) and total approved grant of Rs.4.65 crores for a period of two years.

University Grant Commission has also approved the establishment of Deen Dayal Upadhyay Kaushal Kendra at G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector 32, Chandigarh, to start the vocational courses, viz., B.Voc. & M.Voc. in (i) Agri Business and Agarian Entrepreneurship, (ii) Fashion Technology & Apparel Design, and (iii) Hardware Networking with an intake of 50 (Each Programme) and total approved grant of Rs.4.65 crores for a period of two years.

- (4) Dr. SSB University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology (Dr. SSBUICT) has been honoured with the 'Outstanding Engineering Institute in North India' in recognition of leadership; development, marketing an institute and industry interface. Professor Meenakshi Goyal, Chairperson, Dr. SSBUICT, received the award in person at a function in Mumbai.
- (5) A team from Dr. SSBUICT led by Professor Seema Kapoor has bagged 1st Prize of Rs.1 lakh for its project "Amal-Vari" from Enactus Uniliver Special Competition under the Uniliver Sustainability Living Plan Criteria. Enactus is an international non-profit organization which works with leaders in business and higher education in 36 countries and over 1600 universities to create sustainable change for societal benefit using entrepreneurial approach. The team has further received Enactus Blue Dart Empowering Competition grant of Rs.40,000/-, Enactus Mahindra Rise Special Competition grant of Rs.40,000/- and Semifinalist trophy from teams representing renowned Engineering, Commerce and Management Schools. Professor Seema Kapoor has also received 'Best Enactus Faculty

Leadership Award of Rs.15000/- for the professional and personal development of Enactus students; and

- (6) Shri Ravneet Singh, Member Parliament, Ludhiana, has sanctioned a grant of Rs.5 lakhs for construction of Hall/Canteen at Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under MPLAD Scheme.”

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in the previous meeting of the Syndicate he had proposed that all those persons/Institutes, who/which had made achievements as far as GGSD College, Sector 32, Chandigarh and Dev Samaj Postgraduate College for Women, Ferozepur City are concerned, should be congratulated/felicitated. After discussing the issue, it was decided that congratulatory/felicitations letters should be written to these Colleges, but he did not know whether it had been done or not. Anyway, he is happy that now it has become a part of the agenda.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the process for inspection of certain Colleges has been delayed by the University. He added that a College has been inspected and some others are yet to be inspected by the University for grant of affiliation. He suggested that the Colleges which are yet to be inspected and also those which have been inspected, but affiliation to them is yet to be granted, should be given 15-20 days time to make the admissions for the session 2015-16. 31st August being the last date for admission, these Colleges should be given at least three weeks time to make the admission.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that 15 days additional time to these Colleges for making the admissions would serve the purpose.

Professor Navdeep Goyal endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Principal Gurdip Sharma.

It was informed that 4-5 cases of Colleges namely Bajaj College, Halwara College, Syon College, Samadh Bhai College, Nightingale College and Sai College, for grant of affiliation are under process and the process for the same would be completed soon.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that the period for which the last date for admission is to be extended, for the same period the last date for submission of returns should also be extended.

Principal Sanjeev Arora, endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. I.S. Sandhu, suggested that along with the extension in last date for admission, the last date for submission of returns and examination forms should also be extended.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there are different dates for admission, including the last date for admission with late fee with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor, which is 31st August. He has suggested grant of 3 weeks time to the Colleges, the cases of which for grant of affiliation are under consideration and the same was only to give special permission which is within the power of the Syndicate to allow admission without late fee. They had been extending the last date for admission with late fee with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor and it is not for the first time that they are extending the last date for admission with late fee with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor and the returns have been coming to the University in time. But as Principals if they are feeling certain difficulties, the last

date for submission of returns in the case of those Colleges, which are to be given 15-20 days more time to make admission, should be extended, but not in the case of other Colleges. He added that the Colleges could also submit supplementary returns. He therefore, pleaded that the last date for submission of returns of students should not be extended; otherwise, they would be violating the Regulations, which is not within the power of the Syndicate. As per Regulations, all the Colleges are supposed to submit the returns of the students and the teachers in the month of July/August or as decided by the Syndicate from time to time. Unfortunately, no College had been submitting the returns even up to the month of December, what to talk of July/August, maybe because they have yet to appoint teachers. He felt that the Colleges should be asked to submit the returns, including of the teachers who are in position at that time, within the date stipulated in the Regulations and if there is any change, the same should be intimated later on. What is happening is that there are certain exceptional Colleges, which did not submit their returns in the University at all and always say that they would appoint the teachers and submit the returns. He added that the teachers from such Colleges are appointed examiners, evaluators, etc., who are not even approved by the University and their returns have never been sent to the University. After years, when the issue is raised, the Colleges say that the University has never objected to the continuation of those teachers. How could the University say that they are not approved teachers? To take care of this problem, he suggested that they must try to follow the provisions of the Calendar in letter and spirit.

It was informed that GHG Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar and DAV College, Sector1-10, Chandigarh have got B.Voc. courses. They should also be included in list of Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City and GGSDS College, Sector-32, Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor agreed to this.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Dr. Girish Sahni, Recipient of Panjab University Vigyan Rattan Award & P.U. alumnus and Director, CSIR-Institute of Microbial Technology (IMTECH), Chandigarh, on his appointment as Director General (DG) of Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), New Delhi;
 - (ii) Dev Samaj Postgraduate College for Women at Ferozepur City on being approved for the establishment of Dean Dayal Upadhyay Kaushal Kendra to start the vocational courses, viz. B.Voc. in (i) Global Professionals in Beauty and Aesthetics, (ii) Textile & Fashion Technology, and (iii) Hospital Administration and Management with an intake of 50 (Each Programme) along with a total grant of Rs.4.65 crores for a period of two years;

- (iii) G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector-32, Chandigarh, on being approved for the establishment of Dean Dayal Upadhyay Kaushal Kendra to start the vocational courses, viz., B.Voc. & M.Voc. in (i) Agri Business and Agarian Entrepreneurship, (ii) Fashion Technology & Apparel Design, and (iii) Hardware Networking with an intake of 50 (Each Programme) along with a total grant of Rs.4.65 crores for a period of two years.
- (iv) GHG Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar for getting B.Voc. Degree Courses in (i) Food Processing and Quality Management and (ii) Medical Lab Technology along with a grant of Rs.1.7 crore from UGC.
- (v) DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh for getting B.Voc. Degree Courses in (i) Food Science and Technology and (ii) Medical Lab Technology along with a grant of Rs.1.7 crore from UGC.
- (vi) Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology (Dr. SSBUI CET) on being honoured with the 'Outstanding Engineering Institute in North India' in recognition of leadership; development, marketing an institute and industry interface;
- (vii) The team of Dr. SSBUI CET led by Professor Seema Kapoor for winning 1st Prize amounting to Rs.1 lakh for its project "Amal-Vari" from Enactus Uniliver Special Competition under the Uniliver Sustainability Living Plan Criteria.

(2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. Nos. (1), (2), (4), (5) and (6), be noted and approved; and

(3) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 31.05.2015, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Appointment of Deputy Registrars

2(i). Considered minutes dated 05.08.2015 to 08.08.2015 of the Selection Committee for appointment of Deputy Registrars-6 (General-5, SC-1)(1 at PUSSGRC Hoshiarpur and 5 at Chandigarh) (Advt. No.1/2013), Panjab University, Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that this matter, as they knew, at the moment is under the consideration of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and the High Court has ordered that the appointments should not be finalized till the matter is heard. The Court has sought some clarifications from the Registrar, which would be provided by the Registrar on the next date of hearing. The appointing authority of the Deputy Registrars is the Senate, which would happen at the end of September and before that one more meeting of the Syndicate would

be convened. So he leaves it to them whether they wished to consider it today or in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Jarnail Singh opined that that they should honour the verdict of the High Court and this matter ought not be considered today.

Majority of the members endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Jarnail Singh.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that without discussing this item, he wished to state that the Court has sought certain clarifications from the Registrar and it is the sole responsibility of the Registrar to clarify the position to the Court. However, the Syndicate has not been taken into confidence as to what are the proceedings which are under process in the Court, what is the case which has been filed by Panjab University Staff Association (PUSA) and what was the response of the University. At least, he as a member of the Syndicate does not know anything more than what has been reported in the media. Would the Vice-Chancellor like to inform the Syndicate as to what has happened and what is actually in the Court and why the Court has ordered that the appointments should not be finalized.

The Vice-Chancellor read out the orders of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, which reads as under:

“Record of the applications received by the University, in response to the corrigendum to advertisement No. 1 of 2013 (Annexure P-11), be produced on 1.9. 2015. Till then the selection to the posts of the Deputy Registrar shall not be finalized.

The Registrar of the respondent University shall also remain present in Court, to answer, as to how he has, in paragraph 7 of his written statement, stated that those who had applied in response to advertisement No. 1 of 2013, are not required to apply afresh, because in the corrigendum issued on 19.02.2013 (Annexure P-11), it is very clearly stated that all candidates shall be required to apply afresh.

A copy of this order be given to learned counsel for the respondent-university, under the signatures of the Bench Secretary of this Court.”

What was stated in the corrigendum is that only those candidates have to apply afresh, who were not eligible in accordance with the earlier advertisement, but have become eligible because of the slight change(s) in the qualifications.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that but the order of the Court says something else.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever transpired in the Court hearings, something from that is missing in the order.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant the Registrar has not made any wrong statement.

The Vice-Chancellor reiterated that in accordance with the corrigendum, only those candidates were to apply who had become

eligible in view of the slight change(s) in the qualifications and those who had become ineligible due to such change(s) could seek refund of the fee paid by them. At one place, an earlier prescribed experience of five years was brought down to four years and was made specific to Class-I posts, i.e., Superintendent or above. The spirit of corrigendum was that they should assert that they are eligible for these posts now. Certain people asserted that they are eligible and applied afresh. They have to supply all such things to the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they (media) had reported only the orders of the Court. According to him (Vice-Chancellor), the order of the Court might have been misinterpreted from the view of the Court, for which they need to go to Court to clarify. But his suggestion is that before clarifying the position in the Court, they should be on very very strong footing so that it does not embarrass the University any more.

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

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though they are not discussing the issue, he did not know what is the stand of the University in the Court because the Syndicate has taken the decision in its previous meeting that the interviews for the posts of Deputy Registrars would not be conducted as per the schedule and to his understanding, which could be wrong, the Vice-Chancellor had assured that he would get the facts checked and clarify the position in the next meeting of the Syndicate. But thereafter they got an e-mail wherein the complete chronology of events was explained as to how many posts are sanctioned in the Budget, how many have been advertised and certain other interpretations, though he would discuss the same later. Has the University taken a stand that it is wrong to say that the Syndicate had not approved the qualifications because the Syndicate was of the view that it has not approved the qualifications advertised for the posts of Deputy Registrars?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not allow the discussion on this issue at the moment.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item, be deferred till the order of the Court.

Appointment of Assistant Professors in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 13.08.2015 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professor-2 (General-1, SC-1) (Advt. No. 4/2015) in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Assistant Professors (General-1, SC-1) in the Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh on one year's probation, in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Saifur Rahman (General)
2. Mr. Nitin Raj (SC).

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

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

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

Appointment of Associate Professors in the Department of Mathematics

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 20.08.2015 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor-2 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

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

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

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

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. A summary bio-data of the selected candidate enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidate fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Mathematics) Stage-4 to Professor (Mathematics) Stage-5 at University Institute of Engineering & Technology

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 20.08.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Mathematics) Stage-4 to Professor (Mathematics) Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vinay Kanwar be promoted from Associate Professor (Mathematics) Stage-4 to Professor (Mathematics) Stage-5 at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab

University, Chandigarh, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **11.01.2015** in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to 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 second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letters of appointments to the persons appointed under Items **C-2(ii)**, **C-2(iii)** and promoted under **Item C-2(iv)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Recommendations of Board of Finance dated 17.08.2015

- 3.** Considered the following recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 17.08.2015 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19):
Item 1

That the Revised Estimates (Non-Plan), Sports and Hostel Fund for 2015-2016 be approved as below:

(FIGURES IN LAC OF RUPEES)

	Particulars	Actuals	Estimates for the Current year 2015-2016	
		2014-2015	Original	Revised
A	Revenue Receipts (Non-Plan)	18105.01	17051.78	19092.28
	(Sports)			187.85
	(Hostels)			681.25
	Total Revenue			19961.38
B	Expenditure			
	(Employee Cost (Non-Plan)	34103.01	41653.00	39694.37
	Other Expenditure (Non-Plan)	5603.63	6701.04	7183.93
	Sports			295.00
	Hostels			644.00
	Total Expenditure			47817.30
C	Deficit (Non-Plan) (A-B)	21601.63	31302.26	27855.92

- NOTE:**
1. The detail of budget heads where revision is proposed (upward/ downward) is enclosed herewith as **Appendix – I (P – 1 to 17)**.
 2. The provision under the budget head ‘Salaries’ has been revised taking into account the liability of enhancement in the rate of D.A. @ 7% w.e.f. 01.01.2015 which is yet to be released, expected enhancement of D.A. w.e.f. 1.7.2015, annual increments, promotional benefits, appointments made during the last financial year and the tentative liability of post expected to be filled in current financial year.

Sr. No.	Heads of Expenditure	Actuals		2015-2016			%
		2013-2014	2014-2015	Original Estimates 2015-16	Actuals up to 01.04.2015 to 31.07.2015	Revised Estimates 2015-16	
1	*Salaries	23651.11	26069.75	32956.80	8636.49	30169.55	64.36
2	Retirement Benefit	5586.11	7640.86	8265.00	2650.04	9025.82	19.25
3	Medical Assistance/ medicines	346.98	361.37	332.20	152.76	400.00	0.85
4	Leave Travel Concession/ Home Town Concession	108.15	31.03	99.00	0.63	99.00	0.21
5	Books & Journals, Publications etc.	374.44	610.38	661.21	8.07	653.63	1.39
6	Teaching & Research Aids and Other outreach activities	317.00	188.32	340.63	21.59	346.60	0.74
7	Scholarships/ Fellowship/Subsidy/ Contribution etc.	151.41	216.68	417.74	59.45	404.22	0.86
8	New Academic Programme, NAAC Fee, Registration Fee etc.	9.28	20.39	34.39	2.73	35.25	0.08
9	Conducting Examinations (except Salary Components)	2198.54	2590.08	2947.25	1389.78	3186.11	6.80
10	Office & other General Administration expenditure	474.50	425.65	550.76	112.89	599.44	1.28
11	Electricity & Water Charges	440.01	850.70	777.61	233.51	957.12	2.04
12	Running, Repair & Maintenance of equipments and vehicles etc.	230.24	169.15	284.00	35.02	298.79	0.64
13	Annual Repair, Maintenance & Minor Improvements (Civil, Electrical, Public health etc.)	352.55	417.52	479.94	81.99	461.93	0.99
14	Other Lumpsum , Non-Recurring & Stale Cheques/Refund	222.12	114.76	207.51	82.73	240.84	0.51
	Total:	34462.44	39706.64	48354.04	13467.68	46878.30	100.00

Item 2

That the sanction of funds for various works as below, be approved:

Sr. No.	Name of the Proposal	Estimated Amount	Source
1	Providing & Fixing Paver Block on Foot Path in Front of A.C. Joshi Library Appendix - II (P-18 to 19)	4,37,500	Estate Fund
2	Construction of Security Post & provision of New Entrance Gate at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana Appendix-III (P- 20 to 27)	11,19,000	Estate Fund
3	Raising of Boundary Wall from the building of UIET up to the Main Gate near Dental Institute towards Sector -38, P.U. South Campus Appendix - IV (P- 28 to 30)	14,78,000	Estate Fund

4	Creation of Footpath along the road from entrance gate opposite Sector -14 to Girls Hostel No.8 in P.U. South Campus, Sector -25, Chd. Appendix - V (P- 31 - 32)	11,81,500	Estate Fund
5	Renovation of Law Auditorium of P.U, Chandigarh Appendix - VI (P- 33 to 42)	38,64,000	Estate Fund
6	Estimate for extension of Scooter parking near Entrance Gate No.1 towards Arts Block -I, P.U. Chd. Appendix - VII (P- 43 -44)	12,45,000	Estate Fund
7	Estimate for provision of Police Post in P.U. South Campus Appendix -VIII (P- 45 - 46)	9,25,000	Estate Fund
8	Purchase of Non-Consumable Items for University Instt. of Engg. & Technology (UIET) Appendix - IX (P- 47)	16,00,000	Development Fund
9	Purchase of Furniture for New Faculty & Staff Members (UIET) Appendix - X (P- 48)	12,82,000	Development Fund
10	Digitization of thesis, manuscripts and rare books Appendix - XI (P- 49 to 51)	35,00,000	Development Fund
11	Estimate for Setting up of Basic Office & Purchase of Furniture for Newly introduced 5 years Integrated (Hons. School) Programme in Social Sciences (PU- ISSER) Appendix - XII (P- 52)	7,68,874	Development Fund
12	Purchase of Computers, Printers, UPS, CCTV Cameras & DVR System for Monitoring & Security purposes for Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences Appendix - XIII (P-53 to 54)	8,39,000	Development Fund
13	Renovation of Syndicate Room, P.U. Admn. Block Appendix - XIV (P- 55 to 57)	5,46,670	Development Fund
14	Renovation of Research Labs of Chemistry Department Appendix - XV (P- 58 to 63)	12,09,200	Development Fund
15	<i>Purchase of Furniture/Fixtures (mattress, curtains, bed sheets, pillows, towels, bathroom articles, TV's, LCD's, Geezers, Emergency Lights, Pantry Items, Water Coolers, Water Purifiers, Oven's etc.) for Youth Hostel</i> Appendix - XVI (P- 64)	3,00,000	Youth Welfare Fund
16	Provision for payment of two Welfare Officers (Male & Female) @ Rs.15000/- p.m. (fixed on contract basis) under budget head 'Contractual Services' for Youth Welfare Department Appendix - XVII (P- 65 to 67)	3,60,000 (p.a.)	Youth Welfare Fund
17	Renovation/Addition/Alteration of Student Holiday Home Building at Dalhousie Appendix-XVIII (P- 68 to 75)	39,75,000	Student Holiday Home Fund

Item 3

That the benefit of diet allowance of Rs.20/- per day be granted to Multipurpose Health Workers, Female-3 and Sister Nurse-1 working in the Bhai Ghanayaji Health Centre, Panjab University Chandigarh in terms of Punjab Govt. Notification No. 4/12/2011-4Hlth.5/3154, dated 02.12.2011 and 1/28/09-2Hlth.4/3614, dated 14.12.2011 issued by Health & Family Welfare Department **Appendix-XIX (P-76 to 77)** already adopted by the Panjab University regarding the payment of Uniform Allowance w.e.f. 22.12.2012 (the date on which the Senate has already approved the recommendations of the BOF/Syndicate dated 17.10.2012 & 4.11.2012) as per the terms & conditions of such notification.

**Additional Financial Liabilities: Rs.29,200/- p.a.
(approx.)**

NOTE: On the recommendation of BOF/Syndicate dated 17.10.2012/ 04.11.2012, the Senate in its meeting dated 22.12.2012 has approved the uniform allowance to the Multipurpose Health Workers working in the P.U. Health Centre Appendix – **XX (P – 78)**.

The matter regarding benefit of diet allowance of Rs.20/- per day to the Multipurpose Health Workers has never been considered by the University. Now, the effected employees have requested for grant them diet allowance on the basis of said notifications as the Punjab Govt. has already granted the same benefit to their employees.

Item 4

That the minimum rates of Stipend for Apprentice Trainees from Rs.2530/- p.m. to Rs.3542/- p.m. (each) be revised as per sanctioned strength in the following departments of the University in terms of Notification dated 23.12.2014 issued by Govt. of India **Appendix-XXI (P-79)** w.e.f. date of approval of BOF/Syndicate/Senate:

Sr. No.	Name of Department/Library	Sanctioned Strength	Filled
1.	A.C. Joshi Library, P.U.	05	03
2.	Architect Office, P.U.	04	03
3.	P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana	02	..
4.	Computer Centre, P.U.	03	..

Additional Financial Liability : Rs.72,900/- p.a. (approx)

NOTE: The Ministry of Labour and Employment vide its Notification dated 19.12.2014 has enhanced the rates of Apprentice Trainees to Rs.3542/- p.m.

The Director & Regional Centre Apprenticeship Advisor, Board of Apprenticeship Training (Northern Region) Kanpur vide his letter No.BT/Circular-1/11559-14059 dated 21.01.2015 has communicated to all the Heads of Engg. College/Polytechnic/Vocational Institutions in Northern Region on the basis of Govt. of India Notification **Appendix-XXII (P-80)** regarding the revision in the rates of Apprentice Trainees.

Item 5

That new provision of Rs.1,80,000/- (Recurring) out of the Amalgamated Fund Account under budget head 'Fuel/Maintenance of Buses' under the Dean Student Welfare to run two AC Buses for transportation of scholars and students of Panjab University Departments to avail research facilities in different institution under Chandigarh Region Innovation & Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) from the session 2015-16 be created.

Financial Liability: Rs.1,80,000/-p.a. (approx)

NOTE: The Coordinator, CRIKC has requested to make provision for fuel & maintenance expenses for two AC buses (already purchased by the University) under the office of Dean Student Welfare for transportation of Panjab University scholars and students to different Chandigarh Region Innovation & Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) Institutes. This would enable to commuters to make use of available research facilities in different institutions.

As per Clause 3 (xxxix) of P.U. Cal. Volume – III (2009), Page -307 the Amalgamated Fund can be utilized for objects connected with students activities of an educational character.

Item 6

That the existing one vacant post of Associate Professor in the pay-band of Rs.37400-67000 + GP 9000 be converted to that of Assistant Professor in the pay-band of Rs.15600 – 39100 + GP 6000 for teaching B.Ed and M.Ed (Special Education with Specialization in Learning Disabilities) to meet the requirement of Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI), New Delhi.

Item 7

That the following budget provisions for newly established PU-ISSER (Panjab University - Institute of Social Sciences Education & Research) from the financial year 2015-16 be created **Appendix-XXV (P-84)**.

Sr. No.	Budget Head	Proposed Budget
1.	Office & General Expenses	1,00,000
2.	Books, Journal, Magazine, Subscriptions, Software/Spectrum Licenses, etc.	15,000
3.	Running, Repair & Maintenance of equipment etc.	10,000
4.	Seminar/Symposia/Workshop/Special Lecture	20,000
	Total	1,45,000

Financial Liabilities : Rs.1,45,000/- p.a. (approx.)

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.07.2015 (Agenda Item No. 48) has resolved that the five year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences at PU-Institute of Social Sciences Education and Research (PU-ISSER) be introduced w.e.f. the session 2015-16. The Minutes of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.07.2015 are yet to be released/finalized **Appendix-XXVI (P- 85)**.

Item 8

That the following Deputy Librarians (Sr. No. 1 to 6) be placed at the stage of Rs.14940/- in the pay-scale of Rs.12000-18300 (Selection Grade) who had completed 5 years service in the said scale under CAS of UGC w.e.f. the date as noted against each and the payment of arrears may also be made in favour of the nominee (Sr. No. 2 to 6) of the concerned employees as mentioned against each.

Sr. No.	Name of employee/ Designation/Deptt.	Name of nominee	Date of placement in Selection Grade/ drawing Basic pay	Completion of 5 years service in the scale of Rs. 12000-18300(S.G.)	Earlier date of placement at the stage of Rs.14940/- as per conditions in CAS (adopted by the PU w.e.f. 27.7.1998)	Revised date of placement at the stage of Rs. 14940/- as per directions of the Hon'ble Court
1.	Dr. Rashmi Yadav, Deputy Librarian, AC Joshi Library, PU	Self	2.4.1993	2.4.1998	27.7.1998	2.4.1998
2.	Late (Mrs.) Maninder Kaur Bhatia, Deputy Librarian (Retd.),	Dr. Y.S. Bhati (Husband)	1.3.1989	1.3.1994	27.7.1998	1.1.1996

	Deptt. of Gandhian Studies, PU					
3.	Late Sh. Tilak Raj Bajaj, Deputy Librarian (Retd.), AC Joshi Library, PU	Mrs. Shail Bajaj (Wife)	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	27.7.1998	1.1.1996
4.	Late Sh. Jaspal Singh, Deputy Librarian (Retd.), PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana	Mrs. Harpreet Kaur (Wife)	1.3.1992	1.3.1997	27.7.1998	1.3.1997
5.	Late Sh. Shamshad Husain Khan, Deputy Librarian (Retd), PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana	Mrs. Farhat Khan (Wife)	1.1.1986	1.1.1991	--	1.1.1996
6.	Late Sh. Kulwant Singh, Deputy Librarian (Retd.), AC Joshi Library, PU	Mrs. Khushwant Kaur (Wife)	3.6.1991	3.6.1996	--	3.6.1996

Financial Liabilities : Rs.9.00 lac p.a. (approx.)

NOTE: (i) An office note/ brief history of the case available as **Appendix-XXVII (P- 86 to 87)**.

(ii) Earlier the Board of Finance/ Syndicate/Senate in its meeting dated 11.12.2014/25.01.2015/ 29.03.2015 has granted the similar benefits to the retired Deputy Librarians/Petitioners as per decisions of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana in the CWP No. 5019 of 2012, w.e.f. 01.01.1996 **Appendix-XXVIII (P-88 to 91)**.

Item 9

That the cases of LTC of employees in whose case the LTC travel was sanctioned by the Controlling Officer before the issue of Panjab University Circular No.5950/FDO dated 26.12.2014 whereby LTC facility was suspended for the financial year 2014-15 be allowed **Appendix- XXIX (P- 92 to 93)**.

Financial Liabilities : Rs.2,70,877/- (Approx)

NOTE: (i) In terms of Govt. of India Notification No.7(I)/E.Coord./ 2014 dated 29.10.2014 as well as Punjab Govt. Notification No. 8/1/2014-5-Fin/326017/1 dated 16.10.2014 **Appendix-XXX (P-94 to 99) & XXXI (P-100 to 103)**, the Panjab University had taken the decision that the benefit of LTC shall not be allowed in the financial year 2014-15 except in cases where LTC travel has already been sanctioned by the competent authority which was circulated to all the

departments vide letter No. 5950/FDO dated 26.12.2014.

- (ii) The following employees of Panjab University have already obtained prior permission from their controlling officer/competent authority for availing the LTC before issue of University Notification for the same vide letter No. 5950/FDO dated 26.12.2014 and therefore their claim for LTC was covered under the above Circular:

Sr. No.	Name of Employee	Date of Journey	Amount of LTC (Rs.)
1.	Dr. Ashwani Sharma	02.01.2015 to 08.1.2015	58,124.00
2.	Dr. Suruchi Aditya	24.3.2015 to 30.3.2015	1,14,324.00
3.	Sh. Uttam Chand	01.1.2015 to 11.1.2015	33,069.00
4.	Dr. Surbhi Goel	29.12.2014 to 25.1.2015	43,915.00
5.	Dr. Sonal Singhal	27.12.2014 to 2.1.2015	21,445.00
TOTAL			2,70,877.00

- (iii) The Resident Audit Officer has not admitted the LTC claim of above said employees with the observation that whenever decision regarding withdrawal of LTC is taken, it is made effective from the date of issue of the letter in this regard. Moreover, it creates discrimination when an employee who has applied and sanctioned LTC in respect of the journey for the period between 26.12.2014 to 31.03.2015 and another employee who had applied before 26.12.2014 and was not sanctioned LTC in respect of the journey for the period between 26.12.2014 to 31.03.2015. This also creates a discrimination whereby an employee is not allowed LTC and another is allowed in respect of the journey for the period between 26.12.2014 to 31.03.2015 only on the basis that an employee has already got it sanctioned and another has not applied and got sanctioned before 26.12.2014.

- (iv) In this context the office has clarified that whenever a cutoff date is fixed, there shall always be such a situation where an employee who would have availed the LTC benefit before the cutoff date, will be in an advantageous position, as compared to those who could not avail LTC benefit before such cutoff date. The so called discrimination, would be there, even if, the

cutoff date is fixed at 26.12.2014 without giving any relaxation to employees who have got sanctioned LTC before such date. Because, in that case also, there might be discrimination among the employees who could not avail LTC travel before that date vis-à-vis the employees who had availed LTC before the issue of such circular.

Item 10

That the following recommendations of the Committee for providing financial assistance/grant/ subsidy to the re-employed teachers of the University for attending conferences/workshops/symposiums, etc. within Indian and abroad **Appendix-XXXII (P-104 to 106)** and enhancement of existing budget provision from Rs.21.00 lacs to Rs.24.00 lacs under the budget head 'Impetus to Research' sub head 'Subsidy for Education Conferences' within India be approved:

- i) That re-employed teachers of the University may be provided financial assistance/grant subsidy up to Rs.25,000/- for delivering invited lectures in international conferences abroad once in five years out of budget head 'Travel' under the General Development Assistance of UGC. However, before implementing this, a clarification may be sought from the UGC as to whether the reimbursement of expenditure on travel to the re-employed teachers out of above budget head is admissible.
- ii) That the re-employed teachers may be provided subsidy up to Rs.20,000/- once in two years subject to a maximum of twice in five years during the period of re-employment for meeting expenses on TA/DA etc. for presenting paper and delivering invited lectures in national conferences within India out of major head 'Impetus to Research' sub-head 'subsidy for attending conferences by University teachers within India' and existing provision may also be enhanced from Rs.21.00 lacs to Rs.24.00 lacs for meeting the additional expenditure for the purpose.
- iii) However, wherever there is a provision of funds available with the department under the SAP, CAS, DRS programmes funded by the UGC, the re-employed teachers may be allowed to attend conferences within India and the expenses incurred for the purpose may be paid out of the available funds with the department under such grants.

Item 11

That:

1. those Library Restorers who had been promoted provisionally as Semi Professional Assistant but could not acquire the required qualification for such promotion, their promotion be postponed by two years as per the original recommendation of the Committee dated 19.10.2010.

2. the original clause recommended by the Committee in its meeting 19.10.2010 be implemented as below:
- i) The Library Restorer who has matriculation with one year certificate/ diploma in Library Science will become eligible for promotion as Semi Professional Assistant in the pay scale of Rs.5910-20200+GP-3000 on completion of 6 years of regular service as Library Restorer.
 - ii) The Library Restorer not possessing the minimum qualifications prescribed as at Sr. No. 1 above will become eligible for placement as Semi Professional Assistant in the pay scale of Semi Professional Assistant (without designation) on completion of 8 years of regular service as Library Restorer.

Item 12

Noted and ratified the decision of the Syndicate vide Paragraph-44, dated 8.3.2015 **Appendix-XXXVIII (P-114 to 115)** that the payment of Rs.11,56,234/- (an amount equivalent to last pay which would have been drawn till his normal date of superannuation at the age of 60 years) be made to Dr. (Mrs.) Amrit Tewari W/o Late Shri V.N. Tewari, Professor, School of Punjabi Studies, (who was killed in terrorist action on 03.04.1984), as special family pension, as a welfare measure, out of the budget head 'Salary of the University School of Open Learning'.

Financial Liabilities: Rs. 11,56,234/- (approx.)

- NOTE:** 1. In pursuance of Punjab Govt. Notification No.9/7/85-6GE/16530 dated 14.07.1987 **Appendix-XXXIX (P-116)** issued by the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms in partial modification of Govt. instruction issued vide letter No.9/7/85-6EG/898-99, dated 20.01.1987 granted the following financial benefits namely:
- (i) Special Ex-gratia grant of Rs.50,000/- (Rs. Fifty Thousand only) including the Ex-gratia grant admissible in accordance with the provisions of Rule 2.7 of the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume II.
 - (ii) Special family pension equal to the last pay drawn till the date of superannuation and thereafter normally family pension as admissible under the rules.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.10.1992 (Para 13) **Appendix-XL (P-117)** resolved as under:

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

Further, resolved that, for future, instructions as issued by the Punjab Govt. from time to time, be adopted automatically for grant of financial assistance to the families of University employees killed in terrorist action.

3. In term of the above decision of Syndicate and office order was issued vide No.728/Estt. I dated 19.03.1993 that Dr. (Mrs.) Amrit Tewari W/o Late Professor V.N. Tewari, School of Punjabi Studies who was killed in terrorist action on 03.04.1984 was sanctioned special family pension, on the basis of last pay which was to be drawn by late Professor Tewari till 31.03.1996 i.e. the date of his superannuation **Appendix-XLI (P-118)**.

Item 15

Noted and ratified the following correction in the decision of Board of Finance dated 06.02.2014, Agenda Item No. 21 (B-II) approved by the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation approval of Board of Finance **Appendix-LII (P-142 to 143)**.

“The date 24.03.2013 as appearing in resolved part of Agenda Item No.21(B-II) of Board of Finance dated 06.02.2014 be read as 24.03.2003”

Item 16

That the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor for sanctioning of revised honorarium including transportation charges to the following officers as mentioned against each w.e.f. 6.4.2015, be approved:

Sr. No.	Designation	Existing Honorarium (p.m.)	Revised Honorarium (p.m.)
1	Dean University Instructions	Rs.2000/-	Rs.5000/-
2	Dean Research	Rs.2000/-	Rs.4000/-
3	Dean Students Welfare (Men & Women)	Rs.2000/-	Rs.3500/- each
4	Dean International Students	Rs.2000/-	Rs.3000/-
5	Dean Alumni Relations	Rs.2000/-	Rs.3000/-
6	Wardens	Rs.1000/-	Rs.2500/- each
7	Advisor & Secretary to Vice-Chancellor	NIL	Rs.3000/-

8	N.S.S. Programme Coordinator	NIL	Rs.2500/-
9	Chief of University Security	NIL	Rs.2500/-
10	Director (IQAC)	NIL	Rs.3500/-
11	Associate Director/Secretary (IQAC)	NIL	Rs.2500/-

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate vide Para 9 dated 25.1.2015 has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to decide the quantum of honorarium including transportation charges to be paid to Dean of University Instruction, Dean Students Welfare (Men & Women), Dean Research, Dean International Students, Dean Alumni Relations, Wardens, A.S.V.C., N.S.S. Programme Coordinator, Chief of University Security and Director Sports.
 2. The Vice-Chancellor has approved the honorarium as above vide Office order Nos.3287-99/Estt.I dated 17.4.2015 and No.11579-89/ Estt. dated 2.6.2015.

Item 17

The Audited Annual General Statements of the following accounts for the year 2014-15, be approved **Appendix-LIII (P-144 to 197)**.

Sr. No.	Name of Fund	Page No. of Appendix
1.	Non Plan Account	144
2.	Plans/Schemes/Projects (UGC) Account	145-146
3.	Plans/Schemes/Projects (Other than UGC) Account	147-149
4.	Infrastructure Development Account	150
5.	Resource Mobilization Account	151
6.	Depreciation Fund Account	152
7.	Provident Fund Account	153
8.	General Provident Account	154
9.	Pension Corpus Fund Account	155-156
10.	Special Endowment Trust Fund Account	157-160
11.	Teachers Holiday Home Fund Account	161
12.	Youth Welfare Fund Account	162-163
13.	Students' Holiday Home Fund Account	164-165
14.	Estate Fund Account	166
15.	Building & Infrastructure Account	167
16.	Foundation for Higher Education and Research Fund Account	168-169
17.	Revolving Fund Account of Publication Bureau	170
18.	Revolving Fund of Dean College Development Council	171-172
19.	Library Security Fund Account	173
20.	Student Aid Fund Account	174
21.	Student Scholarship Fund Account	175
22.	Placement Cell Account	176

23.	Development Fund Account	177
24.	Amalgamated Fund Account	178
25.	Students Medical Fund Account	179
26.	Library Development Fund Account	180
27.	Electricity & Water Charges Fund Account	181
28.	Dr. H.S. Judge Dental Institute Fund	182
29.	Merit-cum-Means Loan Subsidy Scheme Account	183
30.	Constituent Colleges	184-185
31.	Employees Welfare Scheme Account	186
32.	Foundation Day Memorial Fund Account	187
33.	UIAMS Examination Wing Fund Account	188-189
34.	Revolving Fund of IAS Coaching Centre Fund Account	190
35.	SAIF	191
36.	University Hostels Fund Account	192
37.	Sports Fund Account	193-194
38.	Revolving Fund Housing Account	195
39.	Revolving Fund Conveyance Account	196
40.	Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP) Fund Account	197

Item 18

That the honorarium of Technical Advisor (Elect.) Er. Param Hans Singh, Engineer-in-Chief (Retd.) be revised from Rs.3000/-p.m. to Rs.15000/-p.m. on par with Technical Advisor (Civil) **(Appendix-LIV, P-198)**.

Item 19

That the minimum salary at the Professor's level has to be Rs.43000/- on 01.01.2006 for directly inducted Professors in the scheme of VI Pay Commission.

NOTE: 1. The Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in its meeting held on 22.04.2015 considered the issue of pay fixation of Professor Deepak Kapur appointed by way of direct selection and made following recommendations:

- i) Pay of Professor Deepak Kapur be fixed by granting initial start of Rs.43000 + Grade Pay of Rs.10000/- + 5 increments (non-compounded) in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000.
- ii) Pay of other similarly situated employees may also be fixed accordingly.

2. The Vice-Chancellor approved the above recommendations of the Committee in principal with following two queries:
 - i) Please confirm explicitly that the fixation of Rs.50340 + Grade Pay of Rs.10000 is comparable to the last pay drawn by the new appointee.
 - ii) Do I have the authorization as Vice-Chancellor to approve and implement the above proposal?
3. The same Committee in its meeting held on 07.05.2015 examined the issue again in reference to the queries of the Vice-Chancellor and made following recommendations:
 - i) As per the recommendations of the Committee dated 22.04.2015, the pay of Dr. Kapur shall be fixed at Rs.50950 + Grade Pay Rs.10000 from the date of joining which is comparable to the last revised pay which would have been drawn by Dr. Kapur.
 - ii) Minutes of the Committee may be submitted before the Board of Finance for consideration and for making recommendation to the Syndicate/Senate for approval.
4. Minutes of the meeting dated 22.04.2015, 07.05.2015 and office note are enclosed as **Appendix – LVI (P- 202 to 210)**.
(Minutes of the Board of Finance dated 17.8.2015 enclosed).

Referring to Sub-Item No. 2, Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the renovation of the Senate Hall should also be done.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said a number of times, he had raised the issue that the Sadhu Ashram/Regional Centre at Hoshiarpur did not have any computer. Since the University is setting up IQAC, for which data is to be collected from the Departments, there should be connectivity with the Regional Centres. The University should make efforts to provide at least 4-5 computers to Sadhu Ashram so that they can do their department work and keep in touch with the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point raised by Dr. Dinesh Kumar is well taken. In fact, there is a proposal that we should set up video conferencing facility with the neighbouring universities. This is going to be a part of IQAC. It is also a part of the agenda of the State Higher Education Council of Punjab. It will help the University to get connected to all the Regional Centres and decentralize the administration. These things are in the pipeline and he had been

asked to make a presentation before the highest level officers of the Punjab Government and Secretary, Higher Education.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that nowadays at most of the International Level conferences, one is allowed to make presentation through video conferencing. Even one of his colleagues, who wanted to make a presentation through the video conferencing to a University in UK, had to go to another University for this purpose as the facility is not available here. He, therefore, suggested that a provision for video conferencing facility should be made.

Referring to Sub-Item No. 10, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it has been suggested in recommendation (i) that before implementing this, a clarification be sought from the UGC as to whether the reimbursement of expenditure on travel to the re-employed teachers out of the above budget head is admissible. He suggested that this condition should also be mentioned in recommendation (ii).

The Vice-Chancellor said that usually no reply is received from the UGC to such queries. If they did not provide such a support to the teachers, it would adversely affect their performance. Therefore, they should not wait for approval of the UGC.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even the UGC also supported the superannuated teachers. As such, the University support would not make much difference.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that since the teachers are being re-employed for a period of 5 years, which is a long duration, they must provide support to them at least for the domestic conferences.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that though he is not against providing the above said support to the re-employed teachers, if the audit raised any objection at a later stage, what would be their (University) reply.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish suggested that the item should be approved as recommended by the Board of Finance.

Referring to Sub-Item 11, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said on page 33 of the minutes of the Board of Finance, it has been mentioned in the resolved part that “taking a sympathetic view, the members unanimously resolved to recommend to the Syndicate that those Library Restorers who had been promoted ... 19.10.2010.” He suggested that the words “taking a sympathetic view” should be deleted from the minutes of the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Dr. Dinesh Kumar is well taken and the words “taking a sympathetic view” would be substituted by “taking a considered view”.

Referring to Sub-Item No. 15, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the remuneration payable to the guest faculty engaged by the IAS Coaching Centre has not been revised since long. He pleaded that the remuneration should be revised.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Dinesh Kumar to submit a note to him so that he could take necessary steps in this regard.

On a point made by Dr. Dinesh Kumar (Sub-Item 16) that they should bifurcate the honorarium including transportation charges without changing the total amount, it was clarified that since Central

Government has different kinds of allowance including Children Education Allowance, transport allowance, etc., they are not following the same and instead are following the Punjab pattern. If they follow the Central pattern, they have to change the total pattern.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that incidentally he had a chance to visit Shimla twice during the last month and he had observed that the building where the supporting staff members stay has been declared unsafe. A very good parking space has been provided wherein good living rooms could be created by making partition/s, which would entail very less expenditure.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that though there was a proposal for the stay of the drivers, the same did not materialize. He pleaded that a provision for the stay of the drivers should be made.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Registrar to take care of the points raised by Shri Jarnail Singh.

Referring to Sub-Item 18, Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that the hike in the honorarium of the Technical Advisor (Electricity) is to the tune of five times. What was the reason for not revising the same on regular basis?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue has been discussed at length and they needed the services of Er. Param Hans Singh as Technical Advisor (Electricity) very rigorously. Therefore, the proposed hike should be approved.

Referring to Sub-Item 19, the Vice-Chancellor said that they had not given even the initial pay of Rs.43,000/- to the persons who have been appointed as Professors through open selections. Now the Board of Finance has approved the initial pay of Rs.43,000/- to the Professors inducted through direct recruitment.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that recently they had approved minimum basic pay of Rs.43,000/- to the Professors appointed through open selections, but the RAO has still raised the objection.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would attend to the issue personally.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this issue was discussed in the last meeting of the Syndicate also. They raised their concerns, but some people thought as if they are against some particular persons. So far as this matter is concerned, there are two issues involved in it – (i) fixation of basic pay at the minimum of Rs.43,000/-; and (ii) whether somebody is to be given the additional increments which are given to him/her in the un-revised pay-scales. Rightly or wrongly, he is not competent to answer the queries raised by the RAO. It had been mentioned in the minutes of the Board of Finance that the nominee of the Government had suggested that the RAO should be called to represent the case that those, who are directly recruited as Professors even before the issuance of notification by the UGC, needed to be given the minimum pay of Rs.43,000/-. But as he understands that as per the decision of the Board of Finance, at least the RAO should have been associated in the Committee, which had been constituted by the Vice-Chancellor because it has been resolved that the Sub-Committee will take decision on behalf of the Board of Finance. If the Regulations were clear and they were also convinced that the persons appointed as Professors through open selections all

over the country are getting minimum basic-pay of Rs.43,000/-, what was the problem in inviting the RAO to the meeting of the Committee. He did not know whether the RAO was invited to the meeting or not. If he had been invited to the meeting, it should have been mentioned in the note. Secondly, if somebody who has earned six increments in the pre-revised scale, could they grant him/her six increments while fixing his/her pay starting from Rs.37,000/-? Thirdly, after having fixed a person appointed as Professor through direct recruitment as per the Regulations, which are being quoted, could they give him/her the additional advanced increments, which were granted to him/her in the pre-revised scale, in the revised scale at the minimum of Rs.43,000/-? If the person concerned is entitled to advance increments after fixing him/her at the minimum of Rs.43,000/-, is it not advisable on their part, as pointed out by the nominee of the Government, to take into confidence the RAO or the nominee of the Government or take the matter again to the Board of Finance, so that after having getting the matter approved from the Syndicate and Senate, they do not face embarrassment at the hands of the RAO. So far as the giving of initial start of Rs.43,000/- is concerned, the point is well taken, but so far as second part, i.e., grant of advance increments is concerned, it should be decided only after taking the RAO into confidence.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the observations made by Shri Ashok Goyal would be noted and placed before the Sub-Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether the recommendation/s of the Sub-Committee would be placed before the Syndicate or ...

A couple of members namely Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the recommendation/s of the Sub-Committee must come to the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of Board of Finance contained in its minutes dated 17.08.2015 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19), be endorsed to the Senate for approval

Appointment of Dean Research

4. Considered if, the next senior most Professor (Seniority list attached), be appointed as Dean Research w.e.f. 01.09.2015 as Professor L.K. Bansal has completed two years on 30.06.2015 as Dean Research.

- NOTE**
1. As per seniority list Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, UBS is the senior most person next to Professor L.K. Bansal.
 2. The Senate in its meeting dated 29.09.2013 vide Para 7, has approved the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 15.04.2013/25.04.2013 Para 2 that the appointment of Professor Lalit K. Bansal as Dean Search, made as per following clause (ii) of C-5 be ratified:

“C-5 That-

(i)

xxxxxxx xxx

(ii) the next senior-most Professor be offered the position of Dean Research. In case he/she declines, the offer be given to the next Professor in the seniority list.

3. Professor L.K. Bansal was appointed as Dean Research w.e.f. 01.07.2013 till further orders vide No.10929/Estt. dated 28.11.2014.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the matter related to the appointment of Dean Research was debated at various forums in the past. Before presenting the matter to the members, he had looked into the history of the case and had found that Senate had discussed certain things related to the appointment of Dean Research. Respecting the observations of the Senate, he had presented this item to the members on the premise that Professor L.K. Bansal has completed two years as Dean Research. The Senate meeting was held in September 2013 and the name of Professor L.K. Bansal was considered in the Syndicate sometime in the month of July/August 2013. In that background, he had brought this item. In the case of appointment of Dean of University Instruction, the term of appointment has been specified in the Calendar for two years, but in the case of appointment of Dean Research, no period has been specified anywhere. The term of appointment of Dean Research has never been discussed in the Senate during his (Vice-Chancellor) term. He felt that if the term of appointment of Dean of University Instruction is two years and the senior-most Professor has to graduate to the post of Dean of University Instruction, the next senior-most Professor would serve as the Dean Research. Now, Professor L.K. Bansal has completed two years as Dean Research. The members should guide him as far as the term of appointment of the Dean Research is concerned. In that spirit, he had brought the matter to the members for consideration and the matter is now before the members for discussion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that he has also gone through the discussion taken place in the meeting of the Senate. When they talk about the position of Dean Research, this position has nowhere been mentioned in the Calendar and this issue was also discussed in a meeting of the Senate. The position of Dean Research, in fact, was first introduced on 18th February 2008 when a letter was written by the University to Professor M.R. Khurana, who was appointed first Dean Research of the University. Though the position of Dean Research was introduced, the duties, role, tenure and other things were not decided. When the appointment of Professor L.K. Bansal was placed before the Senate, many members expressed their views as to whether the appointment of Dean Research should be made on the basis of seniority, etc. Though he is not touching that point, it is acceptable to him even if the appointment of Dean Research is made on seniority basis. Since the tenure of Dean Research has not been fixed, it is not proper, right now, to bring in a item to the Syndicate saying that the incumbent should not continue. He suggested that a Committee should be formed by the Vice-Chancellor to look in to the duties, tenure and other terms and conditions of Dean Research, before the matter is finally decided.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, at the moment, the Dean Research is performing the job or coordinating the Research Promotion Cell, which provides/facilitates the research agenda of the

University. The Dean of University Instruction is the academic in-charge of the University and is performing a full time job. There is a limit as to how much job could be handled efficiently by a person both as a teacher as well as a Dean/Director of a Cell/Centre. Since they had more than 65 Departments, research agenda of the University is expanding. The NAAC has also commented that the Research Promotion Cell has to be strengthened and it ought to play a larger role. As such, the necessity of the Research Promotion Cell is there and there could not be two opinions about it. They needed Research Promotion Cell because it does many jobs, including that of coordination, whenever they intend to execute a MOU between different organizations for promotion of research of mutual interest. They indeed need the office of the Dean Research in a stable form, not that somebody heads the office of the Research Promotion Cell for a small time and moves on to occupy the office of the Dean of University Instruction. This is what was happening in the past, and that was why this office had not been performing the important task satisfactorily. In order to ensure stability in a default way, the notion of Co-Coordinator of Research Promotion Cell was introduced, and the Co-Coordinator might not be the third senior-most person. They had so many persons as Dean Research during the last three years, including Professor R.K. Kohli, Professor Madhu Raka, etc. The arrival of Professor L.K. Bansal as Dean Research provided stability. In this way, the Research Promotion Cell also got into some shape. However, in the eyes of NAAC, this office needs further strengthening. They also need this office to be manned by people who can devote maximal time to this office.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should not decide the appointment of next Dean Research till the other terms and conditions are not decided and until then the present Dean should be allowed to continue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the practical view is that Professor L.K. Bansal has completed two years term as Dean Research and the maximum duration of Dean of University Instruction is also two years. At the moment, they should not exceed this maximum term. Secondly, as per seniority, Professor Dinesh Gupta is likely to be the next Dean of University Instruction within the next four months. They could use this period for evolving a policy for the office of Dean Research, and then let the change happen. Another view is that they should evolve the policy within the next four months and involve Professor A.K. Bhandari, present Dean of University Instruction and Professor Dinesh Gupta, who is likely to be the next Dean of University Instruction, in it.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the office of Dean Research has come up during the last few years. Professor Navdeep Goyal is right that the position of Dean Research is not a part of the Calendar. Now since the University is evolving many things, they needed to critically look into many things which are part of the Calendar. With the passage of time, the University is growing and many new things are coming up. According to him, the Syndicate is a fit body to give proper understanding/shape to such issues and evolve a well thought of policy. Research has always been a part of the teaching because the Universities are not meant only for teaching but research also. Earlier, they did not have office of Dean Research in order for collating/coordinating research and also did not have much interaction, which had been during the last couple of decades. As such, this office has become very important in the University academic mode. Secondly, the office of Dean Research has become

important as the office of the Dean of University Instruction has expanded a lot and the research is also expanding at a larger scale. Therefore, the office of the Dean Research is required and there is no doubt about it at all. This office had come up suddenly though some informal discussion might have taken place. Now the time has come when they had to decide the procedures for proper functioning of this office so that it could really contribute. What sort of criteria they wanted to evolve for appointment of Dean Research, needed to be discussed. This office needed to be strengthened so that it could be a nodal point to look into the research. They had three journals and the Dean Research used to coordinate them.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that at the moment, since the duties of Dean Research have not been defined/assigned, there is a lot of confusion which needed to be overcome. Though there is a full chapter in the Calendar on Dean of University Instruction, nothing is there about the Dean Research.

The Vice-Chancellor said that both Professor A.K. Bhandari and Professor Dinesh Gupta would be involved in the framing of the policy for the office of the Dean Research.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he agreed with Professor Navdeep Goyal. In fact, he remembered that the Vice-Chancellor has missed one name, Professor R.K. Pathak, who has also worked as Dean Research for some time. At that time, it was also discussed that when the name/turn of somebody, who is next senior-most person, crop up and his/her name is considered, if at that time they talk about framing of some policy, probably that would send a signal that he/she is not found fit for the position concerned. Right from day one, the view of the Vice-Chancellor is that it needed to be looked into and the seniority alone should not be the criterion, but at that time it was discussed that they should frame a policy. However, even after 7½ years of this office coming into existence, it is not a part of the Calendar. On the one hand, everybody is saying that this office is not a part of the Calendar and on the other hand, it is very much required, then amongst them who is to be held responsible. They are the ones who are to be held responsible that such an important position did not find mention in the Calendar in spite of the fact that it had been pointed out on occasions more than once. Professor A.K. Bhandari, the Dean of University Instruction, has also said that the position of Dean Research should be clearly spelt out. Therefore, they should take steps in ensuring that the position of Dean Research also becomes a position well defined in the Calendar at par with the position of Dean of University Instruction, Dean of Student Welfare, Dean Alumni, etc. It has been rightly pointed out that there are so many appointments, like, Dean of University Instruction, for which it is not mentioned in the Calendar that they have to appoint the senior-most Professor as Dean of University Instruction, but it has been the time tested healthy practice that they have been appointing the senior-most Professor as Dean of University Instruction. He remembered at least two instances in which a dispute regarding seniority was there and they did not make the appointment till that dispute was resolved as to who between the two was senior, despite there being no specific provision in the Calendar that the senior-most Professor is to be appointed, they ensured that the senior-most is not got ignored. Similarly, neither there is a provision of Dean Research in the Calendar nor rules are there that the term of Dean Research is of two years as is in the case of Dean of University Instruction, still the Vice-Chancellor brought an item to the Syndicate for consideration. Because according to the Vice-Chancellor, since

Professor L.K. Bansal has completed the term of two years, he has brought an item to the Syndicate for consideration that if Professor Dinesh Gupta, who is the next senior-most Professor, be appointed as Dean Research. It is also true that he would be left with only about 4-5 months period for working as Dean Research. According to him, it is an opportunity for them not to break the healthy tradition and at the same time evolve a policy for Dean Research within a period of four months for making the same a part of the Calendar. They should not send a signal to the society that the next senior-most person is not being appointed as Dean Research. He himself had pointed out in the year 2013 that this very Syndicate had appointed a Dean Research (Professor Shashi K. Sharma), who himself was not a Ph.D. because the strongest argument given was that he was the senior-most Professor. He, therefore, suggested that Professor Dinesh Gupta should be appointed Dean Research, till he takes over as Dean of University Instruction, if at all, his turn comes. In the meanwhile, a Committee (headed by Professor A.K. Bhandari or the Vice-Chancellor himself) keeping in view the importance of position of Dean Research, comprising Professor Dinesh Gupta and some other senior teachers, should be constituted to frame the policy along with the rules, term, duties and functions of Dean Research. However, at this juncture, if for making the policy, they did not appoint the next senior-most Professor as Dean Research, item pertaining to which has been brought to the Syndicate for consideration, it would be sending a wrong signal outside.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the argument that since the item for consideration of the Syndicate has been brought that if Professor Dinesh Gupta, the next senior-most Professor, be appointed the Dean Research and if the same is not approved, it would send a wrong signal, is not valid because earlier also appointments brought to the Syndicate had not been approved. Therefore, they should allow Professor L.K. Bansal to continue as Dean Research for another four months or till they decide the policy for the position of Dean Research. So far as the argument given by Shri Ashok Goyal that they had also appointed a Dean Research, who was not Ph.D. himself, is concerned, that person has to have something towards the research. He was sure that Professor Dinesh Gupta has done very good research and he is not doubting his research capabilities, but for future they need to evolve a policy so that the Dean Research could know that these are the difficulties which are faced by the researchers. Till the policy is evolved, Professor L.K. Bansal should be allowed to continue as Dean Research even though item with regard to appointment of Professor Dinesh Gupta, the next senior-most Professor as Dean Research has been placed before the Syndicate; otherwise it would tantamount to curtailing the tenure of Professor L.K. Bansal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that had the Court not stayed the retirement of Professor L.K. Bansal, his tenure as Dean Research would have come to an end much earlier.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that Shri Ashok Goyal has pleaded that for the time being Professor Dinesh Gupta should be appointed Dean Research and next time, they would frame the policy, which would also send a wrong signal. Earlier they frame the policy, it would be better for all of them. He, therefore, pleaded that the policy for the position of Dean Research should be framed at the earliest.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he has never proposed that Professor Dinesh Gupta be accommodated. He was, in fact, restricting himself only to the item, which has come as a proposal of

the Vice-Chancellor and the item is to consider if the next senior most Professor be appointed as Dean Research w.e.f. 01.09.2015 as Professor L.K. Bansal has completed two years on 30.06.2015 as Dean Research. If they did not appoint Professor Dinesh Gupta, who is the next senior most Professor, at this stage, it will not send a right signal. Therefore, he is suggesting that the item should be approved as proposed and thereafter the policy for the Dean Research should be framed. After introducing the item, if they say that the Syndicate did not find favour with the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor that the next senior most Professor be appointed Dean Research, which position in his opinion is at par with Dean of University Instruction and the term of the DUI is also two years, it would not send a good signal. Secondly, they are supposed to consider only the item placed before them. If they say they did not accept that the term of Dean Research is at par with the Dean of University Instruction, it is not an item before them for consideration. That was why he was suggesting that the item that the next senior most Professor be appointed Dean Research w.e.f. 01.09.2015, should be accepted and at the same time a Committee, comprising Professor A.K. Bhandari and Professor Dinesh Gupta, headed by the Vice-Chancellor himself, should be constituted to frame the policy. It is just possible that the Committee might also recommend after defining the duties and functions of Dean Research that the next senior most Professor be appointed Dean Research. Why were they presuming that the Committee will not recommend it? Therefore, his view is that the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor that the next senior most Professor be appointed Dean Research and in the meantime, the exercise should be made so that in the month of December, the Senate should approve the policy of the position of Dean Research and implement the same.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that if they wanted to strengthen the research, the Dean Research should be appointed on full time basis. As such, only those persons should be considered for the position of Dean Research who could devote maximum time.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the Dean Research usually is not able to devote more than 50% of his time as he is a full time faculty member and has full teaching load. They are also receiving complaints from the students that the Dean Research is not devoting full time to his office to attend to their research related problems.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that what the Vice-Chancellor has said, in fact, should be the job of the Dean Research. When this position was created, it was not to promote research and sort out the research problems being faced by the students. In fact, this position was created only to look into the problems being faced by the students qua G&P Section, especially delay in getting grants and it was suggested that there should be a person from amongst the faculty members who knows as to what are the actual difficulties being faced by the research students and should be able to get the grants released from the G&P Section at the earliest. Now with the evolution of history, they really wanted to have a Dean Research as has been in other Universities/organizations. One of the members has also suggested that the Dean Research should be a full time position, but such things could be very well taken care of by the Committee suggested to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor. Whether the position of Dean Research should be filled in by way of promotion from amongst the teachers or the position be filled up on full time basis. If the position is to be filled on full time basis, then they have to follow the whole process including the Board of Finance for creating a budget head for the purpose. According to him, all these things

could be taken care of by the Committee. He proposed that right now, the item should be approved and he did not think there is going to be any compromise so far as University position and research is concerned. As said by Professor Navdeep Goyal, he also felt that probably nobody has any problem so far as research capability of Professor Dinesh Gupta is concerned. If Professor Dinesh Gupta is appointed Dean Research even for a period of five months, they are not going to lose on any front.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he fully agreed with the thinking of the Vice-Chancellor that Dean Research is a very important position and the same had also been pointed out by NAAC. However, there should be some guidelines, duties and responsibilities of the Dean Research as observed by Professor Navdeep Goyal. If they did not approve the proposal which has come from the Vice-Chancellor, it would not send a right signal. Their only concern is that the research of the University did not suffer, but if they did not appoint the Dean Research, research is definitely going to suffer. Once an item has come, it is not in the fitness of the things that the other related issues, which cropped up from the discussion, should be given priority by sidelining the real issue. It is not that they could not reject an item, but in the interest of the University and the students, they should approve the item even if Professor Dinesh Gupta would serve as Dean Research for a period of 4-5 months. During this period of 4-5 months, they should evolve a policy having duties, responsibilities etc. of the Dean Research.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that it is very heartening to know the discussions which took place in one of the Senate meetings, which has been annexed with the item. But she was surprised about as to why observation of Senate has become suddenly so important for them. They are well aware that discussion in the Senate for hours together took them to one direction and the decision took them to another direction. They have never taken those models for taking the decision. At this juncture, when the name is out and the item has been proposed by the Vice-Chancellor which is already on the agenda and if the item is not approved, that would be quite embarrassing. Why they did not think for evolving a policy for Dean Research six months or one year earlier and why they are thinking for it now. According to her, it is the most improper time to talk about framing of a policy for Dean Research and not appointing a person as Dean Research, whose turn has matured. They needed the terms and conditions for Dean Research, but she was sorry to say that this is most improper time for the purpose. Therefore, she suggested that they must approve the item which has been proposed by the Vice-Chancellor himself.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that it is his job to bring an item for their consideration, but it is not that every item brought/proposed by him is to be approved. He only did his duty in bringing the item. There were many occasions when the Syndicate took a call on the issue/s and somehow it was at variance with the proposal made. That is why it is a collective and democratic job. Therefore, they should not worry about that it would send a wrong signal if they rejected the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor. They have to take a correct call which is in the interest of the University's future functioning. As he sensed, there is a broad agreement that they should give up this notion that the senior-most person has to be appointed Dean Research, but if it is ratified by the Committee to be constituted, then they should take a call on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that they should not give up the notion that the senior-most person should be appointed Dean Research, but the issue should be left to the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that there is a broad consensus that a Committee should be there having both Professor A.K. Bhandari and Professor Dinesh Gupta. The recommendations of the Committee would be placed before the Syndicate and thereafter before the Senate because the position of Dean Research has been created on the basis of the discussion/decision taken by the Senate. They have to take the discussion that if they form a Committee, they have to take the Senate into confidence that a Committee has been formed to evolve policy for Dean Research. If the Committee comes up with a resolution before the next Senate meeting, the matter would be placed before the Senate and if not, the whole matter would be explained to the Senate.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla remarked that if Professor Dinesh Gupta is to become Dean of University Instruction after 4-5 months, what would he be able to do?

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that they are going to appoint a Committee to evolve a policy for streamlining the functioning of the office of Dean Research. Though Professor L.K. Bansal has remained Dean Research for about 2 years and about 3-4 months, the issue was being raised in the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate that despite his best efforts, he is not being able to do justice to the position of Dean Research being holding the additional charge. He opined that since the Dean Research is a major position, person should be appointed on full time basis. How could it be done, is a matter to be discussed threadbare. Secondly, since the University has become larger with the addition of certain new departments/centres and the promotion of research is the need of the hour, as also the college teachers wanted to collaborate in research with the University teachers and also wanted to guide Ph.D. students, the infrastructure in the office of the Dean Research need to be expanded and only a person who can devote maximum time, should be appointed as Dean Research. Dean Research needed to devote maximum time to sort out the problems being faced by the teachers as well as the Research Scholars because Dean of University Instruction is already much burdened. He has no objection if Professor L.K. Bansal is allowed to continue as Dean Research for 4-5 months more and in the meanwhile they must try to streamline the functioning of the office of Dean Research by way of evolving a policy. He suggested that instead of appointing the senior-most Professor as Dean Research, they should invite applications from the teachers who could devote maximum time and the appointed person should be allowed to retain his/her lien in the parent department. In this way, they could ensure the overall academic growth of the University including in the field of research.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora said that as pointed out by the Vice-Chancellor, the position of Dean Research is very important. He suggested that the Committee proposed to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor should be asked to submit its report within a stipulated period so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that as of now the Senate has decided that the senior-most Professor be appointed the Dean of University Instruction, the term of whom is two years, and that

mathematically fixes the term of the Dean Research as two years. As such, it is wrong to say that there is no term for Dean Research. Had he opted for Dean Research, the term of Professor L.K. Bansal as Dean Research could not have exceeded two years under any circumstances. Secondly, they are presuming that the next Dean Research (Professor Dinesh Gupta) would serve only for 4-5 months because if Professor L.K. Bansal is allowed to continue by the Court, then he would be the next Dean of University Instruction. Thirdly, if Professor P.S. Jaswal comes back, he would be the next Dean of University Instruction. Therefore, it is wrong to presume that Professor Dinesh Gupta would be Dean Research only for 4-5 months.

Professor Navdeep Goyal remarked that in the present case, the term of Professor A.K. Bhandari as Dean of University Instruction would also exceed two years.

Professor Ronki Ram remarked that both Professor L.K. Bansal and Professor Dinesh Gupta are doing well in their respective positions. Professor Dinesh Gupta is taking care of his academic duties and also giving sufficient time to his students. They are not doubting the research capability of any of them in any manner. Now, the time has come that they should think to streamline the functioning of office of Dean Research by evolving a policy irrespective of whether it is the turn of Professor Dinesh Gupta or anybody else. Why they are saying that only the senior-most/next senior-most Professor should be appointed as Dean Research as the appointed person might be able to perform well and might also not be. If he/she is not able to perform well, the responsibility for that also lay with them because they are unable to create such an environment and take appropriate decision. Secondly, the issue is that the post of Dean Research did not exist at all. Therefore, they have to think about the post also. They should be least concerned whether Professor L.K. Bansal should be allowed to continue or Professor Dinesh Gupta be appointed as Dean Research. One day, this House had to decide the issue in totality. Now, the time has come that they could not delay it any more. However, the whole issue should be dealt with in such a manner that it should not look as if they are favouring somebody.

Professor Rajesh Gill, agreeing with Professor Ronki Ram, referred to the discussion where Ambassador I.S. Chadha had stated that they should adopt other criteria for appointing Dean Research instead of appointing a person on seniority basis, because Dean Research is a very specialized job. She did not know whether it is possible to develop any objective criterion to determine the merit and caliber of a person because they had seen what the API has done to them. They might constitute any Committee but would it ever be possible to develop any objective criterion to see that a particular person would be able to do the job more efficiently and the others not. When they are designating people as Professors, they have to believe in their integrity; otherwise they would be questioning their own system. It should be wrong to presume that seniority should not be the criterion for appointing the Dean Research. In fact, seniority is the best tested method, but the Committee might decide and recommend otherwise. According to her, seniority even in the case of Dean of University Instruction, Dean Research etc. has proved to be the most undisputed, accepted and respectable way of appointment. Formal decision to evolve a policy has to be taken. Why are they not respecting the prior decision of the Syndicate and Senate? She pleaded that following the decision of the Syndicate and Senate, they should appoint Professor Dinesh Gupta, who is the next senior-most

Professor, and she was sure that Professor Dinesh Gupta would be able to do full justice to the position of Dean Research under the leadership of Professor A.K. Grover. In the meantime, they could get a policy framed by a Committee involving Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor Dinesh Gupta and few others. She was sure that by the time, Professor Dinesh Gupta becomes the Dean of University Instruction, the policy for the position of Dean Research would be in place.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he wanted to clarify that even in the meeting of the Senate, the members of the Senate including Ambassador I.S. Chadha, have not anywhere questioned the criterion of seniority. Rather he said that had their rules been clear, there would not have been any problem for making the appointment of Dean Research on seniority basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that seniority is not the issue which is under consideration just now. When Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor himself has said that the papers relating to discussions taken place in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate and decisions thereof have been annexed with the item for the information of the members, the Vice-Chancellor said that it is not part of the agenda but a part of the agenda papers.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Vice-Chancellor has himself said that these papers are for the information of the members for their help to discuss but now the Vice-Chancellor is saying that they could not discuss these. The Syndicate in the months of May and July has never questioned that why he (Vice-Chancellor) is not appointing the Dean Research as the two years term of Dean Research, which is at par with the term of Dean of University Instruction, is over. It is an obvious thinking on the part of the Vice-Chancellor that since the term of the Dean of University Instruction is of two years, in his opinion, the term of the Dean Research is also two years. To say that every time there would be a name of somebody as and when they would be making a policy and it would look as if they are accommodating somebody and ignoring the claim of somebody else. Had the item come keeping in view the discussion, which had taken place in 2013, to evolve a policy for appointment of Dean Research without having considered the expiry of the term of the present incumbent and without proposing the name of next senior-most Professor for the position of Dean Research, there would have been no difficulty. At the most, they could have raised objection as to why Professor L.K. Bansal has been given more than two years. In the instant case, the item proposing the name of next senior-most person for appointment as Dean Research has been brought by the Vice-Chancellor himself. Even though he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying that he did not have any problem if the proposal is rejected, nobody brings any item for its rejection. If whatever is his (Vice-Chancellor) proposal, which is in the best interest of the University, teaching faculty and the research also, the man who had been shortlisted by the Search Committee for the Vice-Chancellorship of Panjab University and when his term came, they are saying that they should not consider him and allow the same man to continue. Whatever explanation they might give but it would not be anything else that the Syndicate did not find favour with the name of Professor Dinesh Gupta whose name was proposed for the position of Dean Research for a period of 4-5 months, which would be indefensible on the part of the Syndicate. Therefore, his opinion is that as proposed they should appoint Professor Dinesh Gupta as Dean Research and if hopefully he becomes the Dean of University Instruction, in view of the judgment

whatever comes from the Court, it is alright, somebody else could be appointed Dean Research as per the recommendation of the Committee as suggested by the Vice-Chancellor or he (Professor Dinesh Gupta) would continue for more than 5 months.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that they are not talking about the formation of a Committee which has to make its recommendations at the earliest. As per the present norms, the appointment of Professor L.K. Bansal as Dean Research is till further orders, which is the case in all such appointments. As soon as the decision of the Committee comes, which is not in line with the way they appointed the Dean Research up to now, would they change the Dean Research on that very day or in the next meeting of the Syndicate. It is not appropriate to appoint a Dean Research at this stage, because as per the existing norms, they could allow Professor L.K. Bansal to continue as Dean Research and let the Committee be formed to make recommendations at the earliest.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever would be the recommendations of the Committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for framing the policy for the position of Dean Research, the same could not be implemented after the Syndicate approval, but would, in fact, be implemented after the approval by the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they have to hold a meeting of the Senate by the end of September and there is no option to that because they have to send the revised budget estimates to the Government. Before the Senate meeting, they would have a meeting of the Syndicate also. He requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to have the Committee deliberations and recommendations within 15 days' time. He proposed that the consideration of the item should be deferred till the next meeting of the Syndicate and in the meanwhile appoint a Committee comprising Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor Dinesh Gupta, Professor L.K. Bansal and three members from the Syndicate to deliberate on the issue and make recommendations in maximum two meetings. When a couple of members suggested, the Vice-Chancellor said that okay he would chair the meeting/s of the Committee and see that the recommendations are made within a stipulated time. Another proposal is from Shri Ashok Goyal that as proposed they should approve the appointment of Professor Dinesh Gupta as Dean Research and a Committee should be formed to frame the policy for the position of Dean Research within a period of next couple of months, which could be considered and approved by the Senate in its meeting to be held in December 2015.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that they approve the proposal made by the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if the item, which is a proposal of the Vice-Chancellor, is not approved, it would amount to the fact that it would be an insult of the Vice-Chancellor even though the Vice-Chancellor had said that he would not have any problem. But what about the message that the item, which was proposed by the Vice-Chancellor pertaining to the appointment of a particular person to the position of Dean Research, has been deferred, especially when they had already a system in place which according to them is not good. The Vice-Chancellor had himself said in the year 2013 in response to Ambassador I.S. Chadha that he had no hesitation in accepting the directive of the Syndicate. As far as appointment of Professor L.K. Bansal as Dean Research on seniority basis is

concerned, he is an experienced and honourable person. As far as other criteria are concerned, they could discuss the same in the end. He did not know whether anything was discussed in the end of that Senate meeting or not. However, he was sure that nothing was discussed in the end of that meeting because had it been discussed it would have been brought here at least today if not earlier. Now, since 29 September 2013, i.e., precisely after 1 year, 11 months and 1 day, they are saying that they intend to form a Committee for laying down the criteria for appointment of Dean Research, especially when the name of a particular person has already been placed before the Syndicate for consideration. Therefore, he again suggested that Professor Dinesh Gupta should be appointed Dean Research and should not take a decision to ask the Committee to be constituted to frame the policy within a short period of 15 days on such an important item, which is to be taken to the Senate for approval. He pleaded that they should give reasonable time at least 3-4 months (up to December) to frame the policy so that they could make the appointment of next Dean Research as per the policy framed by the Committee and approved by the Syndicate and the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had two options. One is to appoint a Committee which would take a call and make recommendations. The recommendations of the Committee would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that it indicated that the item is placed on the agenda of the Syndicate, he (Vice-Chancellor) wanted to take a specific decision and if that decision is not taken, the consideration of the item is deferred, which gave a wrong message.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that earlier also, they had been disapproving the proposal/s of the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, it is not disapproval of the item. If the consensus is that the consideration of the item be deferred and a Committee should be formed, which could opine on it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is no consensus that the consideration of the item should be deferred. She remarked that they are making the Syndicate a political forum by counting the numerical numbers.

Professor Ronki Ram said that whenever the decision could not be arrived at unanimously, they have to decide the matter through votes which is always done in democracy.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they were not talking about quantity but quality.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not allow more discussion on the issue as they have to move on. At the moment, there are two options – (i) the proposal made by Shri Ashok Goyal that they should approve the item and in the meanwhile, constitute a Committee to deliberate on the issue and frame a policy for the position of Dean Research; and (ii) that the consideration of the item be deferred till the next meeting of the Syndicate and in the meanwhile, a 7-member Committee would deliberate on the issue and make recommendations, which would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting. If no recommendations came, then they would have no option but to place the matter pertaining to appointment of

Professor Dinesh Gupta as Dean Research, who is the next senior most Professor, before the Syndicate in its next meeting. With these words, he put the matter to vote.

Shri Jarnail Singh, Principal Gurdip Sharma, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Principal Sanjeev Arora, Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla, Professor Ronki Ram and Professor Yog Raj Angrish (8 members) voted in favour of option (ii) i.e. deferment of the item till the next meeting of the Syndicate and constitution of the above proposed 7-member Committee for framing of the policy for the position of Dean Research.

However, Professor Karamjeet Singh, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor A.K. Bhandari voted in favour of option (i) i.e. that the item, which is the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor, that the next senior most (Professor Dinesh Gupta), be appointed as Dean Research w.e.f. 01.09.2015 as Professor L.K. Bansal has completed two years on 30.06.2015 as Dean Research and in the meanwhile a 7-member Committee be constituted for framing of the policy for the position of Dean Research.

Since majority of the members, i.e., 8 against 4 were in favour of option (ii), it was –

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the matter be deferred and in the meanwhile, a Committee, to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor comprising Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor L.K. Bansal, Professor Dinesh Gupta and three members of the Syndicate, would meet under the chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor and deliberate on the whole issue to make recommendations to be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting to be held in the month of September 2015.

Against this decision, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Karamjeet Singh and Professor Rajesh Gill staged a walk out.

The Vice-Chancellor requested them to stay in the interest of the University. Shri Ashok Goyal responded that the Vice-Chancellor's proposal has been rejected and he is asking them to stay. The Vice-Chancellor replied that his proposal on appointment of Professor A.S. Ahluwalia as Dean of Student Welfare had been rejected by the Syndicate in 2013. The four members however chose to go away with a statement by Shri Ashok Goyal that they would come back soon.

Conferment of designation of Honorary Professor upon Dr. Chandra Shekhar Mishra, Senior Scientist at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL), USA in Department of Physics

5. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Dr. Chandra Shekhar Mishra, Senior Scientist at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL), USA, be given designation of Honorary Professor in Department of Physics, Panjab University, under Clause 18 of P.U. Act, appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

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

“Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate

confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes”.

2. The Faculty in its meeting dated 04.05.2015 (**Appendix-V**) has considered and approved the proposal put forward by Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar and Professor J.B. Singh for appointment of Dr. Chandra Shekhar Mishra as Honorary Professor in Department of Physics.
3. The Joint Academic and Administrative Committees (JAAC) in its meeting dated 18.05.2015 (**Appendix-V**) has forwarded the name of Dr. Chandra Shekhar Mishra for consideration at University level.
4. The Chairman Department of Physics vide letter dated 02.07.2015 (**Appendix-V**) has written that Dr. Chandra Shekhar Mishra has more than 30 years of experience on various kinds of Accelerators and Detectors developed at LANL and FNAL, USA and have contributed to the discovery of various particles including Top Quark. He is also associated with the premier Indian Institute BARC (Mumbai), RRCAT (Indore) and IUAC (New Delhi), to build high Intensity new accelerators in India. He has played a key role in the recent US-DOE (USA) and DAE (India) agreement to collaborate on building High Intensity Proton Accelerators for Accelerator.

At, present he is also Deputy Project Manager, PIP-II Indian Institute and Fermilab Collaboration. As a man of Accelerator and Detector, association of Dr. Mishra with the Physics Department will be great benefit in enhancing collaboration with the Premier Institute Fermi Lab and Establishment of the DST-DAE mega projects-Centre for High Energy Physics Detectors and Instrumentation (CHEPDI) and 6 MV Accelerator Centre at P.U. Campus.

5. Brief Bio-Data of Dr. Chandra Shekhar Mishra enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor in Department of Physics, Panjab University, be conferred upon Dr. Chandra Shekhar Mishra, Senior Scientist at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL),

USA, under Clause 18 of P.U. Act, appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

When item 6 on the agenda was being taken up for consideration, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Karamjeet Singh and Professor Rajesh Gill entered the house again for participating in the debate on the remaining agenda items.

Issue regarding grant of extension in Extra-ordinary leave without pay to Dr. Nahar Singh

6. Considered if, Dr. Nahar Singh, Professor (re-employed), School of Punjabi Studies, be granted extension in Extra-ordinary leave without pay up to 05.10.2015 i.e. attaining the age of 63 years. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-VI**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Nahar Singh has requested vide letter dated 05.06.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) for extension in Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 14.03.2015 to 31.03.2016, as he is not in a position to resume his duty due to unavoidable and compelling family circumstances. He has to care for his daughter's family.
 2. Dr. Nahar Singh, Professor (Re-employed), was granted Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 01.09.2014 to 13.03.2015 (in term of decision of Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.10.2013 vide Para 5) vide office order 8024-25/Estt. dated 22.08.2014 (**Appendix-VI**).
 3. Dr. Nahar Singh, Professor was re-employed for three years i.e. up to the age of 63 years, which will come to an end of 5.10.2015 vide Syndicate decision dated 04.11.2012 vide Para 58 (i) (**Appendix-VI**).
 4. The Senate at its meeting dated 22.01.2012 (Para XXI) that the present scheme of re-employment of teachers including teachers of affiliated Colleges after superannuation be extended for 5 years i.e., up to 65 years of age instead of existing 3 years, i.e. up to 63 years of age. Other Rules governing re-employment of teachers after superannuation, namely Rules (3)-(10) at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 would remain same. The decision be made effective w.e.f. 8.9.2012. However, the re-employment shall be after one day break following the date of superannuation and the usual one day break will be there at the completion of every year during the re-employment.
 5. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.10.2013 (Para 5) has resolved that the teacher re-employed after superannuation,

be entitled to 20 days Casual Leave (any time), Special Casual Leave for 10 days and Special Academic Leave for 30 days and Duty Leave as per University Rules and Regulation except Half Pay Leave and Commuted Leave. In addition, Extra Ordinary Leave without pay not exceeding one year be also allowed to the incumbent.

6. Recently, the Syndicate at its meeting held on 20.04.2015 (Para 20) has resolved that the request dated 28.01.2015 of Dr. Devi Sirohi nee Devi Verma, Professor (Re-employed), be granted Extra-Ordinary Leave without pay for two years more w.e.f. 07.02.2015 up to 07.02.2017, (till as her term as Chairperson, Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights).

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that keeping in view the fact that leave up to one year could be granted and also that Dr. Nahar Singh has already availed leave for one year, he could not be granted further leave. Even if they had committed a mistake, as quoted above, they could correct the decision. They should not grant any further leave.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it seemed Dr. Nahar Singh is facing some difficulties. He is away in Canada to take care of his granddaughter. It is not known whether he would return or not. Perhaps, he might not come back. However, since he is a renowned scholar, it possible, they should grant him leave.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that since it would be a violation of the Calendar, they should not grant him any more leave.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that it is clearly mentioned that in case he is granted any more leave, it would become more than one year. He has to stay back due to some emergency. He specially came to submit his application for leave, and even did not take the salary of 20 days, which the University had paid to him. The Syndicate could consider to grant the leave. The Department recommended the extension in leave because he is an expert in the subject of Punjabi Culture and Folklore and none else is available in this field. When he would return, he would be in the 65th year of his age. They have two posts of Associate Professors and only one person was eligible. Under the circumstances, it would take at least two more years to fill up the posts. Dr. Nahar Singh would come back in March 2016, and they will be able to utilize his services for some time. He added that there is no doubt on his competency. The Academic Committee of the Department in its meeting discussed some similar cases in which the Syndicate has allowed the extension in leave. His humble request to the House is that keeping in view the shortage of teachers in the Department and also the eminence of Dr. Nahar Singh, extension in leave should be granted. He also added that only one teacher is eligible for the post of Professor. The shortage of teachers was also discussed in the meeting of the Language Faculty as well as in the Senate. As suggested, the conversion of the posts would also take about 1½ years. His humble request is that as the Syndicate has also been granting extension in some cases, Dr. Nahar Singh may also be granted extension in leave. There are about 250 students in the

Department and they are facing difficulty of shortage of teachers even though they had engaged some Research Scholars. They had also organized a seminar for the junior teachers as well as Research Scholars on how to teach the students. He further added that Dr. Nehru, who had also proceeded on leave, would come in the month of December 2015.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that granting leave to re-employed teachers for a very long time is not practical, especially when their appointment is only for one year at a time and then a day's break after which one is re-appointed. Dr. Nahar Singh has remained on long leave. He did not know whether it would be right to grant long leave to re-employed teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is practical difficulty in inducting the faculty. At the moment, since the appointments of Assistant Professors are on hold, they could not induct any Assistant Professor. They are not even, in a position to appoint Associate Professors. Due to the API score, most of the Departments do not find suitable candidates. As he sees, the advertised posts of Professors and Associate Professors are not getting filled. Even if an advertisement has been given, the appointments could not be made till March 2016. Even if they wanted to fill up the posts of Professors, they could not do so till advertisement, which they had given earlier, is exhausted. If Dr. Nahar Singh comes and they asked him to teach till the age of 65 years, the Department would get his services and the work of the University would go on. In view of this, he was inclined to grant leave to Dr. Nahar Singh. Had they been in a position to induct the faculty, then as suggested by Professor A.K. Bhandari, long term leave should not be given to the re-employed teachers. It would not be justifiable that on the one hand they are not in a position to fill up the posts and on the other hand, they are not providing teachers.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that contractual appointments could also be made so that the students did not suffer for want of teachers.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Professor A.K. Bhandari is right when he says that in the case of re-employed teachers, long leave is not practical. Again it is the same thing when only recently they had sanctioned leave without pay to somebody for two years, without discussing the merit of the case. Then why they are discussing all these things now just because it is a case of a particular Department. How would they explain as to why they did not discuss a case of another Department? As Professor Yog Raj has said, it is not only the request of Dr. Nahar Singh but also of the Department. The person has explained the difficulty and now it is their duty to take call in view of the practical difficulty. They have already violated the rule that the re-employed teachers are eligible for leave of one year only. However, in view of what Professor Bhandari said that it is not practically possible, they should make a rule to the effect that this power will not be with the Syndicate so that it does not give a message that they are adopting a pick and choose policy.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Nahar Singh, Professor (re-employed), School of Punjabi Studies, be granted extension in Extra-ordinary leave without pay up to 05.10.2015, i.e., attaining the age of 63 years.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 9.3.2015 regarding conversion of teachers appointed on contract basis to that of temporary basis and payment of allowances to them

7. Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 09.03.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.01.2013 regarding conversion of teachers appointed on contract basis to that of temporary basis, accordingly payment of entitled benefits such as HRA etc. be given to the faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, with effect from the date of decision i.e. 27.01.2013 and not retrospectively.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it had been discussed a number of times earlier also what is the definition of the contract, *ad hoc*, temporary. A decision was taken by the Syndicate that whatever is the nomenclature of the employees, all are to be treated at par with temporary employees and entitled for all the benefits, including House Rent Allowance (HRA). This decision was taken on 27th January 2013 and even after two years, they are standing where they were standing two years ago. In the meantime, he is sure that the teachers, whosoever they are, must have suffered a lot because they have not got the HRA. He distinctly remembered that the Vice-Chancellor had assured at that time that everybody is entitled. This should be looked into as to why such a delay has occurred. He remarked that they could not get satisfactory work from a dissatisfied employee. He was not sure that they would get the benefit even w.e.f. 27th January 2013 as earlier decision was that they be given these benefit, including HRA w.e.f. the date of their joining. He added that the decision taken on 27th January 2013 is being resolved on 30th August 2015. This is a serious issue

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he was a member of the Committee, which had made this recommendation. It was the observation of the RAO that only six persons were left, and it was not mentioned in the proceedings of the Senate.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.01.2013 regarding conversion of teachers appointed on contract basis to that of temporary basis, accordingly payment of entitled benefits such as HRA etc. be given to the faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, with effect from the date of decision i.e. 27.01.2013 and not retrospectively, and accordingly, the benefit be given.

Recommendations of leave cases Committee dated 13.7.2015 and 3.8.2015

8. Considered:

- (i) the minutes dated 13.07.2015 (Item No.1)(**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.01.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.
- (ii) the minutes dated 03.08.2015 (Item No.I, II (along with observations of the Vice-Chancellor), III, IV, V) (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.01.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) has resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to appoint a Committee to look into the leave cases of members of the teaching staff before, these were put up to him for consideration.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 13.07.2015 and 03.08.2015, as per **Appendices**, be approved.

Protection of pay of Shri Surinder Pal Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics

9. Considered if, the pay of Shri Surinder Pal Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics, be protected at Rs.18990 + AGP Rs.6000 (i.e. Basic Pay which he was drawing with his previous employer i.e. Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 w.e.f. the date of his joining in the Panjab University i.e. 01.08.2014 with next date of increment as usual.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate dated 24.08.2013 (Para 26) has resolved that the following addition be made in the Syndicate decision dated 26.05.2007 (Para 15), regarding rules for protection/ fixation of pay of Class (A&B) employees of the University:

“that the persons who joins Panjab University from either Government or Government aided Colleges affiliated to any of the Universities or from an affiliated College of Panjab University and are drawing U.G.C. pay-scales, their pay be also protected in order to avoid audit objections.”

2. An office note along with the Last Pay Certificate (LPC) issued by D.R. (Estt.), Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, vide No. 4706/Estt. dated 24.02.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-IX**).
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015, vide Para 6, has resolved that it be recommended to the Senate that the recommendations of the Committee dated 30.01.2015 (**Appendix-IX**) be approved with the modification that these rules be made applicable even in the pending cases and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to protect the pay of the teachers in accordance with these rules, on behalf of the Syndicate and the Senate.

RESOLVED: That the pay of Shri Surinder Pal Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics, be protected at Rs.18990 + AGP Rs.6000 (i.e. Basic Pay which he was drawing with his previous employer, i.e., Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 w.e.f. the date of his joining in the

Panjab University, i.e., 01.08.2014 with next date of increment as usual.

Appointment of Director and Associate Director/ Secretary of IQAC

10. Considered the recommendations dated 13.08.2015 (**Appendix-X**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that Professor Rajiv Lochan, Department of History, be appointed as Director of IQAC (additional charge) and Professor Archana Bhatnagar, Department of Biochemistry, be appointed as Associate Director/ Secretary of IQAC (Additional charge) for a period of three years and they be paid an honorarium of Rs.3500/- per month and Rs.2500/- per month respectively.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that their decision to make appointments at IQAC, is a good one. He, however, remarked that these appointments should be full-time basis and the appointees should be given leave from their parent Departments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the teachers are not interested in leaving their academic work. They could make a request to the Departments to relieve the teachers or to assign less teaching work to enable them to perform full-time duties at the IQAC.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that for efficient working of the IQAC, the Director should be empowered to take independent decision/s.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to ensure that the IQAC cell is functional, and strengthen with guidelines so that all the Chairpersons cooperate with them. It should also be ensured that the directives of the IQAC are not disregarded. Any directive from the IQAC should be deemed to be the directive of the Dean of University Instruction.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that a circular in this regard should be also sent to all the faculty members.

RESOLVED: That Professor Rajiv Lochan, Department of History, be appointed as Director of IQAC (additional charge) and Professor Archana Bhatnagar, Department of Biochemistry, be appointed as Associate Director/Secretary of IQAC (additional charge) for a period of three years and they be paid an honorarium of Rs.3500/- per month and Rs.2500/- per month, respectively.

Issue regarding preponement of date of promotion of Shri Arvind Kumar, Assistant Professor

11. Considered if, the date of promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) of Shri Arvind Kumar, Assistant Professor, UIET, be preponed to that of Lecturer to Lecturer (Sr. Scale) w.e.f. 05.11.2004, under UGC Regulation, 2000, as recommended by the Committee in its meeting dated 19.05.2015 (**Appendix-XI**), based on the orders of the Court passed in an another case (CWP No. 8417 of 2005), by counting his previous service rendered by him as Lecturer at Moradabad Institute of Technology. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XI**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 29.05.2011 (Para 2(xii)) had decided the date of promotion of Shri Arvind Kumar, Assistant Professor, UIET, from (Stage-I) to Assistant Professor (Stage 2), under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfillment of U.G.C. conditions), w.e.f. 01.10.2010 (i.e. the

date one day after completion of Refresher Course) already decided under UGC Regulation 2010.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that he is not against giving any favour to anybody. Whatever is the right of a person, should be given to him/her. In the instant case, the case of Dr. Latika Sharma has been quoted and on the basis of that the Committee has made recommendations. His personal opinion is that if any judgment comes from the Court, and if they wanted to adopt the same, it should be made a rule so that everybody gets the benefit irrespective of the person. As such, first they should frame a rule and then extend the benefit. However, certain issues emerged over a period of time. He, therefore, suggested that they should form a Committee, which would frame the rule/s. The other issue is about getting the certificate from the previous employer. Thirdly, so far as he understood, this Moradabad Institute of Technology is the first self-financed institute in UP. The University rules are that any person coming from any government or government aided institute is entitled for pay protection. They could re-examine this case and frame the criteria. Otherwise, since the advertisement for making appointment of faculty has already been issued and many persons would be joining the University in the near future, if the criterion/criteria for counting of past service is/are not framed, they would face a lot of problems on the issue.

Principal Gurdip Sharma and Professor Navdeep Goyal also endorsed the re-examination of the case as proposed by Professor Karamjeet Singh.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that all the facts are not before them. Secondly, he has not gone through the minutes of the Committee, but on a glance he found that there is no mention whether the candidate had applied through proper channel or not? For counting of past service, there are so many conditions, one of which is that the candidate should have applied for direct recruitment through proper channel and the other is that the post held by the candidate was in equivalent scale of pay equal to the post of Lecturer. However, it has not been mentioned whether this candidate fulfilled these two conditions. Another condition that has been passed by the Syndicate is that in the case of candidates working in private institutions, unless and until the candidate brings the last pay drawn certificate, which is an important document, how could they come to know that the candidate was serving in that pay scale. In the last pay drawn certificate, the pay scale in which the person was working, what pay he/she was drawn should be mentioned. Is it possible that a person having served in that pay-scale getting basic salary what has been mentioned in the certificate? In certain case, it had been found that a person having worked for four years should have earned four increments, but as per the last pay certificate, the basic pay does not make even more than two increments. All could be clear only from the last pay drawn certificate. That was the reason why they had passed that in the case of private institutions the person has to support his contention with Form 16 and the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to that. They must know how a certificate from private institutions could be procured and that also after a lapse of so many years. The person should have submitted these documents at the time of joining itself. As said by Professor Karamjeet Singh, they should not consider the cases like this. In one case the Court has decided that the past service be counted, and they should consider another case on the same basis. Even when a similar case goes to the

same Court, the Judge says that the facts are different in that case. If the person has not earned the increments, which he should have earned meant that either he was not working in that pay-scale or he had not actually worked for that period or the certificate is wrong. In the instant case, it is mentioned that the person has worked for four years, whereas he has earned only two increments. This meant, that for two years he has not worked. Would they intend to give the benefit of past service for four years, including the period for which he had not been granted increments? In view of this, he suggested that the case be re-examined as to whether the candidate had applied through proper channel and also that the NOC was submitted at that time and also whether he actually worked in that pay scale. Only after that, they could consider the case.

The Vice-Chancellor cited the example of Punjab Government wherein persons are appointed in the pay-scale, but are being given only the basic salary for first three years. If such persons apply to the University, could they grant the benefit of past service for pay protection?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that counting of past service is allowed as per the UGC Regulations 2000 and 2009.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that, as said by Shri Ashok Goyal, they should ask the candidate to supply the requisite information along with the application.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever Professor Karamjeet Singh has said is right. First of all, they should frame the Rules.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate would be constituted to frame the rules and the President, PUTA would also be associated with that Committee.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to a Committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to re-examine the whole case.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Sub-Committee of the Syndicate, be constituted to frame the guidelines/rules on the issue, and the President, PUTA be also associated with the said Committee.

Confirmation of Dr. Rupinder Kaur, Medical Officer, BGJ Institute of Health, Panjab University

12. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Dr. Rupinder Kaur, Medical Officer, BGJ Institute of Health, P.U., be confirmed in her post with effect from the due date i.e. 06.03.2015 after completion of one year probation period on 05.03.2015. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XII**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Dr. Rupinder Kaur, Medical Officer, BGJ Institute of Health, P.U., be confirmed in her post with effect from the due date, i.e., 06.03.2015 after completion of one year probation period on 05.03.2015.

Confirmation of Shri Het Ram, Superintendent (Proof Reading), P.U. Press

13. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Shri Het Ram Superintendent (Proof Reading), P.U. Press, be confirmed in his post with effect from the due date i.e. 02.06.2015 after completion of one year on 01.06.2015. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIII**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Shri Het Ram, Superintendent (Proof Reading), P.U. Press, be confirmed in his post with effect from the due date, i.e., 02.06.2015 after completion of one year on 01.06.2015.

Amendment of Rule

14. Considered amendment in Rule 4 (ii) (a) & (b) at page 76-77 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 with regard to promotion of Steno-typists to the posts of Stenographers, as proposed by Joint Consultative Machinery dated 4.06.2015 (**Appendix-XIV**) as under:

Existing Rule	Proposed Rule
<p style="text-align: center;">Class B Posts</p> <p>4(ii)(a) Stenographers: 25% posts of Stenographers shall be filled in by promotion from amongst the Steno-typists and the person having completed 15 years' service as a Steno-typist shall be eligible for promotion against this quota.</p> <p>(b) The remaining 75% posts of Stenographers shall be filled by promotion of Steno-typists through competitive tests in Shorthand and typing to be held after every 5-6 months preferably in January and July each year. In case no person from in-service employees qualifies the test, the post may be advertised and selection made by a selection committee to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, through competition which may be made open to outsiders as also in-service steno-typists/Clerks.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Class B Posts</p> <p>4(ii)(a) Stenographers: 50% posts of Stenographers shall be filled in by promotion from amongst the steno-typists and the person having completed 15 years' service as a Steno-typist shall be eligible for promotion against this quota.</p> <p>(b) The remaining 50% posts of Stenographers shall be filled by promotion of Steno-typists through competitive tests in Shorthand and typing to be held after every 5-6 months preferably in January and July each year. In case no person from in-service employees qualifies the tests, the post may be advertised and selection made by a selection committee to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, through competition which may be made open to outsiders as also in-service steno-typists/Clerks.</p>

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

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the proposal is okay. The ratio of promotion from the post of Steno-Typist to the Stenographer is being increased from 25% to 50%. In the similar manner, the promotion quota from Assistant Registrar to Deputy Registrar should also be increased from 25% to 75%, i.e., 75% by way of promotion and 25% through direct recruitment as is prevalent in the case of Assistant Registrars. Earlier also, he had raised the issue in the meeting of Senate that the ratio for promotion to the post of Deputy Registrar, should be raised from 25% to at least 50%.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Karamjeet Singh to give a proposal so that the same could be moved through a competent body.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it needed to be looked into so that a particular section of non-teaching did not feel that a different policy is being adopted for them. Probably, a proposal is already in the pipeline not for this, but might be on some other issue. He urged the

Vice-Chancellor to take care of it and ensure that the same is placed before the JCM.

RESOLVED: That Rule 4(ii)(a) & (b) at pages 76-77 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 with regard to promotion of Steno-typists to the posts of Stenographers, be amended as proposed below:

Existing Rule	Proposed Rule
<p style="text-align: center;">Class B Posts</p> <p>4(ii)(a) Stenographers: 25% posts of Stenographers shall be filled in by promotion from amongst the Steno-typists and the person having completed 15 years' service as a Steno-typist shall be eligible for promotion against this quota.</p> <p>(b) The remaining 75% posts of Stenographers shall be filled by promotion of Steno-typists through competitive tests in Shorthand and typing to be held after every 5-6 months preferably in January and July each year. In case no person from in-service employees qualifies the test, the post may be advertised and selection made by a selection committee to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, through competition which may be made open to outsiders as also in-service steno-typists/Clerks.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Class B Posts</p> <p>4(ii)(a) Stenographers: 50% posts of Stenographers shall be filled in by promotion from amongst the steno-typists and the person having completed 15 years' service as a Steno-typist shall be eligible for promotion against this quota.</p> <p>(b) The remaining 50% posts of Stenographers shall be filled by promotion of Steno-typists through competitive tests in Shorthand and typing to be held after every 5-6 months preferably in January and July each year. In case no person from in-service employees qualifies the tests, the post may be advertised and selection made by a selection committee to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, through competition which may be made open to outsiders as also in-service steno-typists/Clerks.</p>

Modification in the promotion policy for Head Malis

15. Considered the modification in the promotion policy from 'Head Mali' to that of 'Horticulture Supervisor' (already approved by the Syndicate decision dated 11.08.1994 (**Appendix-XV**)), as proposed by the Joint Consultative Machinery dated 04.06.2015 (**Appendix-XV**) as under:

Existing Promotion Policy	Proposed modification in promotion policy (Approved by the JCM)
<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>(i) That the post of Horticulture Supervisor be filled in from amongst the internal candidates, on seniority-cum-merit basis who have put in at least 10 (ten) years of service as Head Mali, in relaxation of the decision of the Syndicate dated 18.07.1992 (Para-24) laying down Matriculation with 10 years' experience as Head Mali as the condition; and</p> <p>(ii) That in case none of internal candidate</p>	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>(i) the post of Horticulture Supervisor be filled in from amongst the internal candidates, on seniority-cum-merit basis who have put in at least 3 (three) years of service as Head Mali; and</p>

fulfils the condition of required experience, the post be advertised with the qualifications already approved by the Syndicate.	(ii) No Change
---	----------------

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

RESOLVED: That, as proposed by the Joint Consultative Machinery dated 04.06.2015 (**Appendix-XV**), the promotion policy from 'Head Mali' to that of 'Horticulture Supervisor' (already approved by the Syndicate decision dated 11.08.1994 (**Appendix-XV**)), be modified as under:

Existing Promotion Policy	Proposed modification in promotion policy (Approved by the JCM)
<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>(i) That the post of Horticulture Supervisor be filled in from amongst the internal candidates, on seniority-cum-merit basis who have put in at least 10 (ten) years of service as Head Mali, in relaxation of the decision of the Syndicate dated 18.07.1992 (Para-24) laying down Matriculation with 10 years' experience as Head Mali as the condition; and</p> <p>(ii) That in case none of internal candidate fulfils the condition of required experience, the post be advertised with the qualifications already approved by the Syndicate.</p>	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>(i) That the post of Horticulture Supervisor be filled in from amongst the internal candidates, on seniority-cum-merit basis, who have put in at least 3 (three) years of service as Head Mali; and</p> <p>(ii) No Change</p>

Qualifications for the post of Training & Placement Officer at UIET

16. Considered if, the following qualifications for the post of Training & Placement Officer, at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., be approved:

"B.E. in any branch of Engineering with M.B.A. (H.R.) with 15 years of experience in Industry or any organization of national repute.

Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Director, UIET vide letter dated 27.07.2015 has proposed that a Training & Placement Officer may be appointed for UIET in the pay-scale of Associate Professor against a vacant post of Associate Professor to look after the placement work from the year 2016 onwards.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the proposal for appointment of a Training & Placement Officer against the post of Associate Professor has come directly from the Director, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, i.e., without consideration by

the Academic and Administrative Committees. He suggested that the proposal should be routed through the Academic and Administrative Committees. He remarked that nobody in the Department knew about this matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was not in his knowledge whether the proposal had come through the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department or not. In the absence of the approval of the proposal from the Academic and Administrative Committees, the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the Department has recommended that the appointment of Training & Placement Officer be made against the post of Associate Professor. Technically speaking, if the Department is interested in converting the post of Associate Professor to that of Training & Placement Officer, the proposal should come through the Board of Finance.

Professor A.K. Bhandari observed that the proposal would have been sent to the Board of Finance, had the Finance and Development Officer not said that since finances are not involved, there is no need to take the proposal to the Board of Finance.

It was clarified that as per the office note, it was not a case of conversion of the post of Associate Professor, but appointment of Training & Placement Officer against the post of Associate Professor. As such, there is no need to take this to the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the post of a Training & Placement Officer is an important position in an institution and experienced persons are entrusted this responsibility. Normally, Professors are assigned this duty, but some Professors are not interested to perform this duty as it disturbed their academic work. The proposal needed to be processed through the Academic and Administrative Committees.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if a person is appointed as Training & Placement Officer in the pay-scale of Associate Professor, after a period of four years, there could be a proposal from the Department that the person concerned should be appointed/promoted as Professor.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that advertisement has to be given for making the appointment of Training & Placement Officer. He enquired could they give an advertisement of a post, which did not exist in the Budget. According to him, it is not a temporary arrangement. They are just presuming that one post of Associate Professor is to be converted permanently to that of Training & Placement Officer.

RESOLVED: That, in view of the discussion took place above, the consideration of the item, be deferred.

Amendment of Regulation

17. Considered the following recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 02.12.2014 (Item 5) (**Appendix-XVI**) regarding amendment in Regulation 3.1 (F-Grade) and addition of R-Grade in B.E. and M.E. courses, (effective from 2012-2013) in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>3.1 F-Grade: The F grade denotes very poor performance i.e. failing the course. F grade is also awarded in case of poor class/lab attendance (<75%). If candidate gets F grade he/she will have to reappear in subsequent University examination as well as Internal Assessment examination for that subject.</p>	<p><u>3.1 F-Grade: The F Grade denotes very poor performance i.e. failing the course.</u></p> <p><u>If a candidate gets F Grade he/she will have to re-appear in subsequent University examination as well as Internal Assessment examination for that subject.</u></p> <p><u>R-Grade: R Grade will be awarded in case of poor class/lab attendance (<75%).</u></p> <p><u>A candidate who does not fulfill the attendance (<75%) in any subject he/she will get R Grade and he/she will have to repeat the course of instruction in that subject.</u></p>

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

- NOTE:**
1. The proposed regulation was placed before the Regulations Committee in its meeting held on 02.12.2014. The Regulations Committee considered the above amendment and decided that the Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, be consulted with regard to the proposed amendment and if it is okay after the observation of the Dean, the Chairman, Regulations Committee be authorized to approve the recommendation of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, on behalf of the Regulations Committee.
 2. The observation of the Dean Faculty of Engineering on the above are reproduced below:-

“If student does not fulfil attendance requirement then he/she is not allowed to appear for end semester examination, then what is the meaning of ‘R’ Grade. A student who gets ‘R’ grade has to repeat course of instruction, give internal and external assessment also.”

The Chairman of Regulations Committee/Vice-Chancellor has approved the same.

RESOLVED: That the following amendments/ additions, be made in Regulation 3.1 (F-Grade/R-Grade), in B.E. and M.E. courses, (effective from 2012-2013), in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>3.1 F-Grade: The F grade denotes very poor performance i.e. failing the course. F grade is also awarded in case of poor class/lab attendance (<75%). If candidate gets F grade he/she will have to reappear in subsequent University examination as well as Internal Assessment examination for that subject.</p>	<p>3.1 F-Grade: <u>The F Grade denotes very poor performance i.e. failing the course.</u></p> <p><u>If a candidate gets F Grade he/she will have to re-appear in subsequent University examination as well as Internal Assessment examination for that subject.</u></p> <p>R-Grade: <u>R Grade will be awarded in case of poor class/lab attendance (<75%).</u></p> <p><u>A candidate who does not fulfill the attendance (<75%) in any subject he/she will get R Grade and he/she will have to repeat the course of instruction in that subject.</u></p>

Recommendations of the Committee dated 10.8.2015 regarding change of nomenclature and Faculty of MBE Course

18. Considered if the following recommendations of the Committee dated 10.08.2015 regarding change of nomenclature and Faculty of MBE course as per gazette notification of Government of India that:

1. Option should be taken from the students as to whether they would like to join M.Com or M.A. (Economics) in place of MBE, and the seats for them may be created accordingly.
2. From the session 2015-16, all the colleges currently running MBE course, be permitted to have one unit of M.Com. in place of one unit of MBE.
3. If need be, additional seats for the students opting for M.A. Economics in place of MBE, may be sanctioned for the session 2015-16.
4. Nomenclature of the course of MBE be changed to M.A.(Business Economics) from the session 2016-17 under the Faculty of Arts.

NOTE: 1. The Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor under the Chairmanship of Dean Research in its meeting held on 10.08.2015 considered the Gazette notification of India (UGC) dated 05.07.2014 and made the recommendation.

2. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, approved the recommendations. Accordingly, circular was issued vide No. 11291-294/GM dated 13.08.2015 to Principal DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh, Principal GGSD College, Sector-32, Chandigarh, Principal Arya

College, Ludhiana and Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana, where the MBE course is being run.

3. In pursuance of the above circular, Principal DAV College and Principal GGSD College, vide No. 2900 dated 18.08.2015 and No.SDC/9534 dated 18.08.2015 respectively have given suggestion that the nomenclature of the MBE course may be changed to MBA Business Economics on the pattern of Delhi University because there is large number of resentment amongst the students on the circular dated 13.08.2015 under note No.2 above.
4. On the joint representation of the MBE students of DAV & GGSD College, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dean Student Welfare & Member of Syndicate & Senate, P.U., has made certain observations on the same.

Initiating the discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the Government issued the gazette notification on 5th July 2014, in which the UGC suggested that the nomenclature of M.B.E. should be changed to that of M.A./M.B.A./M.Com. (Business Economics). Thereafter, a Committee was constituted to look into the matter and suggest appropriate nomenclature and the Committee recommended that the M.B.E. course should be restructured as M.A. (Business Economics) and M.Com. (Business Economics) but did not recommend M.B.A. (Business Economics). When the proceedings of the Committee were approved by the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, a problem arose that the students of the Colleges, where M.B.E. course was being offered, came to the University, Dean of Student Welfare office and many other places and they along with their Principals submitted the representation that M.B.A. (Business Economics) course should also be given along with M.A./M.Com. (Business Economics). He added that the admission to M.B.E. course had already taken place. In fact, one of the representations was referred to the Dean of Student Welfare by the Vice-Chancellor. He has gone through the said representation, annexed documents and discussed the same with his colleagues and thereafter, he made certain recommendations. First of all, they could not simply take away the option of M.B.A. (Business Economics) from the students who had already been admitted to and studying M.B.E. course because they had taken admission in that course considering it a professional course. Now, they could not degrade the said course to M.A./M.Com. (Business Economics). So far as UGC is concerned, it has simply asked the University to restructure M.B.E. course to that of M.A./M.Com./M.B.A. (Business Economics). According to him, nothing special needed to be done. This is a directive of the UGC, which has already been implemented by University of Delhi, Delhi. He suggested that they should give all the three options, i.e., M.A./M.Com./M.B.A. (Business Economics) instead of giving only two options M.A. and M.Com. (Business Economics).

The Vice-Chancellor asked if he meant to say that M.B.A. should not be given, but M.B.A. (Business Economics) should be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that M.B.E. course has been discontinued and has not been recognized by the UGC as per notification dated 5th July 2014. If the gazette notification of July 2014 could not be intimated to the Colleges as a result of which they made the admission to M.B.E. course, which was not recognized by the UGC, even in July 2015. Are they not supposed to introspect as to where they went wrong? After about one year, both DAV College, Chandigarh and GGSDS College, Chandigarh, which are offering M.B.E. course, wrote letters on 18th August 2015 that they have already made the admissions to this course and now the University is writing them to discontinue the course. He emphasized that it needed to be looked into as to how and under what circumstances the information was not given to the Colleges in a period of more than one year that the UGC has discontinued M.B.E. course and asked to restructure it as M.A./M.Com./M.B.A. (Business Economics). Secondly, he did not know how the University has provided the relief to the students. The relief might have been given by the concerned branch at its own or with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor. He understood that the existing students have been asked to opt for either M.Com. or M.A. (Economics) in place of M.B.E. he enquired under whose instructions, the course M.A. (Business Economics) w.e.f. the session 2016-17 has been put under the Faculty of Arts? In fact, three options have been given, viz., M.A. (Business Economics), M.Com and M.A. (Economics). This is the fourth proposal which has probably come from the Dean of Student Welfare or as requested by both the Colleges that the nomenclature of M.B.E. course should be changed to M.B.A. (Business Economics) and the Vice-Chancellor has pertinently asked "should there be the word M.B.A."?. He added that sometime they mention M.B.A. (HR), sometime M.B.A. (Finance) and sometime M.B.A. (General). In this case, they would be mentioning, as suggested M.B.A. (Business Economics). This has to be decided that, in case they could not continue with the M.B.E. course as the UGC did not allow it, could they allow M.B.A. nomenclature in the Colleges because he knew that earlier it was barred that no degree College would be able to offer M.B.A. course.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they had already been running M.B.A. course in Master Tara Singh Memorial College, Ludhiana. In fact, the College had started the course with the same nomenclature, but they (University) had allowed them to offer M.B.E. The UGC has given them just the option that either they could offer M.A. (Business Economics) or M.Com. (Business Economics) or M.B.A. (Business Economics). Since the UGC has given them the option and the students as well as the Colleges are for it and they had also the precedence of Master Tara Singh Memorial College, there is no harm in allowing these Colleges to offer M.B.A. (Business Economics) course.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla stated that the specialization should be in bracket as in the case of M.B.A. (CIT), which meant M.B.A. (Commerce and Information Technology). Similarly, the proposed course should be M.B.A. (Business Economics). That was why they had changed the nomenclature of M.B.E. course as the same was without brackets.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in fact, it is the re-designation of the same course, which is being offered in Master Tara Singh

Memorial College. The query of Shri Ashok Goyal is correct. Therefore, it should be MBA (Business Economics) and what relief they wanted, should be given to the students. However, making the admissions in future by distorting the rules/regulations, would not be proper.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that probably Principal Parveen Chawla was not the Principal of that College, when MBACIT course was introduced in that College. First of all, it should be checked from the records of the University. It is not MBA course, which has been given to Master Tara Singh Memorial College. In fact, it was hotly debated in the Senate, not once or twice, but at least for five times that how Master Tara Singh Memorial College is using the nomenclature of MBA in the prospectus and advertising that they are offering MBA course and were also mentioning CIT within brackets. The course was sanctioned by the UGC under the Innovative Scheme, which did not fall under the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce. In fact, the course is MBA (CIT), i.e., Master of Business Administration (Commerce and Information Technology). At one stage, the University also stated mentioning that course 'MBA (CIT)' as if it is MBA with specialization in Commerce and Information Technology. Thereafter, in one of the meetings of the Senate, it was got corrected and the University said that they would see the Certificate and then issue the Certificate with MBACIT because AICTE did not allow MBA to be given to different Colleges. Then he spoke to the then Principal of the College as to how she got the course, and she told that since MBA is not allowed, they designed an innovative course so that the students should feel that they are doing MBA and they (the College) should feel that they have created a postgraduate degree. He did not want to share the name of the person, who had designed the course. He knew that if they allowed this practice to continue, a day would come when in the Syndicate and Senate people would say that they had already granted MBA to Master Tara Singh Memorial College, why they are not allowing the other Colleges. Now, his simple question is whether AICTE allowed MBA course to degree Colleges or not.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there is no rider. This is only a change of nomenclature. This course is not MBA; rather, it is a special course with changed nomenclature. They already had a precedence as Delhi University has already changed it. He suggested that whatever options the UGC has given, the same should be given to the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would give this option, but it should not be repeated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it needed to be looked into whether a course like M.B.A. could be given to the Faculty of Arts. He pointed out that sometime Faculties are being given a complete go back. So far as academics are concerned, earlier they were bypassing the Board of Studies, Faculties and Academic Council and getting the matter done through the Syndicate and Senate and had now started it doing through some Standing Committees, which is totally against the Regulations of the University.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that a lot of debate is going on this issue, i.e., on the nomenclature of this course. Professor Navdeep Goyal had referred to certain documents of the University Grants Commission. Principal Gurdip Sharma and others had said that since the University of Delhi has already done it, what is the

harm if they also do the same. Giving the background, he said that there was a judgment of the Supreme Court in the year 2013 in which it had said that there was no need for the Colleges to seek their approval for starting the M.B.A. course. He had another judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court (Justice Lodha along with the Bench of 4 Judges) which says that they have overruled the judgement and subsequently the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 9th May 2014 has passed the following orders:

“...prior approval of All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) is compulsory and mandatory for conduct of a technical course including the MBA/Management course by an existing affiliated Technical College and also new Technical College which will require affiliation by a University for conduct of its Technical Courses/ Programmes for the academic year 2014-15.”

A copy of the letter written by Dr. S.S. Mantha, Chairman, All India Council for Technical Education, which has been addressed to the Vice-Chancellor of all the Universities along with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, might also have come to this University. It has also been mentioned in the aforesaid letter of AICTE that “accordingly it is requested that you may ensure that no Technical Institute/Technical College is considered or granted affiliation unless it has obtained prior approval of AICTE for the academic session 2014-15”. After getting this letter, he talked to a senior Professor at University of Delhi who told him that they are trying it for so many years but they have not been allowed to start this M.B.A. course. Then he talked to Dean, University of Delhi who told him that the University could start any course without the approval of AICTE. When they started UIAMS, they started M.B.A. courses without the approval of the AICTE, but as per the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the abovesaid letter of Chairman, AICTE, no affiliated College/Institution could start such a course without the prior approval of AICTE.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they should take a conscious decision. It should not happen that firstly they should make it M.B.A. but when the degree is de-recognized by the UGC/AICTE, they have to think over it.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that the judgment which Professor Karamjeet Singh has quoted has been ignored by the UGC as the notification has come after the aforesaid judgment. Though M.B.A. course has to be recognized by the AICTE, this is not an M.B.A. course and it is just renaming of the course.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the practical solution is that this batch of students of M.B.E. course should be allowed to continue.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that the notification says that the M.B.E. course should be restructured and not renaming of the course, and in the restructuring M.B.A. component has to be there.

Professor Ronki Ram said that while starting the course, if they (Colleges) had taken permission of the UGC, only then they could rename the course. As such, the clause which Professor Karamjeet Singh has quoted is not applicable in the instant case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if as per the notification, the course is to be restructured, there is a technical point. Secondly, if even Sri Ram College of Commerce, Delhi is not allowed to offer M.B.A. course as told by Professor Karamjeet Singh, then there is a problem. At the moment, the matter regarding change of nomenclature of M.B.E. course should be deferred and let it remain M.B.E.

Professor Karamjeet Singh and Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could be verified from the website whether Sri Ram College of Commerce, Delhi is offering M.B.A. course or not.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it is a wrong statement that the Colleges could not offer M.B.A. course without the approval of the AICTE.

Shri Ashok Goyal objected to it and said that Principal Gurdip Sharma must withdraw his statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to resolve the matter and move forward. Since there are a lot of ambiguities, no change should be effected at the moment. If anywhere else in the country, a University or a well known institution has started M.B.A. (Business Economics), they would also do so; otherwise, they would continue with the M.B.E. course for this batch of students.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that MBE is an Innovative Course. In fact, what proposal is being given by the College/s, the same is approved by the UGC under its Innovative Programme. Professor Karamjeet Singh is also right that MBE course is not being offered all over the country.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is distinction in Innovative Courses to be offered in the Institutions/Colleges and the courses are to be offered in the Universities. If the College/s had submitted the proposal to start MBE Course and the UGC had permitted them, then this applied to them. MBE Course is not being offered in any of the University Teaching Department at the Campus. They should try to give the relief to this batch of students and in the meantime, solve the problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal drew the attention of the House towards the notification of the University Grants Commission. The UGC did not say that this Course be restructured as MBE, rather the UGC has suggested that MBE be restructured as 'M.A./MBA/M.Com. (Business Economics)'. That is why they have suggested that where it is not possible, they could restructure it as M.A. (Business Economics) or MBA (Business Economics) or M.Com. (Business Economics).

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to provide relief to this batch of the students. From next year, the College could be asked to restructure it as either M.A. (Business Economics) or MBA (Business Economics) or M.Com. (Business Economics).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they are taking a conscious decision that these two Colleges be allowed to continue to offer MBE Course in violation of Supreme Court and taking the risk, he has no problem.

On a request of Professor Karamjeet Singh, the Vice-Chancellor clarified that since they have given prior information

neither to the Colleges nor to the students that MBE Course is being discontinued. Now, since the students had taken admission, they have to give relief to the students. From the next year, the course would be restructured as per the directive of the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Colleges have been given the option of only renaming the course (M.A. (Business Economics) or MBA (Business Economics) or M.Com. (Business Economics) with the same syllabi. The reply to this is that the admission to M.Com. is given to the students having Commerce background as if with the change of nomenclature, the background is also to change and with the change in nomenclature as MBA, the background is not to change.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the students to this course are being admitted after their qualifying in the OCET.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they imposed the restriction that it is a MBA (Business Economics) course and for that one has to have Commerce background, it is okay.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the two options which are being given to the students are also in different Faculties, i.e., M.A. (Economics) in Faculty of Arts and M.Com. in Faculty of Business Management and Commerce.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that in the interest of the students, they came up with a very innovative solution that since they could not offer MBE anymore as it is not approved by the UGC and also could not allow MBA course as per the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court, they suggested that an option should be given to the students to choose either M.Com. for which an objection was raised that they are not eligible, and to which they had said that even a B.A. student could take admission in M.Com. As such, they should make a special provision for admitting such students. Keeping all this mind, the Committee recommended the students should be given two options – (i) either they could opt for M.Com., which is still a popular course; or (ii) M.A. (Business Economics). Under the prevailing circumstances, these two options recommended by the Committee, should be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they conducted a referendum in the Colleges, 50% of the students would opt for a course and the remaining 50% for another course.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to bring to their notice that one of these two Colleges was running MCA Course, where also the University had given some concession. Finally what was done was that all the students of MCA of that College were transferred to the University Campus to get the course completed, as a special case and whatever fee was charged by the College was transferred to the University. At that time a lot of hue and cry was made both by the parents and the students that the course, to which they had taken the admission, had not been approved by the AICTE and also that they were neither informed by the University nor by the College. As such, they were not at fault. Ultimately, the students were to be transferred to Department of Computer Science & Applications, where the students were imparted instructions in the evening shift as additional infrastructure was not available there for the purpose. If such a problem arose here also, were they ready to face the same knowingly that the Supreme Court/AICTE did not allow it.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that, if need be, a clarification in this regard be sought from the UGC/AICTE.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the UGC has already given three options.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the fault for creating such a situation lay with all of them. Now, to come out of the mess, they should make Principals of these Colleges aware about the possibilities and also that if they wanted they could continue with the existing MBE Course for this year (2015-16).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that MBE Course could be continued to be run for this year as well as the notification of the UGC is of 5th July 2014, whereas they started making admissions from 2nd July 2014. As such, even if they allowed one more batch from this year onward (2015-17), they would be at par with the students of the batch 2014-16, and in this there would be no risk. Otherwise also there would not be any contempt from the UGC. He added that at the moment the students could be given two options – (i) either they should opt for M.A./M.Com. (Business Economics); and (ii) they should continue with the existing MBE Course for one more year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that so far as MBA (Business Economics) is concerned, they have to find out whether there is an administrative provision for the purpose.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that Master Tara Singh Memorial College is already running MBA Programme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Master Tara Singh Memorial College is running MBA (CIT) Course, which is an Innovative Course.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla clarified that, in fact, Master Tara Singh Memorial College is running MBACIT Course and not MBA (CIT).

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they should write MBACIT and not MBA (CIT).

The members suggested that as proposed by the Vice-Chancellor option should be given to the students. They also suggested that a clarification in this regard be sought from the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that practical solution of the problem is that, at the moment, they should maintain the status quo, and consideration of the item should be deferred till a final solution to the problem is found. So far as clarification from the UGC is concerned, one of them has to go to the UGC for the purpose as usually no reply/clarification is received from the UGC.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since Guru Nanak Dev University is also running the MBE Course, the Registrar's Office should contact them and seek requisite information.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Registrar to seek information from Guru Nanak Dev University with regard to the MBE Course.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in this very Syndicate about 2-3 months back he had pointed out that certain courses are being

offered, which are not recognized by the UGC and it was said that now it is high time that they should take necessary steps to ensure that such thing did not happen from the session 2015-16 onwards, but even then the information has not gone. They should understand that the nomenclature of MBE Course is to be changed keeping in view orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, UGC and also the difficulties being faced by the University.

RESOLVED: That consideration of the item be deferred, and in the meantime, status quo be maintained until a final solution to the problem is found.

Sanction of Rs. 10,14,700/- out of 'Development Fund' for construction of ramps

19. Considered if, a sum of Rs.10,14,700/-, be sanctioned out of the budget head 'Development Fund' for construction of ramps up to Ground floor, in various buildings of Panjab University in Sector-14 & 25. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XVII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: Rough cost estimate submitted by Executive Engineer-I, P.U. construction office enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired whether the ramp for Post Office is to be constructed by the University. As far as he remembered, the State Bank of India had itself constructed the ramp. His only concern in asking is to cross check as to whether the ramp is to be constructed by the University or by the Post Office itself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that was the building of Post Office constructed by the University. When told that it is the building of the University, the Vice-Chancellor said that they have to construct the ramp. Secondly, while making assessment next time, the NAAC would ask them and not the Post Office.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, referring to Sr. No. 19, suggested that the XEN Office should be asked to provide pavements for pedestrians, especially connecting the Vice-Chancellor Office and Administrative Block because one cannot freely walk in the campus as they are not able to declare the University vehicle free zone. If he has to come to his (Vice-Chancellor) office, there is no way on which he could walk. Last time when he had raised this issue with the XEN, they constructed the pavements between the Departments of Zoology and Botany.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Dr. Dinesh Kumar is well taken.

RESOLVED: That a sum of Rs.10,14,700/-, be sanctioned out of the budget head 'Development Fund' for construction of ramps up to Ground floor, in various buildings of Panjab University in Sectors 14 and 25.

Exemption from Entrance Test enrolment to Ph.D. Ph.D. for

20. Considered the case of Ms. Richa Sood, Assistant Professor, Biophysics, Dr. R.P. Government Medical College at Tanda, District. Kangra, Himachal Pradesh, be exempted from Ph.D. Entrance test for enrolment in Ph.D. course under the faculty of Science in the Department of Biophysics, P.U.

NOTE: 1. The Research Promotion Cell in its meeting held on 30.06.2015 under Item 5

has resolved that as per the existing UGC Guidelines, Ms. Richa Sood is not eligible for Ph.D. enrolment in Panjab University, Chandigarh without clearing the Ph.D. entrance test or any other equivalent examination, **as the approved permanent (regular for Government Colleges) teachers of the Panjab University and Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University with two year's experience can be exempted from Entrance Test/s for admission to Ph.D.**

2. The Dean, University Instruction has clarified that the above rule/guidelines is not a UGC regulations. This has been approved by the Syndicate and is in vogue, though, somewhat in contravention with UGC regulation, 2009. In analogy teachers of affiliated Colleges of a neighbouring University can be allowed Ph.D. without entrance, in principle by the Syndicate.
3. The Vice-Chancellor has observed as under:

“P.U. is an Inter-state Body Corporate, which attracts good students from all the neighbouring states. I, personally think that if teachers working in Colleges are given exemption to enroll for Ph.D. then a similar concession ought to be considered for teachers working in good Colleges affiliated to premium Universities of neighbouring state as well.”

Shri Jarnail Singh, referring to Note 1, said that the Dean of University Instruction should explain whether to become eligible for the posts of Assistant Professors, the College teachers are also required to get Ph.D. degrees under the UGC Regulations, 2009.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the Syndicate has exempted the approved permanent (regular for Government Colleges) teachers of Panjab University and Colleges affiliated to Panjab University with 2 years' experience from the entrance test for admission to Ph.D. programme.

Shri Jarnail Singh pointed out that when they go to Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University, they found things to be otherwise and always say that their standard is lower. However, they are exempting their own teachers from the Ph.D. Entrance Test. How could they rate themselves higher than those Universities?

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that even the teachers of the University as well as Affiliated Colleges who wanted to do Ph.D. did not find suitable guides. Even the candidates, who had qualified UGC NET/SLET did not find guides, as a supervisor could guide only maximum of 8 candidates. On the one side, their own students are not finding supervisors and on the other side, they are proposing to

allow Ms. Richa Sood, Assistant Professor, Dr. R.P. Government Medical College, Tanda, Distt. Kangra, H.P., which would aggravate the problem more.

Shri Jarnail Singh remarked that if the other Universities/institutions are allowing their (Panjab University and its affiliated Colleges) teachers, only then they should allow the teachers of others Universities/Institutions; otherwise not.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the University Syndicate and Senate had allowed the teachers of Panjab University and its Affiliated Colleges to register themselves for Ph.D. programme without having qualified UGC-NET/SLET. If other Universities also allow them, they could get themselves registered there.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that they had exempted their own teachers from the Entrance Test for registration to Ph.D. programme and could also allow others, but his submission is that if they go by the UGC Regulations, they could not allow even their own teachers. Now, if they open the doors for others, he agreed with Dr. I.S. Sandhu that they would be opening another Pandora's box.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired whether the persons doing Ph.D. under system, would be doing Ph.D. under the UGC Regulations, 2009?

Principal Gurdip Sharma remarked that that is a big question mark.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that even the teachers of their Colleges are entitled to get Ph.D. degree under the UGC Regulations, 2009. They had a permanent job in the Colleges and do not want to change their job, but are getting Ph.D. degree for academic progress. In this spirit, they had allowed their College teachers. In the same spirit, he felt that being an Inter-State Body Corporate and a national University, if the teachers of neighbouring Universities/State wanted to do Ph.D., who had permanent jobs, they should be allowed.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the spirit is very good. No doubt, they could promote such ideas for further research. Once they had a unified system/procedure for registration and getting Ph.D. degree, they should standardize the research excellency. In that category, they are trying that anywhere in India in Colleges or Universities which are governed by the UGC, they should follow such Regulations/Rules that either UGC-NET/SLET or Entrance Test to be conducted by the University for registration to Ph.D. programme. Secondly, the person, who would guide the Ph.D. student, must have at least three years' research work. The candidate, who is registered for Ph.D., has also to do pre-Ph.D. course work. If this person is allowed registration for Ph.D. giving the relaxation, when she would apply for Professorship being a Ph.D., an objection might be raised that since she has not done Ph.D. in accordance with UGC Regulations, 2009, she is not eligible.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he is posing them a question that they had given this relaxation to the teachers of the University as well as affiliated Colleges. When they would get the degree, would they be in a position to say that the degree is as per UGC Regulations 2009 and the members in one voice said no. That meant, they should withdraw this facility.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that 'Yes' they have to withdraw this facility.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the degree to be awarded to such teachers would only be valid in Panjab University alone and not in any other University. Secondly, the persons would approach the Court and make Panjab University a party.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even in their own University (Panjab University), such a degree would not be valid for a new job. At the moment, the way it has come, it could not be approved and they have to give a thought as to how to attend to those colleagues to whom they had already granted exemption. He requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to take a call on it.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, replying to the question posed by the Vice-Chancellor for giving exemption to their own teachers for registering them towards Ph.D. without UGC-NET/SLET or Entrance Test to be conducted by the University, stated that there was a reason for giving this exemption as nowadays one could not become Principal without Ph.D. as Ph.D. degree is must for becoming a Principal. If they did Ph.D., they would become Principals. Secondly, it has been mentioned in Note 2 that the Dean of University Instruction has clarified that this is not a UGC Regulation and instead it is a rule/guideline approved by the Syndicate, which is in vogue, though it is somewhat in contravention of UGC Regulations, 2009. The Ph.D. degree issued to any of these persons by the University would be directly in contravention of UGC Regulations, 2009. He suggested that the exemption given even to their own teachers should also be got reexamined through a Committee.

Principal Gurdip Sharma pointed out that the case of a lecturer of DAV College namely Dr. Tracy Kohli was rejected and the same was cleared only when she produced the certificate of SLET.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the case of Ms. Richa Sood, Assistant Professor, Biophysics, Dr. R.P. Government Medical College at Tanda, District. Kangra, Himachal Pradesh, for exemption from Ph.D. Entrance Test for enrolment to Ph.D. Programme, under the Faculty of Science in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, be rejected.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the exemption granted to the teachers of the University as well as its affiliated Colleges from UGC-NET/SLET and the Entrance Test for registration to Ph.D. Programme.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 22.06.2015 regarding assessing the research values of thesis

21. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 22.06.2015 (**Appendix-XVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (as per authorization given by the Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 (Para11)), to examine the thesis of Mr. Prem Singh for assessing the research value of his Ph.D. thesis. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Earlier, the case of Shri Prem Singh for submission of his Ph.D. thesis was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 (Para 13) (**Appendix-XVIII**) and resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a three members

Committee comprising Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, one member each from NITTTR and Punjab Engineering College to examine the case of Shri Prem Singh and If found that the thesis has no research value, the thesis of the candidate would not be processed.

2. The Committee dated 22.06.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor has recommended that on the basis of the presentation made by Mr. Prem Singh, proofs of conducting experience at various organizations including PEC Chandigarh, IIT, Kanpur, HAL (F&F) Bangalore, TBRL Chandigarh, current relevance of his thesis topic, the committee recommends acceptance of his thesis for evaluation.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 22.06.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Condonation of delay in submission of Ph.D. thesis

22. Considered the recommendation of the Joint Research Board dated 07.05.2015 (Item 28) that Mr. Danesh Hor, be allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis within 15 days from the date of communication of decision by condoning the delay of about 8 years, as he could not submit the thesis due to following reason:

“Due to prolonged illness and passing away of his elder son, his family life was disrupted for many years. They have to relocate and move to Himachal Pradesh and during the process of shifting his entire work and research was lost and as a result he could not submit his thesis in time.”

Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: Mr. Danesh Hor, research scholar, was enrolled under No.14468/Ph.D. dated 18.04.2002 in the Faculty of Languages, Department of Urdu/ Persian. He was required to submit his Ph.D. thesis on 17.04.2007 (including extension for two years), but he could not submit his thesis. The total delay period for submission of Ph.D. thesis as on 03.03.2015 is 7 years 10 months and 16 days.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that in the case under consideration, the delay is about 8 years and in the case contained in next item, the delay is of 1 year and couple of months beyond the permissible period of 8 years. If they allow this candidate to submit the thesis after condoning the delay of more than 8 years, it would set a wrong precedent. He pointed out that in this case also the precedent of Ms. Gunjan Sud, Research Scholar, Department of Botany, has been quoted, where the delay of about 8 years had been condoned in accordance with some professional understanding. Now, even the topic of the thesis might have become irrelevant. As such, he could not digest the condonation of delay in the case under consideration.

Professor A.K. Bhandari pointed out that even in the Item 21, they had got assessed the research value of Ph.D. thesis of Mr. Prem Singh, a Ph.D. candidate in the Faculty of Engineering and Technology. If they wished, the relevance of the topic of research of the candidate under consideration could also be got assessed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would definitely get assessed the relevance of Ph.D. thesis to be submitted by Mr. Danesh Hor.

Professor Ronki Ram pointed out that in the Ph.D. Regulations/Rules/Guidelines of Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), there is a clause under which a candidate could continue his/her Ph.D. even after the period of 20 years. On the one hand, they wanted to bring in professionalism and on the other hand, they are not allowing the candidate to submit the thesis by condoning the delay. If the candidate did not want to continue with his/her Ph.D. or is unable to submit the Ph.D. thesis, they could have a provision to deregister him/her. If he/she wanted to pursue the Ph.D. at a later stage, he/she could get himself/herself registered again. If they adopted the aforesaid provision of JNU, they would never face such a problem. He added that there might be certain reasons which have not permitted the candidate to submit the thesis in time.

RESOLVED: That the relevance of Ph.D. thesis to be submitted by Mr. Danesh Hor, be got assessed and thereafter, the matter be placed before the Syndicate.

Condonation of delay beyond 8 years in submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Neeru Ahuja

23. Considered if, delay of 1 year and 2 months beyond eight years, for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Neeru Ahuja, Research Scholar, enrolled on 01.05.2007 in the Faculty of Law, Department of Laws, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her Ph.D. thesis up to 30.06.2016, as she could not complete her remaining work due to following reason:

“I got married in 2004 and there were some complications in my pregnancy. After a long treatments including surgery I gave birth to my first baby in March 2009 and the second baby in July, 2010 both by caesarean operation. As a result, after these two surgeries, my health fell down. I have been consulting the doctors and taking medicines as prescribed by them. Besides, shouldering other social responsibilities, I have to look after these two school going kids. Owing to other important family responsibilities, some of my work has still remained pending. Although, I am trying very hard to complete the same but I need more time to complete the remaining work.”

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

- NOTE:**
1. Request of Ms. Neeru Ahuja dated 25.06.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).
 2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as eight years from the date of

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

RESOLVED: That, keeping in view the reasons explained by Ms. Neeru Ahuja, a Research Scholar, enrolled on 01.05.2007 in the Faculty of Law, Department of Laws, the delay of 1 year and 2 months beyond eight years in the submission of Ph.D. thesis by her, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her Ph.D. thesis up to 30.06.2016.

Request of Shri Prabhdeep Singh, for admission to LL.B (3 year)

24. Considered request of Shri Prabhdeep Singh S/o Shri Balwinder Singh that he be given admission to LL.B (3-Year) in the Department of Laws, under the category of Riot Victim/Terrorist Victim, as the family has got financially and socially incapacitated till date.

NOTE: 1. The Dean, University Instruction has observation as under:

“As per rule (vii) on page 219 of Hand Book of Information, 2015 sons/daughters of persons killed/incapacitated in November, 1984 riots 2% seats are reserved. This has been approved by the Syndicate. In 2013 based on practice in Punjab Government and legal opinion the benefit was extended to the wards of those whose property/business was destroyed in riots. However, when this was sent to Syndicate for ratification/endorsement, it was not approved after some discussion. In case this benefit is to be extended to economically effected persons, it needs approval of Syndicate as well as nominal period notice of to other similar situated candidates who may apply, if the benefits is extended to economically affected persons.”

2. Earlier, the item regarding amendment in rule (vii) at page 219 of P.U. Handbook of Information 2015, for admission to the courses offered by the University Teaching Department/Centres/Institute to the person/s killed/incapacitated in November

1984 riots and terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh, was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.07.2015 vide Para 51 and the consideration of the item was deferred. In the mean while, a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.

3. Later on, the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendations of the Committee has approved the amendment in the said rule, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the benefit under the category of riot victim/terrorist victim should also be given to the grand children of the riot/terrorist victims as the wards are not available. During the time of terrorism in Punjab many persons, especially Hindu Gentlemen sold their properties at throwaway prices and left Punjab. Similarly, when the riots broke out in Delhi, many people from other States came to Punjab and settled here and also claimed benefit/s of riot victims. He pleaded that though the benefit of riot/terrorist victims should be given to the grand children, it should be ensured/verified that a First Information Report (FIR) in that respect has been lodged and the FIR not found to be lodged, the benefit should not be given. So far as certificate is concerned, everybody would produce the certificate to this effect.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that last to last year when the Punjab Government had allowed this benefit, they had obtained legal opinion and the legal opinion was that since the Punjab Government has done it, they should also do it. They (University) did it in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate as it was admission time, but when the matter was reported to the Syndicate, the Syndicate did not ratify the same. However, thereafter no such admission was made.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that so far as the suggestion put forth by Dr. I.S. Sandhu is concerned the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider the admission guidelines for the courses offered by the University to the persons killed/incapacitated in November 1984 riots and terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh, has recommended that Rule 2(B) (vii) be amended and grandsons/grand-daughters should be incorporated. However, the Rule says that the persons killed/incapacitated in November 1984 riots should be given 2% reservation, whereas the candidate is neither killed nor incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh. They could only adopt the policy of the Government, but could not make change/s in the policy of the Government. They are asking that since such an admission was made in the year 2013, he should also be given admission. However, no comment has been given on it by the Department of Laws. The candidate submitted an application and they placed the item before the Syndicate without any document.

Professor Ronki Ram read out Notes 1, 2 and 3 mentioned under the item. Now, the matter is before the Syndicate to take an appropriate decision.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that both existing and proposed Rule has been mentioned in the recommendation of the Committee

(page 187), but there is no difference between existing and proposed rule.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that rule with regard to killed and incapacitated persons are already there, but for economic losses it is not there. There are many families which had suffered such a huge economic loss that they were really incapacitated, not physically but economically. As they had done a couple of cases (in earlier item) on humanitarian grounds, this case could also be done as a special case on humanitarian grounds and it should also be made precedence.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he did not know why the Committee headed by the Dean of University Instruction has given one observation that an admission was made in the year 2013 based on a practice followed by the Punjab Government and legal opinion. He wondered how such an admission was made in spite of the fact that the University has faced more than one case in the High Court wherein those, who have suffered economically, had very well said that they should also be included in the category of incapacitated and they also gave example of some admissions made from that category in the Department of Laws in the year 2007, but the Hon'ble High Court turned down their application/petition saying that incapacitated is clearly defined that unless and until one is incapacitated to more than 50%, he/she could not be considered as incapacitated. So it is either killed or physically incapacitated, but these people say it is much worse to suffer monetary loss than getting physically incapacitated. Now, see what they are doing. They are seeking a benefit to a loss which they incurred in 1984, that too, to the grand children against the economic loss incurred in the year 1984 as if nothing has been done during the last 34 years and the revival is only based on the admission sought. Earlier, the logic which had been given was that they had lost something and what is the evidence and that was why a policy was framed and entry in this regard was to be made in the Red Card as to who are the dependent/s who is/are eligible for the grant of concession under the riot victim/terrorist violence category. Thereafter, they said that the entries in the Red Cards are to be made only of the wards/children of the riot/terrorist victims. Grand children should also be allowed because now children are hardly available who are in the age of getting admission in the Colleges/University because all those who have been covered under the existing rule, they should try to create another category so that this rule keeps on. He said that after 20 years even the grand children would cease to be, would they be considering their grand children and there would be no end. The policy of the Government is only and only for the freedom fighters where right from the beginning they had covered the category of grand children, but the category of freedom fighter was also created in the year 1970, in spite of that in the year 1990 they intentionally included the grand children to the list. In the last meeting, an item was placed before the Syndicate and it was decided that the consideration of the same be deferred, and in the meantime, a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the case and make recommendation/s so that the Syndicate considers the recommendation/s of the Committee and that was qua covering the grand children. In the meeting of the Committee, in which all the three members of the Syndicate, i.e., Dean of University Instruction, Professor Ronki Ram, Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla, were present in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, instead of making the recommendations to the Syndicate, are recommending that the Rule 2(B)(vii) be amended as proposed and the Vice-Chancellor may

approve the same in anticipation approval of the Syndicate for admission for the current session. That was why he was wondering how this has not seen the light of the day because he remembered that it was also suggested that Shri Ashok Goyal would also assist the Dean of University Instruction/Committee. No recommendation has come to the Syndicate as it has only come in the form of recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor, and the person, who wanted the admission, has got the admission. Another category is coming up that the definition of incapacitated be also changed by the Panjab University and incapacitated should include those who have suffered economically. He did not know whether Professor Karamjeet Singh remembers it or not, but he knew it for sure that there was a son of an employee of the University itself and grandson of riot/terrorist victim, who had sought admission in Department none other than the University Business School on the plea that his grandfather was not only incapacitated but had also suffered loss economically. He had pleaded that his father had died and they had suffered loss economically, but the University had not acceded to his request. Professor Naval Kishore might also remember that there was a lot of pressure from Delhi as well as SGPC that they would make a case of excesses, but the University did not succumb to the pressure. The candidate went to the Hon'ble High Court and the High Court dismissed the writ petition that he could not be considered under the category of riot/terrorist victim. He did not know why this observation has not been mentioned here? They should not make another wrong on the basis of a wrong committed earlier. He pleaded that it should be enquired as to why and under what circumstances such an admission was made earlier rather than changing the definition, that too, in August, i.e., the end for admission for the session 2015-16. If at all they could change the definition, it should be from the session 2016-17 only. Since the Committee met on 3rd August 2015, he did not know why the process, including issuance of fresh admission notice giving at least one week's time from the date of notification, has been completed or not. However, here they are considering a particular case by changing the policy only to accommodate a particular person, which would not send a right signal, especially in the corridor of the Judiciary.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that he knew that there are similar cases and the candidates have failed to apply. What about those candidates, because in the Hand Book of Information nowhere it has been mentioned that the benefit of riot/terrorist victim would also be given to the grandchildren. If they wanted to extend this benefit to the grandchildren, this provision should be mentioned/incorporated in the Hand Book of Information and admission from the next session, i.e., 2016-17 be made accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if an exigency arrived to change the rule, they should refer to the policy/rule framed by the respective Government because they did not have any mechanism to check/verify as to how much loss one has suffered.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the Syndicate dated 19th July 2015 decided that the consideration of the item be deferred, and in the meanwhile, a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the whole case and make recommendation/s. The Committee was constituted, met on 3.08.2015 and perused the Notification No.5/35/2014-5HB-III/559 dated 30.03.2015 issued by the Department of Medical Education and Research (Health-III Branch), Government of Punjab, and No.13/14/2015-4TEZ/529486/1 dated 7.7.2015 issued by the Department of

Technical Education & Industrial Training (Technical Education Branch-II), Government of Punjab, wherein the children/grandchildren of those who have lost a bread winner owing to terrorist action or where such a person has suffered permanent disability of 50% and above as a result of terrorist action or children/grandchildren of riot victims, if someone in family, was killed between **31.10.1984** and 07.11.1984 in the riots in Delhi, Bokaro, Kanpur and other places, have been given the benefit of reservation. As such, they did not make any recommendation at their own, but on the basis of Department of Medical Education and Research and Department of Technical Education & Industrial Training, Government of Punjab.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that it should be taken in two parts – (i) whether the financial and socially incapacitated people are to be included or not; and (ii) in the case of grandchildren, they should follow the directive of Government only. The letters to which Professor Ronki Ram was talking, that should have been annexed with the item as an annexure.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no consensus so far as first part is concerned. So far as 2nd part is concerned, they should follow the Government directive.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the request of Shri Prabhdeep Singh S/o Shri Balwinder Singh that he be given admission to LL.B (3-Year) in the Department of Laws, under the category of Riot Victim/Terrorist Victim, as the family has got financially and socially incapacitated till date, be **not** acceded to.

Recommendations of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 7.08.2015

25. Considered minutes dated 07.08.2015 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 07.08.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Revised rates for printing of Text-Books by private publishers

26. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 04.08.2015 (**Appendix-XXI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to review/revise the existing price formula of Text-Books published by the private Publishers and prescribed in the University courses.

NOTE: A copy of previous formula approved by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 23.03.2008 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**)

RESOLVED: The recommendations of the Committee dated 04.08.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Discontinuation of extension of affiliation granted to SGGS College, Sector 26, Chandigarh, for B.A.-I (Functional English)

27. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation earlier granted to Sri Guru Gobind Singh College (co-educational), Sector-26, Chandigarh, for B.A.-I (Functional English), be discontinued from the academic session 2016-17 in the phased manner as per regulation 13.5 i.e. there would be no admission for B.A.-I (Functional English) from the session 2016-17, but the admission for B.A.-II (Functional English) and B.A.-III (Functional English) will be made, no admission in B.A.-II (Functional English) from the session 2017-18, but the admission for B.A.-III (Functional English) will be made and there

would no admission in B.A.-I, II & III (Functional English) from the session 2019-20. Information contained in office note **(Appendix-XXII)** was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 13.5 appearing at page 161 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, reproduced below:

The discontinuation in respect of each integrated Course of study/subject for which it is affiliated shall be in stage as under:

(i) In the first year, admission to Part I classes will be discontinued and admissions to Part II/III will continue;

(ii) In the 2nd year, admission to Part II classes will discontinue and class for Part III, if any, will continue;

(iii) In the 3rd year, there may be no admission.

2. Sri Guru Gobind Singh College for Women, Sector-26, Chandigarh, was granted temporary extension of affiliation Functional English (Elective) for the session 2013-14 vide letter No. Misc.A-5/9225-9239 dated 10.07.2013 **(Appendix-XXII)**.

3. The Senate in its meeting dated 29.09.2013 vide Para XLIX **(Appendix-XXII)** had approved the following recommendation of the Syndicate dated 15.05.2013 (Para 18):

“That an Inspection Committee be appointed for inspecting GGS College for Women, Sector 26, Chandigarh, for grant of temporary extension of affiliation in Functional English (Vocational-Elective) at graduate level for the session 2013-14 in place of Diploma in Creative Photography.”

4. Request dated 11.07.2015 of the Officiating Principal, Sri Guru Gobind Singh College (co-educational), Sector-26, Chandigarh, enclosed **(Appendix-XXII)**.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that as per his knowledge, the College has discontinued the admissions to B.A.-I (Functional English) from this year itself, whereas even if the College is permitted, the decision would be effective from the academic session 2016-17. Therefore, it should be verified.

It was informed that a clarification has come from the College that they would discontinue the course from the session 2016-17.

Principal Gurdip Sharma still urged that the Dean, College Development Council should be asked to verify as to whether the

College has made admissions to B.A. I (Functional English) or has actually discontinued the course from the session 2015-16 itself.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council to verify as to whether the College has made admissions to B.A. I (Functional English) or has actually discontinued the course from the session 2015-16 itself.

RESOLVED: That temporary extension of affiliation earlier granted to Sri Guru Gobind Singh College (co-educational), Sector-26, Chandigarh, for B.A.-I (Functional English), be discontinued from the academic session 2016-17 in the phased manner as per Regulation 13.5, i.e., there would be no admission for B.A-I (Functional English) from the session 2016-17, but the admission for B.A.-II (Functional English) and B.A.-III (Functional English) will be made, no admission in B.A.-II (Functional English) from the session 2017-18, but the admission for B.A.-III (Functional English) will be made and there would no admission in B.A.-I, II & III (Functional English) from the session 2019-20.

Award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy

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

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that since the preparation of the minutes of the Syndicate meetings takes time, the candidates, whose award of Ph.D. degrees are approved, suffered a lot. He, therefore, suggested that the power to approve the award of Ph.D. degrees should be delegated to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even if the power to approve the award of Ph.D. degrees is delegated to him, some delay could occur at his level as well.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the power to approve the award of Ph.D. degree should be delegated to the Controller of Examinations.

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

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
1.	Ms. Rajinder Kaur Hostel No.2, Room No.4, Panjab University	Science/ Zoology	THERAPEUTIC POTENTIAL OF BEE POLLEN AGAINST OXIDATIVE STRESS INDUCED BY <i>SALMONELLA TYPHIMURIUM</i> IN MICE
2.	Mr. Anil Kumar Teacher Flat No.8, Sector-14, P.U.	Science/ Chemistry	NUCLEOPHILIC SUBSTITUTION REACTIONS OF α -HYDROXYKETONES: SYNTHESIS AND STRUCTURAL STUDIES OF α -FUNCTIONALIZED KETONES
3.	Ms. Nitina Ahuja H.No.105, Sector-45-A, Chandigarh	Science/ Botany	AN ASSESSMENT OF THE HERBICIDAL POTENTIAL OF EUGENOL AND SOME INSIGHTS INTO ITS MODE OF ACTION

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
4.	Mr. Suman Lal S/o Jai Ram V.P.O. Kuhna Teh. Rakkar Distt. Kangra H.P. – 177043	Science/ Physics	SYNTHESIS AND CHARACTERIZATION OF CARBON NANO-TUBE DOPED ELECTROACTIVE POLYMERS
5.	Ms. Kumari Reena #5063/2, Modern Complex, Manimajra Chandigarh	Science/ Chemistry	ADSORPTION OF SOME ORGANIC AND INORGANIC ADSORBATES FROM VAPOUR AND AQUEOUS PHASE ON ACTIVATED CARBONS
6.	Ms. Amanpreet Kaur C/o S. Jagsir Singh V.P.O. Himmatpura Teh. Nihal Singh Wala, Distt. Moga (Pb.)	Science/ Nano science & Nano technology	DESIGN AND SYNTHESIS OF TRIPODAL AND POLYMERIC RECEPTORS: NANOPARTICLE BASED SENSORS AND BIOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS
7.	Ms. Shivani H.No. 426, Sector-25, Panchkula	Languages/ English	EXPLORING THE USE OF FIRST LANGUAGE GRAMMAR TO FACILITATE SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL
8.	Ms. Nidhi Kataria House No.287, Sector- 20-A, Chandigarh	Arts/ Psychology	EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGERS: THE ROLE OF INNOVATION, EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE
9.	Mr. Sardool Singh Staff Colony S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Distt. Hoshiarpur	Arts/ Political Science	INDO-US STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP IN THE POST COLD WAR PERIOD
10.	Ms. Priyanka Singla #2734, Street No.1 Lachhman Colony Gidderbaha Muktsar, Punjab	Science/ Botany	EFFECT OF EXOGENOUS APPLICATION OF FLAVONOID ON GROWTH, SYMBIOTIC PERFORMANCE AND RELATED METABOLISM IN MYCORRHIZAL CHICKPEA PLANTS UNDER SALT STRESS
11.	Mr. Hamzeh Moradi Room No.35, Block No.1 Boys Hostel No.2 Panjab University Chandigarh	Languages/ English	SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY OF PERSIAN-ENGLISH CODE – SWITCHING AND CODE-MIXING AMONG IRANIAN BILINGUAL STUDENTS IN INDIA
12.	Mr. Inder Jeet Singh V.P.O. Jolna, Teh. Sihoala Distt. Chamba, H.P.	Arts/ Geography	HORTICULTURE IN HIMACHAL PRADESH: A SPATIO-TEMPORAL ANALYSIS (1974-2006)
13.	Ms. Simran Jaidka H.No.612, Sector-18-B, Chandigarh	Arts/ Economics	IMPACT OF SELF-HELP GROUP-BANK LINKAGE PROGRAMME ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF BENEFICIARIES: A CASE STUDY OF PANCHKULA DISTRICT OF HARYANA
14.	Ms. Deepika Bagga Bagga Cottage Balachour, Nawanshahr, Punjab	Science/ Biophysics	NEURAL SUBSTRATES OF COGNITIVE DEFICITS IN ALCOHOL DEPENDENTS: A MULTIPARAMETRIC MR APPROACH
15.	Mr. Lokender Kumar V.P.O. Haripur Tehsil Manali Distt. Kullu (H.P.)	Science/ Microbiology	MOLECULAR MECHANISM OF IMMUNOPROTECTIVE POTENTIAL OF ZINGERONE AGAINST INFLAMMATION CAUSED BY LIPOPOLYSACCHARIDE OF <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
16.	Ms. Sandeep Kaur B-XX, 2032/4, Gobind Nagar Near Saggu Market Chowk PAU Gate No. 3 Ludhiana	Business Management & Commerce	INFLUENCE OF EMOTIONAL LABOUR AND WORK FAMILY CONFLICT ON BURN OUT AND JOB SATISFACTION (AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOSPITALS OF PUNJAB)
17.	Mr. Yadwinder Singh Deol H.No. 2238/37, Gali No. 6, Shanti Nagar Manimajra Town Chandigarh -160101	Science/ Chemistry	STUDIES IN ARYLATION OF AMINO- CARBANIONS VIA BENZYNE INTERMEDIATE AND THEIR APPLICATIONS IN SYNTHESIS OF ALKALOIDS AND RELATED COMPOUNDS
18.	Ms. Guneet Toor 891-A, New Punjab Mata Nagar, Ludhiana	Education/ Education	DYSFUNCTIONAL CAREER THOUGHTS OF ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR SELF EFFICACY EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND CAREER INDECISION
19.	Ms. Neelima Gupta H.No.2361, Sector 35-C Chandigarh	Business Management & Commerce	INFLUENCE OF BUSINESS STRATEGY AND HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICES ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED SMEs IN NORTH INDIA: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION
20.	Ms. Santosh Bhukal H.No. 121/B-3, Bhima Devi Colony, Pinjore District Panchkula	Science/ Environment Studies	SYNTHESIS OF SOFT AND HARD FERRITES FROM INDUSTRIAL WASTE WATER AND THEIR CHARACTERIZATION
21.	Mr. Sandeep Kumar Pundir Vill. Nagali Mahnat P.O. Paharpur (U.P.) Saharanpur-247551	Science/ Physics	GROWTH AND CHARACTERIZATION OF BISMUTH AND ANTIMONY BASED SEMICONDUCTING COMPOUNDS, THIN FILMS AND NANOCOMPOSITES FOR THERMOELECTRIC PROPERTIES
22.	Mr. Kulvinder Singh C/o Prof. S.K. Mehta Department of Chemistry P.U., Chandigarh	Science/ Chemistry	SYNTHESIS AND CHARACTERIZATION OF NANOSTRUCTURED METAL OXIDES FOR ELECTROCHEMICAL SENSOR AND OTHER POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS
23.	Mr. Santosh Kumar Gautam A-6, Sainik School Kapurthala(Pb.)	Languages/ English	RECENTRING WOMAN: A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE IN THE SELECTED WORKS OF KAMALA DAS, IMTIAZ DHARKER AND SUJATA BHATT
24.	Ms. Guneet Inder Jit Kaur Karam Kunj 12-A-1, Ranbir Marg Model Town Patiala	Arts/ Psychology	EXCELLENCE IN ACADEMICS AND SPORTS: THE ROLE OF GRIT, PERFECTIONISM, SELF-EFFICACY, FLOW AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE
25.	Ms. Ramandeep Kaur 345-, Aggar Nagar Ferozepur Road, Ludhiana	Education/ Education	STUDY OF WORKPLACE STRESS, COPING STYLES AND PERSONALITY HARDINESS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS
26.	Ms. Neetu Ohri W-12, Sector-14, P.U., Chandigarh	Education/ Education	EFFECT OF BRUNER'S CONCEPT ATTAINMENT MODEL ON ACHIEVEMENT IN HINDI IN RELATION TO LEARNING APPROACHES AND INTELLIGENCE
27.	Ms. Ritu Pasrija H.No. 2119, St. No.15, Abohar	Science/ Physics	TRANSPORT PROPERTIES OF NANOFLUIDS

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
28.	Ms. Kanwalpreet Kaur Uppal H.No. 2351 Sector-38-C Chandigarh	Science/ Botany	STUDIES ON GROWTH PATTERN OF <i>SPIRULINA PLATENSIS</i> AND ITS ROLE AS HEPATOPROTECTANT
29.	Ms. Binderjit Kaur 2466 Mohalla-Mata Gujri Kartarpur District Jalandhar (Pb.)	Education/ Education	TEACHING COMPETENCE OF STUDENT-TEACHERS IN RELATION TO GENERAL, EMOTIONAL AND SPIRITUAL INTELLIGENCE
30.	Ms. Jyoti D/o Shri Ram Bhai V.P.O. Jalalpur, Kalan Tehsil & Distt. Jind	Science/ Zoology	EFFECT OF CELL-PHONE FREQUENCY ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATIONS ON EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF CHICK AND BRAIN OF RAT
31.	Ms. Neeru Bhatia nee Neeru Verma 1057/HIG , Cat.-I (G.F.) Sector-39-B Chandigarh	Arts/ Library Science	APPLICATION ON INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY FOR PROVIDING REFERENCE AND INFORMATION SERVICES: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES OF DELHI AND CHANDIGARH
32.	Mr. Kanchan Kumar De Quarter No. 6 M.S. College Staff Qtrs. Tilak Road Saharanpur	Science/ Physics	STUDY OF MODULATIONAL INSTABILITY AND SOLITARY WAVE SOLUTIONS FOR CLASS OF NONLINEAR SCHRODINGER EQUATIONS
33.	Mr. Harjinder Singh Room No.32 Block 1 Boys Hostel No.4 (Patel Hall) P.U., Chandigarh	Science/ Botany	CELLULAR DIFFERENTIATION IN A RICE FIELD CYANOBACTERIUM WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO AKINETES

RESOLVED FURTHER: That, in order to avoid delay, the power to approve the award of Ph.D. degrees, be delegated to the Controller of Examinations, and if need be, the information be given to the Syndicate.

Deferred Item

29. 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. 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.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari, who was the Chairman of the Committee constituted to explore the possibility of re-designation or upgradation of existing posts of Executive Engineer-1 & Sub-Divisional Engineer (Electrical & Horticulture) to that of Superintending Engineer & Executive Engineer (Electrical & Horticulture), to brief the members about the whole issue.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that though it has been written that the recommended re-designation/upgradation to these persons would be without financial benefits as a measure personal to them, it seemed that financial benefits are involved.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why such an item has been placed before the Syndicate in the Supplementary Agenda. According to him, only those items should be included in the Supplementary Agenda which arose out of certain emergencies and needed to be discussed/considered urgently. Since this item needed thorough discussion, its consideration should be deferred till the next meeting.

This was agreed to.

Consideration of Items 30, 31, 32 & 33 on the supplementary agenda was deferred till next meeting, viz. -

Deferred Items

30. To consider 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 consequent upon in the placement of Senior scale.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 04.08.2012 (Para 12) 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. An office note was enclosed.

31. To consider 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.

- 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. Cal. Vol. 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 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) , 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 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. An office note was enclosed.

32. To consider minutes of the Committee dated 25.05.2015 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 are enclosed.
 2. Minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 05.05.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding N.C.T.E. Regulation-2014 are enclosed.

33. To review the 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.”

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. Detailed office note was enclosed.

Condonation of delay for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Laxmi Devi

34. Considered if, delay of 1 month and 27 days beyond eight years, for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Laxmi Devi, Research Scholar, enrolled under No.16488 dated 23.06.2007 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Geography, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to following reasons:

- (i) She had been working on relevant topic. The nature of her research work requires data pertaining to all the states and union territories. She could not collect this data in spite of her frequent efforts. In order to produce good work, she could not compromise with quality work.
- (ii) Problems faced in data collection coupled with her professional assignments as she is teaching in school of Punjab Education Board in S.B.S. Nagar District, Punjab and she had to travel a long distance between her place of work and the University. This slowed down the pace of her research work.
- (iii) The relevant data made available in the last year related to 2011 Census. She decided to make use of it and place it in her dissertation work but this requires time.

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

NOTE: 1. Request dated 23.07.2015 of Ms.Laxmi Devi enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/ Senate is reproduced below:

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

reasons to be recorded. The relevant regulations be amended accordingly”

RESOLVED: That, keeping in view the reasons explained by Ms. Laxmi Devi, a Research Scholar, enrolled under No.16488 dated 23.06.2007 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Geography, the delay of 1 month and 27 days beyond eight years in the submission of Ph.D. thesis by her, be condoned and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision.

Execution of MoU between INFLIBNET and Panjab University

35. Considered and

RESOLVED: That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXIV**) for Shodhganga/Shodhgangotri, be executed between Information and Library Network Centre (INFLIBNET) an IUC of University Grant Commission located at Gandhinagar and Panjab University, Chandigarh. Dr. Raj Kumar, Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, be appointed as University Coordinator for liaising with INFLIBNET on behalf of the University.

Confirmation of faculty members

36. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor, and

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

(i) Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
>1.	Ms. Nidhi Singhal	Assistant Professor in B.E. MBA	25.12.1985	28.05.2014 (A.N.)	29.05.2015
>2.	Ms. Harjit Kaur	-do-	14.08.1979	02.06.2014 (F.N.)	02.06.2015
3.	Dr. Sanjeev Gautam	Assistant Professor in Physics	16.04.1971	24.06.2014 (A.N.)	25.06.2015

> **In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.**

(ii) Public Administration

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
*1.	Dr. Bharati Garg	Assistant Professor	05.12.1975	19.05.2014 (A.N.)	19.5.2015
*2.	Dr. Bhawna Gupta	Assistant Professor	12.02.1976	19.05.2014 (A.N.)	20.05.2015

* **In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.**

(iii) UIHM&T

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
**1.	Dr. Arun Singh Thakur	Assistant Professor	13.07.1985	28.05.2014	28.5.2015
**2.	Dr. Jaswinder Kumar	Assistant Professor	07.01.1981	03.06.2014	3.6.2015

**** In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.**

(iv) Philosophy

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Pankaj Srivastva	Assistant Professor	13.12.1975	29.05.2014	29.5.2015

(v) Urdu

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Ali Abbas	Assistant Professor	02.03.1980	06.06.2014	6.6.2015

(vi) UBS

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Kulwinder Singh	Assistant Professor in Economics	15.08.1982	10.06.2014	10.6.2015
2.	Dr. Pooja Soni	Assistant Professor in Operation Research	06.03.1985	18.07.2014 (A.N.)	19.7.2015

(vii) Economics

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
\$1.	Dr. Paramjit Singh	Assistant Professor	03.03.1984	24.07.2014	24.7.2015
\$2.	Dr. Meenu	Assistant Professor	09.07.1981	07.08.2014	7.8.2015

\$ In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.

(viii) Physics

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
^1.	Dr. Lokesh Kumar	Assistant Professor	03.05.1981	23.07.2014	16.7.2015
^2.	Dr. (Ms.) Sakshi Gautam	Assistant Professor	09.03.1987	21.07.2014 (AN)	17.7.2015
^3.	Dr. (Ms.) Gulsheen Ahuja	Assistant Professor	05.04.1976	18.07.2014	18.7.2015

^ In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.

NOTE: Subject to decision of Hon'ble High Court in CWP No.12025 of 2015.

(ix) Microbial Biotechnology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
• 1.	Dr. (Ms.) Rachna Singh	Assistant Professor	25.04.1984	19.5.2014 (AN)	19.5.2015
• 2.	Dr. Samer Singh	Assistant Professor	26.01.1975	19.5.2014 (AN)	20.5.2015

• **In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.**

(x) Geology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
✓ 1.	Dr. Seema Singh	Assistant Professor	29.10.1981	06.06.2014	2.6.2015
✓ 2.	Dr. Mahesh Thakur	Assistant Professor	09.06.1980	09.06.2014	3.6.2015
✓ 3.	Dr. Senthil Kumar G.	Assistant Professor	15.03.1984	04.06.2014	4.6.2015

✓ **In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.**

(xi) Biophysics

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Naveen Kaushal	Assistant Professor	26.09.1980	25.06.2014	25.6.2015

(xii) University School of Open Learning

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of confirmation
➤ 1.	Dr. Purva Mishra	Assistant Professor in Public Administration	11.2.1978	21.5.2014	18.5.2015
➤ 2.	Sh. Anil Kumar	Assistant Professor in Public Administration	1.3.1982	19.5.2014	19.5.2015
❖ 3.	Dr. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal	Assistant Professor in English	21.9.1970	18.6.2014 (A.N.)	29.5.2015
❖ 4.	Ms. Ravinder Kaur	Assistant Professor in English	26.8.1986	30.5.2014	30.5.2015
5.	Dr. (Ms.) Kamla	Assistant Professor in Political Science	2.4.1965	28.5.2014	28.5.2015

➤ **In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.**

❖ **In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.**

(xiii) English & Cultural Studies

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of confirmation
1.	Mr. Sudhir Mehra	Assistant Professor	14.7.1983	29.5.2014	29.5.2015

(xiv) Evening Studies-MDRC

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of confirmation
1.	Ms. Simran Kaur	Assistant Professor in Economics	16.6.1984	4.7.2014	4.7.2015

(xv) P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of confirmation
1.	Dr. (Ms.) Meera Nagpal	Assistant Professor in History	16.6.1981	22.07.2014 (A.N.)	23.7.2015

(xvi) Computer Science & Applications

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed Date of confirmation
#1.	Dr. (Ms.) Kavita Taneja	Assistant Professor	1.5.1979	23.7.2014 (A.N.)	21.7.2015
#2.	Ms. Supreet Kaur Mann	Assistant Professor	13.5.1985	22.7.2014	22.7.2015

In order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 19.8.2015

37. Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 19.8.2015 (**Appendix-XXV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the complaint of Dr. Gurdial Singh as an eminent scholar against the Punjabi Publishers.

- NOTE:**
1. Requests of Professor Yograj Angrish and Professor Gurdial Singh enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).
 2. Photocopy of the relevant Rules and Appendix 'A' as mentioned in the minutes of the Committee enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

Professor Ronki Ram stated that Dr. Gurdial Singh has made a complaint that the publishers of the books entering into an agreement with the authors, after paying the royalty for a period of 6 months or so, do not pay royalty to the authors thereafter, whereas the books are prescribed regularly. Dr. Gurdial Singh has now suggested that whenever a book is prescribed in undergraduate/postgraduate course, the publisher should submit NOC from the author that he has paid the royalty to the author/s, is paying the royalty and will also pay the same in future as well, so that the author/s has/have the knowledge

that they are being paid the royalty for the books being prescribed by the University.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated since the syllabus is revised after a period of 4 years, new books are invited from a registered publisher for a course only if the syllabus is changed. So far as the subject of Punjabi is concerned, there are only 6 registered publishers. The Board of Studies assessed the books for a period of 2-3 months before recommending a book for any course. He had met Dr. Gurdial Singh, who has told him that though his books are prescribed in Panjab University and other Universities, the publishers, whose books are prescribed in Panjab University, neither inform him and nor pay the royalty. He suggested that a system be created wherein a copy of the agreement on a stamp paper of Rs.50/- between the author and the publisher, should be submitted along with the books invited from the publisher, wherein the payment of royalty should be mentioned and also that the publisher will continue to pay the royalty in future also whenever the books are prescribed in a course.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated he has a great respect for Dr. Gurdial Singh. However, the payment of royalty is an issue, which is between the author and the publisher.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that at the time when the publisher gives the proposal, it should be decided how many books he proposes to sell and he should be asked to submit the consent of the author so that it is in the knowledge of the author.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that the consent of the author should be taken after every 2 years.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that whenever the Board of Studies recommends the books, the consent could be obtained.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out to a problem being faced with the publishers. In the subject of Punjabi, there are no international publishers and even outside the State. Similar problem is also being faced in other regional languages. He, therefore, suggested that the publication of the books of regional languages by publishers in a State should be considered as national level books.

Professor Karamjeet Singh pointed out that the Dean of University Instruction has issued a circular that every department must update the periodicals. He, however, did not know whether the same has been implemented or not.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that several Committees have been formed for implementation of the said circular. On enquiry by Dr. I.S. Sandhu whether he (Dr. Sandhu) has been appointed a member of the said Committee, Professor Bhandari said that he (Dr. Sandhu) would also be associated with the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if a publisher says that he has paid the royalty, but the author says that he has not received, how the matter would be resolved. If they took a copy of the agreement, it meant that they have to become the arbitrator. Could they become the arbitrator? Referring to the comments that "there is no provision for royalty for text books and if the Vice-Chancellor wants to make this kind of provision, he may be requested to carry this item to the Syndicate/Senate", he said that he did not know whose handwriting

is. Probably, the Vice-Chancellor has marked the letter to the Registrar and the Registrar has marked the same to the Manager, Publication Bureau, who has written that there is no provision for royalty for textbooks.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the Manager, Publication Bureau, is referring to another matter which related to compilation of stories of different authors, wherein the rates for compilation have been mentioned and the same is out of context

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is written on the letter of Dr. Gurdial Singh. The copyright is either with the publisher or in some cases, it is with the author. If the copyright is with the publisher, then it is an arrangement between the author and the publisher, and the University does not come in the picture anywhere. But if they say that they have to take an affidavit from the publisher that he is paying royalty, he thought the University would be entering into an era wherein the University would prescribe only those books where the publisher pays the royalty to the authors. It is not in the case of Dr. Gurdial Singh alone. He is an eminent person and did not bother about the royalty. His only concern is about the exploitation of the genuine authors by the publishers. They have a provision of telling the name of the real author and the publisher is supposed to tell the name of the real author at the time of submitting the books. The publisher shall give the name of the real author and the author shall declare that he is not a secret partner and he shall not seek election to the Board of Studies. They have to take the undertaking from the author to the effect that he will not seek election to the Board of Studies also, which would mean that the consent is taken. The author is not going to give the consent to the publisher till he is satisfied with him. As they are asking for the affidavit from the publisher, it would not be possible for the University to enter into dispute and become a judge about payment between the two parties.

Professor Ronki Ram clarified that the departments invite publishers to submit the books. At the time of prescribing the books, the University should know the arrangement between the author and the publisher, including royalty.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated another clause could be added that the University after accepting/prescribing the book, will intimate the author that so many books have been purchased by the University. In this way, the interests of the author would be got protected. While protecting the interests of the author, the interests of the University should also be protected. The reason being that tomorrow, the University might not be held liable in the Court of the Law that it was the responsibility of the University that the author is being paid the royalty by the publisher.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the author should know that his book has been prescribed for a particular course.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that a system should be put in place through which the authors could come to know about the prescription of books in a particular course and how many books have been sold by the publisher so that they could know how much the publisher has earned through the sale of the books.

Professor Ronki Ram read out the letter written by Dr. Gurdial Singh.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the matter needed to be legally examined. They are giving the contract to the security agencies also and in the agreement, it is mentioned that the contractor has to fulfill the terms and conditions of the contract like payment of minimum wages fixed by the administration, uniform and other facilities. But if tomorrow, a complaint came, they could not be the judge. They have to ensure that as per the agreement, the worker is not being forced to perform duty for more than 8 hours, he is being paid the minimum wages. Since the agreement is between the two parties, why the third party should take the responsibility?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the dispute could be that the royalty at the rate of per copy of the sale or in lump sum is not being paid by the Publisher. He did not know whether Dr. Gurdial Singh would agree with or not. When the University places order for the purchase of books, the publisher should pay the royalty in lump sum payment as per the agreement made.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they have received a letter from Dr. Gurdial Singh, which is a request as well as a complaint against the publisher. They could take an affidavit in the case of a book where Dr. Gurdial Singh is the author. They could ask the publisher to get a letter from the author that he (Publisher) has been paying the royalty; otherwise, the University would not accept/prescribe the books. If they do so in all the cases, they would have to form a separate tribunal for all such matters.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the Board of Studies in their case meets after two years and the syllabus is changed after 3 years. Whenever any change in syllabus is made, only then the books are changed. The mention of period of 6 months is automatically solved. Whenever any book is changed, the publisher is to be informed that if there is any dispute, the books will not be accepted.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if there are 100 students in a class, all the students do not purchase the books. How could they say that all the students had purchased the books and this much number of books have been sold? If the University purchased the books itself, only then it could tell the author about the number of books sold. Even if the books have been purchased by 100 students, the publisher would say that only 10 students have purchased the book and he is paying the royalty of 10 books.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that there could be an instance when the publisher might ask the author to refund a part of the royalty already paid by him for 1000 books as only 500 books have been sold.

RESOLVED: That an intimation be sent to the Author whenever his/her book/s is/are prescribed by the University, along with the information about the Publisher, enabling him/her to settle the issue of royalty with the Publisher accordingly. A letter in this regard be also simultaneously written to the Publisher to pay full royalty to the Author.

Routine and formal matters

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

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Dr. Upinder Sawhney, Professor, Department of Economics, P.U., to avail sabbatical Leave w.e.f. 01.08.2015 to 31.03.2016 instead of 01.07.2015 to 31.03.2016 already sanctioned vide office letter No. 6245-49/Estt.I dated 15.07.2015 (**Appendix-XXVI**).

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in accordance with the decision of Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. (Ms.) Pushpinder Syal, Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U. on contract basis up to 28.08.2020 (i.e. attaining the age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58)/29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension of CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance. Senate decision dated 29.03.2015, Item-8 (C-20) circulated vide No.3947-4027/Estt.-I (**Appendix-XXVII**) dated 11.05.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.

NOTE: (i) Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment.

(ii) Rule 4.1 at page 130, Cal. Vol.-III, 2009 reads as under:

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

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Dr. Rajinder Kaur, Professor, University Institute of Legal Studies to retain the lien against

her substantive post as Assistant Professor in Department of Law, P.U., Chandigarh till her confirmation as a Professor in Law at University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Rajinder Kaur, Assistant Professor, Department of Laws was appointed as Professor in Law on one year's probation at UILS.

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

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has ordered that Dr. Suman Mor, Assistant Professor, Department of Environment Studies be given additional charge of Co-ordinator, Centre for Public Health, P.U. until further orders, in place of Dr. Vijay Lakshmi Sharma. It is anticipated that she would take a part of teaching load in the Centre for Public Health in addition to her responsibilities in Department of Environment Studies.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted extension in term of appointment of Dr. Anuj Gupta, Assistant Professor (temporary), Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering, Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U., upto 30.06.2015 with one day break on 01.05.2015, 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 & conditions, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has –

(i) extended in term of appointment of the following persons as Assistant Professor in U.I.E.T. (Sr. No.1 to 38) upto 30.06.2015 with one day break on 01.05.2015, purely on temporary basis, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(ii) re-appointed (afresh) as Assistant Professor purely on temporary basis, mentioned at Sr. No.1 to 38 w.e.f. 06.07.2015 to 31.12.2015 or till the regular post/s is/are filled by regular faculty, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person	Branch	Sr. No.	Name of the Person	Branch
1.	Ms. Preeti Aggarwal	CSE	20.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
2.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Maths	21.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
3.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Mgt.	22.	Mr. Gurmukh Singh	IT
4.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Mgt.	23.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE

5.	Mr. Geetu	Physics	24.	Mr. Manu Bansal	IT
6.	Mr. Saravjit Singh	ECE	25.	Ms. Shweta Mehta	IT
7.	Ms. Garima Joshi	ECE	26.	Ms. Manisha Kaushal	CSE
8.	Ms. Daljit Kaur	ECE	27.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
9.	Ms. Rajni Sobti	IT	28.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Bio-Tech.
10.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh	IT	29.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	Micro-Electronics
11.	Ms. Renuka Rai	Chemistry	30.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
12.	Ms. Pardeep Kaur	ECE	31.	Dr. Gursharan Singh	Bio-Tech.
13.	Dr. Ranjana Bhatia	Bio-Tech.	32.	Mr. Chander Prakash	Mech.
14.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Mathematics	33.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	EEE
15.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Bio-Tech.	34.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
16.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Bio-Tech.	35.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Physics
17.	Ms. Jyoti Sood	Physics	36.	Ms. Leetika	Maths
18.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE	37.	Mr. Munish Kansal	Maths
19.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE	38.	Mr. Gurjinder Singh	Maths.

- (vii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Kaur Sahni, # 1134, Sector-71, S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali, as 'Medical Officer (Full-Time)' purely on contract basis in the B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. on fixed emoluments of Rs.45000/- p.m., initially for the period of six months (i.e. w.e.f. the date she joins her duty) & further extendable upto two years by giving one day break after every six months upon satisfactory performance, with the following stipulation:-

“That the above appointment is being made purely on contract basis & for the period as mentioned above. It is understood that she will have no claim whatsoever for regular appointment after expiry of term of contractual appointment & her appointment shall be terminated without any notice. Her appointment shall come to an end automatically on completion of term of contract appointment as stated above.”

- (viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Zarreen Fatima as Assistant Professor on contract basis at fixed emoluments of Rs.30400/- in the Department of Urdu w.e.f. the date she starts work, for the academic session 2015-16 i.e. upto 31.05.2016 against the vacant post in the department or till the post is filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier, under regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions according to which she had worked previously during the last session.

- (ix)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Programmers working in Computer Unit, P.U. for six months more i.e. w.e.f. the dates noted against each after giving them one day's break, or till the posts of Foreman (against which they are appointed) are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions:

Sr. No.	Name of employee	Designation	Term upto	Date of Break	Period of Further extension
1.	Ms. Cheshta Arora	Programmer	04.06.2015	05.06.2015 & 03.09.2015	6.6.2015 to 2.9.2015 (89days) & 4.9.2015 to 1.12.2015 (89days)
2.	Ms. Charleen Kaur	Programmer	27.05.2015	28.05.2015 & 26.08.2015	29.5.2015 to 25.8.2015 (89days) & 27.8.2015 to 23.11.2015 (89days)
3.	Mr. Neeraj Rohila	Programmer	10.06.2015	11.06.2015 & 09.09.2015	12.6.2015 to 8.9.2015 (89days) & 10.9.2015 7.12.2015 (89days)

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, and on recommendations of the Board of Control of Chemistry dated 09.07.2015, has approved the following amendment in regulations for M.Sc. Chemistry (Two Year Course) Semester System appearing at page 132 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 from the session 2015-16:

Present Regulation	Proposed Regulation
(a) B.Sc. (Medical/Non-Medical) candidates who have passed the said examination securing 50% marks in the aggregate as also 50% marks in the subject of Chemistry separately. The candidates, who have passed B.Sc.(Medical Group) examination shall be required to study Mathematics in First and Second Semesters, and those who have passed B.Sc. (Non-Medical) examination shall be required to study Biology for First and Second Semester.	(a) B.Sc. examination of the Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate securing at least 50% marks in aggregate and with Chemistry & Mathematics for M.Sc. Chemistry course along with any Science subject Provided that a student who had not taken Mathematics as one of the subjects in B.Sc. examination may be admitted to M.Sc. (2-year course) in Chemistry on the condition that he/she passes an additional paper in Mathematics (50 hour course) in the first year examination securing at least 40% marks.
(b) to (d) xxx xxx xxx	(b) To (d) xxx xxx xxx

NOTE: A copy of the orders sent to the O.S. Regulations/A.R. (R&S) and D.R. Colleges vide No.9740-42/GM dated 13.07.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-XXIX**).

- (xi) Pursuant to the discussion in the Senate held on 26.04.2015, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has approved the recommendations of the Committee constituted to study the ramification of the Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgment in a case P. Suseela & other Vs. University Grants Commission that the selection panels be given to the affiliated Colleges to facilitate the appointment of Assistant Professors, as per the eligibility

conditions laid by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, wherein, only the candidates with NET/SLET qualifications of those who obtained Ph.D. Degree under University Grant Commission (Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of Ph.D. Degree) Regulation, 2009, are eligible for applying for the advertised post.

NOTE: Circular issued vide No.61054-61254 dated 19.05.2015 by the D.R.(Colleges) enclosed **(Appendix-XXX)**.

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendations of the Standing Committee dated 30.07.2015 **(Appendix-XXXI)** constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the ongoing Semester System:

1. In B.Com/BCA/BBA, the minimum number of marks required to pass each semester examination should be 35% in theory and 20% in internal assessment. If a candidate has not qualified 50% papers up to 2nd or 4th semester will not be promoted in 3rd and 5th semester respectively.
2. If a candidate of a college fails in Annual System in B.Com/BCA/BBA, the college should give the admission to the students under the Semester System stream by creating additional seats in their own college only after the approval of the competent authority from the University.
3. In B.A./B.Sc. etc. if a student fails or absent in the Practical Examination, will be allowed to appear in both theory & practical examinations with reappear cases.
4. The Dean College Development Council, P.U. will communicate the decision of the above said committee to all the colleges without any delay.

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Joint Research Board dated 07.05.2015 (Para 58) **(Appendix-XXXII)** and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the amendment in Regulation 13.1 appearing at page 193 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, with regard to extension in the submission of Ph.D. thesis.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the fee structure **(Appendix-XXXIII)** of Semester-I and Semester-II for the newly introduced Five Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences 2015-16.

- (xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following revised fee structure for Foreign/NRI/PIO for the B.D.S. course at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute Dental Science & Hospital for the session 2015-16:

At the time of Admission	Tuition Fee (p.a.)	Misc. Fee (p.a.)
B.D.S. 1st year	US \$ 18540+680 (Regd. Fee one time)	Rs.20,637/-
B.D.S. 2 nd year	US \$ 6180	Rs.20,637/
B.D.S. 3rd year	US \$ 6180	Rs.20,637/
B.D.S. 4th year	US \$ 6180	Rs.20,637/

NOTE: A copy of Circular No.4194/ ST/FC dated 06.08.2015 issued by ARA-II enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

- (xvi) The Vice-Chancellor, has extended the validity of Advertisement No. 1/2013 for six months more i.e. up to 18.02.2016, for filling up of various non-teaching post.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 vide Para 27 (**Appendix-XXXV**) has resolved That the validity of Advt. No.1/2013 for filling up various non-teaching posts be extended for six months more, i.e., up to 18.08.2015, so that the posts could be filled up.

- (xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the name of Shri Harit Sharma, Advocate, for inclusion in the panel of High Court, Advocates at Sr. No.38, which has already been ratified by Syndicate vide Para 52 R (x) (**Appendix-XXXVI**) in its meeting held on 19.07.2015 on the same terms and conditions.

- (xviii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the appointment of the following Assistant Professors, on contract basis as a special case till further orders or till the end of ongoing academic session 2015-16 (i.e. start of summer vacation 2016) or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier, at a fixed salary of Rs.30400/- on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name of Candidate	Subject	College
1.	Ms. Simranjeet Kaur D/o Shri Jagtar Singh	Computer Science	PUCC, Nihal Singhwala, Moga
2.	Ms. Shaffy Girdhar D/o Shri Satish Kumar	Computer Science	PUCC, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib
3.	Shri Varun Maini S/o Shri Bhagwan Dass Maini	Computer Science	PUCC, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur
4.	Shri Pawan Kumar S/o Shri Om Parkash	Computer Science	PUCC, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur

(xix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved that the students who have failed in B.A./B.Sc./ B.Com./B.B.A./B.C.A. 2nd year in 2015 under Annual System of examination are eligible to appear either as late College student or may join the College in the 3rd semester under Semester system of examination as a regular student and the said students who have already cleared the paper of Environment Studies, they shall have no need to clear it again.

(xx) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following clause of revised BDS Course (7th Amendment) Regulations, 2015 as per DCI communication in lieu of the existing clause (Regulation) **i.e. any student who does not clear the 1st BDS examination in all the subjects within 3 years from the date of admission shall be discharged from the course**, duly approved by the Senate vide Para XXV dated 26.04.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVII**):

“any Students who does not clear the BDS course in all the subjects within a period of 9 years, including one year Compulsory Rotatory paid Internship from the date of admission shall be discharged from the course” this will be effective from the current academic session i.e. 2015-16 onwards.”

(xxi) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following qualifications for appointment of Physiotherapist (women):-

Essential qualifications:

- (i) Bachelor of Physiotherapy of four and a half year course including six months of compulsory internship approved by the UGC under Section 22 of the Act from a recognized University/Institution.
- (ii) Two years experience as Physiotherapist in Sports Medicine/injury and Orthopaedics from a reputed Govt. Institute/University.

Desirable:

Master of Physiotherapy.

(xxii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed afresh following Assistant Professor purely on temporary basis at P.U. Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. the date of start of the classes for the academic session 2015-16 or till the regular posts are filled in through regular selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2014-15:

1. Dr. Gurjit Singh (Assistant Professor in Punjabi)
2. Mr. Surinder Singh (Assistant Professor in Political Science)

3. Mr. Munish Kumar (Assistant Professor in Computer Science)
4. Ms. Seema (Assistant Professor in Physical Education)

(xxiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has extended the term of following Assistant Professors, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the start of Academic Session 2015-16 till further orders or up to the end of academic session 2015-16 (i.e. start of the summer vacation 2016) or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject	Name of the College
1.	Dr. Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi	Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshehar
2.	Dr. Naresh Kumar	Punjabi	
3.	Dr. (Ms.) Poonam Dwivedi	English	
4.	Mr. Hari Nath	Hindi	
5.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi	
6.	Ms. Sukhjit Nahar	Sociology	
7.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Commerce	
8.	Mr. Hari Krishan	History	
9.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce	
10.	Mrs. Ruby	Mathematics	
11.	Mr. Inder Bhagat	Computer Science	
12.	Mr. Deepak	Computer Science	P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur
13.	Dr. Resham Singh	Punjabi	
14.	Dr. Hira Singh	Punjabi	
15.	Dr. Gurdeep Singh	Punjabi	
16.	Dr. Hardeep Singh	History	
17.	Dr. Kumud Manohar Meshram	Hindi	
18.	Dr. Harnam Singh	Physical Education	
19.	Mr. Kapil Dev	English	
20.	Ms. Simarjeet Kaur	Mathematics	
21.	Ms. Nishi	Commerce	
22.	Mr. Mohammad Sazid	Commerce	
23.	Mr. Harjinder Singh Bhardwaj	Political Science	P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singhwala, District Moga
24.	Dr. Parminder Singh	Punjabi	
25.	Dr. Harjeet Singh	English	
26.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai	Hindi	
27.	Ms. Rajni Bhalla	Commerce	
28.	Ms. Monica	Commerce	
29.	Mr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology	
30.	Mr. Shaminder Singh	Physical Education	
31.	Ms. Ritu Mittal	Economics	
32.	Mr. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics	
33.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Political Science	
34.	Mr. Karan Gandhi	Commerce	

35.	Dr. Inderjit Singh	Political Science	} P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib	
36.	Dr. Sukhjeet Singh	Punjabi		
37.	Dr. Ram Singh	Commerce		
38.	Dr. Sumit Mohan	Hindi		
39.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Punjabi		
40.	Mrs. Navdeep Kaur	English		
41.	Mrs. Mamta Rani	Commerce		
42.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Economics		
43.	Mr. Rajesh Chander	History		
44.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur	Physical Education		
45.	Mr. Jaswinder Singh	Punjabi		
46.	Mrs. Rajni Chauhan	Commerce		P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana

The Vice-Chancellor said that **Sub-Item R-vii** on the agenda be treated as withdrawn as the appointee has not joined.

Referring to **Sub-Item R-(iii)**, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Dr. Rajinder Kaur, who has been appointed as Professor at University Institute of Legal Studies, should be allowed to retain her lien against her substantive post of Assistant Professor in the Department of Laws. He, however, pointed out that Dr. Naveen Gupta has been appointed as Associate Professor in another department, but he is not joining because no decision is being taken on his request for retaining his lien even though he has moved the application on 6th instant.

The Vice-Chancellor assured that they would allow Dr. Naveen Gupta to retain his lien.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the issue of retention of lien within the University has never arisen. However, it had happened that a person was appointed to a higher post and he joined as such after leaving the lower post. The issue went to the Court and the appointment was rejected. Later on, he automatically joined the previous post in spite of the fact that no such decision was taken. As such, it is a practical solution and the issue of lien did not arise.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that when a person is working in a particular department and is availing certain facilities. When he is appointed in another department and is unable to adjust there and wanted to come back to his previous department, he should have the opportunity. Therefore, permission of retaining the lien till his/her confirmation should be allowed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the decision to permit retention of lien within the University till confirmation in another department either on the same post or on higher post should be taken and a rule in this regard may be framed and incorporated in the Calendar.

Referring to **Sub-Item R-(xi)**, Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that a letter has been written by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) to the Principals of all the affiliated Colleges (page 234 of the Appendix) that the candidates with NET/SLET qualifications or those who have obtained Ph.D. degree under the UGC (Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of Ph.D. Degree) Regulations, 2009, are eligible for the posts of Assistant Professors. As discussed a couple of hours before, the regular teachers having minimum of two years experience had been exempted from the NET/SLET/University Entrance Test for

registration towards Ph.D. programme, and the same has become contradictory as they would not be obtaining the Ph.D. degree under UGC Regulations, 2009.

When it was pointed out that the decision with regard to exemption from NET/SLET/University Entrance Test for registration to Ph.D. programme has been withdrawn, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that though they had discussed the issue, they had to appoint a Committee to examine the issue and recommend withdrawal of the decision which has been taken by the Syndicate and the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such a decision could not be taken without consideration, a regular item needed to be brought to the Syndicate on the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the eligibility is not being verified by the subject experts/Vice-Chancellor's nominee on the Selection Committees, certain Colleges are calling ineligible candidates for the interviews and making appointments. He, therefore, urged that they should verify the eligibility of all the appointments recommended by the Selection Committees for the Affiliated Colleges and if any appointment of ineligible candidate is found to be recommended, the candidates placed on the waiting list should be appointed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that such an appointment has been made in a local College wherein the appointed person has neither qualified UGC NET/SLET nor obtained Ph.D. degree under UGC Regulations, 2009 on the plea that the candidate is exempted from UGC NET/SLET for registration to Ph.D. programme.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had suggested a long time back but he did not know why it did not find favour. They should not presume that the members of the Selection Committees, including the nominee/s of the Vice-Chancellor, do it intentionally but in spite of his suggestion nobody supplied the instructions of the University that these are the things which are to be kept in view while recommending appointments. For example, that these are the essential qualifications and whosoever did not possess is/are ineligible. If whatever has been told by Dr. Dinesh Kumar has happened in Chandigarh, what would be the position at Mudki.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council to prepare instructions having do's and don'ts for the members of the Selection Committees and supply the same to them whenever they go to the Colleges for conducting the interviews.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed that certain Colleges called even ineligible candidates for the interview and pressurized that these should be appointed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the case to which he was talking about, during the interview itself, a person was sent to the University for clarification and the Chairperson of the University Teaching Department in the subject concerned had given in writing that the candidate in question is eligible.

Referring Sub-Item R-(xii), Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that none from the subject of Commerce had been associated with the Standing Committee, which comprised of 17 members, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the pass percentage of B.Com.

examination. Though the recommendations have already been implemented and results declared, his only submission is that it should not be made a precedent. However, this decision should be for this session only and, for future, the matter should be referred to the Board of Studies/Faculties concerned and the Academic Council so that a well thought decision could be taken in the matter.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that a new system has been started and in the 1st semester the pass percentage has been fixed at 35%, and thereafter it has been raised to 40%.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that it is not true. In fact, the mistake was admitted in the meeting that they had received the minutes late. It has been mentioned in the minutes of the meeting of the Standing Committee itself that the Controller of Examinations apprized the members regarding the difficulties faced in declaring the results of B.Com. 2nd Semester. The result of B.Com. 1st Semester was declared with 35% marks in each paper as the regulations framed by the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce was approved in the Syndicate meeting dated 8.3.2015, but the same could not be communicated to the affiliated Colleges and Examination Branch in time, whereas the result of B.Com. 2nd Semester was declared on 20.7.2015 as 40% marks in each paper as per B.Com. Regulations approved in the Syndicate on 8.3.2015. As such, it has not happened due to the fault of the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce, but due to communication gap. Whenever they approve the Regulations, it is always written that these Regulations are effective from such and such session. Therefore, the decision of the Standing Committee should be ratified for the session 2014-15 only.

Principal Gurdip Sharma observed that since the students have been admitted under these regulations, it would remain effective till this batch of students pass out.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Standing Committee was never intended to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to be the substitute to the Faculty; rather it was only to review the ongoing Semester System and not to review the ongoing Regulations or Regulations framed for different courses. In fact, all the powers of the Faculties, Syndicate, Senate, Government of India and all the statutory authorities of the University in supersession of everything have been taken over by this Standing Committee and even the pass percentage has also been decided by it. He wanted to bring to their notice as to what kind of serious problem they are facing. On one side, a heated discussion took place in the meeting of the Syndicate that there should be uniformity so far as pass percentage in the courses offered under the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce is concerned. It was also argued that why the pass percentage of papers for promotion to 3rd and 5th Semesters is 40% and in the other Faculties it is 50%. They would be surprised to know that in the case of Computer Applications, the instructions (duly approved) went to the Colleges that even if somebody failed in 100% papers in 1st and 2nd Semesters, he/she is entitled for admission to 3rd Semester and the admissions have been made in the Colleges accordingly. The Colleges made a hue and cry that how could they admit a student to 3rd Semester who has not passed even a single paper? The students took those instructions of the University and argued with the College authorities as to how they could deny them admission.

Principal Gurdip Sharma and Parveen Kaur Chawla said that no such instructions have been received by them.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he came to know about this only when the Colleges replied to certain students that they would not make their admission and would not follow these instructions of the University and the students came to him. He argued with the students the University could not issue such instructions to the Colleges but the students put before him a copy of the instructions issued by the University. The Colleges were forced to make the admissions and the people reached the office of the Director Public Instructions (Colleges) (DPI) which interpreted the instructions and allowed the admission of the students. Subsequently, probably it came to the notice of the Standing Committee which opined that in all the cases the pass percentage of papers for promotion/admission to 3rd and 5th Semesters should be 50%. Subsequent to the meeting of the Standing Committee, these instructions were also sent to the Affiliated Colleges. However, the Colleges said that they had already made the admissions in accordance with the rules (duly approved by the University) produced by the students. Now the same University is asking that these are the conditions, but the Colleges are saying that they had already made the admissions. Where should they go – whether they should cancel the admissions or the University is going to regularize the admissions of the students as a special case? If this kind of confusion is prevailing, he does not know what would happen. He had a copy of those instructions which had been sent to the Colleges under the seal of the Chairperson, Department of Computer Science and Applications.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu, referring to the statement made by Shri Ashok Goyal that the Standing Committee had exercised the powers of the Syndicate, Senate, Government of India, etc., stated that first of all Shri Goyal should take back his this statement.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the above said statement be withdrawn.

Continuing, Dr. Sandhu stated that the Standing Committee had taken the decision about the Rules/Regulations and there might have been reasons for that. The decision is to be implemented for the whole batch of the students; otherwise they might face certain difficulties maybe at a later stage. Secondly, the decision has been taken by the Committee as per the Rules/Regulations of the University. Therefore, it is wrong to say that the Standing Committee has exercised the power of the Syndicate, Senate, Government of India, etc. He did not know why such issues are raised time and again. Even if they dig out the records for the last 15-20 years, they would find that the Regulations for B.A./B.Sc./B.com., especially pertaining to pass percentage/percentage of qualifying the papers for admission to certain higher semesters, were the same. Therefore, the Regulations/Rules meant for B.A./B.Sc. courses should be implemented for B.Com. course as well. Whenever the course contents/syllabi relating to the language subjects (Punjabi and English) are decided for the students of B.Com. and B.B.A. courses, it is always decided by the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce instead of Board of Studies of the subjects concerned. The Faculty of Business Management and Commerce is overstepping its authority in deciding the course content/syllabi of the subjects which fall under other Faculties, especially Languages, to which he is totally against. He reiterated that the Regulations meant for other undergraduate courses should be applicable for B.Com./B.B.A.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to resolve this matter in a manner, which does not look like serious confrontations. He agreed that in B.A./B.Sc./B.Com courses they have to have same synergy and uniformity. If there are differences, this (Syndicate) is the forum where the differences are to be resolved or if some exceptions have to be made, they should do so. Therefore, the issue should not be forced, but resolved. In subject specific, the input of the primary departments is necessary. However, in Panjab University if somebody is a teacher of Commerce at University Institute of Legal Studies, he is not recognized at the University Business School. The NAAC had pointed out that this should be regularized as they are also a part of the University and the students should be given the benefit of best teachers. They are trying to evolve some procedure for the purpose.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. I.S. Sandhu has said that for the last 20 years or so, there had been parity amongst B.A./B.Sc./B.Com. courses, why the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce is now creating problem for them. Dr. Sandhu is right, but if for the last 20 years or so whatever Dr. Sandhu said is not correct and if for B.Com., the percentage was 40% in spite of 35% in other courses, how could they change it now.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that nobody is interfering in the affairs of others. Dr. I.S. Sandhu has raised two issues – (i) about the arbitrariness of the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce; and (ii) framing of course contents of language subjects. So far as pass percentage is concerned, 40% in B.Com. is there right from the day one and so far as framing of syllabi for Punjabi and English for the students of B.Com. and B.B.A. is concerned, whenever these are framed/revised, they always consult the colleagues of the subjects concerned. He further stated that it has been mentioned in the minutes of the Standing Committee (page 236 of the Appendix) that “Professor A.K. Bhandari informed the members that the Commerce Faculty has prepared their own regulations of B.Com. and BBA and other regulations of B.A/B.Sc. have been prepared by the Standing Committee, which were approved by the competent authority. Now we can only make the recommendations in this meeting and put up to the competent authority such as Faculty, Syndicate or can implement the changes with the approval of the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate”. His only submission is that whatever has been recommended by the Board of Studies and the Faculties, should be implemented as such.

The Vice-Chancellor said that so long as they restrict discussion to the essence, there is no problem. The problem is when they create extraneous situations. In the heat of the moment and emotions, they say certain things which are not necessary to make the point.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that even though all other Faculties and Departments have implemented the decision of the Syndicate and Senate that the College teachers be also appointed Supervisors/Co-Supervisors of the Ph.D. students, the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce (University Business School) has not implemented the same and is still adamant that they would never allow the College teachers to become Supervisors/Co-Supervisors of Ph.D. students. He added that several applications of College teachers for their appointments as Supervisors/Co-Supervisors of Ph.D. students are pending but they are not being considered by the University Business School.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that it is wrong to say that University Business School is not allowing the College teachers to become Supervisors/Co-Supervisors of the Ph.D. students. Not even a single request of the College teachers has been rejected by the University Business School. However, the procedure followed at the University Business School for appointment Supervisors/Co-Supervisors is that the candidates choose their Supervisors Co-Supervisors themselves.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that everybody knew that the Syllabi for B.A./B.Sc. (General) Courses in the subject of English and Punjabi are decided by the Board of Studies in English and Punjabi as the case may be. He did not know why in the case of B.Com./BBA, the teacher/s of English and Punjabi is/are called/consulted for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor urged Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Professor Yograj Angrish to send him a note, so that he could resolve it as a considered item. He would also gather information at his own with the help of the Dean of University Instruction. The issue would also be discussed in the meeting of Chairpersons and would see as to how they could resolve this matter. The issue would be placed before the Syndicate as it is a governing body of the University, which the Chairpersons forum is not.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that B.Com. and other courses offered at the graduation level are not professional courses. Had B.Com. been a professional course, the Regulations/Rules any of the statutory body, i.e., AICTE would have been applicable on it as in the case of M.B.A. and Engineering Courses, AICTE is the statutory body and in the case of Education Courses, Medical Courses and Dental Courses, the statutory bodies are NCTE, MCI and DCI, respectively. He did not know what the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce is doing. In the case of other courses the pass percent is 35, whereas the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce has fixed the pass percent as 40%. Similarly, the other Faculties had fixed the pass percentage of papers for promotion to 3rd and 5th Semesters at 50%, but the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce has suggested 60%. In Faculty of Science, there are about 40 subjects including Microbiology, Biotechnology, etc., and they have kept the pass percentage uniform in all the subjects. Since the B.Com. is an academic course, while reviewing, his viewpoints should be kept in view. He added that the uniformity should be maintained in all the courses (B.A., B.Sc., B.Com., etc.) being offered at the graduation level where the Regulations/Rules of statutory bodies are not applicable.

The Vice-Chancellor, referring to qualifying of 50% papers for promotion to 3rd and 5th Semesters, said that could it be done that even if a student has qualified all the papers except all the papers of a Semester, he/she is allowed promotion to 3rd or 5th Semester as the case may be.

The members opined that such a candidate could be promoted to 3rd or 5th Semester as the case may be provided he/she attended the course instructions and fulfilled the attendance requirement.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that though all other Faculties had fixed the Internal Assessment 10%, but the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce has kept 20%.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this exception could be given to the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce if the governing body (Syndicate) approves it.

When certain members tried to speak in favour of and against uniform pass percentage and pass percentage of papers for admission to higher Semesters simultaneously, the Vice-Chancellor remarked that the Syndicate reconsiders many matters and review its own decisions.

Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Karamjeet Singh and Dr. Dinesh Kumar simultaneously said that the decision of the Committee is being ratified only for this session.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could bring the matter to him and it is his duty to place the matter before the Syndicate with adequate background so that the issue could be discussed threadbare.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the B.Sc. Courses which are being offered in the University Teaching Departments, are Professional Courses. Are the Regulations/Rules of the statutory bodies like AICTE, NCTE, applicable there? There also, the Regulations/Rules of the statutory bodies like AICTE, NCTE, are not applicable and different pass percentage is there.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xiv), Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired is the Five Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences a Self-financing Course.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a Self-financing Course. It is an unfortunate fact of the history of the Panjab University that the Honours School Course in Social Sciences, which was to be introduced more than 30 years ago, is being introduced now.

Principal Gurdip Sharma and Shri Jarnail Singh appreciated the Vice-Chancellor for making concerted efforts to introduce the Honours School in Social Sciences, which could have been introduced several years ago.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that they are hiring Faculty for imparting instructions in certain courses from within the University and from outside as well. If they wanted to make this Honours School Course successful, they have to transfer certain persons to PU-ISSER. Since he teaches in other Departments as a Guest Faculty, at the maximum he could devote only 15 minutes extra and not more than that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is an evolving thing and he is already taking due care of the matter.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xvi), Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about the Sub-Item R-xvi.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item is about extending the validity of advertisement for filling the posts of Assistant Registrars. The matter is at the advance stage and he is hoping that the entire process would be completed shortly and they would be able to provide Assistant Registrars to the University. He is already putting enough time to fill up these posts. If they remained strict and advertise the posts again and again, they would never be able to fill up their posts.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why they are extending the validity of this advertisement. He drew the attention of the Vice-Chancellor to Page 247 of the appendix wherein the reply of the Vice-Chancellor on his query in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 8.3.2015 has been mentioned. He read out his statement and the reply of the Vice-Chancellor, which is reproduced below:

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

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

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

After six months of that, again they are saying that the screening is at advanced stage, which was also at advanced stage in March 2015. Where is the difficulty in calling those who have become eligible for these posts during the intervening period?

The Vice-Chancellor said that alright, if they insisted the posts of Assistant Registrars would be re-advertised with the same qualifications. However, it would be mentioned in the advertisement that those, who had already applied in response to advertisement No. 1/2013, need not apply, but if they wanted to provide any additional information/documents, they could do so.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the posts should re-advertised and the candidates, including those who had applied in response to advertisement No.1/2013, but they should be exempted from the fee, so that they did not face the problem, which they are facing in the case of Deputy Registrars.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the posts of Deputy Registrars were advertised in 2011 and were again advertised in January 2013. In the advertisement, it was specifically mentioned that those, who had already applied in response to advertisement issued in 2011, need not apply afresh. Confusion arose only when they issued the corrigendum in February 2013. But once they say that the persons, who had applied in response to the earlier advertisement, need not apply afresh, the matter ends there. His only submission is that it looks odd that after 2½ years, they are considering only those candidates who had applied in the year 2013.

Professor Ronki Ram remarked they had not filled up the posts of Deputy Registrars for the last more than five years and the posts are still not being allowed to be filled up. This is being done just to ensure that the ineligible/incapable persons could be got promoted from Assistant Registrars to Deputy Registrars.

Professor Karamjeet Singh and few other members said that this is not the case.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in **Item R-(i) to R-(ii), R-(iv) to R-(vi), R-(viii) to R-(x), R-(xii) to R-(xv) and R-(xvii) to R-(xxiii)** on the agenda, be ratified;
- (2) the information contained in **Item R-(iii)** on the agenda, be ratified, and in future, the persons be allowed to retain their lien within the University till they are confirmed to their posts (either on the same or higher) in other Departments; a provision in this regard be made in the Calendar;
- (3) **Sub-Item R-(vii)** on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn;
- (4) the information contained in **Item R-(xi)** on the agenda, be approved, and the Dean, College Development Council be asked to prepare instruction having do's and don'ts for the members of the Selection Committees and supply the same to them whenever they go to the affiliated College for conducting the interview/s; and
- (5) so far as **Sub-Item R-(xvi)** is concerned, the posts of Assistant Registrars be re-advertised with the same qualifications and it be mentioned in the advertisement that those, who had already applied in response to advertisement No. 1/2013, need not apply, but if they wanted to provide any additional information/ documents, they could do so.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the issue of appointment of College teachers as Supervisors/Co-Supervisors of the Ph.D. students by all the University Teaching Departments, including University Business School, be placed before the Syndicate after getting the same discussed in the meeting of the Chairpersons.

Routine and formal matters

39. The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(viii)** on the agenda was read out and noted –

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor has:
- (i) extended the term of appointment of Dr. Neha Singla as Assistant Professor (temporary), Department of Biophysics up to 30.06.2015 with one day break on 01.05.2015 in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
 - (ii) re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Neha Singla as Assistant Professor for next 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 under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. Pushpinder Syal Professor Department of English and Cultural Studies	13.07.1978	31.08.2015	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007.
2.	Dr. Dharmanand Sharma Professor Department of Philosophy	12.08.1977	30.06.2015	(ii) Furlough as admissible under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 121 of Cal. Vol.-I, 2007.
3.	Dr. Reena Bhasin Professor in Economics University School of Open Learning	01.10.1982	31.08.2015	(iii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

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

(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.	Ms. Veena Mehta Deputy Registrar RTI, Cell	27.12.1974	31.08.2015	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Shobha Rani Deputy Registrar University School of Open Learning	15.01.1975	31.08.2015	
3.	Ms. Bhagwati Yadav Superintendent UIAMS	05.06.1978	31.08.2015	
4.	Dr. Rakesh Khullar Additional CMO BGJ Institute of Health	22.07.1994	30.09.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
5.	Ms. Neelam Kumari Superintendent Accounts Branch (G&P)Section	30.03.1982	31.08.2015	
6.	Ms. Devinder Kaur Superintendent Secrecy Branch	18.10.1982	31.08.2015	
7.	Ms. Kamlesh Kumari Superintendent CET Cell	30.01.1986	30.09.2015	
8.	Ms. Parmod Kumari Sr. Technician G-II Department of Physics	14.03.1990	30.06.2015	
9.	Shri Matbar Singh Daftri Re-evaluation Branch	16.06.1969	31.08.2015	
10.	Shri Lachhman Lineman-cum-Groundman Directorate of Sports	17.07.1974	31.08.2015	

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

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned the following terminal benefit to the petitioners, i.e., (1) Uma Rana W/o Late Shri Devi Lal Rana (2) Himani Rana D/o Late Shri Devi Lal Rana (3) Deepak Rana S/o Late Shri Devi Lal Rana (4) Teju Rana S/o Late Shri Devi Lal Rana, No.2 to 4 are minors through their mother and natural guardian Smt. Uma Rana, all resident of House No. A-10/B, Sector 14, Panjab University Campus, Chandigarh, in terms of succession certificate dated 07.05.2015/ 29.05.2015 issued by the Court (Succession

Application No. 28140/2013 decided on 15.12.2014), in respect of Late Shri Devi Lal Rana, Beldar, Construction Office, Panjab University, who expired on 18.10.2012, while in service:

Sr. No.	Benefit	Under Rule
1.	Gratuity (In the event of the death while in service)	Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007
2.	Ex-gratia Grant	Rule 1.1 at page 136 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009
3.	Earned leave encashment Up to the prescribed limit	Rule 17.4 at page 96 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefit to the petitioners, i.e., (1) Ms. Karamjeet Kaur W/o Late Shri Surinder Singh, (2) Ms. Pal Kaur W/o Bhag Singh Mother of late Shri Surinder Singh, (3) Shri Satnam Singh S/o Late Shri Surinder Singh, (4) Shri Harpreet Singh S/o Late Shri Surinder Singh, all R/o Village Sangariwala P.O. Mullanpur, Tehsil Kharar, Distt. SAS Nagar, Mohali, **in equal shares**, along with interest, as per Orders dated 20.05.2015 passed in case I.D. No.201300003062014 (Succession case No.306 of 2014) by the Hon'ble Court of Shri Hirdejit Singh, Civil Judge (Junior Division), Chandigarh, in respect of Late Shri Surinder Singh, Common Room Attendant, Boys Hostel No.2, Panjab University, who expired on 23.11.2013 while in service:

Sr. No.	Benefit	Under Rule
1.	Gratuity (In the event of the death while in service)	Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007
2.	Ex-gratia Grant	Rule 1.1 at page 136 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-III, 2009
3.	Earned leave encashment up to the prescribed limit	Rule 17.4 at page 96 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-III, 2009

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned terminal benefits to the members of the family of the following employees who passed away while in service:

Sr. No.	Name of the deceased employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of death (while in service)	Name of the family member/s to whom the terminal benefits are to be given	Benefits
1.	Late Shri Paramjit Singh Senior Assistant Boys Hostel No.8 g	07.02.1989	08.06.2015	Smt. Harminder Kaur (Wife)	Gratuity and Ex-gratia grant as admissible under the University Regulations and Rules
2.	Late Shri Hari Chand Security Guard Department of Indian Theatre	24.06.1985	04.04.2015	Smt. Gomti Devi (Wife)	
3.	Late Shri Jagdish Singh Security Guard Security Staff	05.03.1993	11.11.2014	Smt. Paramjit Kaur (Wife) (25%) Sh. Davinder Singh (Son) (25%) Ms. Balwinder Kaur (Daughter) (25%) Ms. Parvinder Kaur (Daughter) (25%)	
4.	Late Shri Hari Mal Painter (Technician-G-II) P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	15.05.2015	Mrs. Phoola Devi (Wife)	
5.	Late Shri Umesh Chand Security Guard Security Staff	30.12.1998	12.06.2015	Smt. Geeta Devi (Wife)	

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Ms. Baljinder Kaur Sharma as Assistant Professor in the Department of Indian Theater, P.U., against the post lying vacant, purely on temporary basis for one year in the pay-scale Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

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

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, has appointed Principal Gurdip Sharma, GGSD College, Haryana, Hoshiarpur as Acting Chairman of Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) till Shri G.K. Chatrath (Present Chairman of JCM) gets better and is out of the hospital.

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

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

- (1) Shri Jarnail Singh stated that he had sent letter and e-mail regarding extension in service being given by some of the Colleges to the Principals beyond the age of 60 years. The Panjab University Regulations say that all the employees – non-teaching, Principals, Lecturers, etc. will retire on attaining the age of superannuation, i.e. 60 years. The managements of the Colleges, on the pretext that none applied for the posts or no suitable candidates are available/found suitable, grant extension to the Principals beyond the age of 60 years. This decision of the managements of the Colleges is violation of the Regulations of the Panjab University and is discriminatory also. According to him, there are so many eligible persons. Secondly, none is indispensable. As such, this decision should be reviewed and withdrawn, and if need be. Regulations in this regard should be framed; otherwise, there is a provision for re-employment through which the managements can associate the retired Principals as President, Secretary, Advisor, etc., and pay them from their own sources. It has been observed that different persons are working as Principals, i.e., one for the University, another for the DPI and another for the UGC. Managements pass resolutions and give extension to the Principals. If some of the Principals are academically active and want to continue in private Colleges, they should compete with others. As such, there is an urgent need to review it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a regular item in this regard would be brought to the Syndicate for consideration. He would also ask the Dean College Development Council to prepare information as to how many new Principals have been appointed, how many requests have been made by the Principals to allow them to continue as such beyond the age of 60 years and the circumstances under which they have been permitted.

- (2) Shri Jarnail Singh stated that they have shifted from the annual examination system to semester system, but there are students who could not clear their examinations under the annual system within the permitted chances. But they still wanted to continue with their study. He, therefore, requested that one extra/special chance over and above the permissible chances should be given to all such students enabling them to complete the studies.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction and the Controller of Examinations to prepare the guidelines under which such a relief can be given to the students.

- (3) Principal Gurdip Sharma requested the Vice-Chancellor to take action on the representation of the students of M.Phil. in Music Vocal, which he handed over to the Vice-Chancellor on the floor of the House.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar also urged the Vice-Chancellor to consider the representation of M.Phil. students of Department of Music, which has been handed over by Principal Gurdip Sharma.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into in consultation with the Dean of University Instruction.

- (4) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that Punjab Government is filling up the posts of teachers on contract basis, which would create problems. There is a big College in Ludhiana, the strength of the students of which is around 4500-5000 and the University had sanctioned M.Sc. in Physics and Chemistry courses to it. The College is fulfilling the conditions imposed by the University meant for the first year. They were paying Rs.25800/- to the teachers, who were appointed a year ago, but now they have starting payment of Rs.21600/- to the teachers appointed on the pattern of Punjab Government. He added that though there are 45 students in M.Sc. Physics course and the College is earning about Rs.28-29 lacs in two years, is paying to the teachers Rs.12 lacs over a period of two years.

- (5) Professor Ronki Ram said that the process for recruitment of Principals in the Constituent Colleges was started, but the same is yet to be completed. He urged that the appointments of Principals should be made on regular basis.

- (6) Professor Yog Raj Angrish pointed out that a problem is being faced in preparing the syllabus in the subject of Punjabi by the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce for the last about 10 years. In the meeting of the Faculty of Languages, it was decided that syllabus as approved by the Board of Studies in Punjabi be adopted by the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce and the proposal was sent to the Dean of University Instruction and Professor Shelley Walia also talked to the Dean of University Instructions in this regard. It was informed that a High Power Committee was constituted by the DUI and the Committee has taken a decision that the Faculty of Languages will prepare the syllabus. In the Faculty of Languages, there are teachers from the University as well as the Colleges, who prepare the syllabus after threadbare deliberations. He said that the problem arises only when one Faculty has no subject expert of the other Faculty. The Faculty of Business Management and Commerce decided that they will call two subject experts to the Faculty meeting.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that in the Honours School also, they used to face same sort of problem where subsidiary course is taught. Now, the parent departments get the syllabi of the subsidiary course passed by the concerned Board of Studies. For the B.Com. course also, the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce could authorize the Faculty of Languages to send the syllabus and the same should be implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said he will get the matter resolved as per the suggestions put forth by Professor A.K. Bhandari, it being a healthy practice.

- (7) Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since January, in every meeting of the Syndicate 2-3 cases of pay protection are being put up for consideration. There are many cases which are pending for more than two years.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to bring this issue as an agenda in the next meeting of the Chairpersons. He said that a circular should be sent to all the Chairpersons with a request to bring it to the notice of the faculty members whose pay protection cases are pending. It should be ensured that all such cases are resolved with the help of President, PUTA by the end of the year. In any case, all such cases should be placed before the Senate in its meeting to be held in December 2015 so that these are approved.

- (8) Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that in the meeting of the Syndicate held in April, the Finance and Development Officer was asked to list out all such pending cases. Perhaps, he was not able to do so as the entire information pertaining to this might not be available with him. Now, the Establishment Branch should be asked to prepare the list of all the pending cases instead of asking all the departments to send the cases as it would expedite the matter. He, however, pointed out that the Establishment Branch is not mentioning in the official orders as to what the Resident Audit Officer is asking for. He also pleaded that a Committee should be constituted to look into the cases of the candidates, who have done Ph.D. without pre-Ph.D. Course Work, for the purpose of eligibility for the post of Assistant Professor. He added that the University prepared new guidelines for Ph.D. in 2009, in accordance with the new UGC Regulations, 2009 as well as in 2010. He also suggested that a circular be issued that those, who have done the course work in their masters degree, are exempted from course work in Ph.D. He enquired whether a candidate, who started Ph.D. in the year 2007 and could not complete till 2012, has to do course work or not. He suggested that the R & S branch may be issued the guidelines to issue equivalency certificate.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that equivalency has to be established and a Committee may be constituted to sort out the problem in which President, PUTA may also be involved.

- (9) Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there is no teacher in the subject of Economics in the Constituent College at Balachaur.

- (10) Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University has faced embarrassment in the case of selection of Deputy Registrars. His concern is that since the non-teaching staff is an important wing of the University and what has happened, is not a good sign. He has been saying in every meeting that they should not give an impression that they do not bother about the non-teaching employees. At the same time, everything cannot be accepted. The employees have given a letter addressed to the members of the Syndicate raising 3 points, one of which need not to be considered as the matter is already in the Court. The other two points for consideration are that - (i) the decision of the JCM, which they say has been approved by the Vice-Chancellor, is not being implemented by the office of the Registrar; and (ii) an effort is being made to put 5 persons senior to certain Clerks. He did not know what is right and what is wrong. No such mechanism is there, where such things could be sorted out by mutual consultation so that this kind of scene is not created. The Vice-Chancellor has himself said that there is nothing, which could not be resolved, as everything could be resolved across the table. He thought that the things should not be allowed to reach such a situation. He had come to know that there was a candle march also, which is not a good thing. They have to reach the root cause of the problem. Sometime they become defiant and say that they do not need to debate. They should try to find out how the employees could be consoled and made to understand about the difficulty of the Administration, and he was sure that the employees would understand the same. Maybe, the Vice-Chancellor must have exhausted all the channels. Though the Syndicate is there to help the administration of the University, unfortunately the impression is given that by keeping aloof the Syndicate, but the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar are doing the things at their own level. That is one thing, which could also be accepted as the Chief Executive Officer of the University, who has to execute everything. The Vice-Chancellor might understand that when the outside people ask them as to what is happening in the University, they probably do not know. He thought that they need to know at least something that why this kind of unrest is there and whether it is the teachers, non-teaching staff, Senators or non-Senators. His view is that the problems of the University and the employees could be discussed for which proper appropriate forum is the JCM. But in spite of JCM, problems did not seem to be receding. His humble suggestion is that the issue should be resolved and if his services are required and can be of any help, he is always there.

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

Shri Jarnail Singh said that as said by Shri Ashok Goyal, the non-teaching employees are an integral part of the University. He requested the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar that whenever there is any problem of the employees, they should try to listen to them and resolve the issue/s.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR