

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 1st May 2016** at **10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Professor Anil Monga
4. Shri Ashok Goyal
5. Dr. Balbir Chand Josan
6. Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi
7. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
8. Professor Emanuel Nahar
9. Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky
10. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
11. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
12. Professor Keshav Malhotra
13. Professor Navdeep Goyal
14. Shri Raghbir Dyal
15. Dr. Shelley Walia
16. Principal Surinder Singh Sangha
17. Col. G.S. Chadha Registrar ... (Secretary)

Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

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

- i) Professor M.M. Sharma (Retd) of the Department of Evening Studies, on March 11, 2016;
- ii) Professor M.P. Bhardwaj, former Chairperson of the Department of Hindi, on March 29, 2016;
- iii) Smt. Krishna Devi, mother of Dr. Parmod Kumar, Fellow, PU and Director IDC, on April 4, 2016;
- iv) Shri Pushpinder Singh Bakshi, husband of Professor Gurmeet Kaur Bakshi (Department of Mathematics) on April 21, 2016.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor M.M. Sharma, Professor M.P. Bhardwaj, Smt. Krishna Devi and Shri Pushpinder Singh Bakshi 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 Hon'ble members that –

- (1) Panjab University has been placed at 12th rank in the MHRD initiated 'National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF)' amongst the Universities of the country. The rankings were released for the Higher Education Institutions by Union Minister of Human Resource Development (MHRD) Smt. Smriti Zubin Irani at New Delhi on April 4, 2016.
- (2) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) has secured Second place amongst Pharmacy Institutions in the 'National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) under Pharmacy (Category A-Research and Teaching). Prof. B. S. Bhoop, Chairperson, UIPS, received the Certificate Award from Smt. Smriti Zubin Irani, Union Minister of HRD at a ceremony organized by MHRD at Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi on April 4, 2016.
- (3) Prof. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Fellow and Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) has been selected for a prestigious International recognition, 'The Name in Science Award', by the academic union, European Business Assembly, Oxford, UK, for his contributions in the field of science, medicine and education. The award will be conferred upon Prof. Bhoop at the Annual Meeting of European Business Assembly on June 29-30, 2016 in Germany.
- (4) Prof. Ronki Ram, Fellow and Hon. Director, ICSSR (NWRC), has been invited by the British Council, New Delhi, to participate in the Warwick International Programme in the Leadership and Management of Higher Education (IPLM), at University of Warwick, UK, from May 4 to 13, 2016.
- (5) The Consulate General of India, San Francisco, California and the Indian American Community, has invited Prof. Ronki Ram, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Sciences as Chief Guest and Key note Speaker at the 125th Birth Anniversary celebrations of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar.
- (6) Prof. Rajeev Patnaik, Deptt. of Geology, has been felicitated by the Government of India with the 'National Geosciences Award 2014' for his outstanding contributions in the field of Basic Geosciences. Prof. Patnaik received the award and cash prize of Rs.3 lakh from the President of India, Shri Pranab Mukherjee at Rashtrapati Bhawan, New Delhi on 5th April 2016.
- (7) Prof. Prince Sharma, Deptt. of Microbiology, had been selected for the Glaxo Smith Kline Vaccines Travel Award by a US-based company to present his research work on the development of vaccines against multi-drug resistant pathogenic microbes, in the European Congress of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ECCMID) at Amsterdam, Netherlands from April 9 to 12, 2016.

- (8) Dr Harish Kumar, Associate Professor in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, has been awarded 'Young Faculty Research Fellowship' for five years w.e.f. May 2016 upto 2021 with a financial layout of Rs.37 lacs, under Visvesvaraya Scheme for Electronics and IT by the Media Lab Asia a non-profit company promoted by Deptt. of Electronics and IT, Ministry of Communication and IT, to do research and guide Ph.D. research scholars related to Information Communication Technology (ICT).
- (9) Professor Rani Balbir Kaur, former Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre, PU, has been selected for 'Sangeet Natak Akademi Award (Puraskar) for 2015' for her overall contribution in Theatre by the Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi. The 'Akademi Award', carrying Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees one lakh), besides a Tamrapatra and Angavastram, will be conferred upon at New Delhi, by the President of India. She is a well known actress, director, teacher, musician and researcher.
- (10) Professor Chaman Lal Ahuja, former Chairperson, Department of English, has also been selected for 'Sangeet Natak Akademi Award (Puraskar) for 2015' for his overall contribution/scholarship to performing Arts by the Sangeet Natak Akademi. The Akademi Award, carrying Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees one lakh), besides a Tamrapatra and Angavastram, will be conferred upon at New Delhi by the President of India.
- (11) Dr Chandershekhar Prasad, an alumnus of Panjab University, has been selected for Ustad Bismillah Khan Yuva Puraskar 2015 for his contribution in direction by the Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi. The Yuva Puraskar carries a purse money of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty five thousand only). The Yuva Puraskar will be presented at a special ceremony by the Chairman, Sangeet Natak Akademi.
- (12) Dr Mamta Joshi, Head of the Deptt. of Music, Post Graduate Government College, Sector-11, Chandigarh, has been selected for Ustad Bismillah Khan Yuva Puraskar 2015 for her contribution in the field of 'Folk Music, Punjab' by the Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi. The Yuva Puraskar carries a purse money of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty five thousand only). The Yuva Puraskar will be presented at a special ceremony by the Chairman, Sangeet Natak Akademi.
- (13) Prof. M.M. Gupta (Re-employed), Deptt. of Physics, was invited as Key Speaker at the International Conference on New Physics at the Large Hadron Collider hosted by the Nanyang Technological University, Singapore from 29th February to 4th March 2016. Only one Speaker from India and one from China (Well known physicist Prof. S. Zhou from Chinese Academy of Sciences) were invited to this very prestigious conference.
- (14) Prof. V K. Jindal (Re-employed), Deptt. of Physics has been invited for a research visit of 3 months to University of Wurzburg by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation beginning in July 2016."

The Vice Chancellor stated that they are well aware that 11 Universities have been placed little higher than Panjab University. Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore and Institute of Chemical Technology are very special institutions. The remaining nine Universities which are ahead of them are all Central institutions. Amongst the State Universities or the Interstate Body Corporate, their University is reckoned as a premier University. The numerics which have been shown in the table and if they look at the difference of the marks of the University which had been ranked at number 6 and other on rank 15, the difference is very marginal. NIRF is not a system in which all the Universities uploaded their data during the first year. Many Universities could not upload their data, but most Universities, amongst which are the premier institutions did upload their data and he was happy that P.U. is amongst such institutions. He was also happy to share with them that amongst the high ranking institutions, there are only a handful which have undergone NAAC review three times. Only 38 Universities in the country, which have undergone the NAAC ranking three times and P.U. is amongst such institutions. If they look at 11 Universities, which are ahead of them in NIRF ranking, none of them have undergone three cycles of review by NAAC. The Panjab University has good fundamentals and a good system in place, and they are also conscious that there is a lot to improve still. NIRF is a system, in which not only the University as a whole is ranked, but one could also offer many institutions belonging to a given University to get rank(s) in individual manner. For instance, their Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (viz., UIPS) took the initiative to upload its data and he was happy to share with them that their University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences secured second place amongst the Pharmacy Institutions of India under the category of Pharmacy. Professor Bhoop of the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences was invited to first NIRF Awards event in New Delhi and the Hon'ble Minister (MHRD) presented him the certificate at Vigyan Bhawan. The Pharmacy Institute which was ahead of UIPS, P.U., was the Manipal Institute of Technology, Manipur. The Manipal University is a private University, having a good Medical School as an integral part of their University Campus and this probably helped Manipal graduates to get better placements. Amongst the traditional University Pharmaceutical Departments, UIPS, P.U., is the only Department, which has completed 50 years in the Indian University system. Overwhelmingly everybody congratulated the Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences for setting up of high standards.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he would like to say something about information in Vice-Chancellor's statement 2 (ii) that about the national ranking framework, so far as he understood, was a wake up call for them. It is right that every ranking agency has its own parameters to rate any educational institution or University. The ranking system which have been introduced by the MHRD, according to him, there were 5 main parameters. About Perception, they have done very well in that and they have got 97 in it. Others are effectiveness of teaching learning process, research infrastructure, graduate outcomes, higher studies and placements, outreach and inclusiveness. He said that he had gone through the record and found that they could do somewhat better in graduate outcome. He congratulated the Department of Pharmacy for performing well and also the Department of Chemical Engineering which have been placed at rank number 100. He further that he had so many times highlighted the issue in the meetings of Syndicate and Senate that

their placement Cell was not doing up to the mark and he had suggested that the placements should be uploaded on the website. This fact has been there in the findings of this MHRD agency. In the graduate outcome, what the University and the teachers are giving to their students, there was no improvement in that. According to him, they were doing well but as the IITs have been kept in Engineering category; otherwise, it might be quite possible that the ranking of the Panjab University might have slipped down further. In his view, more emphasis needs to be given on the academics. They were doing well but still they need improvement. Placements should be given due attention, the courses needed overhauling, they need to be made industry oriented. He stated that he had a little disappointment in the matter that when these findings were in the press, the statement of the Vice-Chancellor was there in the print media and as the head of the University family, there was a statement of the Vice-Chancellor about the University Business School. The reporter had asked him (Vice-Chancellor) as to why the University Business School was not amongst the top 100s. He stated that the Vice-Chancellor had held the politics in the Department responsible for it. According to him, it does not look good, as a head of the University family, he (Vice-Chancellor) should have called the department people in his office to know about the reasons, it was not good to take the issue in the press, it could have been avoided. He thought that the ranking system, which has been designed by the MHRD, as per the parameters, needs improvement.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he was expecting something about grants, which the UGC has given to the University in the Vice-Chancellor's statement and what were the financial implications. He suggested that in every meeting of the Syndicate, something about grants should be there.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the Vice-Chairman and Joint Secretary of UGC who were here in the University and his assessment is that as soon as the MHRD releases the money from UGC, they will give the P.U. share. His assessment is that unless the MHRD convenes the meeting of all the stakeholders and it is determined how the needs of P.U. have to be addressed, the UGC would not be in a position to take decision at its own. So he (the Vice-Chancellor) had made numerous requests to MHRD to get a meeting convened. He (the Vice-Chancellor) had separately communicated to the MHRD Minister, Smt. Smriti Irani as well. He had independently sent communications to Secretary, MHRD twice, in third week of April reiterating that the meeting of all the stakeholders should be convened. All the communications with Secretary, MHRD and Vice-Chairman, UGC were made available to the Chancellor. The Chancellor's office also enquires with the UGC and the UGC officials acknowledged it. The requirements of the Panjab University need to be met, there are no two opinions on it. Both the Chancellor's office and the UGC are alive to it. In the UGC budget there does not seem to be any specific allocation in the name of the Panjab University. P.U. is paid money from the non-plan budget of the UGC and on 31st of March, the day of the last year budget, he (the Vice-Chancellor) was asked by the Secretary, UGC in the morning as to what were the needs of the Panjab University. He (the Vice-Chancellor) articulated the needs and told him all the facts. He (Secretary UGC) told him that he would try to make the maximum possible allocation that he could. The Communication that the UGC had received from the MHRD was that the needs of the Panjab University be met considering their

overall resources. Between 3.30 and 5.30 in the afternoon of March 31st, whatever happened, he had no idea of it, but, before the day closing on 31st, P.U. received a communication that they will get only Rs.26 crores. No explanation was given why the number was restricted to 26. They had done it. Now he (Vice-Chancellor) had to interpret it. 150 crores was received earlier and 26 crores has come now that makes Rs.176 crores. 176 means whatever money was released to them in the previous year, it stands capped at that level. He told all this to the Chancellor who had called him to Delhi. The Chancellor was informed that they had also sent a communication to the MHRD Minister. He (Vice-Chancellor) had taken help of several other people on the Union cabinet, who had visited Panjab University in recent months, namely, Chaudhary Birender Singh who came to the University, who had offered Vice-Chancellor to meet him personally in his office in New Delhi. All the communications between the Panjab University and the MHRD and the Panjab University and the Chancellor's office were made available to Chaudhary Birender Singh who is a Minister in the Union cabinet. He had also made available all these things to the office of Hon'ble Minister, Smt. Sushma Swaraj via her Secretary. Another Hon'ble Minister, Gen. V.K. Singh (Retd.), whose daughter had done graduation from our University two years ago, was also met in Delhi. Four Central Ministers have been informed about all these facts. At an unofficial level, the MHRD officers say that the first instalment would be released to the Panjab University via UGC, before May 15.

Professor Malhotra enquired as to whether the money would be for this financial year.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that 'Yes'. This was a part of continuity. They had a shortfall during the last two years. They had asked for an amount. They were released some amount. They have sent their requirement for the next year also and they have been told that the money would be released.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the Board of Finance there was a feeling that, they were to give an increase of 8% to reach the amount to 192 crores. But they have given 176 crores.

The Vice-Chancellor said that from where did Professor Malhotra get this perception.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he got this perception from the developments taking place. UGC is not interested in manpower auditing (at P.U.), they are not ready to listen to the Think Tank (of P.U.), they are not ready to listen to (anything) or (take) care for these logical things.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the Minutes of the Think Tank (of P.U.) have been sent to them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they appreciated the efforts of the Vice-Chancellor. They wanted that the University to get the full grant. He further stated that if they continued to get the grant frozen on 176 crores and they should have the information as to whether the freezing has actually occurred or not, so that corrective steps could be taken. He suggested that time limit should be fixed so that steps could be taken for financial controls.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the time limit has been set by default (actions).

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that he was discussing the issue generally and it should not be taken as perception, he was not criticizing any one. He was raising the issue because all are dependent on it and he was not questioning anyone. Whatever all are observing, it should be seen (as to) what is coming out of it.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he was a contractual employee of the University for a short period. This was the worry of entire university community in the present and also in the past. As regards the past, his responsibility is only a small fraction. The larger responsibility is of all the stakeholders of the University, that is the entire civil society for that matter of the entire state. The Panjab University is a mother institution of all state Universities of India. Its survival and its healthy well being ought to be a matter of concern for the Punjab government, the Haryana Government, the Central government, the Union Territory Administration and so many other agencies. Everybody thinks that something should happen. But as regards the concerns of the Panjab University, somehow nothing has been resolved. It has been made known to all of them that everything needs to be resolved before the next academic session; because, if the income of the Panjab University is to be increased, it cannot be increased by selling property, it is to be generated through contribution(s), by enhancing income of every bit of components contributing to Rs.205 crores. There was a fee component and alongwith fee, there were so many small components and upto which extent and at what rate these components are to be increased for that, they shall have to have a clarity to see that what would be the commitment of the central government. If it was a conscious decision of the central government that there would be capping at Rs.176 crores, then they need to give them in writing that nothing more than 176 crores would be given. Right now, it is by default action. There is no directive of the MHRD that the needs of the Panjab University should not be met. He (Vice-Chancellor) stated that he himself has not seen the document, but they told him that whatever was conveyed to them the day before March 31st, there is a directive to the UGC that the needs of the Panjab University should be met, keeping in view the overall things that were available to UGC. They said that 30th March has approached, the account from which the MHRD has to release the money, that budget head cannot be increased from the budget of the Centre. The UGC could have had compelling requirements from different departments, the UGC had to take decision(s). Why the UGC took the decision that the Panjab University should be given Rs.26 crores only, inspite of the fact that the Secretary of UGC had talked to him (the Vice-Chancellor) at 3.30 p.m. afternoon on that day and asked him (Vice Chancellor) about how much money the University required. The Vice-Chancellor stated that he had to tell the Secretary UGC that, that was not the way the public institutions should be handled with. There must be far more seriousness and concern as to how these institutions are to be dealt with. P.U. had invited the UGC participation in their budgetary exercise. Formally, in the University calendar, there is nothing that there would be a representative of UGC. P.U. had invited the representative of the MHRD, the representative of the MHRD did come. The question is not that the Central Government does not know our requirements. They know what our requirements were. However, there is no provision explicitly

made for us anywhere. The route via which the money for P.U. used to come, via the Ministry of Home Affairs to Union Territory, and in that route, the name of the Panjab University has not been decoupled. After decoupling, the name should get connected somewhere else, that has not come about anywhere into the budget document of the Central Government. So this is a fact that the Chancellor's office is worried about. The Chancellor's office is trying to see that the matter is in progress somewhere. The Chairman came last year, Vice-Chairman of UGC came here in recent months and the Joint Secretary of UGC who handles the money also came, whatever has happened he will that share with the members. After the Vice Chairman UGC went back to Delhi, after that he had sent communication once again to him that happened between him (Vice Chancellor) and the Chancellor's office. Those communications have already been sent to the Secretary, UGC and are being sent to the Chairman of the UGC and the Chancellor. In his personal capacity, Shri Dev Raj told him that he will impress upon the MHRD Minister to address concerns of P.U.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would like to say something about a corrective step. He said that already a Committee was constituted and the recommendations of the Committee have come, which he could not read, and he is not sure whether the members are aware of that.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not encourage more discussion. The House should stop discussion, without documents.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that they should not stop discussion. He further said that this was a current major problem of the University and he wanted that it should be taken seriously.

The Vice Chancellor said that a special meeting of the Syndicate could be convened and he will make all the documents available. He will share with the members whatever has been done. He further stated that he was already spending so much time to redress the problem.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that then for what the Syndicate is there and it is meant to discuss the current problem also.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that on the financial matter, the House should have a special meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was supposed to have a full day special meeting of the Senate to discuss all these things but before the special meeting of the Senate, he had to convene a special meeting of the Syndicate as well. He will make available everything to them, the structured information. He further said that at a personal level whatever possible, he could do, and whatever the Chancellor have done, he will ascertain all those things, he will have one more trip to Delhi so that he has an assessment of each of the person whom he (Vice Chancellor) had contacted.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that last time the University had demanded Rs. 205 crores and they have given us 163 crores plus 8% increase i.e. 176 crores. Rs.30 crores are still to be balanced. Whatever we demand, we get it passed from the Board of Finance, but thereafter nothing happens and we are postponing our corrective steps. If they are not taking corrective steps, its impact is that by

taking Rs.100 crores, we can give salaries and what about the situation afterwards. He further stated that they must identify as to what corrective steps should be taken.

The Vice Chancellor stated that, that was why the meetings of the Think Tank are being held.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the corrective steps shall have to be taken at their own. Nobody would come to their rescue. He stated that if one increases the house expenses to such an extent at his own, the one's parents and friends would not come to help him. One shall have to help oneself. He further said that they were doing just the time pass exercise, the pension corpus has not been given Rs.17 crores and Rs.39 crores are again due, the corpus would be affected.

The Vice Chancellor stated that to discuss these matters, they could hold a special meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice Chancellor should take corrective steps at his own level and all the members are with him. He further stated that the matter should be discussed in the meeting, as this is the major current problem of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that until the Parliament ends, all the people are busy. All the people whom he (Vice Chancellor) met, are concerned for us, they want to help but at the moment, nothing has happened. Let the MHRD tells us. It is not even clear whether our needs which are to be met by MHRD, whether they have taken a conscious decision that it has been frozen to 176 crores. He said that so far he knows that it is the decision of the UGC to give Rs.176 crores and he has no idea why it is so. He has already shared with the members, that upto 31st of March, he (the Vice Chancellor) was asked as to how much they need to run their affairs. The Vice Chancellor said that he told them that the full deficit of this year be given to them and about 17 crores of the last year, they would talk later on. The requirements of the current year should be met. They promised to get back to him (Vice Chancellor) but nobody got back to him so far. He (Vice Chancellor) only wanted the sanction letter before 31st of March and that letter came on 26th of March. The FDO and Dean University Instruction are witness to this event. So many phone calls came on that day. He (Vice Chancellor) was in an event outside. He continued to come out of the event and tried time and again to contact the Secretary, UGC.

Professor Keshav Malhtora said that the efforts which were being talked of were of the UGC. He enquired as to what the efforts are being made by the University within.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was not a matter of short discussion or long discussion, the question is, as to in which way the efforts are to be made, they cannot realistically increase from Rs.205 crores to Rs.410 crores immediately. Whatever they will increase, in that, they will not only be involved, in that all the colleges of Punjab are also involved. This is a bigger complicated job. The Think-Tank had said that they are making proposal to generate Rs.20 lacs to Rs.25 lacs etc. from different segments, the topic of proposal is upto them, but the topic of proposal is not implemented. The question was that up what extent they will meet our deficit? They need to know it.

He further said that it has nowhere been written that our grant has been frozen at 176 crores. Tomorrow, it could be Zero. It has nowhere been written about the quantum of deficit. It is written that our deficit will be met by the Central Government, this was an understanding of one government. This is a factual position that another government has come in. Another decision of the previous Government was that there would be an 8% increase, but this decision was also not an appropriate decision. We were supposed to be given the entire (deficit) money but we were not given the entire money. One government had projected, and the other government has not taken any conscious decision. By conscious decision, meaning thereby, that MHRD has not given any directive that the University be given Rs. 176 crores only. No explicit directive was there (on a precise amount), whatever the UGC may have projected for us, the UGC has released only 176 crores for P.U. For the next year, we have not been given any projection figure. He stated that this was a factual position and let him (Vice Chancellor) visit Delhi once. He informed that they have received an indication that they shall be given money.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked whether this 100 crores would be for this year.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was not a question of 100 crores. He had told to UGC authorities that when they had given Rs.176 crores to the University, the first instalment released was of Rs.100 crores. If they are unable to take any other decision, if they cannot hold a round table meeting with them, there on the presumption of the previous precedent, they could give us Rs.100 crores. During the next 3-4 months, they can have a round table meeting with them, before the submission of revised estimates to government of India for the next year. The revised estimates go before 30th of September and before the submission of the revised estimates, it would be necessary to hold the meetings of Senate, Syndicate and Board of Finance. He said that all this time table, he has intimated to the Centre and this has also been informed to them that whatever is to be done, that shall have to be done before the commencement of the academic session, and he has kept prepared a deadline, which is likely to commence in the first or second week of July, all this process should be completed before that.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the revised estimates be prepared after having meeting with the MHRD, UGC etc., so that the revised estimates go without any delay.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has told them, whether they want that the University should open in July or not, it is the responsibility of the MHRD, the ball is now in the court of the MHRD. He has conveyed all this to every Minister to whom he met, all the Secretaries whom he met. He stated that he is running from one Ministry to other Ministry and he has been utilising every possible personal contacts which he had earned during his last forty years of service. He has pushed the agenda of the University through various Ministries.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to whether the University has not pressed upon the Ministry to give them the 8% increase which they were given last time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want it to be frozen at 8%. He stated that he had told them they are going to adopt the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission. In this way, it is not possible that they will be able to make an increase for the Panjab University. He questioned as to wherefrom the University will get money? He further stated that he asked them to clarify clearly that their income is only a fraction of their total needs, do they want to freeze that fraction? Every year when the projection of the University will increase, say today their income is of Rs.200 crores and Punjab government gives Rs.20 crores and the deficit is of Rs.217 crores. If they are contributing 200 crores out of Rs.441 crores, he questioned if they were expecting that the University would contribute 45% of their total requirement every year. He asked them that please tell us, if the University has to contribute, then the University governing bodies would think and put their mind over it. If they think that the 45% contribution is less and it should be 70% on the part of the University, it should be clearly told. Orally they say all these things. The Vice Chancellor stated the Joint Secretary of MHRD, Mr. S.S. Sandhu told him (Vice Chancellor) that Punjab Government was giving same money to the Guru Nanak Dev University. If the Guru Nanak Dev University is meeting almost 75% of their requirements, why could not the Panjab University?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Guru Nanak Dev University have no financial problem. The Guru Nanak Dev University have planned their resources, they have planned their examination system. Here in Panjab University, on one hand, they are talking of automation in Examination and on the other hand, they are increasing the number of employees. He further stated that if one happens to visit the Kurukshetra University, their examination branch have a very limited number of employees. Presently, everything has turned automatic. He suggested that they should apply their mind, have some capital expenditure, by doing so, quality of results will improve.

He continued saying that his concept was that it is good if they are getting the salary and further said that he has been raising the issue for the last two years every time, he is being given assurance that everything would be okay. He pointed out that the Pension Corpus is in critical condition. He stated that at least he thinks that the things are such.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not given any assurance of such type to anybody. He further stated that he would get them back with a special meeting of the Syndicate to discuss this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was expecting that the financial issue would be a major issue. They need to decide that the issues relating to finance needs serious attention and they have to discuss it in the Senate and the Syndicate and some alarming steps shall have to be taken at the earliest. He further stated that nobody was doubting the efforts of the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor has very painfully said that whatever personal contacts he (Vice Chancellor) had earned in the forty years, he has used for the concerns of the University, this shows his (Vice Chancellor) concern for Panjab University. He said that not only this but the Syndicate, teaching and non teaching staff have equally shown concern about this. They had discussed in February 2015 and there in Board of Finance, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had stated that, he had expressed his

apprehensions that this is where they are going to reach and they should be ready with Plan-B and at that time the Vice Chancellor had stated that he was a diehard optimistic and they are happy that is because of his (Vice Chancellor) attitude in the February 2015 when the Vice Chancellor had said that they would wait only till July 2015 and if by the July 2015, if the University did not receive the grant, they would have a special meeting of the Board of Finance to discuss the Plan-B further followed by discussion in special meetings of Syndicate and Senate but till then let them persuade the government to give special treatment to the Panjab University being a one of the pioneer University in the country. He further stated that, that special meeting of the Board of Finance could not be held because the Vice Chancellor was still hopeful that they have to give them the money in order to acknowledge the special status of the University. But at the same time, some people had seen that at the stage where they would not be able to control the damage, if that stage comes, then what would be done. He stated that in that light the Vice Chancellor had said at that time that in February 2015, it was the directive of the UGC that they fill all the vacant positions. To that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) stated that he had suggested the University should put pressure on the UGC on one hand they have not been releasing the grants and on the other hand, they were pressuring the University to fill the vacant posts. From where the money shall come? He said that he had suggested that it should be told to the UGC that until and unless they are ready to give the funds to the University, it will not be possible to fill the vacant positions by the University. He explained that as per their mandate, they were to continue to fill the vacancies. Thus, in his view, increasing the expected expenditure, not sure, what their attitude would be as far as the grant system is concerned. He stated that again they were hopeful of receiving the grant from them, but this came as a shock that even a projected increase of 8% has not been given. He further said that as far as Punjab government is concerned, they have also not given them in writing that they would not give the University more than that. But they knew that for all practical purposes. Earlier they had frozen at 16 crores and after one year 21 crores and now at 20 crores. He stated that although they have not told them but it is somewhat quite sure that they would not go beyond that. He stated that he was only to say that MHRD have not told them as to what is the finance for the University. But to his view, the conception is that who were supposed to give 192 crores, have kept them at Rs.176 crores, he felt that they should sense their intentions. Now using personal contacts, personal resources, and the alumnus of Panjab University, is going to do nothing in achieving desired goals. He stated that dignitaries like Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Shri Satya Pal Jain and many others who have written to the MHRD to release grants to the University, all of them sitting in the University have no personal interest but 'Yes' they have the institutional interest. So in his opinion, the government should not take the impression as if they were the professional beggars and the Senate and Syndicate in the University is there to join hands in the form of beggars before the MHRD ministry. He stated he was nobody to suggest how to meet the requirements of the University. But, he stated that they should be ready for both the situations. If they give, it is very good and that was why he had said in the Senate also that everybody from the class four employee to the member of the Senate all are with the Vice Chancellor and wherever the services of anybody are required to be used, they are available for the Vice-Chancellor and further stated that the Vice Chancellor was not only utilizing his full energy and even beyond that. But Sir, you

(Vice Chancellor) had said that you have a contractual job at present till 2018 which pains us, why you (Vice Chancellor) should feel that you only have temporary concerns for the University. Why the Vice Chancellor should feel that he is a temporary employee and other people are here to continue. Why the efforts and pains of the Vice Chancellor that shows others around that whether he remains here in the University or not, but for the Panjab University, he has a special place in his heart. He stated that the Vice Chancellor was only to see that everybody has been trying to talk only in that connection. The Vice-Chancellor knows that unless and until they are given assurance how do they expect the University without money to run. How do they expect that the University could do better from its current 12th position? Could it be possible to do without money? The Guru Nanak Dev University is contributing as he (Vice Chancellor) say 75% of their total expenditure by way of generating their own revenue, then it should be considered that before thinking about raising the revenue, the first step which has to be taken is towards reducing the expenditure. Now to say that we cannot afford to reduce the expenditure, then the message should go to the government that they were doing everything including finding ways to reducing the expenditure. It should at least be projected that they were looking into the expenditure also. He stated that he knows in the commercial organisation also and in non commercial organisation to give a message that they were short of money. He suggested that a circular should be issued that from today reimbursement is frozen, such and such expenditure is frozen and such and such things are not in their controls. He stated that they were showing only crocodile tears as far as finance is concerned. He questioned how the University is running successfully in difficult situation.

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) for having secured Second place amongst Pharmacy Institutions in the ‘National Institutional Ranking;
 - (ii) Prof. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Fellow and Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) on being selected for a prestigious International recognition, ‘The Name in Science Award’, by the academic union, European Business Assembly, Oxford, UK;
 - (iii) Prof. Ronki Ram, Fellow and Hon. Director, ICSSR (NWRC), on being invited by the British Council, New Delhi, to participate in the Warwick International Programme in the Leadership and Management of Higher Education (IPLM), at University of Warwick, UK;
 - (iv) Prof. Ronki Ram, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Sciences on being invited as Chief Guest and Key note

Speaker at the 125th Birth Anniversary celebrations of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar by Consulate General of India, San Francisco, California and the Indian American Community;

- (v) Prof. Rajeev Patnaik, Deptt. of Geology, on being awarded by the Government of India with the 'National Geosciences Award 2014' for his outstanding contributions in the field of Basic Geosciences.
- (vi) Prof. Prince Sharma, Deptt. of Microbiology, on being selected for the Glaxo Smith Kline Vaccines Travel Award by a US-based company;
- (vii) Dr Harish Kumar, Associate Professor in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, on being awarded by 'Young Faculty Research Fellowship' for five years by the Media Lab, Deptt. of Electronics and IT, Ministry of Communication and IT, to do research and guide Ph.D. research scholars related to Information Communication Technology (ICT).;
- (viii) Professor Rani Balbir Kaur, former Chairperson, Department of Indian Theatre, PU, on being selected for 'Sangeet Natak Akademi Award (Puraskar) for 2015';
- (ix) Professor Chaman Lal Ahuja, former Chairperson, Department of English on being selected for 'Sangeet Natak Akademi Award (Puraskar) for 2015' for his overall contribution/scholarship to performing Arts by the Sangeet Natak Akademi.
- (x) Dr Chandershekhar Prasad, an alumnus of Panjab University, on being selected for Ustad Bismillah Khan Yuva Puraskar 2015 for his contribution in direction by the Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi. The Yuva Puraskar will be presented at a special ceremony by the Chairman, Sangeet Natak Akademi.
- (xi) Dr Mamta Joshi, Head of the Deptt. of Music, Post Graduate Government College, Sector-11, Chandigarh, on being selected for Ustad Bismillah Khan Yuva Puraskar 2015 for her contribution in the field of 'Folk Music, Punjab' by the Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi.
- (xii) Prof. M.M. Gupta (Re-employed), Deptt. of Physics, on being invited as Key Speaker

at the International Conference on New Physics at the Large Hadron Collider hosted by the Nanyang Technological University;

(xiii) Prof. V K. Jindal (Re-employed), Deptt. of Physics on being invited for a research visit of 3 months to University of Wurzburg by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

2. the information contained in Vice Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (1) and (2), be noted and approved; and
3. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 27.02.2016, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Appointment of Programme Co-ordinator (NSS) in Department of NSS

2(i). Considered minutes dated 15.03.2016 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Programme Co-ordinator (NSS)-1 (Advt. No. 3/2015) (On contract basis of the period of Three years and extendable for further one year) in the Department of NSS, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that there are two candidates for the post of Programme Coordinator (NSS) one is Mrs. Navdeep Sharma and the another is Gaganpreet Kaur. He enquired as to what did ECE mean written in the Column No. 6 of application of Gaganpreet Kaur. Was it a degree or a course work?

The Vice-Chancellor said that what was the concern of Shri Raghbir Dyal to enquire about it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that Mrs. Navdeep Sharma has written in column No. 6 (Ph.D.) as English, enrolled with P.U. Chandigarh. He stated that as far his knowledge goes this candidate has already got her Ph.D. Degree from CMJ University in the year 2013. He questioned as to whether his information was true or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be ensured that the information is complete.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that a letter has been sent to the D.R Colleges that this particular candidate was asking for increments on the basis of Ph.D. D.R. Colleges should write to the concerned college to verify the degree. He said that he was not questioning the integrity of the Selection Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why the candidate has not claimed on the basis of what was in her possession.

Dr. S.S.Sangha said that the Ph.D. degree from CMJ may be in another subject.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that what was the problem in it, it was the choice of the candidate to furnish information or not. He cited an example that if a candidate has 20 published research papers

and if he/she wants to disclose only 10, he/she could do so. It is his/her own wish. He further said that second Ph.D. is also allowed. The candidate is free to do as many Ph.Ds. as he/she could.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not saying that a candidate cannot do Ph.Ds. other than one.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked that what was the concern of her Ph.D. with the instant case.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to whether the candidate was having Ph.D. In the application form, it has only been written 'registered with Panjab University. He stated that it was matter of concern that why the candidate has concealed the fact that she is already a Ph.D. According to him, there is a special column wherein she has written Ph.D. and if the candidate has done Ph.D., she has not been disclosing. She has not only concealed the information, rather she is misleading. He cited an example that if a candidate's basic qualification is B.A. and he/she secured 68% marks in BA and 44 % marks in M.A. and he/she would try to conceal his/her M.A marks because by doing so his/her chances of getting selected could be affected. He further said that unless and until their *pro forma* says information more than relating to the basic eligibility, is not necessary to disclose, the non-disclosure cannot be accepted.

Professor Ranga enquired if she is fulfilling all the minimum qualifications or it is required that she should disclose everything.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that alright, let the House should pass that she does not need to disclose whatever information is with her.

The Vice Chancellor said that the proposal of the Selection Committee was before them, they have to consider the recommendations of the Selection Committee. He stated that whether the House is accepting the recommendations or not accepting the recommendation of the Selection Committee. He stated that if the members have something else about this case, they should bring that to him and if this has a bearing in this case and if it requires some legal way, that would be sorted out.

Professor Shelley Walia said that in the form, she has filled as 'enrolled' rightly speaking that she has a Ph.D. degree while talking about her qualification.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the candidate did not want to disclose her Ph.D. degree, then what was the problem. The members have said that the degree is from the CMJ and she does not want to claim it because CMJ University is in controversy. What was wrong in it?

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Mrs. Navdeep Sharma might not be mentioning her Ph.D. degree because of the controversy of CMJ University. He said that what Shri Bansal was saying that she has not mentioned her Ph.D. but she has asked for the benefit for the degree of CMJ University, from her college subsequently filling up of this form which will have bearing, because she will be granted increments, if she is entitled. If she is not entitled, she will not be granted increments. If she is not entitled, she will not be granted increments. This would have no bearing on the Panjab University.

But if she is entitled and she is granted increments, this will have bearing on the Panjab University because they will have to protect her salary after adding her three or four increments to her salary which she will get on account of Ph.D. degree. Should it not be in the knowledge of the Syndicate that what the authority was doing?

Shri Raghbir Dyal read a Doctor of Philosophy, provisional certificate 2013 stating therein 'This is to certify that the proposal for award of Ph.D degree in the subject of English under the Faculty of Arts to Smt. Navdeep Sharma, registration number such and such year 2010 to 2013 in the topic 'Preservance of Culture and quest for self in Yog. R. Ananthmurthy and

He further stated that she has applied for increments on the basis of this Ph.D. topic. He said he might be wrong and the facts should be checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there was no difficulty in checking the facts.

He further stated that there were various Supreme Court judgements where the qualification sometimes was this, say 10th pass and for a menial job, some graduates applied. They were declared ineligible on the ground that the minimum qualification was 10th pass. Now to conceal the over qualification, the person tells that he/she is 10th pass. Some complaints were there that the person was B.A. pass. The concerned candidate said that it was his own wish to write it or not. The authorities said that he had to write about his over qualification, in the first instance and it is up to them consider it or not and hundreds of such people were terminated, who were employed after concealing their qualification, even after putting in 13 years service because of that fact that they had not mentioned their higher qualification but here in Panjab University, they have gone one step further also. They have made a column of educational qualification and besides that there is a column for any other examination to be specified. In the light of this, he had to say that they should simply had an affidavit from her as to whether she had a Ph.D. degree and if she had a Ph.D. degree, she should be asked to explain that under what circumstances she has not mentioned this fact in the application form.

The Vice Chancellor stated that they have the recommendations of the Selection Committee and the recommendations of the Selection Committee are based on the data and performance. There is a recommendation that her salary should be protected because the Selection Committee wants that an officer should join and salary should not be any issue. She is already in the Pay Band 4 and the issue of Ph.D. which is being discussed here in the light that the salary would not become an issue later on. He (the Vice Chancellor) said that this was the salary which she was having on the day of interview. So as the members have stated that if the increments are granted and a new salary certificate is issued, then all this figure would change.

Shri Ashok Goyal said 'No'. If she produces the revised certificate, that salary shall have to be given. If she does not do so, this salary will stand.

Few members were of the view that after verification, the item be brought again to the Syndicate, while others were of the view that Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his previous statement about her Ph.D. was not complete. He started reading again that.... 'has been awarded by the University (he mean to say Ph.D.) as per the UGC gazette notification No.11. of July 17, 2009 and his humble submission is that it should be cross checked.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that there are precedents that if the House wants any clarification, the matter comes to the Syndicate again after the clarification is received. He further stated that they were not against her appointment.

Citing an example, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in order to bring transparency, they have made a column 'any other examination' so that whatever one has done, he/she must mention it. To say, I do not like to disclose, I do not want to reveal, is not a right thing. He stated that he was saying that if she had a Ph.D. degree, she should tell why she has not mentioned it. If she has not a Ph.D. degree, then also tell about it. He further stated that there was the problem for them to bring it again to the Syndicate.

Dr. S.S. Sangha stated that the other side of the main page, say the fourth page, it has been written therein that more research papers published in Journals while applying. It is 44 and year have nowhere been mentioned. There is a much difference between 4 and 44. He stated that the candidate has asked for increment from the University on the basis of her Ph.D.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if the candidate fulfils the minimum qualification and on the basis of it, the Syndicate should approve her appointment. Secondly, the question which has been raised by the members, regarding that, they were authorising the Vice Chancellor to verify the facts.

The Vice Chancellor reiterated that the recommendation is of the Selection Committee was before them. The 4 or 44 was a typographical error. He stated that if the legal issue is regarding disclosing vs not disclosing, if the latter amounts to a rejection, he will find out. He urged that at the moment the item should be passed and she will not be issued appointment letter until legal opinion arrives. The legal opinion would be taken from at least two people.

The Vice Chancellor further said that the members have not had any problem with the recommendations of the Selection Committee. Now the thing is that if it is necessary under the law of the land to disclose the qualification and in view of that, the questions have been raised as regards the recommendations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in case, there is no problem, legally, then the appointment letter should be issued.

The Vice Chancellor asked if the members were approving the recommendations of the Selection Committee, the members replied 'Yes', there is no question of disapproving the recommendations of the Selection Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the members of the Syndicate come to the meeting to see and do such type of things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it should have been written in the declaration portion that the 'information is complete'.

Shri Raghbir Dyal once again said that they should get it cross checked. It might be that his information is wrong. He further stated that whatever information had come to him, he had placed before the Syndicate. He has only requested to get it examined. He has no problem with the appointment. Professor Shelley Walia also endorsed the requisition of Shri Raghbir Dayal. Shri Raghbir Dayal further stated that he is not doubting the etiquette of the Selection Committee.

Navdeep Goyal said that the legal opinion is required only if that is true which has been stated by Shri Raghbir Dayal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in case probably Shri Raghbir Dayal has said then there is every probability that the degree issued by the CMJ has been invalidated by the Government of India under the directions of Supreme Court judgment.

Dr. Josan disagreeing to the statement of Shri Ashok Goyal, stated that whatever is being said by Shri Ashok Goyal about CMJ, is not true. He had seen the notification of High Court. Everything has been resolved now.

On this Shri Ashok Goyal said that he will give them all the documents, including the judgement of the Supreme Court, including the orders of the Government of Meghalaya, and also including the judgement of the High Court to which they were referring, he stated that they get it examined. Now probably this is the only reason that the degree has been invalidated, the candidate has not claimed the same. He could understand it because the degree issuing University was not in existence. He stated that he could accept to that extent. But on the basis of the same degree, subsequently to having filled the application form, if the demand for Ph.D. is being made, then probably, it was something wrong. Now what Principal Josan has said, he could understand that if the judgement of the High Court has come overruling the judgement of the Supreme Court between the date of the filling of the application form and the way the candidate has claimed, then also he could understand. He stated that now he was saying that he might be wrong. Pointing to the claim made by Principal Josan that everything has been resolved, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that to his understanding the orders of the Supreme Court of India and the Government of Meghalaya still stands.

Principal Josan again did not agree to the claims of Shri Ashok Goyal and terming it as wrong.

During this discussion, pandemonium prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they give him the papers and he will get these legally examined.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is repeating it again that nothing about selection, nothing at the integrity of the Selection Committee, he wants to send this message that this selection has

already been approved by the Syndicate by its wisdom and he would request them to get it cross-checked.

Shri Ajay Ranga said that as has been stated by Shri Ashok Goyal that suppose that one has a Ph.D. degree and after Ph.D., one got some degree or diploma, and if the degree or diploma is cancelled by the University, shall it impose any legal impact on one, because there is no mistake on the part of the candidate.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Navdeep Sharma be appointed Programme Co-ordinator (NSS) (on contract basis for the period of three years & extendable for further one year), Panjab University, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + GP Rs.9000/- plus allowances admissible under University rules, and she be offered basic salary in Pay-Band-4 equal to whatever she is getting in her present position at A.S. College, Khanna. However, the appointment letter be issued to her after getting the documents cross-checked, and obtaining legal opinion from at least two Legal Retainers.

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.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur be placed on the Waiting List.

NOTE: A summary bio-data of the selected candidates enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidate fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

Appointment of Professor in the Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh

2(ii). Considered the minutes dated 22.03.2016 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Desh Deepak Singh be appointed Professor (General), in the Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.10000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

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 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 all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. A summary bio-data of the selected candidates enclosed. It had been

certified that the selected 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 Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Nanoscience & Nanotechnology

2(iii). Considered the minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Nanoscience & Nanotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Navneet Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Centre for Nanoscience & Nanotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **01.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Nuclear Medicine, P.U.

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Nuclear Medicine, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vijayta D. Chadha be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Centre for Nuclear Medicine, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **01.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Anthropology, P.U.

2(v). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gayathiri Pathmanathan be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Anthropology, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **27.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of Biochemistry, P.U.

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Biochemistry, P.U., Chandigarh

RESOLVED: That Dr. Nirmal Prabhakar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **01.09.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection have been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Human Rights and Duties, P.U.

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at Centre for Human Rights and Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh

RESOLVED: That Dr. Namita be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Centre for Human Rights and Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **20.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIAMS, P.U.

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Aman Khara be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the **21.09.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIAMS, P.U.

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-X**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Manu Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the **12.09.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIAMS, P.U.

2(x). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Arunachal Khosla be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the **21.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selections has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIAMS, P.U.

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Nidhi Gautam Prabhakar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the **19.12.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab

University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIET

2(xii). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Mukesh Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engg. (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **07.10.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and 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 API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIHMT

2(xiii). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Sh. Anish Slath be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the **15.10.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of French & Francophone Studies, P.U.

2(xiv). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of French & Francophone Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ramnik Aurora be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of French & Francophone Studies, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the **07.11.2011**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, P.U.

2(xv). Considered minutes dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

The Vice Chancellor said that the candidate is Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur.

Principal S.S. Sangha enquired to whether temporary and contractual appointments are considered in University or not in promotions. This should be clarified.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever is done, it is done by the Screening Committee.

Continuing, Principal S.S. Sangha stated that there are so many teachers to whom this benefit has not been given. If there is any such case, it should be brought to their notice. He stated that supposing a teacher has 4 years of experience while on temporary service, and after formal appointment in the year 2005, his/her next promotion due for 5 years is in the year 2010, after counting the old service, he/she is given CAS promotion of five year, is it possible? He suggested that if such a benefit is being given, then it should be given to all.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could not give answer to this question. He further said that they are considering the appointments. If the members have to ask him queries arising out of the item, the same should be given to him in writing in advance.

Principal S.S. Sangha, referring to page 15, said that the regular appointment happened on 09.09.2011, and the second stage scale-2 was given on 03.08.2013. There is a temporary service from the year 2009 to year 2011 that is too in piecemeal. It should be clarified as it shall have a bearing on the University authorities at a later stage.

The Vice Chancellor stated that all these are governed by the Dean University Instruction who is very experienced person to handle such issues. They should not expect that the Vice Chancellor would check all these things. If the benefit being given to her is becoming an issue, he will check up with the Dean of University Instruction and if there are other persons, who are placed under similar circumstances, the benefit must be given to all of them, but the benefit must be consistent with guidelines of the UGC and norms approved by the Syndicate and Senate.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that he has been contacted by many teachers, who have been denied this benefit. Earlier their cases were rejected.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this benefit should only be given, if the UGC allows. However, if the UGC does not allow, how could they give this benefit to all?

The Vice Chancellor said that he would get it checked. It is not that she should be given it preferentially, and if she is entitled to it, she should be given the same, then all similarly placed persons should also be given this benefit.

Professor Keshav Malhotra again retreated that the benefit should be given, only if the UGC permits.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not only the UGC, it should also be accepted by the governing bodies of the University. It should have approval from the Syndicate and Senate for its adoption. Anyhow, he would discuss the matter with Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that before taking of final decision, legal opinion on the issue should be taken.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the **04.08.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her, subject to the condition that before issuing the appointment letter to her, the Vice-Chancellor would verify whether the temporary service rendered by her is to be counted for the promotion under consideration or not, and if need be, legal opinion be obtained for the purpose.

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

Appointment of Associate Professor (SC) in the Department of Geography, P.U.

2(xvi). Considered minutes of the Selection Committee dated 04.04.2016 (**Appendix-XVII**) for appointment of Associate Professor-1 (SC) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gaurav Kalotra be appointed Associate Professor (SC) in the Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to 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 him subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, with the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

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

Appointment of Professor at Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics, P.U.

2(xvii). Considered minutes of the Selection Committee dated 11.04.2016 for appointment of Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) at Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

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

Appointment of Associate Professor (SC) in Electrical and Electronics Engineering at UIET

2(xviii). Considered minutes of the Selection Committee dated 11.04.2016 for appointment of Associate Professor in Electrical and Electronics Engineering-1 (SC) (Advt. No. 4/2014) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

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

Appointment of Professor in Information Technology at UIET

2(xix). Considered minutes of the Selection Committee dated 11.04.2016 (**Appendix-XVIII**) for appointment of Professors in Information Technology-2 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Krishan Kumar be appointed Professor of Information Technology at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.10000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

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

Appointment of Professors-2 at UIAMS

2(xx). Considered minutes of the Selection Committee dated 26.04.2016 (**Appendix-XIX**) for appointment of Professor-2 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) at University Institute of Applied Management Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he would like to congratulate the Vice-Chancellor and the Selection Committee for selecting very good candidates. They have put Ms. Monika Aggarwal on the waiting list. On the one hand, they had selected very good candidates and on the other, they might look at the experience certificates of the candidate placed on the waiting list. The first one is from Hans Raj Mahila Maha Vidyalaya from 02.07.2002 to 10.07.2007 and the second one is from Gian Jyoti Institute of Management & Technology which is from 05.07.2007 to 05.07.2010. Then there is an

experience certificate from IIPM, Mohali, about which most of the members must be having the knowledge. The experience certificate is not having any reference number and date and she is shown of having drawn a salary of Rs.75,600/- consolidated. Again in the experience certificate issued by Cordia Institute of Business Management, no reference number has been mentioned where she worked as Professor for the period 17.12.2011 to 31.05.2014. Again in the Cordia Group of Institutes, she was appointed as Development Manager-cum-Professor and as per the experience certificates, she was relieved from Cordia Institute of Business Management on 31st May, 2014 and joined on 1st March 2014 in Cordia Group of Institutes which is contradictory. For the last about 3 years, she is not doing anything but working as Post Doctoral Research Fellow and teaching as a guest faculty. The selection of the two candidates is fine. But keeping in view the contradictions in the experience certificates, these should be got checked. For getting no objection certificate or for taking any leave, the candidate has to inform the Registrar whereas the candidate has got a no objection certificate from the Director, UIAMS, Panjab University, which does not bear any reference number. Since she knew that she could become a Professor from a Post Doctoral Research Fellow as she knew that one of the candidates might not join. It would be just like a backdoor entry. This should be got checked.

Professor Navdeep Goyal also said that the matter be got checked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a backdoor entry as the candidates had been interviewed by the Selection Committee and the Selection Committee is not expected to go into the details of such things.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that how the Screening Committee could not take note of the points raised by Professor Keshav Malhotra.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Dean of University Instruction is the Chairman of the Selection Committee.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the overlap of dates in the certificates should be got examined.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the experience certificate should be got examined.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that in such a case, the explanation could be sought directly from the candidate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the waiting list be not approved.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the clarification could be sought from the candidates.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the waiting list be not approved till a clarification is sought.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that it could be seen that they have either to approve or reject the waiting list.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a point to disapprove on the basis of technicality. He would get the technicalities checked and if those are confirmed, then it is fine.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that what he is saying is written in the documents.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the technicalities are to be checked only if there is no documentary evidence. In this case, all the documents are attached.

Professor Keshav Malhotra further said that from the last information on the website of Cordia, which he got, Ms. Monika Aggarwal has been shown as Dean Research-cum-Associate Professor. This is a proforma which is meant for mandatory disclosure every year. He wanted to say that the two selections which have been made are very good but the waiting list is not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not take a decision to reject it. As regards the approval of the waiting list, he would check all these and get back to the Syndicate. He said that the waiting list should not be rejected otherwise it would cast aspersions on the Selection Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the recommendations of the Selection Committee be approved. In view of what Professor Keshav Malhotra has pointed out in the waiting list, the Vice-Chancellor could bring that to the Syndicate as a new item so that it did not seem that they had approved the two selections and rejected the waiting list.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the selected candidates did not join, the offer would not be sent to the waitlisted candidate until the infirmities are cleared.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they wait for those people to join and they did not join and after that the item is brought to the Syndicate, it would look as if they are taking step which is a decision against the candidate. It would be better, whether the selected candidates join or not, let the item be brought to the next Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first the offer of appointment could go to the two selected candidates and he would get it checked.

Professor Keshav Malhotra handed over some documents to the officials.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired whether they could offer higher pay which did not exist in the Panjab University and the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that by adding the basic pay and grade pay, they would like to protect the basic pay by giving higher basic pay.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it would exceed the salary that the University Professors are receiving.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person is from IIT and the grade pay of the Professors in IIT is Rs.10,500/- and in the University,

it is Rs.10,000/- and that Rs.500/- has to be in the basic pay as they have no option.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if a free hand is given to the selected candidate, he would bring a lot of change to the UIAMS.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in order to make it attractive for the selected person to join, the Selection Committee has recommended that after protecting his salary, he should be given one increment. They should try to send a message that in view of the merit of the candidate, his services are required.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about how the salary is protected.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the salary of a person is 'x' number, the grade pay of that person is Rs.10,500/- and in the University, they could pay the grade pay of Rs.10,000/- and in that amount that Rs.500/- could be added.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the rate of increment is 3% and if they add Rs.500/- to that, would the grade pay change? Why do they say that the grade pay remain the same? Why did they not proportionately increase the grade pay also?

It was clarified that for the purpose of calculation of increment, the basic pay and grade pay is added on which the increment is given and the amount so arrived is added to the basic pay which is the structure of the pay as per the pay revision notification.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Selection Committee had recommended the increment keeping in view the merit of the candidate and his pay. The person had shown his desire to come to Chandigarh and join.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that as Dr. I.S. Sandhu is saying if the grade pay of Rs.10500/- could not be given, two increments could be granted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not change the grade pay.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if they grant one increment, then it would be less than Rs.500/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the grant of one increment would amount to more than Rs.500/-. Instead of Rs.500/-, they could grant two increments.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the granting of two increments could be better.

The Vice-Chancellor said they have to protect the pay which has been protected by granting one increment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that two increments could be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the difference of Rs.500/- was to be adjusted by way of granting one increment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they wanted to protect the salary. If they say that they grant two increments to protect the salary and give further incentive, then it would have been better. Anyway, it is fine.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they give two increments in the present pay scales, that person could not be the benefit in the next pay scales.

The Vice-Chancellor said that with the implementation of the new pay scales w.e.f. 1.1.2016, it would get normalised. It is a hypothetical decision and they should not bother about it.

The Vice-Chancellor further shared with the members that with these appointments, this concludes the advertisement No. 4/2014. He wanted to complete the process of appointments of whatever screening had been done. The appointment for only one post of Associate Professor at UIAMS remains to be done which he could not do as he had to go to attend a meeting on 29th April, 2016. He is seeking extension in validity of the advertisement to hold interview only for that one post and time of 10-15 days is required for that.

Most of the members agreed to it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that the appointments in the Regional Centres should also be made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that his next target is that he would try to get the appointments of the Principals and regular teachers in the Constituent Colleges made before the start of the next academic session.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that till the regular appointment in the Regional Centres is made, the guest faculty could be appointed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no issue of guest faculty. He would take up the matter with the Regional Centres.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the replacement of Dr. Jasbir Singh who was shifted from the Muktsar has not been given till date.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what was the problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would have to get it checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when Dr. Jasbir Singh was transferred, the Vice-Chancellor had in fact committed that he would personally ensure that the replacement is given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the proposal should come from the Regional Centre.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Syndicate could direct the Regional Centre to send the requirement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the advertisement of the Assistant Professor had to be nullified as they had to comply with the

directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Now the compliance has been done and they have to advertise the posts and before that the roster of reservation has to be adopted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the posts which were advertised and nullified whether that is included in that advertisement or new advertisement or roster.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the advertisement has not yet come.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that efforts should be made that the vacancies should be included in the advertisement to be given and till the time regular appointment is made, they could direct that guest faculty proposal be sent.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he could not explain the problems being faced by the students of the Regional Centre. Two teachers of the Regional Centre of Muktsar have been transferred. The Syndicate could give the directive to the Directors of the Regional Centres.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a directive from the Registrar would go to the Regional Centres to send the proposals.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the following persons be appointed Professors at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.10000/-, and keeping in view their outstanding performance and merit, their pays be fixed after granting them one increment over and above protection of their present basic salaries and respective grade pay:

1. Dr. Manoj Anand
2. Dr. (Ms.) Upasna Joshi Sethi

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.

- (ii) So far as the waiting list is concerned, the data pertaining to the past service of the candidate needs to be relooked at and validated, and the matter be brought back to the Syndicate for taking a call on the recommendation of the Selection Committee in favour of the candidate.

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

Appointment of Associate Professor in the Department of Physical Education, P.U.

2(xxii). Considered minutes of the Selection Committee dated 27.04.2016 (**Appendix-XX**) for appointment of Associate Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department of Physical Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh

RESOLVED: That Dr. Thingnam Nandalal Singh (SC) be appointed Associate Professor (General) in the Department of Physical Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to 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 all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. A summary bio-data of the selected candidate enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidate fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professor at UBS

2(xxiii). Considered minutes of the Selection Committee dated 30.04.2016 (**Appendix-XXI**) for appointment of Associate Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rishi Raj Sharma be appointed Associate Professor at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.

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

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. Tejinderpal Singh (SC) be placed on the Waiting List.

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

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the validity of the Advt. 4/2014 be extended for a period of one month so that the interview for a post, which is yet to be conducted, could be conducted.

Issue regarding curtailment of period of re-employment of Dr. V.K. Chopra, Professor of English (Retd), Department of Evening Studies

3. Considered the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor (**Appendix-XXII**) that the re-employment of Dr. V.K. Chopra, Professor in English (Retd.), Department of Evening Studies, be not extended, beyond third year.

- NOTE:** 1. The third year of re-employment of Professor V.K. Chopra expired on 18.03.2016. Professor V.K. Chopra had not submitted his academically active report on the completion of first as well as second year. A report was solicited from him via the office of DUI on 19.01.2016. His academically active report submitted on 29.2.2016 covered the period of nearly three years including the first two years,

Vice Chancellor was not satisfied with the report, thus he did not recommend his further extension beyond the third year in exercise of his authority vested in him vide Syndicate decision dated 29.02.2012 reproduced below:

“that this re-employment should be ordered by the competent authority for **three years** in one go and that after every year the academically active status report only should be submitted by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with an advance copy to the DUI. The Vice Chancellor should be the competent authority to accept this report and allow continuance of the said teacher as re-employed faculty. However, the usual one day break will be there at the completion of every year. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of P.U. Cal., Vol. III will be applicable.”

The period **three years** above is meant to be read as **‘five year’** after the increase in re-employment period from three to five years, w.e.f., 8.9.2012.

2. Aggrieved of the Vice Chancellor’s decision, Professor Vijay Chopra had filed a writ petition No. 5393 of 2016 in the Punjab and Haryana High Court. A rejoinder was filed in response to the above writ petition by the University the same is attached as Annexure (pages 307-347). The writ petition now stands disposed off by the Hon’ble Justice Deepak Sibal. The orders of the Court are attached as Annexure (pages 348-349).
3. In light of the writ petition filed in the Court and the period of his re-employment of third year getting expired on 18.03.2016 the matter was considered in an urgent meeting of the Syndicate dated 22.03.2016 (copies of writ petition and the rejoinder given by the University and court orders have already been supplied to the members along with agenda papers of the Syndicate meeting held on 22.03.2016). The proceedings of the meeting are attached. The Syndics in majority, i.e., 9 out of 15 members present endorsed the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor that the re-employment of Professor V.K. Chopra beyond third year be not recommended.

4. The whole matter was placed before the Senate (Item C-37) (**Appendix-I**) in its meeting held on 27.03.2016 and during discussion issue was raised that a specific item be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.
5. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

The Vice Chancellor said that the item is back to them, after they had a long discussion in the Senate. Some of the members were of the opinion that the time given to the Senate was not adequate to go through all the documents which were made available to them and another issue was that the item was not properly framed as this issue happened arising out of the agenda item. All the members are aware of the circumstances of this case. The case concerns a re-employed Professor. The re-employment scheme is very unique to the Panjab University. At one time, the re-employment was for a period of 3 years and they had increased it for 5 years. There were difficulties that every year, the academic active reports used to be submitted and the report used to take some time to get evaluated due to which the people were not getting salaries while they had been teaching. To overcome these difficulties an algorithm was prepared that they should give the re-employment for a period of 5 years at a time with the stipulation that a report should be given at the end of one year and it will take time before somebody gives judgement on it. There is a one day break and then the teacher would continue so that the people have a sense of continuity and are able to work for a period of 5 years as if they are in continuity for re-employment for 5 years. It was also considered necessary in the sense that supposing that if one wanted to apply for a grant somewhere for a period of 3-4 years, that person could say that the University had given the re-employment for a period of 5 years and could ask for a research project which could be executed within the stipulated period. In order to enable people to make competitive and not suffer for technicalities while they apply for research grants, they came up with a very effective thing that the re-employment should be given for 5 years at a time with the stipulation that a break of one day would be there. Evaluation has to be there every year by submission of annual report. The University had devised this mechanism that the Vice Chancellor was given the authority to accord validation of somebody being academically active. This case is concerned with a colleague who was given re-employment and the annual reports were not submitted and something happened and when at the end of the third year, when the report came to him, he recorded his displeasure that he was not satisfied that this person is academically active and the recommendation was discussed in Syndicate and via majority, the decision concurred with the Vice Chancellor. In that sense, the matter is again back to them as two separate items. One is that he did not recommend his continuation beyond 3 years and it was pointed out that since he (Professor Chopra) had been given re-employment for a period of 5 years, it amounted to curtailment of that period and the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor would be effective only if the Syndicate and Senate accepted that. If the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor, as endorsed by the Syndicate and accepted by the Senate, then the curtailment would happen only on the date when the Senate accepted the same and if the Senate did not accept, then he (Professor Chopra) would continue with the old decision of the Senate.

This is where they are. They are all aware of it and if they wanted to go through all the details, they have been given all the documents. So the matter is before the members whether the Vice Chancellor's assessment that Professor Chopra is not academically active be accepted or not.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that he would like to go by the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said in the meeting of the Senate, most of the House was in favour.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it needed discussion.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the items 3 and 4 are interlinked.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that both the items are separate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua felt that the items are not separate and were interlinked since the issues are alike. He had earlier demanded the full records of the purchases, now that has been made available by the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the items 3 and 4 are separate issues. He enquired whether he (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) agreed or disagreed with the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they need discussion on the item.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that then they could discuss the item no. 4 first and thereafter item no. 3.

The Vice Chancellor said that first they have to consider item no. 3 and then item no.4.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he was seeking the permission to first have discussion on item no. 4.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not giving this permission.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Vice Chancellor knew that item no. 3 is before them because of item no.4.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, item no. 3 is before them.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that there should be no problem if both the items are discussed together.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is a mention of the decision of Syndicate dated 29.02.2012. He requested that the minutes of the Senate of December 2012 should be provided to the members.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is not clear about note No.1 on page 6 of the agenda. He thought that the Senate took some other decision which has not been quoted here because he was a new

entrant to the Senate at that time. That is what Professor Keshav Malhotra is referring. Only a portion has been mentioned here which is of the Syndicate dated 29.02.2012 and when this was placed before the Senate, it was modified. Where is the recommendation of the Senate when this item was brought to the Senate?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the decision of the Syndicate which had been quoted in the office note that is where the problem is that the Vice Chancellor is not guided about what are the facts. In fact, the Vice Chancellor had not joined in February 2012 when the decision was taken which has been quoted in the office note as also in the item. It was subsequently that the Vice Chancellor had enhanced the period from 3 years to 5 years and the note says that the period of 3 years above is meant to be read as five years wherefrom this has come.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had already clarified in this regard.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor must have clarified on the basis of some decision. When the period was enhanced from 3 years to 5 years, the decision of Syndicate of February 2012 was changed and that was changed in Senate meeting of December 2012. So that could be referred. As the Vice Chancellor said that the items no. 3 and 4 could not be discussed together or item no. 4 could not be discussed first. He appreciated it as the item is completely independent because item no.3 relates only and only to discontinuation of re-employment of Professor Chopra and that is what it seems to be. In the first para, it is written that on account of non-submission of academically active report, the Vice Chancellor has not recommended the extension beyond 3rd year. If everything had stopped here, then they could have said that items no. 3 and 4 are separate. But the office note clearly says that it is not only on account of the academically active report which has not been submitted and do not mistake him if he had pointed out and everybody knows if the decision is taken in haste like this, it is going to be matter of litigation in the court of law and he, for one, could not afford to face the embarrassment knowing fully well that they have some lacunae while taking such decisions. That is why in the last Syndicate also he had said that this is not the way as there was no item for consideration of the Syndicate and then what was discussed in the Senate. The Vice Chancellor had also, in fact, voluntarily offered that they would take it as an item for consideration. The office note relating to item no.3 refers to the issue raised by Professor Chopra in item no.4. He wondered as to how they could separate the items no. 3 and 4. Not that he was saying that the re-employment be curtailed. He was not advocating on anybody's behalf. But if any stigmatic allegation is levelled against somebody, a proper opportunity of hearing has to be given and whatever action is taken without affording an opportunity would not be sustainable in the eyes of law. So much so that the Vice Chancellor himself has been quoted in the office note by saying that at the moment what they do is that as per rules a show cause notice could be served upon him as he is a contractual employee of the University and if the reply is not found to be satisfactory, an enquiry could be ordered. However, in the meanwhile, they could not continue giving him re-employment. This is the statement which the Vice Chancellor has made and quoted in the office note. Meaning thereby that the Vice Chancellor's intention is that even before concluding the enquiry on the basis of allegations

levelled and after issuing the show cause notice, his re-employment should not be continued that the punishment should be awarded and the enquiry should be subsequently conducted. That is also not proper. The only action pending enquiry in any disciplinary procedure is that they could place a person under suspension if somebody has to be kept away from the job. But there is no such provision where they could dispense with the services of the person without holding any enquiry. Thirdly, it is written on page 11, he did not know as there was no need of any such detailed note, where it is written that further, his files reveal that in the year 2014 he had been indulging in seeking various information through RTI and was alleging misappropriation of funds in UIAMS examination, hostel funds, sports funds and Guest House funds. The copy of the e-mails received by the Panjab University authority in 2014, are attached as Appendix-I. He had requested to forward his complaint. The Vice Chancellor in turn had informed him that "I have inquired from Shri Pradeep Sharma" and the information which has been given by the Vice Chancellor is only qua UIAMS examinations that is what he could gather. First of all, what was the need of writing this? If at all, it was to be written then why the sports, hostel funds and guest house funds were not mentioned in the reply. That meant that they are admitting themselves that they replied only to one part. The whole genesis of the item is a decision of the Syndicate of February 2012. He requested that they go through the minutes of December 2012 wherein there was no such thing which is mentioned here in February 2012. He had mentioned in last meeting that it was not extension of re-employment on yearly basis, it is rather the curtailment of the re-employment which has already been sanctioned to him by the Senate for 5 years. So as he had said in the Senate, the item if at all is to be discussed, then it is for cutting short the period of 5 years. Whatever decision is to be taken, let that decision be taken, let the Senate also take a decision. But at least he had the satisfaction that whatever objections are going to be raised, he had already highlighted in the Syndicate and the Senate. He just wanted to highlight that this probably could not be done unless and until the man concerned whom they want to penalise is given an opportunity of explaining because the office note says that, thus the Vice Chancellor took note of the above and the warning given to Professor Chopra by the Syndicate conveyed to him on 14th December 2007. The Vice Chancellor has adjudged his conduct and academic performance not to be satisfactory. It is not purely academic active report, the conduct has also been made the base and they know pretty well that if they want to penalize somebody for not being up to the mark conduct, it could not be done unless and until opportunity of hearing is given as per the procedures and as per the law of the land. Again he is saying, that he is not advocating, because here in this University, so many people have gone scot free because of the technicalities. Now the Vice Chancellor is very right when he says that let them not talk about the technicalities but we have to be practical. They also appreciate that, but at the same time they must not cut a sorry figure before those bodies who consider all the cases on technical grounds. Probably, the Vice Chancellor is saying that it is better that they resolve all the issues within the University rather than allowing the people to go to the court. So it is in that light that before proceeding further, he would like to see those minutes of Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he expected the members to bring all those papers with them and all such things are with them and it is not a matter that they are seized up off.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then he proposed that let the office be pulled up for misleading.

The Vice Chancellor said that the office has no intention to mislead anybody.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had said in the last meeting of the Senate also and read the minutes of December 2012.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are the members of the governing body, they have to take the decision and they should have brought all the papers and there is no excuse. It is written in the file that as per the decision of Senate dated 22 December 2012 as reproduced below, the re-employment has been enhanced up to the age of 65 years instead of 63 years. The present scheme of re-employment of teachers after superannuation will be extended for 5 years instead of the existing 3 years and the other rules governing the re-employment of teachers after superannuation would remain the same and the decision be made effective from 8.9.2012. All the other conditions remaining the same, the period would be enhanced from 3 years to 5 years. However, the re-employment shall be made after one day break following the date of superannuation. The central issue is that could the Vice Chancellor record his opinion at the end of one year or two years. Has that been revealed, if this is not revealed, then he had recorded his opinion. They are doing it, they are not justified in doing it. It is alright, it is the opinion of the Syndicate. He is not justifying it. If he had a right to record, then he had recorded and what he recorded was his assessment which could be based on so many things. As per his judgement, that person (Professor Chopra) is not academically active. What has gone into his recording this? That person is doing nothing. The person as a teacher should be writing a few papers, should be applying for some grants and do some scholarship work. After all, he had crossed the age of 60 years and got so wisdom after spending 30-40 years and at the end of one's career why should not one record something which is commensurate with scholarship, training and learning. He did not find anything that this re-employed Professor has done something over the last three years which is of that kind. Instead what he found is that he is doing things which he (Professor Chopra) should not do as a re-employed Professor by putting RTI and saying that the University is indulging in loot and plunder. The University is not indulging in loot and plunder, he (Vice Chancellor) is not indulging in loot and plunder. Who is indulging in loot and plunder? Were all his predecessors indulging in loot and plunder and were the governing bodies approving such loot and plunder? The issue before him is that could he accept when somebody says that the governing body of the University is indulging in loot and plunder. To him, this is not an academic thing. Somebody says that the institution is on the brink of extinction. What is the kind of language and phraseology that he (Professor Chopra) is using? To him, it is a hauling and he did not think it academically active. It is okay with him if the Syndicate and Senate differ with him. Each one of the members could have different opinion. If the members do not concur with him, it does not hurt him. He just wanted to record his anguish when the re-employed teacher or even a regular teacher of the University says that the University is indulging

in loot and plunder. About 2-3 days ago, he had got a mail, which he did not circulate, the title of which is loot and plunder and saying that he (Professor Chopra) is being victimised, is not being listened because he (Professor Chopra) is pointing out that the University is indulging in loot and plunder. He is anguished with a teaching colleague who says such things about the institution. He could not recommend that such a person is academically active.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the Vice Chancellor is absolutely justified in pointing out academic active report. It is a very serious lapse. He agreed that the Vice Chancellor had the right to pass his opinion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor should not consider himself separate from them, they are all with him (Vice Chancellor). Unfortunately, a person like him is always misunderstood when he is trying to tell that this step is going to embarrass them further. The Vice Chancellor is so pained and touched by the act of that person, could he allow the Vice Chancellor to take another step which could more embarrass the Vice Chancellor or the members. He thought that he needed to tell the Vice Chancellor that this is the way and this is how they could handle the situation. It is not that they are not supporting. The Vice Chancellor had specifically asked and that was why he (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that it was the duty of the office to update the Vice Chancellor with the latest decision of the re-employment and that put before the Vice Chancellor, he was sure that he could not have recorded his opinion as the Vice Chancellor had already said that was it within his rights to record the opinion on it. If it was not, then the Vice Chancellor should not have. If it was, it is alright. They have referred to the Syndicate decision of February 2012 wherein academic active report after every year has to be submitted to the Vice Chancellor through the Head of the Department. But when the period was increased from 3 years to 5 years, of course, courtesy to Vice Chancellor (Professor Grover) and he still remembered the speech made by the Vice Chancellor in the Senate in favour of extending the period from 3 years to 5 years wherein he specifically said that how he could believe that a person who has been doing research and teaching till the age of 60 years, how could they believe that he would not be able to perform for next 5 years. That was the speech that he still remembered. It was after discussions that this was taken up that instead of year by year, re-employment in one go for 5 years be given and the rules governing re-employment of teachers would remain the same. Meaning thereby that they have increased the period from 3 years to 5 years and other things remain the same. He wanted the Vice Chancellor to check whether there is any such provision where after having granted re-employment for 5 years, there is any provision of the Vice Chancellor recommending every year for continuation. If it is there, then the Vice Chancellor is well within his right. If it is not there and specifically it has been decided that all other rules would remain the same, then probably they are on the wrong footing. The Panjab University Calendar and the decision of the Senate are before the Vice Chancellor. There is only one provision that before granting the re-employment, the academically active report is to be taken. The Vice Chancellor could ask for some additional information also. In case any teacher wishes to submit additional data, he could also do so. If a teacher wishes that the extent of academic activity be determined by the academic committee of the department, he may be allowed to do so. The only thing is that the re-employment was given

after 3 years, no such yearly report would have to come, they changed the period from 3 years to 5 years in December 2012 to be effective from 8.9.2012. But in the meantime in February 2012 in the Syndicate, they incorporated in the Rules that the academic active report should be given every year. He knew and wanted to confirm if this has been implemented in the case of all the teachers, that they are submitting the academic active report every year through the Head of the Department and so much so that even from one department, if one person has submitted and three other persons have not submitted, could they pick and choose that for those three person no action has been taken and against one person action has been taken and that too on the basis of academic active report. But the concern of the Vice Chancellor is not more about the academic but more concern is because of the conduct of that person as according to him (Vice Chancellor), the teachers who are re-employed and those who are regular, are not supposed to behave in the way, Professor Chopra has behaved and if that is also covered in spite of the fact that there is no such provision for recording opinion for sending the academic active report every year. Then that person could not be allowed to go scot free for 5 years. Then they have to adopt the systematic procedure which is in accordance with the law to take care of the situation that is the only way out left for them. If he had said anything wrong, it could be verified from the records.

The Vice Chancellor said that, it is what had happened in the year 2012.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the same was overwritten by the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that meant that there is no check on anybody.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per these rules, there is no check even on regular teachers also and even for non-teachers also. For them, there is a set procedure which has been laid down. As per rules, a show cause notice would have to be given and if the reply is not found satisfactory, an enquiry would have to be conducted and till that the re-employment would have to be continued. That, out of pain and out of sheer concern for the development of the University, he was not questioning the Vice Chancellor. But they have to accept whatever their limitations are. He did not want anybody to become a hero.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to how he (Professor Chopra) has become a hero by doing such things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Professor Chopra) has now become a hero as his re-employment for all practical purpose was discontinued. When he went to the High Court, then the University had to say that that he is to continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that a person does not become a hero because he has come in the newspapers. A person becomes hero by his deeds and not by his misdeeds.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they take some action and the same is reversed by the court. What did they think who would become a hero?

Professor Shelley Walia said that he shared the anguish of the Vice Chancellor and there should be a check considering that they have been talking about improvement and excellence and moving forward. When he looks at this gentleman and the negative issues about this man and the University must have a check not only the re-employed teachers but also on regular employees to see that the people are not hanging around in the University departments doing nothing and did not move forward at all.

The Vice Chancellor said that had they consciously overwritten what had been approved in February 2012, has that been repealed consciously. He did not think that it has been repealed consciously.

Professor Shelley Walia said that on the grounds of merits, academic record that he (Professor Chopra) has, the Vice Chancellor has every right to write his report as in every organisation, the Annual Confidential Reports are written. If tomorrow the gentleman says that there is loot and there is this kind of thing. They could actually relate the two things, one the academic active report and the other is accusation that he has made. Therefore, his plea is that let they separate the two issues. If Professor Chopra says that the University is a thief and engaging in loot which anguishes them and causes some kind of agitation in their mind. But they could not relate the two things and should separate the same. Item no. 3 is speaking of academic issue and also certain kinds of issues of moral turpitude and he felt that on these grounds, let they take action against him (Professor Chopra). He is with the Vice Chancellor that a person could not ride rough shod with the whole system. But let they not engage in this kind of punishment or penalty by which they actually terminate the services. Terminating the services when he is in the stage of re-employment is, in fact, the state of continuation of his real service and the people who are re-employed as he (Professor Shelley Walia) has been re-employed, would get a feeling that he is at the same stage and he would not like to get distinguished.

The Vice Chancellor said that the purpose of giving the re-employment was that otherwise the people would not maintain continuity and would not fully devote to the academic activities which would result in decrease in their academic activities. They are not inducting the persons against those substantive posts. So they have to have an output equal to or greater than a person who is appointed as a regular person. The society would ask them that the re-employment should serve the purpose of the University.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if it is continuity, then they have to take an action and if they take action against the person who is in service, is there any procedure of doing that and in case of re-employment also, there should be a sense of security.

The Vice Chancellor said that there should not be a fear or such a feeling. They did not want to lose good people and allow them to go elsewhere.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he agreed with the Vice Chancellor that this fellow needs to be punished if he has done this and many others also. But the services should not be terminated. He is not advocating for Professor Chopra. But they should follow the procedure as has been pointed out by Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice Chancellor said that is there a consensus amongst them that this kind of behaviour of a teacher is not acceptable.

Professor Shelley Walia said that there are so many people who have behaved in a manner like this and he has seen people who are very rude to the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that if one says that loot and plunder on behalf of the governance of the University is going on for decades in the hostel, sports, guest house and examination funds. These are the same things for which the ABVP made the complaint saying loot and plunder. The same loot and plunder was also there in the complaint by the NSUI. So why is this repetition of loot and plunder?

Professor Shelley Walia said that as he understood that the Vice Chancellor was not terminating the services of Professor Chopra for possession of that behaviour but terminating the services because he has not submitted the academically active report. His services should not be terminated but he must be punished.

The Vice Chancellor said that that person had so much time and he has nothing to show as an academic. This is the governing body and they must address it as it is a challenge before the governance. Could they handle such situations?

Professor Shelley Walia said that they should think about what penalty could be imposed.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no doubt. They have given the re-employment for 5 years. It is correct that they could not terminate his services but could curtail. But there has to be a sound way of curtailing the services. Could they first have a broad consensus that this is not a behaviour that they expect from a teacher?

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that in the Syndicate they could pass a resolution condemning the behaviour of Professor Chopra.

The Vice Chancellor said that condemning is not proper as this is a misdemeanour.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he has read it very carefully and so far as he could understand, 2-3 issues are involved in it. It is okay that the Vice Chancellor has said that Item 4 would be taken up for consideration later on, but its reference has been given in the Item (in Note 3). He fully agreed with the Vice Chancellor that Professor Chopra should not have used such language. But whatever allegations he has levelled, though he does not know whether those are true or false, if those are true, then it means that he has pointed out something wrong, but his way of pointing out is wrong. There are two more issues – (i) Academically active report/s; and (ii) the loan taken by him/his firm. Both these have come up as a matter arisen out of this issue. In accordance with the decision of the Senate 2012, they do not require academically active report/s.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is his (Shri Raghbir Dyal) opinion. In fact, they have not repealed February 2012 decision. The file says that the re-employed teacher is required to submit his

academically active report every year and the concurrence of the Vice Chancellor is required on the same.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that if an individual or a particular person levelled allegations or raised a finger on the governing body or members or a particular office, they should not take any decision on the same without thorough examination. Secondly, so far as the language used by him and the loans taken by his firm is concerned, if they think that the same is against the service rules of Panjab University teachers or non-teachers, then explanation could be taken from him. And if the House is not satisfied with the explanation given by him, they could initiate further action. But he is of the opinion that whatever he has pointed out, when they would examine and discuss the same while considering Item 4, if they think that there is some truth, then they could not take *ex parte* decision.

Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi stated that when a person crosses 60 years of age, he/she takes the retiral benefits and is now a retired Professor. Thereafter, they give him re-employment for five years with a day's break and the re-employment is on contract basis. As such, the conditions of service for the re-employed persons are entirely different from those of regular teachers. The person is employed on contract basis and he violates the contract by doing something negative, and in the case under consideration he did not submit his academically active report/s. If a person does something negative against the University or an economic offence, he violates the contract. They have inserted a line in the contract, that the contract could be terminated by giving a month's notice by either side or salary thereof. In this case, the person has not submitted his academically active reports for two years and by doing so, he has violated the contract. Secondly, there is also misconduct on his part. Technically, every year, there is also a day's break. This meant, the person could continue, provided everything is well. If the person violates the contract and also defames the University, his/her contract could be terminated.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he has not come across any document which negate the decision of February 2012 Syndicate decision that the Vice Chancellor would satisfy himself about the academically active report/s submitted by the re-employed teachers, and that decision has not been explicitly removed to say that the Vice Chancellor would not satisfy himself.

Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi said that the essence of giving this re-employment is to use the expertise of the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could also be verified whether the above-said decision of the Syndicate has explicitly been removed.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it could be verified and corrected also.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should verify it. As suggested by Dr. Randhawa, it could be corrected anytime.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is for what the governing body is there. The governing body should remain vigilant so that they could govern the system effectively. If there are some loopholes in the system, the governing body could plug those loopholes.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this point was discussed in 2012 also. In fact, a Committee was constituted to consider this issue. For re-employment up to 63 years, there was no such clause. But when he (the present Vice Chancellor) enhanced the re-employment up to the age of 65 years, a clause was incorporated that, if at all, an appraisal is required, and not only that another proposal was given that the person concerned should have API score of at least 50 during those 3 years time of re-employment. That recommendation of the Committee was taken to the Syndicate in its September meeting and the Syndicate deleted that recommendation of 50 API score.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could check from the agenda papers of September 2012 Syndicate meeting and also the minutes of September 2012.

The file was brought by the Registrar at this stage and placed before Syndicate.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that 50 API score condition was deleted by the Syndicate in 2012, and thereafter, the matter was placed before the Senate. When the Vice Chancellor tried to go through papers, Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to disburse for lunch, and in the meanwhile, they could go through the papers.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay", they would have a lunch, and then they would come back.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the meeting might go long, but they should not rush through the agenda. When Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they should continue with the meeting till late night, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to share with them that he had come late in the night yesterday only to attend the meeting as yesterday, his cousin had expired.

The members said that it is very sad news.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is serious about the meeting, but due to the circumstances narrated above, it is for the first time that he has not been able to open the agenda.

The Vice Chancellor stated that his plea to all of them is that send a message to the University and the society that this governing body has the spirit to rise to the occasion to handle any matter in an effective manner whatsoever complex it might be. If they send this message, then there is no issue at all.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that there are certain items on the agenda, which need long discussion. Similarly, there are certain items, which could be cleared without discussion. A message should also go that the Syndicate is doing the business, and not that the Syndicate meets for hours together without any fruitful business.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him propose that they would come back at 2.30 p.m. They would try to conclude this item up to 3.30 p.m. and, thereafter, whatever agenda could be attended to within half an hour, which require no discussion, would be attended to. When certain members demanded the zero hour discussion

should also be allowed, the Vice Chancellor said that he is ready to sit and listen to them up to 5.00 p.m.

After the lunch, the Vice Chancellor again welcomed the members to the meeting. He stated that let him recapitulate. The University had a re-employment scheme prior to his coming, and what it was, that stands recorded. The operative part of the scheme was that the people have to submit report every year and then the matter has to come to the Syndicate every year. Since that was causing unnecessary delay, stoppage of salary, recommencement of salary, etc. etc., and to overcome that situation, it was recommended prior to his coming that re-employment should be given in one go, and the people should be asked to submit yearly report. It was sometime in 2012, but before his arrival. When he arrived, there was an anxiety that everywhere the age of superannuation is 65 years, but they do not have. In Central Institutions, the UGC has allowed extension beyond 65 years and up to 70 years. The 65 to 70 years scheme had two parts – (i) 65 years to 68 years; and (ii) 68 years to 70 years. In that scheme, somewhere it was mentioned that there would be reappraisal at the end of three years, i.e., there would be a report, which would be evaluated. Firstly, the scheme was selective, and it was proposed to be even more selective. In the background of that, Brar Committee was constituted to consider re-employment up to 65 years, i.e., 3 + 2 years. If they make it up to 63 years plus two years, they would take care of the UGC clause that there would be appraisal after three years and the person concerned would obtain 50 API scores, etc. etc. The matter came to the Syndicate and the Syndicate decided that the re-employment scheme was approved by it in the month of February should be retained. The recommendations of Brar Committee were considered by the Syndicate in its September meeting, and the same were placed before the Senate in December. In December meeting of the Senate, there was a long discussion and it was said that this is not good and they should make the re-employment scheme up to 65 years, as if the recommendations of the Syndicate of its February meeting would be operative. There was a long discussion and at the end of the long discussion, there is a resolved part, but in the resolved part it is not mentioned. However, since it is there in the discussion, the spirit has not been repealed that there has to be appraisal. The appraisal was inbuilt in the Calendar of 2010, and without appraisal nothing could be done. Appraisal is always there. Appraisal up to the age of 60 years is not linked with the release of salary and so on and so forth. The appraisal for everyone has to be there, which is also being insisted by the NAAC. Submission of annual report is a norm, but its linkage to the salary, etc. is not there. However, appraisal should be there for everyone. So in this case, in 2012 Senate they decided to approve the re-employment scheme, but they were not anticipating that there would be Chopra incident. But at no stage, they had said that they are repealing it. The Senate at no stage has abdicated the responsibility that there would be no annual appraisal. Otherwise, they had a difficult situation because with the appraisal, the salary would have been stopped. To ensure that the salary is not stopped, they decided to grant re-employment up to 63 year in one go and so far as appraisal is concerned, they decided to take academically active report every year from the person/s concerned. So at no stage, they repealed it, though they did not explicitly put it while writing the resolved part of the Senate proceedings. Professor Chopra's case, as and when it happened in the year 2013, his is one of the few cases after the Senate meeting. When his case was approved, there was a noting in his file,

which has been circulated to all of them, and the same has also been ratified both by the Syndicate and the Senate, wherein it has been mentioned that academically active report should be submitted by the concerned faculty member every year to the Head of the Department with an advance copy to the Dean of University Instruction. So report has to be submitted, and in the instant case they know all the history. In this case, neither the report came at the end of the first year nor at the end of the second year. The report came to him at the end of the third year, on which he made certain recordings. Whatever he has recorded, it could not override whatever the Syndicate and Senate decision is. So any curtailment of re-employment or any other adverse decision could only be taken by the Syndicate and the Senate and not by the Vice Chancellor as per the system in place. He has performed the duty, whatever was assigned to him. Now, the entire case is before them. They could record their opinion as to whether whatever observation he had made, is reasonable or not. His observation in nutshell is that whatever he (Dr. Chopra) has done, it is a very serious misdemeanour. They could evaluate whether that judgement of his is correct or not. Now, the question is how to handle this complex situation. All of them are members of this Governing Body. They should sit together and put some checks and balances as they have not confronted such situations earlier. This is a challenge that they have. They had not anticipated this. If they have not put explicitly that the evaluation of the re-employed teachers would be there, but they have not even repealed it at any stage that whatever decision the Syndicate had taken in its February meeting, they had undone that. Now, it is a matter of some interpretation whether they need to take some legal course giving all those things whether it is mandatory for people to submit report/s. If the people do not follow this or indulge in things, which are considered very serious misdemeanour even for a normal faculty member, when he/she is on yearly contract, whether he/she could indulge in such misdemeanour. This is the challenge before them. To face the real situation, they could tighten this system so that the old persons who are left could also be dealt with accordingly. This one issue and expressing their opinion on what their colleague has done is another issue. How to handle this kind of misdemeanour is the third issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the decision of April 2010 to which the Vice Chancellor has referred to that the appraisal would be there and the same has not been discontinued. He enquired as to where the said decision is. The appraisal system to which the Vice Chancellor has referred to, in fact, is not there in the Regulations/Rules mentioned in the Calendars. He stated that before the Vice Chancellor came, the re-employment was given for three years, and thereafter, it was decided that the people, who do not come or work during re-employment, they should be given re-employment on year to year basis and academically active report should be taken from them, but it never became a part of the rules. Thereafter, Professor Arun Grover, became Vice Chancellor. The re-employment scheme was extended to five years and in the Senate they said that they neither agree to the appraisal system nor re-employment on year-to-year basis. If they go by the decision, ultimately, it was the Vice Chancellor, who said that he has no problem if the re-employment is extended to five years in one go. The discussion was only on two points, i.e., one on 50 API scores which was recommended by the Brar Committee in view of the recommendation of the UGC, but the same was not accepted by the Syndicate, and the recommendation of the Syndicate was accepted by the Senate. After discussion, it was

also accepted that the re-employment would not be granted on yearly basis. Now, to what he (Vice Chancellor) is referring of 2013, that was recommended to the Syndicate wherein in the case of Dr. V.K. Chopra it has been mentioned on year to year basis. It was brought to the information of the Syndicate that this letter has been issued because the power lies with the Senate and the Senate has delegated the same to the Vice Chancellor. Whatever letter the Vice Chancellor had issued, the same was placed before the Syndicate and Senate for information.

It was clarified that the matter was before the Syndicate for ratification.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, that meant, that it was ratified and he (Vice Chancellor) was under the impression, as they were also, that the re-employment is on year-to-year basis. But in the Senate a decision has been taken that it is strictly in terms of the Rule/s mentioned at page 113, wherein neither any appraisal has been mentioned nor that the re-employment would be on year-to-year basis. The re-employment was recommended for three years, but the Senate extended it to five years, but the other rules remained the same, and this was to be examined that after having framed the rules in the Senate in 2012. Now he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that it has not been done explicitly. Similarly, they could say if through an oversight the Syndicate has ratified something, which is contrary to the rules framed by the governing body, that would not stand, because they have not changed the rules even now. In this letter also, they had mentioned the rules, which are not there in the Calendar. So he (Vice Chancellor) is right that they had not anticipated such problems. That is why, in fact, he (Vice Chancellor) was one of the votaries that they could not expect evaluation at the age of 60 years or above. Those who wished would work and the others not, but the teachers should not be made to sit at home. So much so it was his (Vice Chancellor) proposal that the teachers, who have ceased to be in re-employment after attaining the age of 63 years, but were left with sometime to attain the age of 65 years, they could also be recalled, and they were also allowed re-employment. So at that time no such problem was anticipated. But one learns new things every day. In the present scheme of things, unless and until they follow the prescribed procedure for taking any disciplinary action or any punitive action, they would have to follow the prescribed procedure. Without that, probably it would unnecessarily defeat the purpose. However, he is not in favour of anybody, who is involved in any kind of indiscipline. Secondly, though it is very far fetched that the allegations which he has levelled in his letter, even though they are not in a desirable language, if any of the allegation is found to be correct, they should not be seen to be sending a signal that whosoever points out some wrong happenings in the University, action is taken against him/her on one pretext or the other because they have to go by the public perception also, they could very well appreciate that they do not want indiscipline, they want academics and other things, but then they could not ignore the public perception that whosoever raises the issue, they say he/she should go out. He again said that none of the charges levelled against anybody prove to be true, but if at all, any of the charges is found to be true, then what would they do?

The Vice Chancellor said that then the things have to be handled separately.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that then they should not have made a mention of this in the item. They should not have mentioned that he (Dr. Chopra) has not submitted the academically active report/s because for conduct, there is a different procedure and for that they have to give him personal hearing. Of course, now the procedure has to be followed and if even after following the procedure, they do something, he was definitely going to tell that he had said that and it has proved to be true. So this has also to be decided while discussing Item 4 – whether there is necessity to look into anything about the allegations or whatever report/s has/have been submitted by the CVO or the Standing Committee that has to be accepted as it is. That would also depend, that is why in the last meeting it was demanded that let the Vice Chancellor certify that everything is in order and they would believe him, knowing fully well that it is very difficult to certify because he (Vice Chancellor) personally is not aware of everything. They have to be very careful because these things are now going to be scrutinized by the public. One of the documents, he was looking at where it had been mentioned and he does not know, how it has happened that something which has come into existence in the month of December, is being approved by the Vice Chancellor in the month of November, and it is not one paper, but more than one. Had it been one paper, he could have understood that it is due to a mistake. The paper/s which has/have come into existence in the month of December, is/are being approved by the Vice Chancellor in the month of November. He apprehended that those papers could go into the hands of a person, who had certain *mala fide* intention, what would be attributed to them and what explanation they have to give. There are two-three bills, which have been raised in December, but have been approved by the Vice Chancellor in November, i.e., almost 30-40 days before. It is not understandable as to why the Vice Chancellor approved those bills.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that it would be checked.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, for that, he is saying that to be on a stronger footing, that also needs to be looked into. He has to give his opinion that neither the Standing Committee nor the CVO has bothered to see any of the documents relating to these, and merely on the basis of the explanation given by one or two officials, the reports have been submitted. Not that they had any intention to ignore the issue or get the issue set aside; rather, it was in good faith that there seems to be nothing fishy in it, so it is all good. Notwithstanding the fact that as Standing Committee and as CVO, they have specific role/s to play that whatever proved to be right should also look justified on paper that what they are saying is correct, but that probably did not draw their attention. So while discussing Item 4, they needed to look into that also. So far as Item 3 is concerned, he has given his opinion that he is not advocating for Professor Chopra. If in view of the rules mentioned in the Calendar and also various decisions of the Syndicate and Senate, their hands are tied that they could not proceed straightaway by taking a decision or by recommending to the Senate that his (Professor Chopra's) re-employment be curtailed. If they could do it, it is very good, but if they feel that it would not serve the purpose or it would not be sustainable in the eyes of law or it would not be right in the eyes of natural justice, then he thought that a Committee might be constituted or the Vice Chancellor might take legal opinion or it could be decided collectively as to what steps are to be taken to ensure that

no such violation by re-employed teachers takes place in future and what is to be done in such matters.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that they have also been discussing the issue during the lunch break. In fact, all of them have seen the decision of 2012 of the Senate, which says that 'the present scheme of re-employment of teachers after superannuation be extended for 5 years, i.e., 65 years of age instead of existing 3 years Rules governing re-employment of teachers after superannuation namely Rules 3 to 10 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 will remain the same'. However, in Rules 3 to 10 at page 130, nowhere it is mentioned that academic report would be submitted every year.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is, if there was no need of it, why it was placed before the Syndicate in its February 2012 meeting. February 2012 happened before there was some uneasiness felt by the governing body that people are not adhering to the norms and, thus, felt that there should have some checks and balances. To have checks and balances into the system, it happened in February 2012 as it falls within the purview of the governing body. In fact, the governing body has to ensure that certain norms are to be followed, and the governing body should not come into criticism that re-employment given, but the re-employed teachers are not coming.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that in the Syndicate 2013 (Ratification), it has been written that academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year, but it is not there in the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that they have to understand the spirit of it and the spirit was to ward of the criticism as of the governing body is not doing it on its own. The governing body could have never anticipated that there would be colleagues of this type. Had the governing body anticipated it, the governing body would have inserted many tight clauses. In fact, the governing body is trying to help the teachers.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they did not anticipate such troubles and that is why, the governing body did not make rules.

The Vice Chancellor said that the governance issues do not even slip through the cracks, and that is why, the Constitution is amended many a times. Why do they do all these things because finally when the situations arise, they make amendments? There are so many amendments in their Constitution whereas there are very less amendments in the Constitutions of other countries, but they could call it a strength as well as weakness. Had they not brought in the amendments, that would have meant, that they are not attending to the situations. When they have brought in so many amendments, they are open to the criticism that they are amending their Constitution more frequently. So it is a similar kind of balance, which they have done. Therefore, it is correct that they need to have some checks and balances, if the same are not there, they have to insert. They are putting in these checks and balances because they have faced the situations. If they are willing to put in checks and balances, then there is explicit acceptance that something happens to the system, which is not very pleasant and ought not to happen. This is one kind of thing and the other kind of thing is that a person has many misdemeanours and perhaps one of the misdemeanour could be

justifiable, i.e., something is pointed out by a person and the same is justified, but that the time would tell. But kinds of things he did, if a judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India comes, and he says that it should be applied to him, and that too, with retrospective effect. What is going on? If an activity is going on in the University and the University is raising some bit of money by doing some work for the society as is being done by University Institute of Applied Management Sciences (UIAMS), one could make a complaint, but series of such things is not acceptable. What does the Vice Chancellor do? The Vice Chancellor has to ask the person concerned. If one could file so many RTIs, then one is supposed to be theoretically active. If along with filing of RTIs, he had written quality papers and good book/s, then it could have been argued that the person is very talented. The academic work is being done minimally and everything else maximally. He pointed out that in the Chapter VI(A) "Conditions of Service" at page 134 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, it has been written that "The appointment and conditions of service including leave rules in the case of such persons shall be determined by the Syndicate". As such, it is their collective responsibility to attend to such difficult situations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that probably keeping this regulation only in mind, he wants that the Syndicate should be conscious of the fact that it has to shoulder its responsibility in a more efficient manner.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not disputing that.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is the only concern. But he knows that sometimes the friends misunderstand him as Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa was saying "are you interested in retaining him or ousting him".

The Vice Chancellor said that he should not point out such thing, because in the heat of moment sometimes they saying such things. However, they could take cognizance of the serious misdemeanour and at least this much consensus could be there.

Dr. Ajay Ranga enquired is the extension a matter of right?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is not a matter of right.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a matter of right but since it pertains to rules as to how to regulate re-employment, it has to be decided by the Syndicate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga enquired are there no rules for re-employment at the moment.

The Vice Chancellor said that rules are there, but somebody could question them at the moment.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if they have rules for re-employment, they have to apply them, and if not, they have to frame rules.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that firstly they have to decide the issue under consideration and thereafter, amend the rules.

Endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Ajay Ranga, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that otherwise, it would go against them.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that they have to set an example, so that such things do not recur in future.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that if the image and dignity of the University is questioned, it should not be compromised/tolerated.

The Vice Chancellor said that whether one admits or not, last year, their grant was delayed simply because of such accusations.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that Professor V.K. Chopra might have violated the ethics of language, but whatever points he (Professor Chopra) has raised, the same needed to be examined. If the points raised by him proved to be null and void, their case becomes more strong.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that they would resolve this after considering item 4.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that till then, they should appoint a small Committee to frame the rules.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is what Professor Chopra had done on 30th November, to which item 4 is connected to, but before that they have to consider and take decision on academic activities, i.e., academically active reports.

To this, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that in this University so many re-employed teachers have not submitted the academically active reports.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they should provide the list of all such teachers so that similar kind of action could be initiated/taken against them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not make serious accusations against people saying that several persons have not submitted the academically active reports. Sweeping accusations should not be made against the re-employed Professors of the University as the same is not proper.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that there are only two ways – (i) either they should deny him re-employment by accepting the recommendation made by the Vice Chancellor; or (ii) if everybody agrees, they could give him a show cause notice and call for his explanation stating as to why action be not initiated against you for such and such conduct and that you have not submitted the academically active report and creating such and such thing in the past. They could not spend their entire day on Professor Chopra as they had many more important issues listed on the agenda.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that then since they had already spent more than enough time on the issue, the decision should be taken on the basis of majority.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the issue whether they wish to accept the recommendations made by the Vice Chancellor or not.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa reiterated that if they wish to clinch the issue, the decision should be taken by majority.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the Senate is one which needs to ratify. So discontinuation/curtailment of re-employment would need ratification by the Senate. So at the moment, if they agree with the recommendation that he does not deserve continuation of re-employment, concurrently they could appoint a Committee, which would also enquire into his conduct. They could ask the Committee that they should give the report in urgency. If they agree it is a serious misdemeanour and he does not deserve continuation of re-employment and the Vice Chancellor has surmised this, then the matter could go to the Senate, while the report of the Committee also comes into.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they could appoint a Committee to enquire into his conduct, but the proposal which has come, should be accepted.

The Vice Chancellor stated that is there a consensus that it is a serious misdemeanour and he is not academically active. Whatever he is doing, could there be consensus that it is not expected from a teacher of this University particularly from the re-employed teacher of the University? Why the re-employment is being given? Re-employment is being given so that the academics in the University should remain at a very higher level; otherwise, teachers could be employed temporarily or engaged as guest faculty against them. Since neither they are filling the vacant post/s nor engaging guest faculty, they are suffering.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that they should take a decision on the matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that his point of view is that he does not deserve recommendation from the Syndicate. So far as conduct is concerned, the same could be enquired into concurrently, so that when the matter goes to the Senate, both the things are there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the academically active report/s which he (Professor Chopra) has submitted has/have not been annexed with the item.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Professor Malhotra) knows everything.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he knows, but the others not.

The Vice Chancellor said that each and every member has read those reports as the same were provided to all members of the Senate.

At this stage, he sought opinion of members one by one.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he is not in favour of his continuation of re-employment. When asked by Professor Keshav Malhotra, he (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) said that

whatever has been recommended by the Vice Chancellor, he endorses that.

Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Anil Monga, Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi said that they endorse the recommendation made by the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Shelley Walia stated the he would like to ask the gentleman, Dr. V.K. Chopra, to explain that these are the allegations against him and he has committed misdemeanour, what explanation he has. Let us follow the procedure and should not hurry into it because tomorrow they might be asked to give him a chance to explain, which needs in all matters of law. Therefore, he thinks and proposes that they actually should not hurry into it in this manner of clinching the issue, but should stop for a minute and decide that they would ask to give his explanation (have you done this, have you done this, etc.). Depending upon his explanation, they could prompt action.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has already given his viewpoint that without giving him any opportunity of hearing as per principle of natural justice, such a recommendation should not be made.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he endorses the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that there is rumour outside and there is also truth in it that if one had made a complaint, only then this issue arose. Had he not made the complaint, perhaps, this issue might not have arisen? Everywhere this message is going. Therefore, firstly he should be heard and thereafter action should be taken against him.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he has already told that this message is going that when this issue was not there, he was academically active during the last three years. When this issue arose, these reports, other annexures, etc. came out. Therefore, procedure should be followed and he should be given a chance so that he could explain his position.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he has already been repeating. Presently, they do not have much option so far as laws are concerned. A small Committee should be constituted to amend the laws, and in the meantime, a Conduct Committee should be formed and Dr. Chopra should be summoned to explain his position.

Principal B.C. Josan said that he endorses the recommendation made by the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that he also endorses the recommendation made by the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that somebody had said that it is not explicit. At least today, it is explicit also and the reference has also given of February 2012 and they have also ratified the same. Today, they would make it explicit that it is absolutely necessary, and up to when these reports must come.

The Vice Chancellor said that then the academic, i.e., academically active report has to be considered a serious business and has to be submitted immediately after completely of 10 months.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that before taking such a decision, opinion of PUTA should be sought.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no need to ask PUTA, but the matter needed to be considered very-very thoroughly.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that it should be considered as a separate item.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that a separate item should be brought to the Syndicate in its next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Fine". He would talk to the Dean of University Instruction and also discuss with the community, and then come back. They have a Chairpersons' Forum and they must take those people into confidence.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they must take those people into confidence.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should discuss it in the Chairpersons' Forum because the Chairpersons are the one who get the initial recommendation. Fair enough, they would go back to the Chairpersons' Forum and would generate a consensus because they are finally working for the community. They want to protect the community from long perceptions by the public. So fair enough, he would go back to the Dean of University Instruction and Chairpersons' Forum.

Shri Raghubir Dyal enquired so what is resolved now.

The Vice Chancellor said that the resolved part is that 9 people endorse the recommendation of this thing, but there could also be an enquiry wherein Professor V.K. Chopra would be asked to answer whatever questions would be posed to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that six people do not say that they do not endorse; rather, they say that without giving him the opportunity of hearing, this recommendation should not be made.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that, as per rules, it is the authority of the Vice Chancellor whether to approve extension to his re-employment or not. He (Vice Chancellor) did not approve extension to him, that is why, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate. 9 members have endorsed his decision and 6 not, and what reasons are required for that.

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that Professor V.K. Chopra should be given a chance to face the enquiry and to explain things.

The Vice Chancellor said, "I would do that concurrently".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could not understand.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that this would go to the Senate along with the report of the Committee where Professor V.K. Chopra would be asked to explain.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that that is not right. They have taken a decision and thereafter, conducting an enquiry. He said that they are endorsing his (Vice Chancellor) view and there is no need of any enquiry.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that it has two parts. He said that he is recommending curtailment of re-employment, but curtailment could not be made effective until the Senate accepts it.

When certain queries were made, the Vice Chancellor clarified that so far as academically active report is concerned, they have seen that it remained slipped somewhere. Otherwise, he (Professor Chopra) should have submitted his academically active report. Had the academically active report/s been given by him, compulsion would have been on him to record his opinion, and then his recommendation would have been that his re-employment should not be discontinued. This could not be implemented at the moment because it slipped somewhere, and to cover up that gap, he (Vice Chancellor) has to go back to the community, and that could only be for future. However, the disciplinary action could be initiated against Professor Chopra. So the entire discussion is being recorded and it would go to the Senate. Now it is only some gap in this though R-1 says that he should submit academically active report every year, but he did not submit the report/s or if he has given the report/s, the same is/are not satisfactory. Respecting the R-1, this recommendation is there, but there is a question on R-1 itself. If it is okay, then this is the recommendation; otherwise, two more things have to be done – (i) they have to go back to the community and plug this gap; and (ii) concurrently this guy has a serious misconduct also and whether that is serious misconduct/misdemeanour or not, to validate that, there has to be Committee.

Professor Anil Monga said that if the information ratified by the Syndicate has actually gone to the Senate, then where is the problem. He added that when it was ratified by the Syndicate, it says “as per rules and regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 29.02”. When they go through the decision of 29.02, it is explicitly written that the academically active report should be there, and the Vice Chancellor is the competent authority to examine the same. Now, the Vice Chancellor is saying that the report in his (Professor Chopra) case is not up to the mark. As such, everything is clear and there is no problem anywhere.

The Vice Chancellor said that someone could argue the Senate has overlooked because in the Senate in December 2012 due to oversight 2010 was got written, wherein 29th February 2012 is not mentioned. Either the Senate or the legal opinion could tell them that the decision of the Senate taken after December 2012 cover up that.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that Professor Anil Monga is right because the decision was taken in 2013 when there was discussion on API score also.

Professor Anil Monga said that if this decision has been ratified by the Senate, there is no problem. In fact, they are implementing the

decision of the Syndicate of 2012 in the year 2013. He added that the Vice Chancellor is competent to make assessment of the academic report.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the Senate, which assumed office in 1st November 2012, would come to end on 31st October 2016. This would go to the same Senate, which would use its wisdom and collectively decide, in view of whatever discussions held so far, that whatever has been done by the Senate in 2013, does it cover up and imply that the decision of 29th February 2012 wherein it had been decided that the academically active report/s has/have to be submitted by the re-employed teacher/s every year. They would also seek legal opinion on it in the meanwhile and submit everything to the Senate. If the Senate wants to redo things on its own in the background of everything, then that would be the wisdom of the Senate. If the Senate with its wisdom wants to change, it could do so.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the agenda item of May/29th June 2013, in which whatever extension has been given to Professor Chopra, note 1 says "Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year". Then why should they go through the decision of December 2012 Senate. Whatever re-employment has been given to Professor Chopra, that has been given on this basis, and on the basis of that Vice Chancellor has taken this decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is why, he had recorded, but some people say that there is infirmity between the decision of the Senate and the recommendation made by the Vice Chancellor. If there is infirmity, it could be validated by the legal opinion. Similarly, if the Senate was to cover up that infirmity in some way, let the Senate decide.

Some of the members said, "Right".

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that even if they accept the argument/s put forth by Dr. I.S. Sandhu that academically active reports for the three years must come, and those did not come, on what basis they are relieving him (Professor Chopra) now. Even if they accept that the annual mandatory reports have not come from Professor Chopra, which did not come, when the reports for the first two years did not come, they did not take any action. Thereafter, when it got linked with another issue, they are saying to him without giving a chance that his services are no more required.

The Vice Chancellor said that is his prerogative to judge. Nowhere it is written that he has to call him (Professor Chopra) to give him a chance. In view of all the circumstantial evident which are there and exchanges that he had with him (Professor Chopra) and so on and so forth, he is convinced that the person is not academically active. If the Senate rejects that, it would be okay with him. He has performed his duty and if they want to debate it once again in the Senate, they are free to do so. And he does not want to answer any more queries.

When Professor Keshav Malhotra tried to raise certain questions, the Vice Chancellor said that he could raise these questions in the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what they have resolved.

The Vice Chancellor stated that in the background of letter issued to Professor V.K. Chopra and the ratification done by the Syndicate and the Senate after Professor V.K. Chopra was offered re-employment, he was given the option to assess him (Professor Chopra). He has not assessed him (Professor Chopra) at the end of 1st and 2nd year, but has chosen to assess him close to the end of 3rd year, and made this recommendation. He has made this recommendation and 9 members present in the Syndicate have endorsed, and 6 members have reservation about this. The matter would go to the Senate along with all the discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal added that if the entire discussion is to be sent to the Senate, it amounts to stating that 9 persons are in agreement with the viewpoint of the Vice Chancellor, whereas 6 are of the view that Professor Chopra be given an opportunity of explaining his stand. When both views go to the Senate, and if the Committee is to be formed (by the Senate) to address to concerns raised by Professor Chopra, the Senate could do it.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that let the Committee issue be handled by the Senate. Dr. Ajay Ranga also endorsed this.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal desired to know what the statement of the item referred to Syndicate was. He pointed out that the item said that Professor Chopra's term be not extended beyond three years. However, Professor Chopra is already into the fourth year.

The Vice Chancellor responded that the statement of the item has been cut and pasted from somewhere. To this, Shri Ashok Goyal replied that one needs to remain technically correct, while recording the recommendations of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal reiterated that right in the beginning he had stated that if they decide to consider the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor that the re-employment of Professor V.K. Chopra be not extended beyond third year, it would not be appropriate. In fact, the item should have been to consider curtailment of his re-employment from 5 years.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the period of re-employment of Dr. V.K. Chopra, Professor of English (Retd.), Department of Evening Studies, be curtailed/cut-down from five years.

At this stage, some of the members said that it is already about 3.45 p.m. and they are exhausted. Therefore, now only items of urgent nature, which either require no discussion or minor discussion should be taken up for consideration.

This was agreed to and hereinafter, the following items were taken up.

Issue regarding grant of extension in leave without pay to Dr. Gurmail Singh (Professor re-employed)

10. Considered if, Professor Gurmail Singh, (Re-employed), Department of Economics be granted extension in Leave without pay for one year more, w.e.f. 5.5.2016, to enable him to continue as Vice Chancellor of Akal University Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda, Punjab.

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Gurmail Singh, Professor (Re-employed) was granted EOL without pay for one year w.e.f. 5.5.2015 to join as Vice Chancellor at Akal University, Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, Punjab.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.10.2013 (Para 5) (**Appendix-XXIII**) 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.
 3. Earlier, the Syndicate in its meeting held on 20.04.2015 (Para 20) (**Appendix-XXIII**) 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 her term as Chairperson, Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights).
 4. Earlier, the request of Dr. Nahar Singh for extension in Extra Ordinary Leave w.e.f. 14.03.2015 to 31.03.2016 was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 (Para 6) (**Appendix-XXIII**) and it was 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.
 5. The request of Professor Gurmail Singh along with office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

Professor Shelley Walia said that the only 20 days casual leave and 10 days special allowed. But what is happening that the re-employed teachers want to go on leave for 2½ to 3 months within a running semester which causes huge disruption in studies. If the re-employed teachers are granted such kind of leave, do they engage guest faculty to take care of the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that the re-employed teachers are working against the substantive posts and the guest faculty could be provided. The re-employed teachers who have accepted the teaching responsibility should complete the responsibility.

Professor Shelley Walia requested the Vice Chancellor that a circular in this regard could be sent to all the departments.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would take up the matter at the meeting of the Chairpersons. If the re-employed teachers wanted to avail leave for a semester or a year, it could be granted but not in piece meals.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that such a bar could not be imposed.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if the re-employed teachers are granted piece meal leave, how the Chairperson of the Department would prepare the schedule and the students would also suffer. He cited an example that earlier when a teacher had to go on leave, a substitute was to be provided so that the students did not suffer.

RESOLVED: That Professor Gurmail Singh, (Re-employed), Department of Economics, be granted extension in Leave without pay for one year more, w.e.f. 5.5.2016, to enable him to continue as Vice Chancellor of Akal University Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, Punjab.

Appointment of Mr. Harsh Tuli S/o late Professor Naresh Tuli, on compassionate grounds

17. Considered if Mr. Harsh Tuli S/o Late Professor Naresh Tuli, Department of Geology be appointed as Assistant Professor in the University Institute of Applied Management Sciences (UIAMS) on compassionate ground, against the vacant position as Academic & Administrative Committees (**Appendix-XXIV**) of UIAMS, UBS and UICET have recommended that he is eligible for the post of Assistant Professor as per AICTE norms. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XXIV**) was also taken into consideration.

Professor Shelley Walia said that this case is similar to one in which they had taken a decision on the basis of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that the appointment on class-I posts could not be given on compassionate grounds.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier he had requested to consider two cases, the present one and the other of the husband of Dr. Shishu, who had to leave his job to take care of his wife and the person concerned is a brilliant one.

The Vice Chancellor said that the appointment in the present case could also be made for appointment on temporary basis for 3 years as had been done in the case of the appointment at the Dental Institute.

RESOLVED: That Mr. Harsh Tuli S/o late Professor Naresh Tuli, Department of Geology, be appointed Assistant Professor in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6,000/-at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences (UIAMS), Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for a period of 3 years, under Regulation 5(b) at page 111-112 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

Post facto approval to appointment of certain Assistant Professors

20. Considered if, the appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent Colleges (Sr. No.1 to 49) be approved (post-facto) w.e.f. 07.07.2014, up to the end of first semester of the academic session 2014-15 i.e. 31.12.2014, purely on temporary basis or under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier:

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

46.	Mrs. Mamta Rani	Commerce	District Sri Muktsar Sahib
47.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Economics	
48.	Mr. Rajesh Chander	History	
49.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur	Physical Education	

NOTE: 1. The appointment of above faculty members was approved by the Vice Chancellor vide No. 6095-98/Estt-I dated 07.07.2014 (**Appendix-XXV**).

2. The audit has observed as under:-

“The establishment branch of the Panjab University vide letter No. Estt./14/6095-98/Estt-I dated 7.7.2014 has issued office orders regarding re-appointment of the 49 Assistant Professors purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 7.7.2014 upto the end of first semester of the academic session 2014-15 i.e. 31.12.2014 under Regulation 5 (a) at pages 111-112 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I, 2007 on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier. In this connection it is stated that the under Regulation 5(a) mentioned above the Vice Chancellor has the authority to make an emergent temporary appointment for a period not exceeding one year. Whereas the term of the officials re-appointed vide letter dated 7.7.2014 has exceeded the period of one year by granting extensions from time to time and accordingly as per Regulation 5 (b) of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I at page 112 the power to make emergent temporary appointment on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor for a period exceeding one year vests with the Syndicate and the appointment made under this regulation shall be reported to the Senate. The Audit has admitted the salaries for the month of July 2014 onwards to avoid hardship to the employees. It was requested that the necessary approval of the Syndicate in respect of 49 Assistant Professors appointed vide orders No.EST/14/6095-98/Estt.-I dated 7.7.2014 issued by the Establishment branch be got approved from the Syndicate and their appointment be reported to the Senate vide letter No. RAO/2014/679 dated 22.9.2014”

3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

RESOLVED: That the appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Constituent Colleges (Sr. No.1 to 49) be approved (*post facto*) w.e.f. 07.07.2014, up to the end of first semester of the academic session 2014-15, i.e., 31.12.2014, purely on temporary basis or under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier:

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

44.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Punjabi	P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib
45.	Mrs. Navdeep Kaur	English	
46.	Mrs. Mamta Rani	Commerce	
47.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Economics	
48.	Mr. Rajesh Chander	History	
49.	Ms. Lakhveer Kaur	Physical Education	

Post facto approval to appointment of Assistant Professors at UIET

21. Considered if, the appointment of the following Assistant Professors in U.I.E.T. (Sr. No.1 to 42) be approved (post-facto) w.e.f. 07.07.2014 to 30.04.2015, for next academic session 2014-15, purely on temporary basis or till regular appointments are made, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person	Branch
1.	Ms. Preeti Aggarwal	CSE
2.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Maths
3.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Mgt.
4.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Mgt.
5.	Mr. Geetu	Physics
6.	Mr. Saravjit Singh	ECE
7.	Ms. Garima Joshi	ECE
8.	Ms. Daljit Kaur	ECE
9.	Ms. Rajni Sobti	IT
10.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh	IT
11.	Ms. Renuka Rai	Chemistry
12.	Ms. Pardeep Kaur	ECE
13.	Ms. Aditi Gupta	EEE
14.	Dr. Ranjana Bhatia	Bio-Tech.
15.	Ms. Sabhyata Soni	ECE
16.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Mathematics
17.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Bio-Tech.
18.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Bio-Tech.
19.	Ms. Jyoti Sood	Physics
20.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
21.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
22.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
23.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
24.	Mr. Gurmukh Singh	IT
25.	Ms. Nidhi	IT
26.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
27.	Mr. Himanshu	CSE
28.	Mr. Manu Bansal	IT
29.	Ms. Shweta Mehta	IT
30.	Ms. Manisha Kaushal	CSE
31.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
32.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Bio-Tech.
33.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	Micro-Electronics
34.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
35.	Dr. Gursharan Singh	Bio-Tech.
36.	Mr. Chander Prakash	Mech.
37.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	EEE
38.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.

39.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Physics
40.	Ms. Leetika	Maths
41.	Mr. Munish Kansal	Maths
42.	Mr. Gurjinder Singh	Maths

NOTE: 1. The appointment of above faculty members was approved by the Vice Chancellor vide No. 6977-78/Estt-I dated 24.07.2014 (**Appendix-XXVI**).

2. The audit has observed as under:-

“Similarly salary of 42 Assistant Professors of UIET on temporary basis w.e.f. 07.07.2014 to 30.07.2015 made vide orders bearing no. 6977-78/Estt-I dated 24.07.2014 was also admitted for the month of July 2014 onwards to avoid hardship to the employees. It was requested that the necessary approval of the Syndicate in respect of 42 Assistant Professors appointed vide orders mentioned above be got approved from the Syndicate and their appointment be reported to the Senate vide letter No. RAO/2014/676 dated 22.09.2014.”

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

RESOLVED: That the appointment of the following Assistant Professors at U.I.E.T. (Sr. No.1 to 42) be approved (*post facto*) w.e.f. 07.07.2014 to 30.04.2015, for next academic session 2014-15, purely on temporary basis or till regular appointments are made, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person	Branch
1.	Ms. Preeti Aggarwal	CSE
2.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Maths
3.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Mgt.
4.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Mgt.
5.	Mr. Geetu	Physics
6.	Mr. Saravjit Singh	ECE
7.	Ms. Garima Joshi	ECE
8.	Ms. Daljit Kaur	ECE
9.	Ms. Rajni Sobti	IT
10.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh	IT
11.	Ms. Renuka Rai	Chemistry
12.	Ms. Pardeep Kaur	ECE
13.	Ms. Aditi Gupta	EEE
14.	Dr. Ranjana Bhatia	Bio-Tech.
15.	Ms. Sabhyata Soni	ECE
16.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Mathematics
17.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Bio-Tech.

18.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Bio-Tech.
19.	Ms. Jyoti Sood	Physics
20.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
21.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
22.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
23.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
24.	Mr. Gurmukh Singh	IT
25.	Ms. Nidhi	IT
26.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
27.	Mr. Himanshu	CSE
28.	Mr. Manu Bansal	IT
29.	Ms. Shweta Mehta	IT
30.	Ms. Manisha Kaushal	CSE
31.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
32.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Bio-Tech.
33.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	Micro-Electronics
34.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
35.	Dr. Gursharan Singh	Bio-Tech.
36.	Mr. Chander Prakash	Mech.
37.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	EEE
38.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
39.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Physics
40.	Ms. Leetika	Maths
41.	Mr. Munish Kansal	Maths
42.	Mr. Gurjinder Singh	Maths

Review of proposal for reserving additional seats for those who excel and outperform by their participation in Youth Festivals

31. Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 23.07.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) constituted by the P.U. Youth Welfare Committee in its meeting dated 04.05.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**), to review the proposal for reserving additional seats in the teaching departments of the University for those eligible candidates who excel and outperform by their participation in the Inter Varsity Youth Festivals, National Festivals and International Festivals.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the Youth Welfare Committee in its meeting held on 4.5.2015 has recommended the purchase of AC bus.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to clarify that they are not considering those recommendations; rather they are only considering the reservation of one additional seat per unit for those candidates, who have excelled and outperformed by their participation in the youth festivals.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 23.07.2015 and 17.03.2016 relating to reservation of one additional seat per unit for those candidates, who have excelled and outperformed by their participation in the youth festivals, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Arising out of the above, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that various Committees, including Youth Welfare Committee, have been constituted by the Vice Chancellor as authorized by the Syndicate, but neither they have been consulted while forming the Committees

nor any information about these Committees has been provided to them. He urged the Vice Chancellor to at least to supply them the list of the members of the Committees.

The Vice Chancellor directed the S.O to the Vice Chancellor to provide the list of various Committees to the members.

Honorarium for the ensuing Senate election

45. Considered the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor, that the following proposed rates and Honorarium for the Senate Election to be held in the month of September, 2016, be approved:

Sr. No.	Item	Rates in the Senate Election, 2012	Proposed rates for 2016
1.	Processing Booth-wise	Rs.0.50 per entry	Rs.0.50 per entry
2.	Proof Reading	Rs.1.00 per entry for two persons	Rs.1.50 per entry for two persons
3.	Checking of eligibility by Superintendent/ A.R.	Rs.0.75 per form	Rs.1.50 per form
4.	Sale of C.D. relating to District-wise vote list	Rs.100/- per C.D.	Rs.200/- per C.D.
5.	Fixed Honorarium to the D.R. & A.R.	Rs.10,000/-	Rs.12,500/-
6.	Fixed Honorarium to the Superintendents (S)	Rs.8,000/-	Rs.10,000/-

NOTE: Honorarium is to be paid to the D.R. & A.R. and Superintendent/s of Election Cell as these officials will have to sit late hours on working days and also to attend the office on Saturdays, Sundays and other holidays for 4-5 months without any break till the completion of Election work

RESOLVED: That the following proposed rates and Honorarium for the Senate Election to be held in the month of September 2016, be approved:

Sr. No.	Item	Rates in the Senate Election, 2012	Proposed rates for 2016
1.	Processing Booth-wise	Rs.0.50 per entry	Rs.0.50 per entry
2.	Proof Reading	Rs.1.00 per entry for two persons	Rs.1.50 per entry for two persons
3.	Checking of eligibility by Superintendent/ A.R.	Rs.0.75 per form	Rs.1.50 per form
4.	Sale of C.D. relating to District-wise vote list	Rs.100/- per C.D.	Rs.200/- per C.D.
5.	Fixed Honorarium to the D.R. & A.R.	Rs.10,000/-	Rs.12,500/-
6.	Fixed Honorarium to the Superintendents (S)	Rs.8,000/-	Rs.10,000/-

Rates of voter's lists

46. Considered the following proposed rates of voter's lists (**Appendix-XXVIII**) for the Senate Election-2016:

Sr. No	Constituency	Price in 2012	Proposed rate for 2016
1.	Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	50 paisa per page subject to minimum of Rs.30/-	Rs.1/- per page subject to minimum of Rs.40/-
2.	Readers and Lecturers on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	-do-	-do-
3.	Staff of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
4.	Professors, Sr. Lecturers and Lecturers of Affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-
5.	District wise Voter's List	-do-	-do-
6.	Registered Graduates Register	-do-	-do-
7.	Principals of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
8.	Heads of affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-

NOTE: 1. The decision of the Syndicate dated 17.05.2012 (Para 4) with regard to revision of rates of voter's list for Senate election 2012 enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

2. After 4 years the cost of paper and printing charges has gone up. The price of the lists of voters may also be increased proportionately.

RESOLVED: That the following proposed rates of voter's lists for the Senate Election-2016, be approved:

Sr. No	Constituency	Price in 2012	Proposed rate for 2016
1.	Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	50 paisa per page subject to minimum of Rs.30/-	Rs.1/- per page subject to minimum of Rs.40/-
2.	Readers and Lecturers on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University	-do-	-do-
3.	Staff of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
4.	Professors, Sr. Lecturers and Lecturers of Affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-

5.	District wise Voter's List	-do-	-do-
6.	Registered Graduates Register	-do-	-do-
7.	Principals of Technical and Professional Colleges	-do-	-do-
8.	Heads of affiliated Arts Colleges	-do-	-do-

Recommendations of the Standing Committee dated 21.03.2016 regarding Semester System at undergraduate level

49. Considered minutes of the Standing Committee dated 21.03.2016 (**Appendix-XXIX**) with regard to discuss the issues regarding Semester System at Undergraduate level.

Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that while marking the attendance of the members in the minutes of the Standing Committee, Principal (Mrs.) Meera Modi has been shown as a Fellow. He enquired whether Principal Meera Modi has been nominated to the Senate now. He requested that the recommendations be approved as it related with the declaration of the results of semester system.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Standing Committee dated 21.03.2016 with regard to Semester System at Undergraduate level, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Arising out of the above, Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that certain students are not given the Roll Number for appearing in the examination/s due to shortage of lectures. Could they be admitted to the 3rd Semester?

Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Shri Raghbir Dyal clarified that even if a student did not appear in the 1st Semester examination due to one reason or the other, he/she could be admitted to the 3rd Semester provided he/she clears all the papers of 2nd Semester because as per the regulation concerned, for getting to be promoted to the 3rd Semester, one has to clear 50% of the papers of both the Semesters, i.e., 1st and 2nd Semesters.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that in this the number of preparatory days should also be mentioned.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would check this up with the Dean of University Instruction.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that the academic session was up to 13th May 2016, but when the date sheet for various examinations was out, he was astonished to see that the academic session was ended by 6th May 2016.

It was clarified that Professor Keshav Malhotra had pointed out this problem, but the reason for the early end of the academic session was that the Standing Committee had received representations from different teachers that the vacations are starting from 26th May 2016 and they do not want examinations during the vacations. That is why, they squeezed the date sheet and started the examinations early.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since the academic session was up to 13th May 2016, they have planned their academic activities by then. Now, the academic session has been reduced by a week.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not reduce the number of teaching days, and if reduced, it would cause a problem for them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No, No". It is a very serious matter that keeping in view that the teachers do not want to go beyond the summer vacation, they had cut down the academic session.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not cut down the number of days. When it was informed that this has been happening in the University for the last few years, the Vice Chancellor said that they could not do it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that certain persons from Law had gone to the Court.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that those who had gone to the Court are not having healthy sleeps. The student who had 17-18 reappears, how his examinations could be conducted within a stipulated time period. In fact, in ULS there are about 120 papers and those needed to be conducted within a month. Usually, back-to-back examinations (one in the morning and one in the evening) are conducted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that firstly they brought in Semester System and now, they are cutting down the number of teaching days by a week or so. Is it academics?

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that by now, in certain courses even the syllabus has not been covered/finished.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the date-sheets have already been announced, nothing could be done, but in future, if need be, the academic session be advanced, but the number of teaching days should not be reduced under any circumstances.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that while preparing the academic calendar, they should calculate everything in advance.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the results of the students are not declared within time, they would be deprived of applying in higher courses in other Universities/Institutes and also for jobs.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant, there is something wrong in their academic calendar.

The Vice Chancellor said that the number of teaching days could not be curtailed; otherwise, they would land into trouble.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that even now the summer vacations have not been declared in accordance with the academic calendar approved by the Syndicate and there is a difference of one week, which resulted into inconvenience to the teachers as they planned their activities in advance.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that there is a very serious problem. The results of M.A. 1st and 2nd Semesters are not declared within the stipulated time and the students have to wait at least up to August/September. However, to cover the syllabus, the classes are held up to the month of November. He suggested that without the results, provisional admission to the students should be allowed even though the fee should be taken from the students later on, i.e., after the declaration of the results, so that the students concerned could attend the classes.

When it was suggested that provisional admission should be given to such students after obtaining an undertaking from him/her, Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that if they allow provisional admission to the students without the result/s and allow them to attend to the classes, and when after the declaration of result/s they become ineligible for the next higher class, they approach the Court and the Court gives them relief on the basis of their attending the classes.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in all the affiliated Colleges, even if the results are not declared, the classes are started. As such, there is not such case in the affiliated Colleges. In fact, they seek excuses for not doing the work.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they are also taking classes in the University, but the problem is that after becoming ineligible, the student approaches the Court and get relief.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that when the student has taken a provisional admission, and that too, by giving an undertaking, how could he/she could go to the Court and get relief.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in a case where the student has neither attended any class in the first year nor taken examination, the Court had allowed him admission to the 2nd year.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, in fact, there should be specific dates for making the admissions to the 2nd, 3rd, 4th Semesters and so on.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the Semester System came into being in India via the IITs. Though the IITs are able to maintain the Semester System, they are failing to do so in the campus. In fact, it is a failure of the University machinery to implement the Semester System successfully. The Semester System should have worked successfully in the University because here most of the management is internal. Somewhere there is problem in the discipline in various Departments, but they have to stick to the system prevailing in the IITs, i.e., the whole time-table (commence of classes and conduct examination, including declaration of results and so on and so forth) has to be displayed and adhered to. Until they implement the discipline, they would not be able to succeed as nobody else could streamline the Semester System. The crux of the problem is that they are more lenient and flexible. Alright, they have pointed out and he would discuss the whole issue in the Chairpersons meeting and get it recorded in the minutes. He would say in the meeting of the Chairperson is that the Syndicate has expressed its concern that the University should adhere to these disciplines when it comes to date of admission, attendance, conduct of examination and so on and so forth. They should display everything in advance and preferably the

time-table should be submitted to the IQAC Cell so that the record is available somewhere ensuring that if somebody defaults, the IQAC Cell is able to enforce the discipline.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that is there any probability that they could declare the results well within the notified dates.

It was informed that 90% of the results are declared within the deadline.

Resolution proposed by Dr. Charanjit Sohi, and Shri H.S. Lucky, Syndics & Fellows

55. Considered the following Resolution proposed by Dr. Charanjit Sohi, and Shri H.S. Lucky, Syndics and Fellows:

“that all the existing Principals who have been re-appointed in the aided Colleges, after the age of superannuation, for one year, their term of appointment be considered for two years.”

EXPLANATION:

It is observed that in some of the Aided affiliated Colleges, the Principals have been re-appointed after superannuation, for a term of one year and in some other aided affiliated Colleges, the Principals have been appointed, for a period of two years at a time. This is discriminatory in nature.

- NOTE:**
1. The Dean of University Instructions has observed that the issue has come up several times before the Syndicate. There has been Committees regarding this issue. It was two years. Then in one of the meeting of the Syndicate it was decided to be one year. But after that a committee recommended two years. There are some with one year term. So, better is to take the resolution to Syndicate for sake of uniformity.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 27.02.2016 (Para 17) (**Appendix-XXX**) has resolved that a Committee to be chaired by Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi including Principal S.S. Sangha, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky and Dean College Development Council (Convener) be formed to consider the resolution with regard to “difficulties faced by the constituent Colleges and unaided Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh on appointing the regular Principals on account of non-availability of the eligible and suitable candidates”.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the resolution is good and it should be applicable to all future appointments and not only to the existing Principals.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he agreed for the re-appointment of the existing Principals but not for future as after a period of two years, there could be so many persons available for the post.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to for whom this would be applicable.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the resolution is that all the existing Principals who have been re-appointed for one year, their term of appointment be considered for two years which meant that they were considering only those who have been re-appointed for one year.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the managements request for the second year, then the University must accord the approval.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the ambiguities could cause problems. They were saying that those who have been re-appointed for one year, their term of appointment be considered for two years. That meant that they were considering only those who have been appointed for one year but those who are yet to be appointed as per the existing decision for one year, it would be one year for those persons. When they took a decision for the re-employment of the teachers up to the age of 65 years, at that time the recommendation of the Committee was for one year and the Syndicate increased it to two years at a time meaning thereby 2 years plus 2 years plus 1 year. Those who have been appointed for 2 years, what would be their fate? The language should be corrected so that it might not look that they were taking the decision to take care of only a particular person who has been appointed for one year.

RESOLVED: That the above Resolution proposed by Dr. Charanjit Sohi, and Shri H.S. Lucky, Syndics & Fellows, be forwarded to the Senate with the remarks that it be accepted with modification that the Principals, who are to be reappointed in the aided Colleges in future also, after the age of superannuation, their term of appointment be also two years.

Routine and formal matters

117. The information contained in Item **R-(xv)** on the agenda was read out:

(xv) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Revised Schedule as per **Appendix-A** for Election of Ordinary Fellows by Registered Graduate Constituency – 2016.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.01.2016/ 06.02.2016 (Para 11) **(Appendix-XXXI)** while approving the schedule for certain constituencies for the Election of Senate-2016 has further ratified the schedule, for the Election of Ordinary Fellows by the Registered Graduates Constituency approved by the Vice Chancellor.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016 (General Discussion (6)) **(Appendix-XXXI)** has resolved that the last date for enrolment as Registered Graduate be extended up to 31st March 2016 keeping in view the recent disturbance in Haryana. If more than one form is received from a candidate, identity proof be sought from him/her; however, no forms would be rejected for want of photograph.
3. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXXI)**.

Referring to the item, Shri Raghbir Dyal said there is no problem with the dates of availability of the supplementary graduate register. He said that when the supplementary register of graduate is published, it contains all the new votes. When the final list is prepared, he had seen that the votes of a district were prepared in any other district. He suggested that it would be better if the supplementary register is prepared district-wise. They think that a vote had been prepared but the vote of place 'A' was prepared at place 'B'. Since there could be errors in the lists, preparation of the district-wise list could reduce these kinds of errors. The votes which had already been prepared also appeared in the supplementary register and they could not find the votes in the final list. He suggested that the vote which had already been prepared should not be included in the supplementary list. A person already enrolled stays at Moga, that person somehow again fills up the form and presently that person stays at Ferozepur instead of Moga. In the supplementary list, that person would be shown as enrolled at Ferozepur. But when the final list would be prepared that vote would be deleted as the software would not pick up the same as that had been already existing. That vote would continue to be shown at Moga. The votes which had already been prepared should not be given in the supplementary list. The software should check it at the initial stage.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the last date for receipt of intimation of change of address is 29.06.2016 and the last date for receipt of claims and objection is 27.06.2016 and the existing register of graduates is to be made available on 29.01.2016. It meant that they were giving 5 months for the change of address and the change of address is to be done by the already existing graduates.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the last date for change of address is 30.06.2016 which is always after the publication of supplementary list.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that sometimes the change of address is also required in the supplementary list as the votes are prepared at some wrong address.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if the form for enrolment had been sent and that had not been registered after the check by the software for preparation of supplementary list, that person could check the list and would get the address changed. He said that the last date for

change of address could be fixed on 15.06.2016. He said the availability of the supplementary register would be on 30.05.2016.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Sub-Item R-(xv)** on the agenda, be ratified, with the modification that the last date for receipt of intimation of change of address be fixed as 15.06.2016 instead of 29.06.2016.

At this stage, the members started general discussions.

- (1) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that a circular was sent to the affiliated Colleges pertaining to grant of leave encashment and retiral benefits to the teachers. In fact, the circular has rightly been sent, but only the teaching staff has been mentioned therein. In the earlier circular which was issued in the year 2008, both the teaching and non-teaching employees were covered, but through an oversight, the non-teaching employees have been left out in the circular issued by the University recently, i.e., 09.03.2016. As such, the non-teaching staff is required to be covered under the said circular. He, therefore, suggested that a fresh circular should be issued to the affiliated Colleges by the Colleges Branch covering both teaching and non-teaching staff.

The Vice Chancellor directed Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, to issue a fresh circular as suggested by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua.

- (2) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that Government College, Ludhiana, has been granted an Innovative Programme namely Diploma in Beauty and Wellness. The University issued the affiliation letter to the College on 20.11.2015, and when the College made the admissions and sent the students' returns to the R&S Branch, the R&S Branch imposed fine on the College. He pleaded that since the College was granted affiliation late, the fine should be condoned.

- (3) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had already sent him (Vice Chancellor) message and also sent SMS and provided the documents regarding the Provident Fund to the teachers in the affiliated Colleges, but nothing has been done so far.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is on the job.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that now the problem is that the Colleges which were earlier giving the Provident Fund as per the regulations of the University, have stopped. And in all the new Colleges, which are functioning in District Ludhiana, in them there is no provision of Provident Fund.

The Vice Chancellor said that the question is how to ensure that all the Colleges give Contributory Provident Fund as per the University regulations. When Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said something, the Vice Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council to contact all the Senators of Ludhiana and request them to visit all the Colleges of Ludhiana on behalf of the University.

- (4) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, he had given him (Vice Chancellor) certain documents relating to appointment of Lecturer in English of Guru Gobind Singh College. Even though the University had written to the College twice, but the College is not taking action and allowing the appointee to join. He urged the Vice Chancellor to take up the matter with the College.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the College is not obeying the directive of the University, action should be taken against the College as per Regulation 11 at page 160 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that certain Colleges do not follow the directives of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that action should be initiated against the College in accordance with Regulation 11 at page 160 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

- (5) Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that about 2-3 meetings before when the qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security considered, he had suggested that the proposed written test should not be approved and his suggestion was accepted by the Syndicate. But when the minutes were prepared, the said decision was not reflected.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the post of Chief of University Security has been advertised and it has been mentioned in the advertisement that there would be a written test to shortlist the candidates.

It was informed that they would not conduct the written test, but the provision has been retained just to keep it open.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that though the proposal was there, the same was not accepted by the Syndicate. When certain more clarification was given, including that if there would be a large number of candidates for the post, the written test has to be conducted, Dr. Ranga said that the condition even with if was not accepted by the House. When this condition was not accepted by the Syndicate, how it has appeared in the advertisement. When the deletion of condition of conduct of written test was not reflected in the proceedings of the Syndicate, it was pointed out by the member/s, and again it was decided that the condition of conduct of written test, be deleted. Now, he is astonished as to how it is being insisted again and again and has been mentioned in the advertisement.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the minutes of the Syndicate meeting, wherein it was decided that the condition of written test for the post of Chief of University Security be deleted, also needed to be corrected.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the Syndicate had decided to delete the condition of conduct of written test for

the post of Chief of University Security, then there is no point in giving the said condition in the advertisement.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that since it would cause a problem for them, a corrigendum should be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a corrigendum should be given that no written test would be conducted.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to give the corrigendum that no written test for the post of Chief of University Security would be conducted.

- (6) Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in future, while giving the advertisement, they should be very-very careful because in the case of Dean, College Development Council, the advertisement says that so and so may also be made eligible. Who is to be made eligible? The Syndicate took the decision that so and so may also be made eligible and it was also mentioned in the advertisement that so and so may also be made eligible, as if somebody else is to be made eligible. Now, the candidates are asking wherefrom the making of this eligibility has come from. He told the person concerned, that it were the minutes of the Syndicate, and the minutes as it were, had been given in the advertisement. With that a template has also been given, but the template is old one and the same is contradictory. So in the case of existing Principals or Professors, wherefrom they give as to what was their workload, time-table and which classes they had taken during the last three years. When Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had told at that time that categories 1-2 is not applicable, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it is not applicable, why the form was evolved and how they would determine the merit.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired under whose signatures, the advertisement has been given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he does not know. He further asked about the last date of the advertisement for the post of Dean, College Development Council.

The Vice Chancellor said that the last date for submission of application for the post of Dean, College Development Council is 30th April 2016.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant, the last date for submission for application for the post of Dean, College Development Council had already been over. As such, he (Vice Chancellor) has to take personal interest so solve the problem, if any, so that there is no confusion, while determining the merit as per the existing template. So they have to decide in advance as to what are the parameters which are to be taken into consideration at the time of interview. In case there is a need to give the advertisement again, the advertisement should be given again, but if the problem could be solved without giving the advertisement again, that would be more appropriate. So that should be looked into. He had also spoken to the Dean of University Instruction yesterday, and he (DUI) said it is not in his knowledge and he would

discuss the issue with the Vice Chancellor. However, he (DUI) agreed that there seems to be some problem.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay", he would talk to the Dean of University Instruction.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are certain people who had not been able to apply, and he thinks one of the members of the Senate had written also asking whether these persons are eligible, and perhaps, a reply had not been given. Probably, the Registrar might be knowing this.

It was informed that the person concerned had met him and the matter was clarified to him.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the person had written, and they have clarified verbally. This meant, that the reply has not been given to the person concerned. Now, a third person could ask that a letter had been written seeking certain clarifications, but no reply has been given. When asked why the reply has not been given by the University, he told that the University itself is not sure as to what is the reply to this. Though they are sure as to what is the decision, it should go in black and white. He urged the Vice Chancellor to look into the whole issue, and to avoid litigation, if need be, the advertisement should be given again, but if the work could be done by any other means, then the same should be done.

- (7) Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that an Approval Committee was constituted. The Committee met once and considered the integrated courses of B.A., B.Sc., B.Ed., etc. Since it took more than two hours, they could not consider the approval cases of appointments made by the affiliated Colleges. Since the election to the Senate is approaching, the approval cases needed to be expedited, which might take 2 or more months. However, the reasons due to which the approvals are pending were got recorded in the minutes. Thereafter, no meeting of the Committee has been convened. He urged that a meeting of the said Committee should be convened to consider the cases.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the cases, which are not being approved due to certain reasons, could be considered by the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council to convene a meeting of the Committee.

- (8) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the rates of remuneration of Centre Superintendents, Assistant Centre Superintendents, Invigilators, etc. have been revised and he is thankful to the University authorities for the same. However, the rates of Centre Clerks have not been increased in the ratio the rates of other examination staff have been increased. Secondly, earlier for the strength of 250 students, two Clerks were permitted, but now they have raised it to 350 students. When the strength was of 250 students, at that time only 2 or 4 papers were used to be opened, whereas, now more than 28 papers

are opened. When more than 28 papers are opened in a Centre and the number of students is more than 400, it is not possible to control more than 350 students by a single Clerk. He suggested that the old strength of 250 students for a Centre per Clerk should be allowed to be continued and the rates of remuneration of Clerk should be enhanced in the ratio of other staff of the examination centres.

Shri Raghbir Dyal, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Dr. I.S. Sandhu, suggested that the rates of Centre Clerk should be enhanced in proportion to other staff.

- (9) Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that he had already made a request to the Controller of Examinations that they seek choices from the teachers for giving duties in the examination centre/s. Even if the teacher concerned is assigned duty in one of the Centres chosen by him, he/she is entitled for T.A./D.A. However, if a teacher wants a particular centre, the Controller of Examinations might not appoint him at that particular centre even on the recommendation of the Fellows. But once a person is asked to give duty at a Centre, he/she could not be denied the payment of T.A./D.A. Since the University should sought preferences from the teachers, they had given the preferences, but that does not mean that they are not entitled for T.A./D.A. Therefore, T.A./D.A. must be given to them.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if two persons are performing same duties and one is getting T.A./D.A. and the other is not. How could that be possible?

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that some letters have been received on which it has been written that it is without T.A./D.A.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thinks that T.A./D.A. is not being given to those, who say that they should not be given T.A./D.A.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that when one knows that he would not be assigned duty in Chandigarh, he gives in writing that he might not be paid T.A./D.A. Suppose he recommend someone to be appointed at Chandigarh, and if he is assigned the duty in Chandigarh, it is not possible that he/she is not given the T.A./D.A. Either on request the duty should not be assigned, but if assigned, T.A./D.A. must be paid.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is still unable to understand as to under which rule, the payment of T.A./D.A. is denied.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that so far as he is able to make out, the persons, who are assigned duty on choice, are not given T.A./D.A., and those, who are assigned duty by the University itself, are given T.A./D.A.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that persons should not be assigned examination duty on his/her centre of choice and not even on the recommendation of the Fellows.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if the teacher is given the centre of his choice, no T.A./D.A. should be paid to him/her, but if the University seeks choices from the teacher, T.A./D.A. must be paid to him/her.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that still several teachers have been issued letters, who were assigned examination duties on the basis of preferences sought from them, stating that no T.A./D.A. would be paid to them.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, in fact, the Controller of Examinations wants to bring in certain reforms and at the same time also wants to save money.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the simple formula for the purpose is that they should take a decision that whosoever is given the centre of choice even though the choices are sought by the University, he/she/they would not be paid T.A./D.A.

It was clarified that Dr. I.S. Sandhu has pointed out a genuine concern, but the concerns of the University are different. A line has been mentioned in the Calendar that if the appointment is to be made at Chandigarh, Hoshiarpur, Ludhiana, the appointment is without T.A./D.A. So far as preferences are concerned, the preferences given by the teachers are scrutinized by the Screening Committee and the appointments are made after getting clearance from the Screening Committee. If the Committee recommends T.A./D.A., the University gives T.A./D.A. and otherwise not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is why the leverage is being given to the Screening Committee as to whom T.A./D.A. would be paid and whom not.

It was informed that parameters could be decided by the Screening Committee.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if somebody is allotted the Centre of his/her choice/preference, he/she should not be paid T.A./D.A. And if somebody is allotted centre out of choice and if he/she refused to take T.A./D.A., he/she should also not be paid T.A./D.A. at par with those who are allotted centres of choice. He remarked that in the ensuing Senate election, the Registrar would seek preferences, but it does not mean that the persons, who would be given the stations of their choice, would not be paid T.A./D.A.

It was informed that firstly they do not receive requisite number of recommendations for Centre Superintendents, etc., and they have to depend on the Principals and have also to take help from their friends. At the moment, they are running Semester System as well as Annual System, but from next year, they would completely switch over to the Semester System. As such, they are hoping that from the next year the system would be streamlined. At the same time, they could also frame Rules keeping in view the discussion held on the issue so far.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that those Fellows, who ask that they should be assigned Flying Squad duty at a particular examination centre/city, they should not be paid T.A./D.A. Let a message go to the society that in view of the financial crisis, the Fellows have stopped taking payment of T.A./D.A.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that, whenever it is presumed that the meeting has to be postponed/adjourned in view of the lengthy agenda, the meeting of the Syndicate should be convened on Saturday at 4.00 p.m. or so, and if need be, the meeting could be reconvened on Sunday, i.e., the next day, to finish the unfinished agenda/business.

The Vice Chancellor said that this meeting has run so long because there are certain contentious issues. If they exclude those 2-3 contentious issues, the whole agenda would be covered within 2-3 hours.

- (10) Dr. Ajay Ranga said that a Committee was appointed by the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) to consider regularization of services of temporary/daily wage employees, and the Committee comprised of Principals Gurdip Sharma, R.S. Jhanji (members of that Syndicate) and he himself (Dr. Ajay Ranga), Professor Yog Raj Angrish and the Registrar. Though the minutes of meeting of that Committee have been confirmed by the Chairman, he did not know why the same are not being placed before the Syndicate for its consideration. Perhaps, the Registrar might be able to throw some light on the issue. He further stated that construction is going on in Sector 25 and he had sent a message to both the Vice Chancellor and the Registrar. In the Enquiry Committee, it was pointed out that sub-standard material is being used there. Two months have passed, but they do not know as to what has happened to the recommendations of that Enquiry Committee. He urged that he should be enlightened about all this.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that earlier also they had talked about the Construction Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would figure it out.

- (11) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that there is a person namely Shri Jasbir Singh, a retired Superintendent, and his daughter, who has passed B.Sc. (Computer Science) has got admission to M.Sc. (I.T.) course and appeared in the 1st Semester Examination. But when she has to appear in the 2nd Semester Examination, she has been informed by the University that her admission has been cancelled as she is ineligible for admission to M.Sc. (I.T.) course. This case is in the knowledge of Controller of Examinations, and perhaps, such an issue was raised by Dr. I.S. Sandhu in last meeting of the Syndicate/Senate. What is fault of the student, who is going to appear in the 2nd Semester Examination tomorrow, but is being now told that she is ineligible and her admission has been cancelled? If she approached the Court, the case would be decided in her favour and the University would be

reprimanded. Although the fault is of the College, which allowed her admission without checking her eligibility, but they are spoiling/wasting a full year of the student.

It was clarified that, in fact, such a case was pointed out by Dr. I.S. Sandhu. The problem is that as per regulations, only those candidates, who have done B.Sc. (I.T.), could take admission to M.Sc. (I.T.). Even if one has done B.Sc. (I.T.) from any other University, he/she has also been made eligible to take admission to M.Sc. (I.T.). But in the case under consideration, the R&S and General Branches have, after verifying the facts, reported that she has studied only one subject, i.e., Computer Science, in her undergraduate degree, and B.Sc. with Computer Science is ineligible for admission to M.Sc. (I.T.). Had she done B.Sc. (Computer Science), a full-fledged degree, she would have been eligible? However, she has studied Computer Science as an elective subject, and this has been observed by the R&S Branch.

The Vice Chancellor said that if she was to be declared ineligible, it should have been done at the initial stage.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that she is B.Sc. in Computer Science from Punjabi University, Patiala.

On an enquiry made by the Vice Chancellor, it was informed that she has appeared in the 1st Semester Examination of M.Sc. (I.T.). The Vice Chancellor said that the UGC says that if they allow somebody to commence a course, then they have to allow him/her to complete the course. In such a case, even the argument of provisional admission does not work.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa reiterated that the candidate has done B.Sc. (CS) and CS means Computer Science. Since she is suffering just because of certain procedures of the University, he is fully with the candidate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the candidate has already suffered a lot.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Controller of Examinations to resolve this case by today itself. He remarked that, that is why, they got into a trouble in another case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, they have done that case subject to the decision of the case pending in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that, they have to do that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is obvious. Though there was no need to do that, they have done that. Now, he had been given to understand that a case has come in the Supreme Court against that.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in this case, they should not wait for the approval of the minutes. He

urged the Vice Chancellor to direct the concerned Officer to expedite this.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this is not an issue. In fact, they had regularized the admissions of candidates in Medical Colleges, who had done +2 with Arts. Some of the Colleges knowing fully well that the candidate is ineligible for admission, admit the candidates concerned. Anyhow he (Vice Chancellor) is also right that they have allowed the candidate to commence the course, and he/she has to be allowed to complete the course. The students' returns come to the University in the month of September. Now, the Semester System has come. The R&S Branch takes its own time to check the eligibility of the students, especially if they have to verify from outside Board or University, then it takes more time. By that time, the candidate already appears in the 1st Semester Examination though provisionally, and thereafter it comes to know that he/she is not eligible. The candidate has got to say as to what his/her fault. The University, in fact, should pull up the College that under what circumstances it had made admission of ineligible candidate/s. However, the University has never pulled up any College for making admission/s of ineligible candidate/s till date. So some of the students and some of the Colleges have made it a point that the candidates should come and take admissions irrespective of whether they are eligible or not. There are certain courses, which the Colleges got late and they also made the admissions late. When the admissions were made late, the students' returns were also sent late. He was surprised that Government College, Ludhiana, had been imposed a fine of Rs.70,000/- to Rs.80,000/- for sending the students' returns late. Because they received the Community College Scheme late, i.e., somewhere in November, naturally the students' returns were to be sent thereafter, the College was imposed fine. The College persons ask the students that since they have been imposed a fine, they (students) should go to Chandigarh and meet the members of the Syndicate of the University and plead that the fine should not be imposed because the College has obliged them. Therefore, instead of penalizing the students, they should evolve a mechanism that no wrong admissions are made. Secondly, they have provisions that where the mistake is on the part of the College, the benefit is to be given to the student/s. He thought that the Controller of Examinations should have put up the case to the Vice Chancellor for getting the admission of this candidate confirmed as a special case.

- (12) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa drew the attention of the House towards a news item wherein it has been written that though the Syndicate rejected, the Vice Chancellor has accepted a case. In fact, this related to Homoeopathic College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh, for which a promotion policy is required to be framed. He does not know why the policy is not being framed and similar is the case of Dental Institute, due to which three Professors of Dental Institute are suffering. Since there are related Medical Institutions, why are they not framing the policy.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not go by the news item as they are deliberately inserted. However, so far as he is concerned, he is pursuing the promotion policies for both Dental Institute as well as Homoeopathic College & Hospital. With great difficulty they have managed to get a promotion policy for Dental Institute framed, which is a part of the agenda. So the Dental Institute matter is almost resolved. So far as Homoeopathic College & Hospital is concerned, he has asked them to provide him a promotion policy. If the University system has failed to provide them a promotion policy, what could he do?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that all kinds of medical faculty must be developed.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is why, he has asked his colleagues to give him a promotion policy. In fact, there should be a promotion policy for all kinds of teachers working in the University System, including Dental Institute, Homoeopathic College & Hospital, Ayurvedic College & Hospital. Framing a promotion policy for Dental Institute took a long time because there is no uniform promotion policy all over India.

- (13) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that there is a Ph.D. student namely Ms. Mukesh Lata in the School of Punjabi Studies. He had also raised the case of the candidate about 3-4 years ago.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, in fact, there are several (about 100) mistakes in the representation given by the candidate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had marked it to the DUI and Dean, Faculty of Language, today before coming to the meeting.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that she (candidate) just wants that her Supervisor should be changed, as he has already gone abroad.

- (14) Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the students, who have national participation or position at State level, should be considered sportspersons and charge fee meant for the ex-student instead of Rs.1,500/- per month or Rs.4,500 for three months.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could do this because the Government of India has asked them to provide sports facilities available to the people, who competed at the national level. There is a directive that the Universities in India must let their sport facilities utilized by the sportspersons to compete at national level.

- (15) Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would like supplement Shri Ashok Goyal that certain guidelines, including eligibility conditions for different courses, are uploaded on the University Website and are also circulated to the Colleges by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges). He is seeing for the last so many years,

that some are picked somewhere from the Calendar and some other from somewhere else. He, therefore, suggested that before uploading the eligibility conditions on the University Website and sending the same to the affiliated Colleges, the same be checked/verified/scrutinized thoroughly. However, these guidelines/eligibility conditions be sent to the affiliated Colleges by 31st May, so that the same could be made a part of the prospectus, and it should also be written that if wrong admission/s is/are made, the College/s would be held responsible. In fact, the guidelines/eligibility conditions are usually sent to the Colleges very late, i.e., in July/August, when the admissions are either underway or going to start shortly. They have a full month (May 2016) and they could scrutinize those guidelines/eligibility conditions and then send the same to the affiliated Colleges.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he only wants to say that whatever decision/s they had taken, the same should be implemented without waiting for the approved paragraphs.

- (16) Professor Shelley Walia stated that being sympathetic to the teachers, he would like to make one recommendation and the recommendation is that there are two fellows on the Campus and they are workers. He thinks that in extreme conditions, i.e., in winter, summer, and they worked absolutely scorching heat from 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. and give some semblance of cleanliness to the appearance of the University. They pick up all the garbage to the extent that he has also seen them picking up dead animals, i.e., dogs, etc. etc. Secondly, whenever they are asked to, they come. The names of these two fellows are Sonu and Sanjay. They have been given an electric cart to pick up and they go around the whole campus in order to keep it clean. His request to the Vice Chancellor is could he help them in terms of one little award, which would be a pat on their back, on 15th August. According to him, it would be an excellent act.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested Professor Shelley Walia to make a recommendation in this regard and send the same to the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired should he write to him (Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said, “No, No”, he has already noted it down.

- (17) Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Horticulture Department of the University is also doing a wonderful job so far as cleanliness and greenery at the Campus is concerned and the University had also got an award “Best Campus Award”. If the Horticulture Department is also honoured publicly, it would also be good and would prove to be morale boosting for them.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Okay”. When a query was made by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua that whether beautification work was done by Horticulture Department, the Vice Chancellor said that, in fact, the Executive Engineer (Maintenance) had also participated.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Registrar has also played a role in it.

Professor Anil Monga said that, in the morning, Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) has talked about different initiatives.

- (18) Professor Anil Monga raised the issue of construction of a road from Sector 25 residential area to the Community Centre. When he discussed the details about the road to be constructed, the Vice Chancellor said that this is not an issue worth consideration by the Syndicate.

- (19) Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when in the morning the University Anthem was being played, he felt that he does not remember the wording of the Anthem. In fact, they could not sing it without music?

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a difficult construction/composition, and is very difficult to sing.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the approval of this Anthem had come to the Syndicate. In fact, there were two Anthems.

- (20) Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the regularization of daily wage staff is a lengthy process and it would take time. Until their regularization is done, it is very difficult for them to survive on the D.C. rates as the inflation has increased too much. The persons work from 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. in extreme winter and scorching heat, which is very difficult. He, therefore, suggested that whosoever has completed minimum of five years service on temporary/daily wage/contract basis, they should be paid D.A. and D.P., and his proposal should be seriously considered.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Professor Keshav Malhotra is right because the salary which is being paid to the persons, who are working on temporary/daily wage/contract basis, is too less.

- (21) Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that the Syndicate had authorized the Vice Chancellor to appoint certain Committees, but the members have not been informed as to which Committees have been formed and which members they comprised of. If the information is provided to them in the adjourned meeting, it would be better.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that either authorization should not be given or if authorization is given, then whatever the Vice Chancellor does, that should be accepted without any ifs and buts.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Professor Malhotra) is not asking why the Committees have been formed. He is just saying that whichever Committees have been formed by the Vice Chancellor as per the authorization given by the Syndicate, they should be informed about them.

The Vice Chancellor directed Shri Rajinder Singh, S.O. to the Vice Chancellor to send information about the Committees, whichever have been appointed by the Vice Chancellor, as per authorization given by the Syndicate, to the members through e-mail. He said that it is no issue at all, and they do not have to put in a RTI for the purpose.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has never filed a RTI.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that one thing is true that if they started filing RTIs, they would start speaking less in the meeting.

- (22) When Professor Emanuel Nahar tried to raise an issue regarding space, seminar rooms, etc., the Vice Chancellor said that it is not a Syndicate matter. There are forms like, Chairpersons meeting, Space Committee Meetings Chaired by DUI, etc. to take care of such issues.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that his only about six months are left as Chairperson of Department of Evening Studies, but he is sorry to point out that he could not get a room vacated from Dayananda Chair. He requested that Dayananda Chair should be given some space somewhere to function as office.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are the matter which the Chairpersons, DUI and the Vice Chancellor should be able to resolve and they should not waste the precious time of the Syndicate. They should do these things and should have the efficiency and understanding to resolve such issues. Most of the senior people are residing at the campus, and they should involve them to resolve such matter.

- (23) Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to discuss about two-three issues, and one is about the Teachers' Holiday Home at Shimla. He could not say anything about Students' Holiday Home at Dalhousie because he has never gone there. He said that with small efforts a lot of improvements could be made at Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla, which he would like to discuss with him (Vice Chancellor) personally. The other issue is related to the teachers of affiliated Colleges, who are DPE, and all DPEs had been converted into Assistant Professor, if they are qualified. Both the Government and the University has done this, but somehow or the other there is a case where for the last almost 15 years, a person working in RSD College, Ferozpur, has not been converted into Assistant Professor.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu intervened to say that the problem is because the College is not sending the case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the College is not sending the case, the University should write to the College to explain as to why the person working as DPE has not been converted into Assistant Professor till date. In fact, she has not been included in the list of approved teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that arising out of this discussion, the Dean, College Development Council should write to the College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the name of the person is Neeraj.

- (24) Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a demand from the lawyers that LL.M. course should be started in the evening shift, and they are ready to pay high fee.

The Vice Chancellor said that such a proposal should come from the Department of Laws.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that LL.M. course is already been offered in the evening shift, but what they want is that the eligibility for LL.M. should be reduced to 50% in LL.B., which at present is 55% marks.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is an academic issue and earning could not be the reason to reduce the eligibility condition.

- (25) At this stage, when the Vice Chancellor asked the members to decide the date of the adjourned meeting, Shri Ashok Goyal said that meeting should be held any day before 25th May, i.e., before the commencement of the summer vacations and no meeting should be convened during the vacations, i.e. in the month of June. Keeping in view that no meeting would be held in the month of June, date for the adjourned meeting should be decided.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the meeting of the Board of Finance is held, the recommendations of the Board of Finance have to be placed before the Syndicate and for that he has to convene the meeting of the Syndicate. The whole timetable depends as to how he is able to convince the Government. Right now the remaining agenda of this meeting would be there and if there are 4-5 more items, all would be included in the agenda. Respecting their sentiments, he would not plan June meeting, until he is not forced by the Centre.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the meeting of the Board of Finance should be held after consulting the Consultative Committee.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that to cover the whole agenda, the meeting of the Syndicate should be convened for two days, i.e., Saturday and Sunday.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the meeting of the Syndicate could not be convened on Saturday, as they have to obtain holiday from their College.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they come prepared (reading through the agenda), this much agenda could be finished just in 3-4 hours.

RESOLVED: That the adjourned meeting be convened on Sunday, the 15th May 2016.

- (26) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the cases of affiliation and extension of affiliation, which are finalized up to the next meeting, all should be brought in the next/adjourned meeting.

This was agreed to.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE CHANCELLOR

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE, which was adjourned on 1st May 2016, held on **Sunday, 15th May 2016 at 10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 1. | Professor A.K. Grover
Vice Chancellor | ... (in the Chair) |
| 2. | Dr. Ajay Ranga | |
| 3. | Professor Anil Monga | |
| 4. | Shri Ashok Goyal | |
| 5. | Dr. Balbir Chand Josan | |
| 6. | Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi | |
| 7. | Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa | |
| 8. | Professor Emanuel Nahar | |
| 9. | Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky | |
| 10. | Shri Harpreet Singh Dua | |
| 11. | Dr. I.S. Sandhu | |
| 12. | Professor Keshav Malhotra | |
| 13. | Professor Navdeep Goyal | |
| 14. | Shri Raghbir Dyal | |
| 15. | Dr. Shelley Walia | |
| 16. | Principal Surinder Singh Sangha | |
| 17. | Col. G.S. Chadha
Registrar | ... (Secretary) |

Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, 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 may inform the members about the sad demise of –

- i) Shri S.D. Sobti, revered father of Professor R.C. Sobti, Vice Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow and former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on May 4, 2016; and
- ii) Professor Jai Narain Sharma, retired from Gandhian and Peace Studies, on May 10, 2016.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Shri S.D. Sobti and Professor Jai Narain Sharma 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**

2. The Vice Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that family of Dr. Urmi Kessar, retired Professor, Department of Arts History and Visual Arts, has donated/contributed Rs.21 lakhs to create endowment for organizing lecture/oration in the

area of Arts History and appreciation and an additional amount of Rs.1.5 lakhs for organizing this year's lecture/oration".

The members applauded and appreciated the gesture of Dr. Urmi Kessar, retired Professor, Department of Arts History and Visual Arts, for making above donation for institution of endowment, by thumping of desks.

RESOLVED: That the donation of Rs.21 lakh made by Dr. Urmi Kessar, retired Professor, Department of Arts History and Visual Arts, for institution of endowment for organizing lecture/oration in the area of Arts History and appreciation, including an additional amount of Rs.1.5 lakhs for organizing this year's lecture/oration", be accepted.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That appreciation and thanks of the Syndicate, be conveyed to the donor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal abstained when the following Item 4 was taken up for consideration:

Report of the Standing Committee and CVO

4. Considered the report of the Standing Committee and CVO along with additional papers with regard to complaint made by faculty member of University against the University Officers.

- NOTE:**
1. An item in respect of item above was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 27.02.2016 (Para 21) for consideration and the same was deferred till the adjourned meeting held on 14th March, 2016, but the item was not taken up in the adjourned meeting held on 14.03.2016.
 2. A special meeting of the Syndicate was held on 22.03.2016 to consider item No. 21 deferred by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 27.02.2016 and again on 14.03.2016, in light of CWP NO. 5393 of 2016 filed by Professor V.K. Chopra in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court. It was resolved that the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor that Professor V.K. Chopra be not given extension in reemployment beyond third year be endorsed to the Senate on the basis of majority opinion.
 3. The whole matter was placed before the Senate (Item C-37) in its meeting held on 27.03.2016 and during discussion issue was raised that a specific item be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that a colleague of theirs had brought a matter to their attention and that needed to be examined by the University bodies. They have before them the reports received from the Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO) as well as the Standing Committee.

The colleague had been invited to come forward and attend the meeting of the Committee. All that is recorded in the reports. At the moment, they were having the reports. Some of the Syndicate members required some additional information and documents and those were made available to all of them and they have to discuss this matter in the background of all this. Now to facilitate the discussion, if there were still some documents needed, they could articulate and the documents could be provided and if there were submissions that the members would like to make for further redressal by the CVO or the Standing Committee, the members could tell and the same could be referred to the CVO or the Standing Committee. It was in that background that the item was before them. He would like the members to be quite focussed and decide to what action needed to be taken. The Registrar had also offered that if the members needed to examine the documents and the members needed more time to visit the office and examine the documents, they could have more time to examine.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that he had gone through the reports and found nothing wrong as stated in the complaint. A proper advertisement had been given in the leading newspapers. The rates were approved and there is no lapse of any kind. A properly constituted Purchase Committee had made all the purchases after following the proper procedure. As such, there is no lapse. Therefore, the reports be accepted.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Professor V.K. Chopra was invited in the meeting of the Standing Committee but he did not attend the meeting because he had not been provided with the papers which had been provided to the Syndicate members though he had made a request in this regard. In the absence of documents, how could he attend the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was his (Professor Chopra) concern. It was Professor Keshav Malhotra's opinion. He asked what is it that they wanted him (Vice Chancellor) to do now.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Registrar had provided the complete record. Professor Chopra had levelled two allegations. One allegation which Professor Chopra had pointed out that was that the shop in the sports grounds has been constructed wrongly. The second one is a shop constructed in the heritage building of Student Centre.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was not his (Professor Chopra) business what he was doing.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Professor Chopra had raised two issues regarding the shops and they reconsidered and reviewed their decision. When a teacher raises an issue, it should not be seen that who has raised the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have accorded complete seriousness to the matter.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they had come to conclusion without hearing anybody. The work which had to be done by the Standing Committee and the CVO has come to the Syndicate and they should have relied upon their reports. The records which

had been provided to the members of Syndicate should have been called for by the CVO and Standing Committee and should have devoted time to study all the documents and give it a tabular form and all the details should have been done. Only then, the matter should have been brought to the Syndicate. They, being the members of the Governing Body, are going through each and every detail of the purchase record. Then what is the job of the CVO.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members had chosen to do so.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they had chosen it. Everything has to be seen by the CVO and the Standing Committee and only then it could come to the Governing Body as the Governing Body could not go into such details.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that what Professor Keshav Malhotra was saying that in this case, a chance of hearing was not given to Professor Chopra. Professor Chopra was called by the Committee but willingly, he did not appear before the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Chopra was doubting the Committee.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that at least Professor Chopra should have appeared before the Committee and explained his position. Whether he had shown any resentment as to why he did not appear before the Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Professor Chopra has told that the record of all the purchases made by the University should be shown to him and if the purchase record had been shown to him, he would have been satisfied and the matter would not have gone further and there would have been no hue and cry. Why this happened because the University is also responsible for it. They could not blame a whistle blower.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not a whistle blower and objected to it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Professor Chopra had raised the issue and it is proved. Why the documents were not provided to him.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Chopra should have come forward and demanded the documents.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Professor Chopra had asked for the documents in writing.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Chopra had not cooperated with the Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the person who had made the allegations, he was not provided the details. If they had marked the case to the CVO and the Standing Committee and worked on it, then officially it is accepted and let the matter be decided.

The Vice Chancellor said that that a Professor of long standing who had also been a former Chairperson of the Department had sent him a matter and it was his duty to place the same to the University bodies. The government of the University is the Syndicate. As a Vice Chancellor, it is his duty to facilitate the working. The governing bodies of the University have determined the way of governance. There is a Standing Committee, there is a CVO. He thought that a point was raised against an officer, the matter was of impropriety. He tried to do his duty as a Vice Chancellor. He had not done anything which he was not expected to do so. The members are the government of the University. The system has expectations from the government of the University to govern and the responsibility of the governance of the University is of all the members.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the governing body could not go into the details and make enquiries.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the members felt that whatever had been provided to them, he would put it before the CVO and let the CVO look into the things, it is okay with him.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the matter had been reported in the newspapers and other actions had also been taken in the matter, they were considering the reports which had not been provided to Professor Chopra.

The Vice Chancellor said that alright, the things were before the members and if they wished he would send the details.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the enquiry had been conducted and the documents had been provided to the members and if even then if they feel, the enquiry could be conducted again.

The Vice Chancellor said that if any written statement is made by any of the members and desired to pass it on the CVO with a desire to look into the matter, he would do it.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he would like to thank the Vice Chancellor that the documents which he had been demanding have been provided. After going through the record and the tenders floated, he was of the opinion that the purchase which had been made, it should not be on the higher side.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever details they wanted to give, should be given in writing and if they wanted to discuss, they could discuss. He could not look at the microscopic details. If the members had issues on it, they could give him in writing and then he would read the same in this background and take a call whether the same has to be submitted to the CVO and the CVO would report after reading through it.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that every time he raises an issue, the Vice Chancellor asks to give in writing. It seems that the CVO has submitted the report without going through the records.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could not say so and whatever they pointed out and give observations on the report, he would bring it to the attention of the CVO.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they had seen the report of the CVO in the last meeting also and the CVO is submitting the report but did not know how the purchases were made.

The Vice Chancellor said that the observations of the members and whatever they were saying, the recording of all this would be passed on to the CVO. In addition to this, whatever the members wanted to submit, they could give the same in writing which would also be sent to the CVO. If he wanted to make some comments on that, he would record the same and send to the CVO.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he would like to share that when he perused the bills, the prices quoted for the supply of air conditioners for which the bills were attached, the price of one air conditioner is on the higher side by Rs.10,000/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would bring it to the notice of the CVO and the CVO has been appointed to check all these things.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the CVO should have seen all these things as it was the duty of the CVO and as Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Syndicate could not see all such details.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would bring it to the notice of the CVO and then he would examine what are the government norms and in case some aspersions are cast or an inadvertent lapse on the part of the CVO. This is not for the first time that such things are before the Indian system.

Professor Anil Monga said that the Committee comprises the University Professors and a finger is being raised.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members of the governing body have the freedom to raise the points and have concern to share their viewpoint. Everything would be placed back to the CVO. There have been many occasions in organisations when the CVO investigates the matters. All the people might not be satisfied what the CVO has done. In that case there were guidelines of the Government as to how the public must be satisfied of the governing system of the University.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if any of the members had any objection, the enquiry could be conducted again. In today's meeting, there are so many items on the agenda and on many of the items every time, they discuss for 2-3 hours, they should not waste time. For example, there was an item for affiliation of a College which had been coming for consideration for the last 4 times but is not being taken up. The issue today is whether they should accept the report of the Committee or not. If the members wished to accept the report, the same should be accepted and if any of the members have objection about the report and think that there is some fraud, the report could be rejected. Whether the item is to be accepted or not, they should take a decision. All the documents have been provided to the members and if there is no objection, it should be accepted or not and they should move ahead.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the report of the Standing Committee and the CVO had been provided. The Vice Chancellor

could give a ruling whether they want to pass the same without discussion or with discussion.

The Vice Chancellor said that right in the beginning he had said to be precise and concise.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Shri Harpreet Singh Dua had raised the point, they needed the response but no response was given. But the public and the people should know what is happening.

The Vice Chancellor said that what Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that an extra amount of Rs.10,000/- has been paid. They became a republic in 1950. They had the first elected government in 1952. So many Parliaments have come and gone. So many Prime Ministers have come and gone. So many purchases had been made on behalf of the Government of India for all the departments. Why did the Government of India create the office of CVO? The office of CVO was created so as to have the confidence of the people of India, the taxpayers of India that the expenses that they make on behalf of the taxes they have paid, are done following certain procedures and people have confidence in the governments. They are a part of that system. The University is an autonomous body of the Indian system and the elected governing body and each one of the members are elected to serve the electorate. They are the elected representatives, there is governance. They have to see that the University community, by and large, has confidence in the governing body. Earlier, they did not have a CVO. Today, they have a senior Professor of Management as CVO, who is also known to be quite ethical. She had resigned as Chairperson of the Department when her daughter had taken admission in the department. She has served various offices of the University. She commands certain respect within the system. He would like to get back to her with whatever suggestions the members would provide. Inadvertently, if she has missed some things or certain issues to be examined in the background of those records, he would get it done. He would ask the CVO whether she had perused the record or not.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice Chancellor had done a good job. When the complaint was received, he (Vice Chancellor) had got it examined. They had raised some points and let the things be clear and have discussion. He requested the Vice Chancellor not to take the side of anyone,

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not taking the side of anyone.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had asked for the record to see whether the proper procedure was followed or not. He did not want to go into the depth whether one thing was right or not. His concern was whether the government money had been utilised in a proper way or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would have a discussion on the issue.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that whenever a team is assigned the duty, it becomes the responsibility to accomplish that task. Whenever he wanted to spend some money of his organisation, he would be more and more careful that there should be no lapses. In

the bills submitted by the supplier, there is no mention of which technology the material had been supplied. There are two bids – technical and financial – of every bid. It is not clear which technical team had inspected the technical bids and the technical bid is not attached with this record. Could they tell us as to which team had approved the technical bid and say that the purchase was made of the technical specifications which the technical team had approved?

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Harpreet Singh Dua to give in writing whatever further documents he needed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he would not give anything in writing.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would make available these things and the proceedings to the CVO who could take action in the matter *suo moto*. It is not a question of his making available these things to the CVO as the minutes of the Syndicate are available on the Panjab University website. Before the proceedings are put on website, he could make the DVDs of these proceedings available to the CVO even before the proceedings are written. If the CVO desires, she could take an action *suo moto*. The CVO has responsibilities and duties to the organisation, let her do it. He would provide the discussion of the Syndicate to the CVO.

Professor Anil Monga drew the attention of the Vice Chancellor on page 2 of the documents provided to the members.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not a technically competent person, he could not comment on it. He could not conduct the meeting where he has to clarify the technology and could not figure it out. He was not a technical person and had no knowledge of engineering technology. He could not conduct the meeting where such technicalities are asked and he had given a ruling on it. He could not do it. They could talk of governance. If the members had some issues, they could give the same in writing and he would make it available to the CVO and the CVO could seek the help of technical persons from within or outside the University to examine these technicalities. The statement made by one person about one technology and responded to by any other person on any recent technology he did not have that competence that he could take a call on it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the main objection made in the complaint was regarding not mentioning the quantity of the items purchased. The definition of the rate contract has been mentioned in the Manual on Policies and Procedures for Purchase of Goods (point 14.1) issued by the Finance Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure which is also available on the website of Government of India where specifically it is mentioned that no quantity is mentioned nor any meaning of drawl is guaranteed in the rate contract that will be a rate contract. Secondly, in the same guidelines (point 14.9) special conditions applicable for rate contract (points 2 and 3), it is mentioned that no quantity is required in a rate contract. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua had raised an objection that the price of the air conditioner is more than the market price. In the comparative statement, the prices quoted by the companies in the tender are of inverter technology. The comparative statement has been prepared on the basis of prices quoted by all the

companies. It could be seen from the comparative statement whether the rates are more than the market rates or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that if something had been left out by the CVO, the members could give him writing and he would go back to the CVO.

Professor Anil Monga said that the complaint was that the quantity of the items to be purchased was not mentioned in the rate contract. It was reviewed by the CVO and accordingly the reply was given. They should accept and close the matter. If they had any other issue, that could be discussed separately.

The Vice Chancellor said that the complaint on procedural lapses has been examined. Now it was said that something had been purchased at a higher price. His plea is that he should be told specifically and if the members did not want to give in writing, then whatever the members were saying he would put the same to the CVO and let the CVO take a call on it. The CVO has to be seen as a public office that the money is spent by the University in a proper way. The CVO could also take *suo moto* action. The CVO office also has to have a competence for the society, colleagues *per se*. Whatever they were discussing has to be uploaded on the Panjab University website and the CVO could take notice of the same. Somebody could also say that on the basis of the discussion, the CVO had not taken a call. It is the duty of the members to help in the governance of the University and they have to be very specific and his plea is that they should give in writing whatever they wanted to point out so that the CVO could further follow it up. It is a duty that the members of the governing body should be willing to do. As far as he as a Vice Chancellor is concerned, the University functions on certain procedures. There is a system in place. They have to be seen moving and not go on and on, on this item No. 4. He would like to wind it up. If the members wanted more time, he would come back to this item later on at the end of all the items or could have a one-day special meeting just to discuss this item.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that now the discussion on the item has already started. If it was so, the Vice Chancellor should have said such in the beginning. They could not take it casually.

The Vice Chancellor said that within next 5 minutes, he would like to conclude this item. If it seems that the discussion was not taking place in that manner, they would like to come back on the item again after considering all the items.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that then why they were stretching the discussion.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has to conduct the meeting. The members could give in writing whatever further information they wanted to seek.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Vice Chancellor did not know about the purchases and was taking it very casually.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a day will come when the meetings of the Syndicate would not be held and the Vice Chancellor

would say that whatever the members wanted to say, that should be given in writing to the University. That day is not far off.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was his (Professor Keshav Malhotra's) opinion.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the short time, the matter could have been discussed as Harpreet Singh Dua was not being allowed to speak but being obstructed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would not give anything in writing because earlier in the meetings of the Syndicate, he had handed over two letters to the Vice Chancellor about 4 months back to which no reply was given. In this way, how the work would go on.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, item No. 4 was under consideration and the members should speak on the item and requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to conclude his viewpoints within 5 minutes.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that in a time of 5 minutes, such an important item and lengthy report could not be discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has to conduct the meeting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he was sorry to say that the Vice Chancellor was conducting the meeting in an arbitrary manner.

The Vice Chancellor said, 'alright', it was his opinion.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it was not his opinion but, if not of majority, few of the members of the House. If this was the way the Vice Chancellor wanted to conduct the meeting of the Syndicate, then nothing would come out, if it is planned in such a manner. On the one hand, the Vice Chancellor was saying that he was not a technical person, okay, he is not a technical person. But at least what he has to put in the proceedings of the Syndicate, that should be recorded and sent to the CVO. Why should he submit in writing as what he was speaking was also written? Whatever a members was putting on record in the proceedings of the Syndicate that should automatically be put on his as his writing. Why the Vice Chancellor was insisting on giving in writing.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to conclude the discussion within 5 minutes.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the item could be referred to the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) or the Vigilance and they could submit their replies to the CBI or Vigilance and they would meet the Chancellor.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Keshav Malhotra.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they wanted to find out a way.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they were just seeking the permission of the Vice Chancellor to discuss the item. Due to some

health problem and late by 10 minutes and this is the way the Vice Chancellor was conducting the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that to conclude there is a proposal from a member that the matter should go the CBI, he would take a voting on it and asked Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa for his opinion on it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there should be no voting.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that rather than going to discuss and clinch the issue, whether they approve the item or not with majority.

The Vice Chancellor said alright.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is not so that with majority whatever they wanted to do, could do so. The day is not far off that with majority they would make a man a woman and a woman a man. If they have to take the decision with majority, then for what the members were here.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if everything was right, then let the matter be handed over to the CBI.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should discuss and would solve the issue and it should not be stretched.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that as the Vice Chancellor had already said, the papers could be sent to the CVO.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that why he is being targeted. Is it because he had started the discussion on the item?

When Shri Raghbir Dyal wanted to speak something, the Vice Chancellor said that he had not taken the permission.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice Chancellor had been speaking for hours and they were listening to him but the Vice Chancellor was not ready to listen to the members even for 10 minutes.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had already stated the matter of two reports before the members. Now there were issues arising out of those reports. There is a claim being made or an assertion being made that extra money has been spent. This is a matter for which the office of CVO has been created. Whatever are the proceedings of the meeting, would be made available to the CVO and the CVO could *suo moto* take a call on it. Whatever additional submissions the members wanted to make of specific kind and those arising out of the study of the documents that the members have asked and studied and there were certain things for which they have concern, the members could tell him those specific issues and he would make it available to the CVO and CVO could also take a *suo moto* call on it. If whatever the members gave to him and he has something to add to that, he would make that submission to the CVO as well. Whatever is submitted to him and that desires certain inputs to be sought from the officers of

the University and the people who have handled these matters at some stage and it might be desirable to get an input from the Tender Committee, Purchase Committee, etc. he would make all these things available and if he felt necessary to those officers to provide inputs, he would have it. If, in addition to all these things, there is a desire that the matter should be referred *suo moto* to the CBI, but that is also a call that the government of the University could take. They are the government of the University and not him (Vice Chancellor). He would like the members to take a call on these three things one by one. First, everything would be recorded and stand recorded. Whatever it is, that goes to the CVO as it is *suo moto* and if she wishes to take a call, it is up to her. Second, whatever submissions the members wanted to make, they could give the same to him or even later also.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that now but not later on. They were here as a member of the Governing Body and could not say that without any discussion, they could refer the matter to the CBI.

When Shri Raghbir Dyal wanted to speak, the Vice Chancellor said that let him complete.

On this Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they were not allowed to speak and the Vice Chancellor was going on speaking. Then it is a one man show.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) was continuously disturbing him.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they were appreciating the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to adjourn the meeting for 5 minutes and they could discuss the matter amongst themselves and come back. They could talk amongst themselves.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if the Vice Chancellor was taking the proceedings to the CVO, then why not let the members speak.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they were not saying that there was something wrong but they have raised some points.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had responded to the points.

At this point of time, the meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes.

The Vice Chancellor welcomed back the members. He once again summarized whatever discussion had taken place. He had placed before the members the two reports that had been submitted by the University Committees and the Committees had looked into the matter because a senior Professor of the University made certain issues. Those issues were of two kinds. One was where some aspersions were cast on some of the University officers and the other was as if certain procedures well laid down in the Accounts Manual were violated. It was in that background that the matter was referred to the CVO and the Standing Committee. The reports from both these have come and were before the members. On the basis of the reports which were placed before the members of the Syndicate, they desired certain records. Some records were made available and were found

partial and some more records have been made available. On the basis of those records, there is a concern that typical issues were being raised. He personally could see these things. However, the technical issues needed examination. Anybody could ask for the DVDs and the same could be provided and ultimately the transcript of the proceedings of the Syndicate would be uploaded on the website. In view of this that everything would be in the public domain and it so transpired that the CVO of the University had overlooked anything inadvertently or because the things were not put to her or of technical nature and were not examined and so on. He has stated that the proceedings would be made available to the CVO and CVO could take *suo moto* action on it. This is one proposal. The other one that he made in the light of the assertions that if the matter deserves look by bodies external to the University. This is one of the issues raised by Professor Chopra. That is why the matter was sent to the Prime Minister as if the University bodies were incapable of looking into these things and the matter went to the CVO. It is his understanding that Professor Chopra did not appear before the Committee and he did not appear because he had trust deficit in the Committee. This is his perception. If he would have appeared before the Committee and certain record must have been made available to him. He could have told the CVO about it. He could not say what the CVO would have done. The matter has now come to them (Syndicate). The CVO examines certain things given the competence and experience even with the help of the system. It is not that the CVO has not handled the hostel matters in the past. She has been a Warden of the Hostel and held so many offices in the University. She has done her job. At the moment as far as this report is concerned, he personally felt that there is nothing which says that Syndicate ought not to accept the report. What few members are saying is that the CVO has overlooked something. In the background of this, if Syndicate wants to do something, Syndicate can look at it on the basis of the observations being made by the members or as he (Vice Chancellor) said that the members could make more submissions. As far as handing over the matter to the CBI is concerned, sending a matter to the CBI would desire that ultimately the matter ought to go to the Senate, and then they refer the matter to the CBI. So proceed further, certain specific assertions would have to be made as to why the matter was being referred to the CBI. They have done the investigation. In the background of that investigation, why is it that the matter is being sent to the CBI. Referring the matter to the CBI means inadequacy on the part of the governing body of the University to handle these matters, when the University bodies have looked into it. How many of the Universities have the Accounts Manual as the Panjab University has? They have so much apparatus in place. They are one of the oldest Universities and take pride in being the 4th oldest University in India. He had come to know that the Stanford University was established in 1885. In this way, Panjab University is even senior to Stanford University. The Honours Schools commenced in 1920s. They are an old institution. So, if they say that the matter should go to the CBI, it has to be a very conscious decision. It could not be frivolously said that the matter be sent to the CBI. He could not send the matter to the CBI because few members feel concerned about it or a Professor of the University says that the matter should go to the CBI because the University system is incapable of looking into. He was not the government of the University but all of the members present were the government of the University. If the matter has to go to the CBI, at least the governing system of the University has failed and the checks and balances in the University have failed to address to the

concern. Members have to admit that they have failed as a Governing body, they could not refer the matter just like this to CBI. The CBI would also want to know how is it that the governing body has failed. Otherwise, if the CBI wants to take *suo moto* action, CBI can do so on its own as the matter had already been sent by the complainant to the Prime Minister, to the President, to the Chancellor. There is no governing organ of India which has not been made aware of this matter. They could take *suo moto* action(s) and institute an enquiry into the affairs of the University and they could ask the University, just as a Fact Finding Committee was constituted when ABVP had made a complaint. If asked, we could make available the transcripts of the proceedings of this House *suo moto* to the Prime Minister because the complaint has been put against the University. The Government is already ceased of the matter and could take a call on it. In view of all this, his plea to all the members was that at the moment whatever output the CVO has sent to them, they should consider it. The CVO had done her job as competently as she could do it. If they wanted to add more to her job and if they want that on the basis of today's DVDs, the CVO should take a *suo moto* action, she could take the action. He would appeal to all the members of the governing body singly, collectively to form a small group amongst themselves and assist the office of CVO so that the governance of the University is seen to happen. He was one amongst them, and it was more a responsibility of the other Syndicate members and they should collectively assist the office of CVO for whatever technical help the CVO needs. He would like to the appeal to the members singly and collectively to form a Committee and assist the CVO so that the air is cleared. If the Accounts Manual has to be relooked, for that some proposal has to be made. They have to see that these things should be relooked into.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he must appreciate that the Vice Chancellor had made 3 points which are valid to have this House to discuss. The issue before the House was to consider the reports of the Standing Committee and the CVO. It was very easy to say that the report is passed and it was very easy to say that they did not accept the report. Unless and until they have got the arguments in favour of accepting the reports or against accepting the reports, probably, they would not be doing justice. The first observation made by the Vice Chancellor, in fact, he thought that he would be speaking, the Vice Chancellor spoke, in spite of the fact that as a man of Physics, he (Vice Chancellor) would claim some expertise in the subject of electronics. But when the Vice Chancellor as a man of Physics also says that he is not a technical person, the first and foremost issue probably which seems to have been ignored or may be left inadvertently that both the Committees have not seen as to which Technical Committee had decided these specifications for the items to be purchased because the allegations have been made that the tender has been floated to favour a particular person or to accommodate somebody. They were sure that there was no such intention and nothing had been done. To be on the strongest footing that they should be in a position to put in black and white and see that there was no intention to favour anybody and everything was open, the technical specifications were approved by the technical people and the technical specifications were made only on the basis of leading brands which are available not only in India but abroad also. But if they did not have a technical person while deciding the specifications, then probably it should have been seen by the Standing Committee and the CVO. Secondly, in the report of the CVO, it was mentioned that and

he had specifically asked that if the Vice Chancellor was ready to confirm that all the expenditure made on the purchases had been pre-audited, then the matter was clinched. The Vice Chancellor had said that he was not in a position to respond like this. If the Accounts Manual says that there were some funds which are exempted from pre-audit, he could accept it. In the last para on p. 104 of the report submitted by the CVO, she has referred that if the purchase value is more than Rs.5 lacs, then the case is to be pre-audited from the office of RAO as per rules. This clause is applicable only where the payment with respect to purchase order is to be pre-audited by the RAO. However, in case of hostel funds, the payments are not audited by the RAO. He was not able to find anywhere any such mention that in case of hostel funds pre-audit is not required. Where from the CVO had given this finding, that needed to be looked into. Again, the CVO had reiterated in the last para that the hostel funds are post-audited by the Chartered Accountant on half-yearly basis and CAG annually, if pre-audit system from the RAO as per requirement is not followed in the case of hostel funds. On Annexure-5, p.111, it is mentioned that, quoting the same Rule 27.14.8 'Pre audit of Purchase Case', every purchase case valuing for more than Rs.5 lacs shall be pre-audited by the office of RAO before issuing the purchase order to the vendor. After taking the financial approval of competent authority, the concerned department shall submit the purchase case to the office of RAO through the Accounts Department alongwith duly filled prescribed check list. Here, it is nowhere mentioned that the hostel funds would not be subjected to pre-audit. The report of the CVO on page 102, 1(b) clearly says that non-specifying of the quantity has been ideated to circumvent Rule 27.14.8 (Refer Flag A-5) of the Panjab University Accounts Manual which acts as a pre-audit check/qualifier, by the office of RAO. These are two allegations which have been made probably by the complainant. The two issues which the Vice Chancellor had touched, he would like to respond to the same. To prove that nothing wrong had been done and to say that everything had been done in a transparent manner, the Purchase Committee had also mentioned in the minutes that besides the quotations which were received in response to the tender, the Committee confidentially verified the prices from the market which meant that the mechanism of verifying from the market had been adopted and if the same had been adopted, then there was no question of any such doubt which had arisen in the mind of Shri Harpreet Singh Dua. He was not able to know whether the technology is inferior or superior, whether the technology was mentioned in the technical specifications. If it was not mentioned then who decided which technical specifications they have to accept for the purchase because at the time of purchase also none of the members, all being Hostel Wardens and certifying that such and such desert cooler or water cooler installed at the specific locations meet all the specifications laid down in the tender. He wondered whether a non-technical person after seeing the item could confirm that the item meets the specifications, especially in case of stainless steel or iron where a technical person has to measure the gauge of the item. They did not know whether the technical specifications had been prepared or not and if prepared, who had prepared the same. Instead of referring back to the CVO or any other agency, it is just possible that they could decide that even if CVO had overlooked something, then there is nothing as such which could be concluded that something wrong had been done or they could reach a conclusion that the things needed to be relooked further. He suggested that as Syndicate, there should be a smaller Committee of the Syndicate which should be

constituted here only and that Committee should look into all the gaps and if the Committee feels that the matter be referred back to the CVO, it could be done. But if the Committee feels that there is no such requirement, it could come back to the Syndicate or in both the cases it could come to the Syndicate, referring or not referring so that what the Vice Chancellor had been saying that let them try to send a message that the University is not sitting as a silent spectator, they were looking into it in thorough details so that nobody could raise a finger against anybody. As far as the observation of the Vice Chancellor is concerned that they had some doubt, probably that were unfounded. The Standing Committee while giving the reports did not go to the extent of condemning somebody, they have only to say that the allegations are wrong or not substantiated or not based on facts but the Standing Committee says that his action is condemnable as if Standing Committee was looking into something other than the allegations. The Standing Committee should have left after submitting the report to the Vice Chancellor that these were the findings and it should have been left to the Vice Chancellor or the Syndicate or the Senate to condemn. The Standing Committee had no business to comment that such an action should be initiated. They have to discuss with a view to pose as if they are completely neutral. He wanted to share and wish again that everything to be wrong what is being shown on the paper much more than that in fact is in the public. The people say that you go through the bills and why are they shying away from finding out who is directly or indirectly connected with the firms, who has supplied goods to the University and the basic rule of Accounts Manual is that nobody should be directly or indirectly beneficiary of any of the purchases made by the University. So much so that, he being a member of the Senate, he has to give in writing that he has no business dealing with the University. So, even if it is not mentioned in the Calendar, even if it has been ignored by the CVO, it is duty of the Governing Body to ensure with full confidence at its command to tell the public that whatever had been done, had been done exactly in terms of the laid down procedure. But still if the House says that let them accept the report then probably it is not going to serve the purpose. As suggested, he proposed that a Committee should be constituted of at least 5-6 members and they should look into the issue. Otherwise, even in 10 meetings on such issues, the questions could arise. Let the Committee look into all the aspects. Let the Committee talk to the CVO as there is no other person than CVO. If the Committee feels that they need to have assistance from a legal person because it is surprising to mention by the Finance and Development Officer in one of the communications that the XEN office was asked to supply the air conditioners, which was denied by them. He wondered as to why the XEN office denied. The XEN office should have given some explanation as to why they were incapable of supplying the air conditioners. These things could be looked into with the help of CVO.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that as far as technical specifications were concerned, the University itself has Refrigeration Equipment Repairing Unit (RERU) in the University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology which deals with the repairs of air conditioners since long and they could take the help of those technical persons. As proposed by Shri Ashok Goyal, let them have a Committee of 5-6 members to examine the whole issue, so that the things are made crystal clear. There are 100% chances that everything would be found in order, but if the fingers have been raised, they must try to come clean.

The Vice Chancellor said that how are they able to conclude that the things would be 100% alright.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is just hoping and nothing is wrong in hoping.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that whatever has been pointed out by Shri Raghbir Dyal, it is quite possible that these have not come to the notice of the Committee. There are certain mistakes in the total. Though these have passed through different persons but none is able to point out the mistakes. Therefore, Shri Raghbir Dyal should be heard so that whatever shortcomings/deficiencies he points out, the same could be taken care of and the next Committee or the CVO might not again skip them.

Shri Raghbir Dyal intervened to say he has not pointed out anything rather he has discussed the issue out of record then the meeting was adjourned.

Continuing, Principal S.S. Sangha said that if the cost of a Television is Rs.50,000/-, when they purchase the television in bulk, the cost could be Rs.45,000/- per television but not Rs.60,000/-. Hence, this also needs to be verified. Secondly, they agreed that the CVO has not seen this record, but the person (Professor Chopra) who sought the record/documents, the same was/were not provided to him by the University. How could they accept the report, especially when neither the CVO nor the Standing Committee has seen anything? Shri Raghbir Dyal has put in a lot of labour to identify the shortcomings/deficiencies, which had escaped from the attention of the CVO and the Standing Committee. Therefore, he should be heard and there is no harm in it. He also suggested that a Committee should be formed to examine the whole issue.

Professor Anil Monga said that the Standing Committee has looked into the matter in a specific context. It has also seen whether quantity has been mentioned in the rate contract and submitted the report accordingly. The Committee has not looked into these details because there was no need for that. Whatever points are being raised by the members, the same should also be sent to the CVO so that she could examine the same and submit her report accordingly. Where is a need to constitute a Committee? Whatever was provided to the CVO and the Standing Committee, they examined the same and prepared their reports accordingly. As such, the reports should be accepted.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the background of whatever is being pointed out, the CVO has to take a *suo moto* action.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the CVO and the Standing Committee have prepared the reports on the basis of questions, allegations, etc. made in the complaint. If there are other observations of the members, the same could also be sent to the CVO for examination instead of referring the same to be Sub-Committee suggested to the Dean, College Development Council. Let her re-examine the issue and submit the report.

The Vice Chancellor said that the CVO also needs to examine certain things, and the members of the Syndicate would have to cooperate with her.

Professor Shelley Walia said that specific questions have been asked and the same needed to be answered by the CVO. So let them ask the specific questions.

Professor Anil Monga suggested that the specific questions should be raised here and those could be sent to the CVO.

The Vice Chancellor said that the CVO could also *suo moto* invite these people. After all it is the responsibility of the CVO, and she could ask the members of the Governing Body to assist her in attending to the matter on the basis of whatever they are saying. They should cooperate with the CVO.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the CVO has done whatever she was asked to do. However, if someone has any objection or observation, the same could be sent to the CVO for looking into again.

The Vice Chancellor said that the CVO has also to protect the University as she is an alumnus of the University. She is the first CVO of this University, and she would be seen to be doing and gaining public confidence. So if the CVO seeks help from any of them or whosoever she wishes to, he would make a plea to all to cooperate with her.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether the report of the CVO would come to the Syndicate or not.

Some of the members said that the report would definitely come to the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when the report would come to the Syndicate, some of the members might raise questions/points that this and this has not been covered by the CVO, which would lead to lengthy discussion/process. In fact, they want to avoid this and therefore, as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal, the matter should be referred to a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not the Government of the University; rather, they are the Government of the University and could take a call as to what they want to do. Tell him, what they want to do and he would implement that.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they have been discussing this item for the last about two hours and he does not think that they would be able to complete the agenda even if they continued with the meeting like this for a week. One proposal has been given by Shri Ashok Goyal, one by he (Ranga) himself, and another by the Vice Chancellor. Let the members decide as to what is to be done.

Professor Shelley Walia asked if, they should appoint a Committee?

The Vice Chancellor said that, in fact, they have to decide and not him. If there is disagreement whether to have a Committee or not, his proposal is let the Syndicate refer back the matter to the CVO and assist the office of the CVO whenever she seeks input from them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that neither they are being allowed to speak nor the matter is being referred to the Sub-Committee of Syndics.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could have a parallel to the CVO.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is not saying that there should be parallel to the CVO. What this Syndicate is doing? Are they not discussing the report of the CVO? What he is saying is, on behalf of the Syndicate, he (Vice Chancellor) said that it is not possible, if a small Committee is made, they could suggest whether the matter could be referred back to the CVO with certain specific questions or it does not need to be referred back to the CVO, so that she also gets full assistant. Because there are so many points, if they say that they have to discuss even if the CVO sends the report again, it has to be discussed in the Syndicate only. It is a specific question for which no answer could be given by anybody. So the Committee has to see as she has specifically said "with reference to Rule so and so at page 103, in the case of hostels, the funds are post audited by the Chartered Accountant on half yearly basis. And she is referring to the same rule, which is mentioned at Flag 5, which says that all the purchases are to be subject to pre-audit. Wherefrom she gave this finding with the supporting annexure, which says something otherwise? So instead of embarrassing the CVO, if a Committee of the Syndicate, on behalf of the Syndicate, is able to take a call, and then bring the matter to the Syndicate, refer it back to the CVO; and otherwise, if they say alright whatever they say would be referred back to the CVO, what does it imply.

The Vice Chancellor said that whether they refer it back to the CVO or not, it would become known to her. It is her responsibility to see if there are inconsistencies, and she would take a call on them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that she (CVO) must not have realized that the issue would reach at such a stage. Otherwise, let him tell them that no CVO could prepare such a report in the absence of record. No record has been annexed with the report of the CVO.

The Vice Chancellor said that she would take note of what he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that do they say that they do not accept the report of the CVO, and they do not want to send this signal also. Otherwise, a signal would be there that the Syndicate did not accept the report of the CVO. Therefore, the Syndicate could make a Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter is before them. So far as he is concerned, the CVO has done her job quite competently. If she desires, she could take a call *suo moto*.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, that meant, they are not serious about it. They want to take a call, they want to save the image of the University, they want to do things in camera, they want to discuss the matter amongst themselves, why they are making it unnecessarily public. The CVO has already considered these things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if such issues are also to be decided with majority of 9 to 6, probably they are not going in the right direction.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is nobody to decide and instead they are to decide.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that one should not think that the matter is decided by 9 to 6 because everybody has right to give his opinion.

When Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (Vice Chancellor) is not stopping the members sitting on the other side, whenever they speak at their own, the Vice Chancellor said that it is not correct that he is doing things in a partisan manner. He is asking everybody to be precise by which some progress could be made not just that continuously make accusations right in front of him.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that they should take up the issue and arrive at a decision.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that at least he should be given five minutes to speak.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already given enough time to him.

To this, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that what he has recorded. If he is not to be listened, then he would stand and would not sit till the meeting ends. Every member has spoken for five or ten minutes, including that Dr. Ajay Ranga, Professor Anil Monga, and Shri Ashok Goyal, have spoken so many times, and they have also listened to him (Vice Chancellor) for two hours, whereas he has not been given even two minutes. Neither he could talk technicalities nor about the procedural lapses. They could also not discuss the report.

When a din prevailed, the Vice Chancellor said that he adjourns the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to discuss the matter and arrive at something. Though they have sharp differences, they have to come out of them.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that the matter should be referred back to the CVO along with the observations made by the members.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky requested the Vice Chancellor to take the opinion of each and every member.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not the Government of the University, and the Government of the University is they themselves, i.e., the Syndicate. His duty is to facilitate them to govern the University. They should give him what is to be implemented.

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate should be constituted to look into the entire issue.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that they should do whatever they wanted to, i.e., either form a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate to look

into the entire issue or refer back the matter to the CVO or rejected with majority, but before that he should be given a chance to discuss the issue. So far he has not been able to speak even for a minute on technical and procedural matters. Unless and until the democratic Institution discuss the report, sometimes they accept the report, sometimes they reject the report and sometimes they refer back the report. However, they could not deny a member of the governing body to at least discuss the report threadbare. They have been discussing the report for the last two hours, even if he had been given 8 minutes out of two hours, he would have made certain observations and recorded certain points.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky intervened to say that he should be allowed to speak and then they should take decision.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he should be given a chance to speak so that he is able to record what as an ordinary member of this Syndicate and as an ordinary person without any technical expertise, he has seen certain lacunae on the basis of technical and procedural lapses. He gives the right to the Syndicate either to accept it or reject it or modify it and that is not a matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) has to value everybody's time.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he has not spoken even for a single minutes.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is his duty to conduct the meeting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since morning the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor has taken (all the time).

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) is not allowing even him to speak.

Shri Raghbir Dyal intervened to say that he (Vice Chancellor) has spoken for one hour.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Dyal) is not allowing him to speak even now.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is going to remain standstill.

The Vice Chancellor said that then he has to adjourn the meeting once again, and they would meet after five minutes. If this is the behaviour of a member of the Syndicate who states that he is an ordinary member of the Syndicate. The Vice Chancellor raised the issue of who is a special member of the Syndicate. He stated that, in fact, all Syndicate members are equal. No one is a special member of the Syndicate. He (Vice Chancellor) had allowed him, but he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) does not talk about the issue at hand; rather, he told him (Vice Chancellor) that he himself had done this or that about 4 months back.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had said that because he (Vice Chancellor) had asked him to give in writing.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay", he is given five minutes to speak.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he has only to record certain points. He thanked the Vice Chancellor for giving him time without wasting any time further. His point number 1 should be recorded that whichever Committee had floated these tenders, who were the technical experts, and from where they had got the technical specifications. Secondly, they had differentiated arbitrarily or in an arbitrary manner. On some electronics items, they have mentioned the brand. For example, for LED TV, they have mentioned Samsung, Sony, LG. Similarly, in some items, they have mentioned some brands. But for Sr. No.4, for Water Coolers with full stainless steel body, they have not mentioned the brand. A large number of water coolers have been purchased, but here the branded item is missing. Is it deliberate or something in order to favour someone? Thirdly, the way the tender process has been discussed, it raises doubt. In the case of Sr. No.4 (Water Coolers), 5 tenders from five firms had come. Under the garb of stainless steel body, the quote of Voltas Company was rejected. There were three more companies, who had given the offer of Voltas and technically the tenders of all the three firms could have been rejected. According to that, there would have remained only two tenders out of five. As such, the entire tender process is wrong. Till they have three technically or financial bids complete in all respects, they could not accept the tender and make the comparative note. In case number four, especially the firm "Electro Powers", has been approved by the Committee without any technical knowhow, whereas the branded Voltas has been rejected which perhaps could also provide fully stainless steel body water coolers. How does the Committee know that Voltas does not provide fully stainless steel body water coolers? As such, he felt that there are technical and procedural lapses in it. Thereafter, when they see the bills of these firms, it seems that these bills have been prepared in a hurry. When the meeting was adjourned, he had pointed out to the members certain deficiencies. At page 43, a bill amounting to Rs.39,837/- is attached pertaining to water coolers with full stainless steel body. The amount mentioned in the bill for two water coolers is Rs.78674/-, but if they multiply it with two, the amount comes to Rs.79,674/-. It is true that he showed the total amount Rs.89,000/-.

On a point of order, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he thinks there is an error because ahead the amount is mentioned Rs.39,337/- instead of Rs.39,837/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there could not be such an error in the bill.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is astonished that though this bill has passed through so many hands, and at page 43 the amount mentioned is Rs.39,837/- and on page 51, the amount mentioned is Rs.39,337/-, but nobody detected/pointed out the mistake. If the Finance Department or the Audit Department of the University deals like this, then it is very difficult. The most important thing is that the Fact-Finding Committee of the UGC/MHRD had perhaps got it recorded that the Hostel Funds should be made part of the University Funds. Even after his (Vice Chancellor) statement, he is surprised that these items had been purchased in the months of January and February 2016, and this meant that they did not make the Hostel Funds, the part of the University Funds. If the Hostel Funds are

made part of the University Funds or not, but they did not make the same a part of pre-audit. He does not have an iota of doubt on the Vice Chancellor, but blanket sanctions have been given. He does not know how an officer knows that the University needs 60 water coolers. Without obtaining pre-requisition from any Department, how could they say that they require 100 water coolers or 10 water coolers or they require 10 ACs? In this whole purchase, before floating the tenders, there is no requisition for any Department. After obtaining the rate contract, the Departments were directed or they placed orders, and there are bills of single date pertaining to several Departments. From this, it is crystal clear that perhaps, they have favoured a local manufacturer leaving aside a branded house. His most important point is that an affidavit should be obtained from all the members of this Purchase Committee that they do not have any conflict of interest with any of the firms with whom the orders have been placed, if they want to have fair dealing and want to save the image of the University. So far he has not said this or doubted the integrity of the Vice Chancellor or any other member. He is not doubting the integrity even today, but the way the CVO and Mehta Committee has given the findings without seeing the purchase orders, without summoning any official, etc., he or any other person has a chance to doubt their integrity or raise a finger. It seems that it is a complete eye wash. On the one hand, the Vice Chancellor is saying that he is not a technical person, and on the other hand, he is saying that he does not think that this report should not be accepted. There is a total classical type of dichotomy on the part of the Vice Chancellor on this issue. So whatever he or other members have pointed out, either the same should be referred to a Sub-Committee, and he would not give these in writing as he has pointed out these in the meeting itself and the same should be recorded or it is decided to be referred back to the CVO, the CVO should take notice of whatever he has pointed out.

The Vice Chancellor stated that very serious allegations in some sense stand made and the University has to come out of them. The allegations have been made in the governing body of the University and since people involved are Dean of Student Welfare and Dean of Student Welfare (Women). One of them (Dean of Student Welfare) is the member of the current Syndicate and the other (Dean of Student Welfare (Women)), the member of the previous Syndicate. When Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Dean of Student Welfare (Women) is not involved in the purchases, the Vice Chancellor stated that the University hostel issues are handled by the office of Deans of Student Welfare, i.e., both Dean of Student Welfare and Dean of Student Welfare (Women). They collectively attend to the affairs of the hostels. So whatever has been stated in this House – irrespective whether the matter is to be referred to the Sub-Committee or to the CVO, the CVO has the option to take *suo moto* action on it. He as a Vice Chancellor has to bring it to the notice of the CVO, whatever has been stated in the Syndicate, and he has no other option and he would like to appeal to each of them to cooperate with the office with the CVO, and she would attend to all these. So it is no longer a question that the Sub-Committee would decide.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say as to how the members of the Syndicate would cooperate with the CVO.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that if the CVO called them and ask something, they have to cooperate with her.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that could the CVO call the members of the governing body.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that, if need be, the CVO could seek clarification/s from the members of the Syndicate.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that if the CVO wants, she could meet the member/s of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no need to write to him now as said by him earlier. However, if the CVO seeks cooperation of the any member of the Syndicate or any member of the public, they have to cooperate with her. They could choose, whatever they wish to. It is his request to all of them that if she seeks their cooperation, they should cooperate with her so that the fair name of the University is cleared. If University colleagues had made certain lapses and retribution does not follow, then the public would lose confidence in them. So now, nobody is required to give anything in writing.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the CVO should be made a member of the Sub-Committee suggested by them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not intending to form a Sub-Committee because he would personally put everything to the CVO. If they wished to form a Sub-Committee, they could do so because he is not the Government of the University, and they are. He requested the members to form a Sub-Committee and it would be okay with him. Actually, there are two issues – (i) it is his duty that he has to bring all this to the notice of the CVO; and (ii) for performing his duty, he does not need their permission. The only issue whether they want to form a Committee to provide an input to the CVO or if the CVO needs any cooperation from them, she should be provided the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one issue is that the matter is to be referred back to the CVO and another issue is whether they want to form a Committee to give input to the CVO or individually if she seeks input from any of them, that could be given.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that sometime 14 members come and shadow Syndicates are created. They could form a shadow Committee. He remarked that they should not do new things and form Shadow Sub-Committees. In fact, they should be asked that they should be provided technical support.

The Vice Chancellor said that since they are the Government of the University, they should do whatever they want, they could ask him, as a Chief Executive Officer. Whatever he could fulfil, he would try to fulfil, and he would not hesitate to fulfil their demand. When somebody whispered something, the Vice Chancellor said that the agenda before them comprises 78 items. Whether it takes 78 days to clear the items, it is okay with him. He does not care for the time; rather, he cares for the image of the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they were, are and would be proud of him (Vice Chancellor).

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he really salutes him (Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said that he is committed to his duties and shall do his duties.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they spend a lot of time for felicitating a person and also spend a lot of time to defame a person. If they had any confidence on the CVO, though he does not know the CVO or his/her credentials, they should have full faith in him/her. Whatever observations have been made by the members, the same should be sent to the CVO and if the CVO needs certain clarifications or input, he/she could have from any of them. If the report is to be sent back, whatever amendments are there, the same should also be sent to him/her.

The Vice Chancellor said that the CVO has written the report in the background of certain things. There is a lot of information which is being stated here. Since she would not have been aware of it, she might not have taken cognizance of them. Now, she would see as to what action is to be taken.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the report has been written in view of the points raised in the complaint and also in the absence of the points, which are being raised here. Like Accounts Manual, she has specifically mentioned that the Hostel Funds are not subject to pre-audit. They have to see whether she is right or not. So some facts were there in the complaints and some are being pointed out now.

The Vice Chancellor stated that if there are certain things which they need to do to make their Accounts Manual stronger. In fact, the Accounts Manual was written when they did not have Double Entry System. The Accounts Manual was written when they did not have certain things put in place and those were put in place after the Fact-Finding Committee came into picture, including that the Hostel Funds would be made part of the University Funds. The audit of these things, at the moment, as he understands, is still being done by the Chartered Accountant.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that, that is where the problem is.

The Vice Chancellor stated that right now, it is not being done the way the purchases were being made earlier, but if there is a need to bring in uniformity, that would emerge out of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is uniformity in the Accounts Manual, and there is no exemption.

The Vice Chancellor said that the things would emerge out of it and they should let the things emerge out of it. Now, he personally feels that there is no need of forming a Committee because the matter is going back to the CVO, but Shri Ashok Goyal has said that there should be a Committee and the Syndicate should be seen to be assisting the CVO, on behalf of the Syndicate, if need be. He said that now he wants to conclude and they should opine whether they want to form the Committee.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he is not in favour of forming a Committee.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that there is no doubt that the entire record has been provided to the members. Now, the Hon'ble member/s should not have any objection. The serious allegation, which have been levelled by the Hon'ble member, which is wrong. So far as CVO is concerned, he is in favour of the CVO, and now the case should be referred to the CVO.

Shri Raghbir Dyal intervened to say that he has not levelled any allegation, and has made certain observations only.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that he is of the opinion that the CVO has prepared the report keeping in view certain specific questions, and that should be accepted. But if the House believes, as the Hon'ble members have made certain observations relating to this report and the report of the Standing Committee, he is of the opinion that this matter should be referred back to the CVO along with the observations made by the Hon'ble members. However, no further Committee should be constituted.

Professor Anil Monga endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Ajay Ranga.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu also endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Ajay Ranga.

Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi said that since they should have full faith in the CVO, the matter is being referred back to her. If they did not form a Committee, they would have wider scope to interact with anyone.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he agreed with it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, probably, what he was saying, all the people sitting his right hand side are agreeing more than what he was expecting from them. But he thought that if a small Committee is constituted after looking deeply, if at all, it is required, they could give input; otherwise, no need. But if they do not make a Committee, anybody is free to go to the CVO or the CVO is also free to talk to anybody. That is why, he was giving the suggestion that, on behalf of the Syndicate, there should be a Committee of five persons to look into it and assist the CVO or get it assisted by the CVO also. But he has no problem and he is very sorry that the issue is being given a colour as if some members of the Syndicate have faith in the CVO and some not. He thinks as an Institution, they all have full faith in the Institution of CVO and where is the question of doubting the faith so far as CVO is concerned. So let them not say, if at all, there could have been such things, they could have straightaway said that they do not accept the report of the CVO as the CVO has not acted in a desired manner. The CVO does not have the right to continue as such. Nobody has raised fingers so far as CVO is concerned. It was only suggested so that the CVO would be assisted by way of some members of the Syndicate. But he is happy with this suggestion also that anybody and everybody could approach the CVO and the CVO could also approach anybody.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that so far as faith in CVO is concerned, he has full faith in the CVO, but as a student of management, he just wants to do it in an organized manner because unorganized manner would create problem/s for them again. With the participation management, if the problem is solved with the participation of the people involved, the problem does not rise again and again. Now technically, the few people would come and few not, and the CVO would submit the report accordingly, which would be placed before the Syndicate. When they evaluate the report of the CVO, again certain new points would emerge and the process would continue like this and there would not be any permanent solution. Resultantly, the issue would appear in the newspapers, media, etc., which would tarnish the image of the University. Therefore, they were suggested that the issue be clinched once for all and for that purpose a Sub-Committee comprising 5-6 members of the Syndicate and the CVO should be constituted, which should examine the issue in an organized manner and the University should support the Sub-Committee, which would be better for the Syndicate and the University.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he endorses the viewpoints expressed by Professor Keshav Malhotra that a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate should be constituted to examine the whole issue.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the Sub-Committee comprising 6 members, who are in favour of the constitution of Sub-Committee, should be constituted.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he is extremely pained by the manner in which some policy decision are discussed and voted for and against, particularly when some decisions are linked with some member of the Syndicate or the Senate. He is also pained by the manner in which the Vice Chancellor was counting the numbers. With majority they could not say that 2+2 is 5. With majority they could not pull down the Regulations of the UGC or for that manner any other Regulatory Body. He thinks that this approach is not good for the academic growth of the University. The manner in which some of the very distinguished members of this House have tried to justify the item in defence or opposition to someone is not good. His only observation since morning was that he should be allowed to record some things. It is well within the jurisdiction of House to reject his observations or discuss his observations, but for the last two hours he has not been allowed to speak. His observation, as an ordinary student of mathematics or a very ordinary Fellow or an ordinary human being after going through the papers, is that he feels that these orders are full of procedural and technical lapses. He might be wrong. He does not point towards the integrity of the CVO. She might be doing her job very well, but her previous report has disclosed that she has not summoned the Dean of Student Welfare and she did not ask her for the purchase record; rather she just relied on the statement of the Dean of Student Welfare and forwarded the same to the Finance & Development Officer. The Panjab University, which has got such a name, should not be seen to be conducting the affairs in such a manner. They could accept it or reject it, but his observation is that all the observations made by all the members should go to the CVO, if they are not agreeing to form a Sub-Committee, he has no problem, but they could not deny them the right to discuss it once again.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the matter should be sent back to the CVO along with the observations made by the members.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky stated that his friend Shri Raghbir Dyal has pointed out that certain decisions in this House are taken with the majority. He thinks that the Vice Chancellor has no other barometer to ascertain how to take a decision, especially when divergent views come from different members. The Vice Chancellor has no other option but to go to the members and ask as to what are their views one by one, and he could not ignore the opinion given by the majority of the members. If the majority of the members are in favour of a particular decision, the Vice Chancellor has no option but to take that decision accepting the majority view. There could be difference of opinion, but ultimately the majority view has to be respected and honoured by the Chair. In this case, his opinion is that they should send this matter back to the CVO after accepting the report. She has prepared the report in accordance on the basis of the documents which were provided to her. Whatever the other members have observed and pointed out, they should also examine the same. As suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal, a Committee could be constituted to make the system fool proof, but that should be for future, but not for the case under consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would go back to the CVO with observations made by the members. She has to do whatever she has to do, and he could not direct her to do certain specific things as she has to do her duty. Certain serious things stand stated and she has to take cognizance of those things, and she has no other option. The other thing, i.e., to have uniformity in the purchases being made on behalf of the Hostels and the University, is a separate matter and for that he would form a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate. When Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what the Sub-Committee of the Syndicate would be formed, the Vice Chancellor said that right now it being said that certain procedures are being followed for purchases in the hostels or rest in the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant, they are accepting that they are not following the Accounts Manual.

Vice Chancellor said, "Alright" that is what he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that could be taken care of if the CVO points out certain things.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the new report of the CVO would come to the Syndicate and the previous report, which they had considered is rejected.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is his (Professor Keshav Malhotra) opinion that the report is rejected.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that the report is being referred back to the CVO along with the additional things/information.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that then what else it is. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they have

considered the report and they have found gaps in the report. Even on the basis of facts, which were before her, at the time of enquiry, and not the facts which are being raised/pointed out now, and there are gaps as she says that as per the Accounts Manual, the hostels funds are not subject to audit.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is the opinion of few members that the report is rejected.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra again said that then what else it is. Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is he (Vice Chancellor) who has said this.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that he has not said that, and he urged the member/s not to put words in his mouth. He has not said that the reports of the CVO or the Standing Committee are rejected. In fact, he has said that the reports of the CVO and the Standing Committee are based on certain facts, which were placed before them.

At this stage, a din again prevailed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they are not accepting the reports as they are full of lacunae.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said that he also rejects both the reports.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they accept both the reports.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred back to the Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO) along with the documents supplied by the office in response to the matter arising out of it and with the DVDs of the proceedings of this meeting for consideration. The CVO may seek input from Syndicate members as deemed appropriate and members are urged to cooperate.

Recommendations of the Committee constituted to suggest ways and means to implement reservation/representation in various constituencies of Senate

5. Considered the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee dated 21.04.2016 (**Appendix-XXXII**) constituted to suggest the ways and means with regard to implementation of reservation/representation in various constituencies of the Senate as per UGC guidelines 2006, pursuant to letter dated 07.04.2016 (**Appendix-XXXII**) of O.S.D. to Vice-President of India and letter dated 30.03.2016 (**Appendix-XXXII**) received from Research Officer, National Commission for Scheduled Castes.

NOTE: 1. The UGC vide notification F.1-5/2006 (SCT) dated 25.08.2006 issued guidelines (**Appendix-XXXII**) for strict implementation of reservation policy of the Government in Universities, deemed to be Universities, Colleges and other grant-in-Aid Institutions and Centres. Clause 16 of the said guidelines is reproduced below:

16. Amendments to existing University Acts and Statutes:

Action should be initiated by the Universities so as to effect necessary

amendments to their Acts/Statutes for the statutory support for reservation in admission, appointments to teaching and non-teaching posts and representation of SC/ST in their bodies like Syndicate Executive Council, Academic Council, Selection Committees, etc.

2. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 19.08.2008 vide Paragraph 36 had considered the recommendations of the Standing Committee meeting dated 02.08.2008 constituted by the then Vice Chancellor and it was decided that the UGC instruction dated 25.08.2006 regarding strict compliances of the New guidelines be followed in toto to give effect to the Reservation Policy for SC/ST categories and other constitutional benefits. The same was approved by the Senate at its meeting dated 28.08.2008. The minutes of the Syndicate dated 19.08.2008 and Senate dated 28.08.2008 along with the minutes of the Standing Committee dated 2.8.2008 are enclosed **(Appendix-II)**.
3. In pursuance of guideline 16 quoted in foregoing Para, the reservation in admissions, appointments to teaching and non-teaching posts are being followed. The representative of SC/ST is also appointed as a member of the Selection Committee.
4. The matter is being looked into from the year 2008 by the various committees constituted from time to time by the Vice Chancellor. A fresh committee was constituted in February, 2013 by the Vice Chancellor under the Chairmanship of S. Tarlochan Singh, Ex-M.P., the Committee met on 17.04.2013 and again on 20.11.2013. The Committee had constituted a Sub-Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma.

The Vice Chancellor stated that it was an issue which had been of concern for the governing bodies for long. The issue was that there is a desire of the Government of India, including the Chancellor, that the Governing Council must consider this issue whether there should be reservation for certain category of people in the Senate. The Senate is made up of elected members as well as nominated. There has to be representation for reserved category people as it is there in the other governance structure of the country. It has to be there in the Senate and also in the Syndicate. Firstly, it has to be in the Senate, then it could progress further in the Syndicate. At the moment, the matter before them is that whether there should be

reservation in the Senate. Several Committees were formed and the Committees have followed up for a long time. The Chancellor has stated that this matter needed to be looked into by the governing bodies of the University and some input has to be given to the Chancellor's office by 16th May 2016 of whatever they deliberate today. He had no option but to report to the Chancellor's office tomorrow. The recommendation and report of the Committee meeting held on 21.04.2016 in the form of minutes which is before the members. He hoped that the members must have read through the report and the operative part of the report. He would like to seek the guidance and opinion as to what he should respond to the Chancellor's office tomorrow. He would like to read the resolved part and seek their opinion on it. The resolved part is that two seats for SC and one seat for ST be allocated in order to give representation in the Registered Graduates' Constituency among open seats; one seat be allocated to SC candidate in the constituency of Heads of affiliated Arts Colleges; one seat be allocated for SC candidate in the constituency of Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers of affiliated Arts Colleges; and one SC seat be allocated in the constituency of various Faculties of the Universities. Now, even if they endorse the resolved part, whether it could be implemented for this election or in the election of 2020 that the Government of India has to take a call on it. As of now, they have to go the way they are doing. It is to progress and if the Government of India takes a call and gives them a directive and that directive in some sense is binding on them then they have to do it. They have to consider only the resolved part and whether they accept the resolved part or modify it or reject it. They have to decide something and it is his duty to inform the Chancellor of what they decide today. It is in this background that the resolved part is before them.

Shri Raghbir Dyal while referring to point No. 16 'Amendments to existing University Acts and Statutes' of the UGC Guidelines of 2006 said that it is written that action should be initiated by the Universities so as to effect necessary amendments to their Acts/Statutes for the statutory support for reservation in admission, appointments to teaching and non-teaching posts which meant that it is reservation in admissions and appointments to teaching and non-teaching posts and representation of SC/ST in their bodies like Syndicate Executive Council, Academic Council, Selection Committees, etc. So, as far as the UGC policy is concerned, it is about reservation to the SC/ST in admissions and appointments only and it is just a 'representation' and not 'reservation'. On these guidelines, the Hon'ble Chancellor has sent a notice of the University that how the UGC guidelines with regard to implementation of policy of Government of India in the Universities. But, on the opposite, he was surprised to see the way the Vice Chancellor had constituted the Sub-Committee to suggest ways and means as to how reservation could be implemented in various constituencies of the Senate. He thought that it would have been appropriate on the part of the Vice Chancellor, although it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor to constitute a Committee, to constitute a Sub-Committee to suggest ways and means as to how representation could be given. He did not know why the Vice Chancellor had deliberately framed the topic of the Committees that how reservation could be implemented in various constituencies of Senate pursuant to letter of April 25, 2016. In the letter, it is nowhere mentioned. It is only about the implementation of Article 16 of the Constitution of India. This was his first observation. The second observation was that as far as he was concerned, it is all

about the 'representation'. The Panjab University Act is designed in such a way to give representation to all people and those people could come from any constituency. He sticks to his stand that it is just about 'representation'. After the conclusion of the Senate election, they should see as to how many people from these categories come and they could write to the Chancellor informing that these categories have got this much 'representation' and it is for the Chancellor to decide how the remaining 'representation' could be made. This is all he wanted to say and it is all about 'representation'.

Professor Shelley Walia said that there is a conflict between 'reservation' and 'representation'. If they look at the two words – 'representation' and 'reservation', he was of the opinion that that when they were considering the teaching and non-teaching posts, they always talk in terms of 'reservation' same is in any other University of India. When they look at the higher bodies – Syndicate and Senate, there would be only 'representation' or 'representation' decided by the Chancellor as he (Chancellor is already doing in terms of the Senate. His position is quite clear that he considered reservation in terms of teaching and non-teaching posts. But in terms of higher bodies, i.e., the Senate or Syndicate, he thought that it is very clear that it is 'representation'.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that he would favour the recommendations made by the Committee headed by Principal Gurdeep Sharma. There is no doubt that the reservation in admissions and employment has been given. But the reservation or representation of SC/ST/BC in the Syndicate/Senate and other governing bodies is not there. There is no difference between reservation and representation and both are the same thing. These recommendations should be implemented as it is. But at the time of implementation, he would like to say that earlier also a Committee under the Chairmanship of S. Tarlochan Singh was formed which had submitted its recommendations, the same should also be looked into. A reservation of 2.5 percent for socially backward castes has been provided in the Calendar, it should also be kept in mind while recommending the reservation. What he wanted to get recorded is regarding nominations. Supposing if the reservation is not implemented from this year, he would suggest that the Hon'ble Chancellor may be requested to give proper representation to the SC/ST/BC/minorities/women/physically handicapped persons in the nomination.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this Committee was constituted for strict implementation of the reservation policy of UGC Guidelines of 2006. These guidelines were accepted by the Panjab University in the year 2008 in toto. Regarding whatever objections relating to representation and reservation have been given by Shri Raghbir Dyal and Professor Shelley Walia, he would like to make this issue very clear that under Article 15, sub-clause 4 and under Article 16, sub-clause 4, it is clearly mentioned as to what is representation. Meaning of the representation is adequate representation and this adequate representation means whatever representation has been quantified which is 15% for SC and 7.5% for ST. Secondly, in addition to all these things, Article 12 of the Indian Constitution is specifically mentioning that the University is a State. Article 330 provides for reservation in the Central Legislative Assembly where elections are to be held. Article 332 provides reservation in State Legislative Assembly. Article 243T provides reservation in Panchayat

and Local Self Government elections. The University being under Article 12 and moreover with regard to the objections raised by members, he cited the UGC Act of 1956, section 20, sub-clause 2 of which says the directions by the Central Government where this sub-clause specifically mentioned that if any dispute arises between the Central Government and the Commission as to whether a question is or not a question of policy relating to the national purpose, the decision of the Central Government shall be final. In this case, no doubt, the word 'representation' has been used by the UGC, but it is the Constitution of the Central Government and the benefit is being given to these communities. So, neither the UGC guidelines nor the Panjab University Calendar could be above the Constitution. He was of the firm opinion that the 'reservation' policy be implemented in toto whatever Central Government has implemented for conducting other democratic elections in India. Secondly, in addition to the reservation for SC/ST, he was of the opinion that the women, minority, disabled people and other stakeholders, who are not duly represented in the governing body should be given due representation through specific quantified reservation.

Professor Anil Monga said that the matter before the House has come out of the letter which they received from the Chancellor's office that the Government of India and UGC guidelines should be strictly enforced. Para 6 of the UGC Guidelines of 2006 says that they should be give reservation in admission and for teaching posts which they are following. There is a reference in Para 16 that they should amend the Act for making representation to the SC and ST in the bodies. They could ensure this representation in two ways either through election or nomination. Since the election process has started and if they want to implement the recommendations of the Committee, perhaps there would be problem in implementing because they were receiving demands from other quarters also. When they see the other Universities, there is no such representation in the higher bodies in those Universities. While looking the reservation in other Universities, he found that the University of Madras had tried and had used the word that if they were not adequately represented, then so much percentage of reservations could be there. While reading the minutes of the Committee, he found that Dr. Jagwant Singh had given a suggestion that in the nomination forms, a column asking for the caste should be inserted by they could come to know about the representation of those categories and if representation is not adequate, then they could approach the Chancellor with a request that those categories be given adequate representation.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that as Professor Anil Monga has said that if they give representation, there could also be a demand for reservation to other categories like defence, borders areas and other categories would also have to be considered. If the representation is given as per the election, it is right. Otherwise, since the Chancellor makes the nomination of 36 members, they could recommend if those categories are not represented during the election. It would be better that the Chancellor could make the nominations. They would have to follow the other reservation policies also.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the already existing policy at national level is not fruitful. The purpose behind the reservation was that those who did not have the economic and social means to uplift them, it was an instrument to uplift them. It was introduced for 10 years in the Constitution. With the passage of time

for political compulsions, it was being extended. If they have a cursory look on the reservations, it could not largely uplift the people. Even today, maximum number of people are not getting the benefit of reservation. For that, there are many suggestions and he had supported that if a person had got the benefit of reservation policy, then next time that benefit should not be given to that person and instead should be given to some other person which would have been better. So before taking a decision on any policy, they should see the pros and cons and there could be a judgment. When they are talking about the election or representation through reservation, the Delimitation Commission for electoral process could be after 10 years, but it is being done after 15-20 years, in which it is to be seen as to what is the number of the voters in that constituency. Accordingly, the reservation is given in that area. If in a constituency, supposing they have 25% people of that category, then they have to give representation to the persons to be elected as 25%. Again in the Graduate Constituency, how could they collect the data. The election process has already started, they could not change.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a separate issue. The Chancellor is asking the opinion if representation has to be given to the reserved category people of SC/ST then how and what it could be given. This was the question which had been posed to the Committee and the Committee had suggested something. As far as the question by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa was concerned, that was not the matter under consideration. The matter under consideration was how to give and how to satisfy that the SCs/STs are represented in the Senate of the University. Only if those categories are in the Senate, they could progress to the Syndicate. It looked to him that the way the Chancellor was pleading and wanted suggestions from them and wanted the opinion that how representation has to be given in the Senate because election to the Senate is for 49 members. If it is to be given out of 49, how many and in what way, what is the algorithm. The way the Chancellor was writing and the way he was demanding from them, to him (Vice Chancellor) it looked like that when it would come to nominations, he (Chancellor) would ensure it on his own and would not ask them. So, let them not get into the nuance of representation. The Chancellor has asked their opinion and a Committee has given an algorithm. What is their view whether they would like to endorse it or modify it or they should write to the Chancellor who could take a call as they were unable to give any more suggestion than what the recommendation has come? If they have more wisdom and want to modify they could do it. Or they give a right to the Chancellor stating that these are the recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor and the Chancellor could take a cognizance of them. If they do not have more wisdom and do not want to modify the recommendations, then he would like to recommend that the matter should be left to the wisdom of the Chancellor. Whether it is representation or reservation, they could say that, in principle, they would be happy if there is representation of SC & ST in the Senate, and while it happens via the election, it has also to happen via nominations. This is a simple question before them.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa every theory is that whatever be the philosophy it has a shelf-life as it has time. This is the time when they should not go back to the reservations. What he personally feels is that if they take one example that any person coming from reserved categories and getting benefits out of that and

his/her children getting the same benefits. What about those persons sitting inside who has not access to those benefits. His point is that the time is changing when everybody is saying that it might not be very bigger, but the reservation policy at national level needs to be on economic basis.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Randhawa) could have general discussion, which might not come to an end for hours. He asked him (Dr. Randhawa) whether he is in favour of the recommendations of the Committee or against.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the Chancellor wants to give representation or proper representation to any part of the society, he could do so while making the nominations because the nominations are made by him at last. He could see in the results whether they are properly represented or not and thereafter make nominations.

The Vice Chancellor said that this has come from the elected persons. So he (Dr. Randhawa) should tell him (Vice Chancellor) whether he (Dr. Randhawa) agrees with the recommendations or not. He is asking a very precise question and he requested Dr. Randhawa to give the answer.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he does not feel that elected people could contribute more and the nominated less. If there is no representation to SC/ST, the Chancellor would give representation to them even to the extent of 40%. On further asking by the Vice Chancellor, he said that does not agree with the recommendations of the Committee.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that he agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be through nomination, especially when it is representation.

Professor Anil Monga said that it should be through nomination, and if after election it is felt that the representation of SC/ST in the Senate is not there or it is inadequate, the Chancellor could nominate persons from these categories.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that it should be through nomination.

Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi said that it should be through nomination.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it should be through nomination.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he wonders why the Committee, while recommending, as Dr. Ajay Ranga has in a very-very precise manner explained the representation means reservation. Had the representation meant reservation, he wonders why the Government of India would have used two words in the same sentence. They are saying reservation in the case of admissions, appointments to

teaching and non-teaching posts and representation of SC/ST in the bodies like Syndicate, Executive Council, Academic Council, Selection Committees, etc. So reservation and representation are to different things. Secondly, on the basis of the instructions of the Government of India, which have been received by the University via a letter from the Chancellor's Office, that also speaks of the same policy, and he wonders wherefrom they have constituted the Committee converting it from representation to reservation. Probably in the light of the policy of Government of India and the UGC, the simple answer, as they are asking for the status report, it should be clearly written to the office of the Chancellor or for that matter any authority in the Government that Panjab University is strictly complying with the reservation policy of Government of India as enumerated in such and such policy.

The Vice Chancellor asked what about his (Shri Goyal) opinion on the recommendations of the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, obviously, "no".

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it should be referred to the Senate Reforms Committee as the same is looking into the amendment/s in the Act/Regulations because it is also part of the Act/Regulations. If it related to nomination alone, then it is in the hands of the Chancellor. It is not that one Senate reform they do now and the other/s later on. Therefore, they should refer this issue to the Senate Reforms Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that a limited question has been posed to them, and they should answer the same.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is simply saying that it is not a one time exercise.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, they have written, "I am also directed to convey that a status report on the steps being taken to implement the above may kindly be sent to this office at the earliest". As such, they could write to them that the matter has been referred to the Senate Reforms Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay". He is asking a question – does he agree with the recommendations of the Committee or not. When Professor Keshav Malhotra did not give answer, the Vice Chancellor said that if he does not want to opine, it's fine.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that actually what does he mean is that in the present form it should not be accepted and it should be referred to Senate Reforms Committee.

On a point of order, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Professor Keshav Malhotra wants that this issue should be referred to Senate Reforms Committee. In fact, the recommendations of that Committee would also come to the Syndicate. Why he (Professor Malhotra) wants to refer it to other way.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that why he is suggested so because they (Senate Reform Committee) might recommend increase or decrease in the number of Senate members, with which the number of elected members might also increase or decrease. Instead of doing it in a piece manner, they should do it in one step.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the recommendations of the Committee should not be accepted.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that he is also not in favour of accepting the recommendations of the Committee and at the same time, if representation to SC/ST is to be given through nomination, one person should also be nominated from the rural areas.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he does not accept the recommendations of the Committee in the present form.

Principal B.C. Josan said that whatever their (SCs/STs) rights are, the same should be given to them.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky stated that once an election process has started, and the Vice Chancellor intervened to say that it is a separate question. Then Shri Lucky said that due representation of SCs/STs should be there in the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor stated that this is a matter to which they would remain seized of. They have also received letters from National Commission for SC/ST. They are also saying that they are concerned that there is inadequate representation of SC/ST in the governing body of the University, and the governing body of the University is the Syndicate. So this process has to commence from the Senate itself. The Senate has both elected as well as nominated people. The opinion has been asked by someone who nominates people, and with which urgency he has asked, they have to assume that he also would have urgency in view of the impending constitution of the new Senate six months from now that he would like to give to that community. What he would give, depends on their answer. At the moment, a fraction of the Syndicate members say that representation should be given in some algorithm way, and they are in minority, but they endorse whatever has been placed before them. His personal opinion is and the National Commission for Scheduled Castes is also saying "... Please take notice that in case the Commission does not receive reply from you within the stipulated time, the Commission may exercise the powers of Civil Courts conferred on it under Article 338 of the Constitution of India and issue summons for your appearance in person or by a representative before the Commission". They are not asking for particular opinion; rather, they have asked for their opinion. As such, what would be decided by the house, the same would be sent to the Commission. Thereafter, they would take action whatever they deem fit. However, his personal opinion is considering that the Chancellor appears convinced that there should be representation of SCs/STs, it would better if they give algorithm as to what representation should be there even amongst the elected members. Election process has started, and whether it could be done this time or in 2020 or thereafter, only time would tell. At the moment, an opinion has been sought from them and they must give that. In the background of this, their own colleagues after a lot of deliberations and looking into all the things, including whether there should be reservation or representation, have given an algorithm. In that meeting also several questions have been raised and despite that they have given majority opinion in the form of resolve part. So he would make a plea that whatever they have said is being recorded and would go to him, but if they could endorse this resolved part, it would help the Chancellor in ensuring that Panjab University is seen to be applying to the national norms and the representation is being given

pro-actively. It is quite possible that it is not there in all the Universities, and it might be some Universities and not in some others. His personal opinion is that they should endorse it; however, he is only one member out of 18.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it could only be done in 2020 and not in 2016. Therefore, it would be proper to refer it to the Senate Reforms Committee.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the resolved part needs comprehensive deliberation as it is incomplete and there are several things which needed to be looked into.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the Committee did not see anything. If this opinion which is there in the recommendations of the Committee, is sent, he wonders what the Chancellor's office is going to think of the Syndicate and the Senate. They have not bothered even to see whether the reservation could be implemented, and if yes, how and if no, why.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if they look at the UGC Rule at page 33, it clearly says only representation for the Syndicate and Senate, and does not say reservation at all.

The Vice Chancellor said that since the Syndicate is made of Senators, representation in Syndicate would be there, only if representation is there in the Senate, and the Senate comprises elected as well as nominated people. Therefore, he personally believes the representation should be there in both separately.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it a good suggestion that it should be referred to Senate Reforms Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since it is a change of Act, the Syndicate and Senate are not competent to do so.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice Chancellor has taken opinion from all and the majority is saying that it is representation and they need comprehensive deliberations. So it should be written to the Chancellor that after the election they would provide him the list of elected persons, and if he sees that there is inadequate representation of these categories, he could nominate persons from these categories.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the letter the Chancellor's office has also written, "... In this regard, you are requested to kindly send us an update on the procedure for election of the Panjab University Senate incorporating measures for adherence to the UGC guidelines on the implementation of reservation policy of the Government it is requested that this matter be treated with utmost urgency and the University Administration should take immediate steps to bring about required changes in the governing bodies of the Universities to bring them in compliance with the UGC guidelines on the implementation of reservation policy of the Government. An annexure with the timeline for various events/process including the incorporation and changes to be made in Panjab University Statutes with regard to the UGC guidelines may also kindly be sent". They could also say that they have already constituted a Sub-Committee, to which this issue has been referred to, and the Sub-Committee might

consider the algorithm given by the Committee. The transcript of today's Syndicate meeting should also be sent to the said Sub-Committee.

Dr. Ajay Ranga drew the attention of the House towards Section 72 of Punjab Reorganization Act, 1966, which is a part of Punjab University Act, especially to Sub-Sections (1), (2), (3) and (4) at pages 15 and 16 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. Clause (1) at page 15 says that it is a body corporate constituted under a Central Act, State Act or Provincial Act ... subject to such directions as may, from time to time, be issued by the Central Government, until other provision is made by law in respect of the said body corporate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Central Government could always issue the directions, and there is no dispute about that.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in 2008, many letters especially to Registrar, Panjab University, were written by the UGC for implementing the reservation policy where no word 'representation' had been used. It has been specifically mentioned in those letters, which are lying in the official record, that central reservation policy of Government of India be implemented in Panjab University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not only in 2008, even now whether it is the office of the Chancellor or UGC or National Commission for Scheduled Castes or for that matter any other authority, whatever letter has been written to Panjab University, they are talking about only implementation of reservation policy of Government of India, and in reservation policy of Government of India everywhere they have used the word 'reservation' except where the governing bodies are concerned they have used the word 'representation', which automatically means that there is difference between the words 'reservation' and 'representation'.

To this, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is not automatic. Clause (4) of Article 15 representation means adequate representation, i.e., reservation, which means quantify and it has been decided in many judgement.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if they go by the UGC rules, the whole document contains the reservation except in places of Syndicate, Senate, Executive Council, Academic Council, etc.

The Vice Chancellor stated that were they against implementation of reservation policy or do they not want adequate number of SC/ST categories persons amongst themselves. In fact, they do want, but they do not know how to implement it because election happens in various constituencies, and they are in a fix as to how to distribute it. They would give an algorithm and there would be hundreds of algorithms. One could argue that in this 49, everything should be allowed to remain as such, and he should cover it in his 36 nomination, and this could be one view, the other view is that, in principle, it should also be in 49, but they have no way to suggest as to in which manner it should be. Their own Committee has suggested an algorithm, they have no agreement amongst them, and this is the only way to do it. At the same time, they do not want to send a message as if they are against the national policy of they being inclusive. They would say that they welcome being inclusiveness of the body, and this what the UGC and SC/ST Commission say. They

want them to be inclusive, but how they should be inclusive, they have no algorithm to suggest at the moment to them. They feel that this matter should be referred to a body which is looking into these things, which could come up with an algorithm, and the same is another way. Are they unanimous that their body should be inclusive, and if they have an agreement that it should be inclusive, that is one view. Now, inclusive in totality, and if totality has some parts, and the inclusiveness should be ensured by sub-parts separately or there is a part, where there is nomination, where only one person is the deciding factor. The one person looks at the things how the 49 have been elected because the Chancellor nominates only when the list of 49 elected persons is before him as he does not make nominations without the knowledge of 49 elected persons. As such, one view is that they want the system to be inclusive and let 49 remain the way it is and when the Chancellor uses his discretion to make it inclusive.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since the reservation policy is being implemented in all the affiliated Colleges, the teachers from reserved categories are available, and they are representing in the Senate. Similarly, they are also representing the "Principals' Constituency" and also in the "Registered Graduates' Constituency".

The Vice Chancellor said that there should be statistics in place as to how many SC candidates were there on the Senate during the last 4-5 terms.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that tomorrow there could be a position where the SC/ST candidate could become a member of the Senate with less than half percent of votes. That are not SC/ST candidates, but they should discuss it logically. Tomorrow a SC/ST candidate could become a member of the Senate, by securing only 50 votes. That is why, he is saying this report is full of lacunae.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there are no Scheduled Tribes in the State of Punjab.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu remarked that when the persons from these categories have become Assistant Professors or Associate Professors or Professors, how they have become weaker. In fact, they are getting equal salary to them. Whosoever is taking the benefits of reservation, they do not belong to weaker sections. As such, there is no need for any reservation or representation.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that wherever reservation was required, it has been given at the initial level. If it is allowed, they would also demand reservation in hostel facility.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the UGC even provides money for construction of hostels for SC/ST students and so on, and whenever the money is given to them by the UGC, they accept those conditions. Therefore, they should understand the spirit and the spirit is that they should be seen to be inclusive. If they have to be seen to be inclusive, their inclusiveness could come via Chancellor making the nomination after getting the results of 49 elected members or they could say that since they are already looking at their Act as they wish to make changes in it, and the report goes to them, and they make certain changes in the Act instead of them (Syndicate) making the changes or opining on it, and then the matter goes to them, and that is another way. The Senate Reforms Committee could

accept this algorithm or suggest another algorithm or they could also say that there is no need for them to give the algorithm and let it be decided by the Government.

Professor Shelley Walia said that many universities have done that.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since a picture is being created that none of the 49 elected members belonged to SC/ST/BC categories, he would like to inform that four persons from these categories are there in the present Senate, i.e., two from Teachers Constituency and two from Principals' Constituency. How much more would they like to do? Similarly, persons from these categories are also representing in Registered Graduates' Constituency.

The Vice Chancellor said that then he has to collect the data to ascertain as to how many persons are there on the Senate who belong to reserved categories. In fact, they should say only those things, which appear to be intellectually valid. Everything said by them should have reason/s so that they are not to be seen as if the governing body of the University wants to swim against the tide.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Vice Chancellor should collect the afore-said data and it should also be kept in mind that the decision could not be taken like this. The reservation policy of Government of India is applicable for the purposes of admissions, appointments to teaching and non-teaching posts and there is no dispute about that. But he thinks that it is very well within the knowledge of Dr. Ranga that here in Panjab University, they could not make any appointment against the post reserved for ST. It is stayed by the Punjab & Haryana High Court. If reservation, which is specifically mentioned in the Government of India policy, could not be implemented, could they take such a decision that certain seats be reserved/allocated for SCs/STs? So that is why, he is saying that the Committee would look into all the aspects. In fact, they are already inclusive in the category of elected members also with regard to which the data could be collected and supplied along with this algorithm and the opinions of the members to the Committee. The order of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court staying the appointment of ST and the data relating to other Universities along with the policy of Government of India itself could also be supplied to the Committee. Thereafter, they could look into the same and ultimately it has to come to the Syndicate only. He (Vice Chancellor) is right, they could also say that their hands are tied, and the Chancellor could himself take necessary action at the time of making nominations. He remarked that Dr. Ranga was a member of the Committee, which has recommended that a seat be allocated to STs. Could they give it in view of the High Court?

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that at least they should put it in process.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could not put anything in process which is in the High Court.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that, that is relating to appointments only.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the appointments, which are provided in the reservation policy of the Government, could not be

approved, and they are trying to do something which is not specifically provided.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are all India University, and all India in the sense that it is not necessary their Graduates' Constituency should only be from the State of Punjab, and instead it could be from Haryana, Delhi and so on. So it is quite possible that there are Scheduled Tribes in those areas. As such, it is a larger question, on which some larger body could take decision. It is, in fact, the Government of India, which could take a call on it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they have also to see as to how many ST students have been enrolled with this University. It is quite possible that there are only 50 students belonging to ST category, and they are ready to give a seat for those 50 students. That is why, he is saying that his Committee report is full of lacunae.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should understand that when the Committees sit, they do a competent job as well as they can. They could find fault in every recommendation. They should also appreciate something which is positive. There is nothing perfect in this world.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that according to this election could not be conducted.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he would say that there are serious errors in the statement made by one of the members of the Committee which existed in this report, which is against the spirit of their Constitution. The statement says that the reservation should be provided in all Constituencies, and there is no problem in it, but the second line says "only SC/ST candidates should cast vote for reserved seat". He thinks that this statement should be withdrawn.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he has made this statement. He would again like to make that statement and tell them as to why he had made that statement and under what were the circumstances. In fact, every member was arbitrarily saying that no reservation should be there, and then he demanded this that there should be reservation and only SC/ST candidate should vote for reserved candidates.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked as a student of Law, this statement was not expected from Dr. Ranga. In 1909, Minto Morley Reforms came in their country, and there was provision for separate electorate for Muslims, which were rejected by the father of their Constitution.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) has a very small knowledge about this because those reforms were brought by the British Government and Gandhi Ji sat on the hunger strike, which resulted into creation of Poona Pact, and the Minto Morley Reforms were withdrawn.

A din prevailed.

The Vice Chancellor said that he thinks that they should not send a message that they are against being inclusive.

To this, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they are not.

The Vice Chancellor said that they only have an issue because they did not have an algorithm how to become inclusive. Because they did not have an algorithm, they do not have agreement as to how it could be made inclusive, but they are not against inclusiveness whether it is ST plus ST or it should be only SC.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the data for the last 5 Senate elections should be collected to ascertain as to how many SC/ST candidates have become members of the Senate. If the number is higher, they are already representing in the Senate.

To this, Dr. Ajay Ranga remarked that even if SCs/STs have become members of the Senate, they had not become as a matter of right. They have, in fact, contested the election and won. As such, they have not become members as a matter of right as no concession is being given to them.

On a point of order, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the basic reason for providing the reservation was to give reservation to the people, because people were not allowed to come forward due to suppression. If some part of the society has already been given this right, it is not right to give them more right. In fact, it is in favour of the University that they have already given them the right, which they wanted to give.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that do they not have faith in the national reservation policy, which is provided in the Indian Constitution.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they are not against it, but they do not want that a situation arise that in the 80,000 Registered Graduates' Constituency, a reserved category candidate represents only 50 students. In this way, one would become a member of the Senate with a very few votes. It should be an adequate representation of votes. With just 2% of the votes, a person could get elected from the Registered Graduate constituency.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had there been any such occasion that they were violating the Constitution of the country or the laid down law of the country, the Government of India would have immediately issued directions under section 32 of the Constitution. Since there was no violation of the Constitution of India and it is not only Panjab University but other Universities also, no University has done this. So, that meant that the other Universities were free to do anything which is illegal and Panjab University is the only which is not a position to confirm while applying the reservation policy of Government of India. It is very easy to say 'yes', they were for the inclusive concept to be introduced in Panjab University. However, there was no such provision of reservation as far as election to the Senate was concerned which proposal had been sent to whatever body. But since they were for inclusive governing body, the Chancellor might take care of it while making the nominations. To say that they were violating the Constitution, to say that whatever was available under the Constitution and how that could be denied, that probably is too harsh and he would like to tell that there was no authority in the Government of India that if they were violating, they could let the University go scot free.

Professor Shelley Walia emphasized that they were not violating at all, if they support to the rules which says representation and the representation is made in the Senate.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they were not violating anything at all. Even if the women are not adequately represented, then the Chancellor has the option to nominate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Section 20 Sub-Clause 2 specifically says that if there is a contradiction or conflict between the UGC policy and the Central Government policy, then the Central Government policy would prevail. The Central Government policy provides for reservation of 15% for SC and 7.5% for ST.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether it was in the academic bodies. If it was so, then Dr. Ajay Ranga should have appended the same with the reports.

The Vice Chancellor said that he personally felt that there should be 15% of the elected members from the SC category. But they have no algorithm as to how to do it. Let the matter be decided by some other body that meant that the Committees which were looking after the reforms to be done in the Act and the Regulations. Could they in principle agree that it should be 15% amongst the elected as well as nominated members. But they did not have any algorithm and they could have a data for the last 4 elections and could appeal to the Chancellor that for nomination of 36 members, he could do maximum nominations so that the adequate representation of SC category is there on the Senate. If the Chancellor has a solution, he could do it and who are they in the matter.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the matter could go to the Senate Reforms Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in fact they were trying to say that in principle they agree that 15% should be there from elected members of the Senate, wherefrom this has come.

The Vice Chancellor said that because they have been asked that there should be adequate representation of that category.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired where it was written that adequate representation by way of election. So, let them not say that 15% of the elected category also. Let the Reforms Committee see whether they were already inclusive or not, let the Committee whether they were violating the Constitutional provisions and in the meantime, if the Chancellor or the Government of India is in a hurry to ensure that representation to this extent has to be made, then who stops them from nominating all people from that category. There is no bar. What he was saying was that they were also not against reservation but they were not above the law of the country. If the law of the country did not provide specifically to provide reservation on the governing body and they were specifically saying for appointments, admissions, hostels, etc., and they were conscious of the fact that they have not put the reservation as far as the governing bodies are concerned, then they are not above the law. The Vice Chancellor was right that even if the Government had not provided for, they could go for that. They were also not barred and could give more than that. So, it was only in that spirit that they were still saying that it could be given. Let them

presume that if they approve the recommendations of the Committee and the output is to be given tomorrow.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Chancellor's office has only asked about the opinion.

Continuing Shri Ashok Goyal said that supposing that the Government says that it has been decided and implement it in the 2016 itself and when it would come for implementation to the Registrar, who would say how it is to be implemented, then the Government could say that it was proposed by the University and they did not know that the University had not done the home work. There were so many things in it which probably is impossible to do unless and until they look into the minute details how the election is to be taken care of even if for a moment they could say that they had done it. The other corresponding things in the Calendar would also have to be changed which could be taken care of by the larger Committee which is already looking into the reforms.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not the first time that the Committee has given the output. The University had been giving a thought to this matter for a long time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee had not recommended that it is to be implemented from the present elections.

The Vice Chancellor said that this issue had come earlier also. The Committees were formed and that is a separate matter whether the meetings were held or not. It was in that background that the algorithm was prepared.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the directions could have come under section 72 of the Punjab Reorganization Act.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Shri Ashok Goyal must have knowledge being the senior most member of the Senate as to how many members of the SC/ST category have represented on the Senate and on the Syndicate which governs the University as well as the affiliated Colleges. Could he be told the name of any ST candidate who had represented in these Houses and also the year wise number of SC members of these House?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier the reservation in jobs was not there. Now the members of these categories also come through election from the University about 4 in number which is 25% of the total members. Now, the reservation is also being followed in the Colleges, which was not there earlier. With the result, the number of the voters and the contesting candidates is more than earlier. Earlier the candidates of these categories were not available. Even in the Registered Graduate constituency, some SC candidates are also contesting.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he wanted to have a record of SC candidates on the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would get the record collected. Concluding, he said that they received this and by and large all feel that they should be inclusive but have no agreement on the algorithm. They also have no agreement whether it should be

implemented via elected separately. But they were all for inclusiveness and this matter is referred to the Sub-Committees for suggesting reforms in the Act and the Regulations. In the meanwhile, the Chancellor could use his option of providing representation to SC candidates as the results of the elections of this year would reach him.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested that it instead of representation the word reservation should be used.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that Dr. Ajay Ranga could record his dissent on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that Dr. Ajay Ranga also knows that there is a difference between reservation and representation.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he was asking for the fundamental rights.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have made their points and somebody has to find a solution and they were not in a position to find out a solution but not against finding out the solution.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are also not against.

The Vice Chancellor said that he just wanted to find a solution.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that instead of referring the matter to the Reforms Committee, a committee of the Syndicate members could be formed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it should be referred to the Reforms Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not against it.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in the governing bodies, there is no word of reservation and it is only representation and about which they could take a decision at any time.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they are not against the inclusiveness but the present algorithm has some lacunae and they could not accept it. The matter should be sent to the Senate Reforms Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the matter go to the Senate Reforms Committee.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if the Chancellor thought that these categories are not represented, he could make the nominations.

The Vice Chancellor said that, in view of the discussion held so far, he would like to propose that they would collect the data pertaining to members of the Senate relating to the last four terms of the Senate, i.e., 2000 onwards, to ascertain as to how many persons from SC/ST categories were there on the Senate. After the collection of the data, they would be able to ascertain by and large as to whether they are inclusive as they have no agreement on the algorithm

recommended by the Committee and also whether it should be implemented in 'Election' or 'Nomination' separately. However, they are for inclusiveness and that this matter be referred to the Sub-Committee constituted to suggest amendment/s in the Act and Regulations, and in the meanwhile, the Chancellor could use his option for providing representation to SC/ST categories while making nominations as the results of elections would reach him.

RESOLVED: The Panjab University to have inclusive policy in the Governing Bodies of the University regarding the representation of reserved categories in consonance with the UGC guidelines and reservation policy of the Government. However, the matter be referred to two already constituted Governance Reforms Committees to recommend the modalities for implementation of the same.

At this stage, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that majority of the items on the agenda related to service matters, leave cases, thesis cases of University teachers/Research Scholars, and it would be better if all such cases are got scrutinized from a five-member Syndics Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the given Dean of University Instruction and few other persons could do this.

Recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 29.10.2015, 3.11.2015 and 3.12.2015

6. Considered the following recommendations of the –

- (i) Regulations Committee dated 29.10.2015, 03.11.2015 and 03.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) (except item nos.11, 20, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 42 and 44):

ITEM 1

That amendment/deletion in Regulation 8 and 11 respectively for Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation and Networking (Annual System) (effective from the session 2011-12), be made, as under and the given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
8. A candidate who has been on the rolls of the USOL and fails to appear or having appeared fails in the examination, may be allowed to continue his/her enrolment for the period of two years immediately succeeding the year in which he/she completed the course on payment of continuation fee as prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time every year, in addition to the examination fee and to appear in the examination as an ex-student of the USOL.	8. <u>If a candidate fails to qualify in any paper/papers of PGDLAN examination, he/she may be allowed to appear for two years subsequently as a 'Late College Student', in the paper/papers in which he/she has failed to qualify. The period of two years is counted from the time he/she becomes eligible to appear in the said examination. If he/she still fails to qualify these papers within this period, his/her result shall stand cancelled. Such a candidate shall not be allowed to appear in PGDLAN examination without repeating the whole course as a regular student of the University School of Open Learning.</u>

11. For reappear cases, candidate should secure at least 50% marks in aggregate and 25% marks in the papers in which he/she has failed.	11. Deleted
---	--------------------

ITEM 2

That amendments/additions in Regulation 10 at page 149 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007 (effective from Senate decision dated i.e 28.9.2014), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>10. A person applying for change of his name in the Register shall submit his application.</p> <p>(a) in the case of a regular student, through the Head of the Department/Principal of the College last attended by him;</p> <p>(b) in the case of private candidate, through a Gazetted Officer or the Principal of an affiliated College, or an Officer of the University not below the rank of an Assistant Registrar or (in the case of a Government employee) through the Head of the Department in which he is employed.</p> <p>The application shall be accompanied by-</p> <p>(i) a Fee of Rs.11 (including Rs.1 for notification in the Government Gazette);</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A Fee of Rs.6 in the case of a woman who changes her name after marriage.</p> <p>(ii) an affidavit relating to his present and proposed names duly sworn in the presence of a Magistrate or an Oath Commissioner by his parent or guardian in case he is minor or by himself, in case he is major; and</p> <p>(iii) a cutting from a newspaper in which the proposed change of name has been advertised.</p>	<p>10. A person applying for change of his/her name in the Register shall submit his/her application.</p> <p>(a) No change</p> <p>(b) No change</p> <p>The application shall be accompanied by-</p> <p>(i) <u>a fee prescribed by the University (revised from time to time);</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>an affidavit relating to his/ her present and proposed names duly sworn in the presence of a Magistrate by his/her parent or guardian in case he/she is minor or by himself or herself, in case he/she is major; and</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>Newspaper (full page) in which the proposed change of name has been advertised. The validity of advertisement will be up to one year from the date of publication.</u></p>

	<p>(iv) <u>Matriculation and Higher Secondary Part I and Higher Secondary Part II or Pre-University or Pre-Medical or Pre-engineering or 10+2 or any other equivalent examination certificates with change of name from the concerned Board/Institution is required, as requested in the application form.</u></p> <p><u>Provided a woman candidate applying for change in sub-caste after her marriage will not be required to fulfil the conditions mentioned at (iii) & (iv) above. However, she will be required to submit the marriage certificate from the competent authority.</u></p>
--	---

- NOTE:**
1. The effective date has not been mentioned in the decision of Syndicate and Senate. Thus, the A.R. (R&S) was requested to intimate from which session the proposed amendment is to be implemented.
 2. A.R. (R&S) vide dated 5/2/2015 has informed that the proposed amendment is to be implemented from the date of Senate decision.

ITEM 3

That amendment in Regulation 1.2 for Masters in Remote Sensing & Geographic Information Systems (GIS) (effective from the session 2014-15), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>1.2 The eligibility for admission to the course shall be as follows:</p> <p>(a) B.A./B.Sc. with Geography of the Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate with at least 50 per cent of aggregate marks; and</p> <p>(b) Three months' Computer Course.</p>	<p>1.2 The eligibility for admission to the course shall be as follows:</p> <p><u>Bachelor's Degree with Geography/Geology/Geophysics/Mathematics/Physics/Botany/ Environment Science/Computer Science/Urban Planning/Regional Planning/B.Tech./B.C.A. or Master's Degree in Geography/Geology/Geophysics/Mathematics/Physics/Botany/Environment Science/Computer Science/M.C.A./Urban Planning/Regional Planning with at least 50% marks in aggregate. The admission to the course shall be through Entrance Test in which a minimum score of 50% marks is mandatory.</u></p>

	<u>B.A./B.Sc./M.A./M.Sc. Geography students will be given additional weightage of 15 per cent of the academic score at Bachelor's level.</u>
--	---

ITEM 4

That amendment in Regulation 5(iii) for 5-Year Integrated B.Sc. & M.Sc. in Fashion & Lifestyle Technology (effective from the session 2014-2015), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
5. There shall be one House Examination in a semester followed by one final examination for that semester.	5. There shall be one House Examination in a semester followed by one final examination for that semester.
(i) xxx xxx xxx	(i) xxx xxx xxx
(ii) xxx xxx xxx	(ii) xxx xxx xxx
(iii) a student is required to obtain 32% marks in the internal assessment in each paper to be eligible for the examination in that paper.	(iii) a student is required to obtain 40% marks in the internal assessment in each paper to be eligible for the examination in that paper.

ITEM 5

That amendment in Regulation 3.1(k) (iii) at pages 82-83 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2014-2015), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
3.1(k). For M.A. Part I (French) a person who has passed:	
(i) B.A./B.Sc./B.Com./B.B.A./B.C.A. or Honours (under 10+2+3 system of education) and Advanced Diploma Course in French with at least 45% marks from the Panjab University or any other University	(i) No Change
OR	
(ii) B.A./B.Sc./B.Com./B.B.A./B.C.A. (under 10+2+3 system of education) with at least 45% in French elective or Honours (under 10+2+3 system of education) from the Panjab University or any other University.	(ii) No Change
OR	
(iii) B.A./B.Sc./B.Com./B.B.A./B.C.A. or Honours (under 10+2+3 system of education) and Diploma Approfondi de La Langue Francaise (DALF Advanced French Language Diploma) issued by the French	(iii) B.A./B.Sc./B.Com./B.B.A./B.C.A. or Honours (under 10+2+3 system of education) <u>and have cleared Add-On Advanced Diploma Course in French (3</u>

<p>National Ministry of Education</p> <p>In addition, this be also noted under 2.1.</p> <p>Provided that:-</p> <p>A candidate shall apply for M.A. in French only if he has the knowledge of the Language as clarified in 3.1(i).</p> <p>3.1.(l) xxx xxx xxx</p>	<p><u>years Course) with at least 45% marks will have to clear a department level entrance examination.</u></p> <p>No Change</p> <p>3.1 (l) No Change</p>
--	---

ITEM 6

That amendment in Regulation 1.5 for B.E. (effective from the session 2014-15), be made as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1.5 The admission will be open to a candidate, who has passed 10+2 examination of the Central Board of Secondary Education, New Delhi or its equivalent with Physics and Mathematics as compulsory subjects along with one of the following subjects:</p> <p>Chemistry, Bio-Technology, Computer Science or Biology</p> <p>Provided that a candidate must have obtained a minimum of 60% marks in the qualifying examination i.e. +2 for admission to the first year B.E. and Integrated B.E. M.B.A. courses in all the University Engineering Departments and Colleges affiliated to it except in the case of SC/ST/Physically Handicapped categories for which the percentage shall be 55% for admission to Engineering courses. The candidates shall be admitted on the basis of AIEEE merit conducted by CBSE.</p>	<p>1.5 The admission will be open to a candidate who has passed 10+2/Equivalent qualifying examination:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language 2. Physics 3. Mathematics 4. Any one of (Chemistry, Biology, Biotechnology, Technical Vocational Subject), 5. Any other subject. With at least 45% (40% in case of candidate belonging to reserved category*) marks in above subjects taken together. <p>*The candidates belonging to Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribes and Persons with Disability (PWD) shall be eligible on the basis of relaxed criteria determined by CBSE for the year 2014 for Central Counselling as indicated above.</p> <p>*The candidates belonging to Backward Classes shall be eligible on the basis of relaxed criteria determined by CBSE for the year 2014 for Central Counselling for Other Backward Class (OBC) if they belong to Non-Creamy Layer (NCL).</p>

ITEM 7

That amendment in Regulation 2 for B. Architecture (effective from the session 2014-15), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION (effective from 2005-06)	PROPOSED REGULATION (effective from the session 2014-15)
<p>2. The mode of admission shall be decided by the Syndicate from time to time. Admission shall be open to a candidate who has passed –</p> <p>(a) 10+2 examination with Physics and Mathematics as compulsory subjects along with one of the following subjects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chemistry 2. Engineering Drawing 3. Computer Science 4. Biology <p>(b) Three-Year Diploma in Architectural Assistantship (10+3) recognized by the Central/State Governments provided the candidate passed the Diploma examination with at least 50% marks in aggregate.</p>	<p>2. The admission will be open to a candidate who has passed 10+2/Equivalent qualifying examination:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language 2. Physics 3. Mathematics 4. Any one of (Chemistry, Biology, Biotechnology, Technical Vocational Subject), 5. Any other subject. With at least 45% (40% in case of candidate belonging to reserved category *) marks in above subjects taken together. <p>*The candidates belonging to Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribes and Persons with Disability (PWD) shall be eligible on the basis of relaxed criteria determined by CBSE for the year 2014 for Central Counselling as indicated above.</p> <p>*The candidates belonging to Backward Classes shall be eligible on the basis of relaxed criteria determined by CBSE for the year 2014 for Central Counselling for Other Backward Class (OBC) if they belong to Non-Creamy Layer (NCL).</p>

NOTE: The page of the Panjab University Calendar has not been mentioned as the Present Regulation has been sent to Govt. of India for approval, which is still awaited.

ITEM 8

That addition to Regulation 1.1(d) for Ph.D. degree in the Faculties of Arts, Languages, Education, Science and Design & Fine Arts at page 187 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2014-15), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
1.1 (a) A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Arts, Languages, Education, Science and	1.1 (a) No Change

<p>Design & Fine Arts Faculties should have obtained from the University the Master's degree with minimum of 55% marks.</p> <p>Provided that- 1 to 4</p> <p>(b) A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Women Studies should have obtained from the University the Master's degree in the first and second class in any Faculty.</p> <p>(c) A candidate who is possessing degree of M.A. in Gandhian and Peace Studies, is eligible for enrolment for Ph.D. degree in the other subjects of Arts and Social Sciences. Provided that they clear the Entrance Test in the subject in which the enrolment is sought.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>(b) No Change</p> <p>(c) No Change</p> <p>(d) <u>A candidate who has passed Master's degree examination in any Faculty with at least 55% marks in the aggregate is eligible for Registration for Ph.D. degree in the subject of Vivekananda Studies provided that the candidate has cleared the UGC-NET/University Entrance Test for Ph.D. in any Faculty.</u></p>
---	---

ITEM 9

That addition of Regulations 17 and 19.2 for B.Sc. (Honours School) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2009-10 & 2013-14 respectively), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

Addition of Regulation 17 (effective from the session 2009-10)

17. A candidate having obtained 92 or more credits (108 or more credit in the case of students of basic Medical Sciences) in the B.Sc. (Honours School) and having cleared all subsidiary subjects may seek the award of B.Sc. pass degree in case he/she wishes to discontinue the Honours School after completing three years of studies for B.Sc. (Honours School).

The division in the case of such candidates shall be determined by the Regulations as for the Honours School students taking into account the best of the 92 credits which he/she has obtained. The date of entry and leaving the Honours School shall be shown on the certificate of the degree awarded to the candidates.

Addition of Regulation 19.2 (effective from the session 2013-14)

19.2 A candidate of B.Sc. (Honours School), who got pass course degree may re-appear as a private candidate in the course, he/she wishes to, with a view to improving his/her performance and he/she shall be allowed to appear in only those papers in which he/she has obtained the best 92/108 credits or more credits. For this purpose, he/she may be given two chances within a period of three years from the year of passing of B.Sc. pass course examination. The candidate shall appear in Annual/Semester examination along with regular students. No improvement shall be allowed in the Internal Assessment as well as practical examinations. The improvement examination shall be examined under the current syllabus.

NOTE: The page of the Panjab University Calendar Volume has not been mentioned as the Regulations for the B.Sc. (Honours School) course has been sent to GOI for approval, which is still awaited.

ITEM 10

That the eligibility criteria for admission to Postgraduate Diploma in Cosmetology and Beauty Care (effective from the session 2015-16), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>The eligibility conditions for admission to Postgraduate Diploma in Cosmetology & Beauty Care (Semester System) shall be Graduation with minimum of 50% marks from Panjab University or from any other University/ Institution whose examination has been recognised as equivalent to the corresponding examination (under the 10+2+3 system of education) of this University. Preference will be given to students having any recognized course in Cosmetology and reservations shall be provided as per Rules and Regulations of the University. Candidates having passed recognized courses in Cosmetology & Beauty Care/Cosmetology/ Beauty care shall be given weightage along the following lines:</p> <p>Certificate equivalent course : 1% Diploma equivalent course : 2% Advanced Diploma equivalent : 3% course</p> <p>Admission to the course will be on the basis of merit as per decision of the University.</p>	<p>The eligibility conditions for admission to Postgraduate Diploma in Cosmetology & Beauty Care (Semester System) shall be Graduation with minimum of 45% marks from Panjab University or from any other University/ Institution whose examination has been recognised as equivalent to the corresponding examination (under the 10+2+3 system of education) of this University. Preference will be given to students having any recognized course in Cosmetology and reservations shall be provided as per Rules and Regulations of the University. Candidates having passed recognized courses in Cosmetology & Beauty Care/Cosmetology /Beauty Care shall be given weightage along the following lines:</p> <p>Certificate equivalent course : 1% Diploma equivalent course : 2% Advanced Diploma equivalent : 3% course</p> <p>Admission to the course will be on the basis of merit as per decision of the University.</p>

ITEM 11**XXX****XXX****XXX**

ITEM 12

That addition of the eligibility conditions for M.Sc. (Biochemistry) (Semester System) to Regulation 2 at Page 132-133 of P.U. Cal. Vol. II, 2007 (effective from the session 2014-15), be made, as **per Appendix**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

NOTE: The Senate at its meeting dated 28.9.2014 (Para XXXI) has introduced M.Sc. (Biochemistry) (Semester System) in the affiliated Colleges (w.e.f. 2014-15) and the Regulations for the above said course would be the same as for other M.Sc. (Semester System) courses available at pages 132-136 in Panjab University Calendar, Volume-II, 2007. Thus, only the eligibility conditions for the said course are to be incorporated at pages 132-136, **as per Appendix**.

ITEM 13

That amendment in Regulation 5 for Postgraduate Diploma in Library Automation & Networking (Annual System) (effective from the session 2014-15) be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

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

NOTE: The page of the Panjab University Calendar Volume has not been mentioned as the Regulations for the above said course sent to Govt. of India for approval.

ITEM 14

That amendment in Regulation 2 for M.Sc. Home Science examination (Semester System) at page 104 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2012-13), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
2. A person who has passed B.Sc. Home Science examination with at least 50% marks in the aggregate from the Panjab University or an examination from any other University recognised as equivalent	2. <u>A person who has passed B.Sc. (Home Science) in any of these streams i.e. Apparel and Textile Design, Composite, Dietetics, Human Development and Family Relations, Interior Design</u>

<p>thereto shall be eligible to join M.Sc. Home Science.</p>	<p><u>Management from the Panjab University with at least 50% marks in the aggregate or an examination from any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with at least 50% marks in the aggregate shall be eligible to join M.Sc. Home Science.</u> <u>In addition to above, a student who has passed B.Sc. Fashion and Lifestyle Technology from Panjab University with at least 50% marks in the aggregate shall be eligible for admission to M.Sc. Clothing and Textiles only.</u></p> <p><u>For admission to M.Sc. (Home Science) Food and Nutrition:</u></p> <p>A candidate who has passed B.Sc. (Home Science) in any stream i.e. Apparel and Textile Design, Composite, Dietetics, Human Development and Family Relations, Interior Design Management from the Panjab University with at least 50% marks in the aggregate or B.Sc. (Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics)/ B.Sc. (Nutrition and Dietetics) from University with atleast 50% marks in aggregate or an examination from any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with atleast 50% marks in aggregate shall be eligible to join M.Sc. (Home Science) Food and Nutrition.</p>
--	--

ITEM 15

That addition in Regulation 36 as a 'Special Provision' for B.A./B.Sc.(General and Honours) examination at page 50 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007, be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>36. A student who has passed his/her Graduation examination from any Indian University other than the Panjab University, Chandigarh, may clear the subject of Punjabi (elective) as an additional subject.</p>	<p>36. <u>The students who have passed their graduation in any stream from Panjab University or any other Indian University may appear in the subject of Punjabi/Hindi/English/Sanskrit (Elective) as an additional subject.</u></p>

NOTE: The page of P.U. Calendar Volume II has not been mentioned as the present Regulation has been sent to the Govt. of India for approval.

ITEM 16

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Fashion Designing (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved, as per Appendix**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 17

That Regulations for Certificate Course in Music (Vocal and Instrumental) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved, as per Appendix**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 18

That Regulations for Bachelor of Library & Information Science on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the academic session 2014-15), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 19

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Applied Agriculture (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 20**xxx****xxx****xxx****ITEM 21**

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Child Guidance and Family Counselling (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 22

That Regulations for Diploma in Stock Market & Trading Operations (effective from the session 2014-15), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 23

That Regulations for Post M.A. Diploma in Professional Counselling & Psychotherapy and Post M.A. Diploma in Psychological Testing on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the academic session 2014-15), **as per**

Appendix, be approved, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 24

That Regulations for M.Ed. Special Education (Learning Disability) on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-15), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 25

That Regulations for Special Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged (Two-Year course) on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-15), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 26

That Regulations for Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged (Four-Year Course) on account of introduction of Semester System in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2014-15), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 27

xxx

xxx

xxx

ITEM 28

xxx

xxx

xxx

ITEM 29

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Nutrition and Dietetics (Semester System) (One-Year Course) (effective from the session 2014-15), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 30

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Cosmetology & Beauty Care (One-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2012-2013), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 31

That Regulations for Master of Fine Arts (Two-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-2015), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 32**xxx****xxx****xxx****ITEM 33****xxx****xxx****xxx****ITEM 34****xxx****xxx****xxx****ITEM 35****xxx****xxx****xxx****ITEM 36**

That the eligibility criteria for following courses newly introduced from the session 2014-2015, **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

- (i) M.E. (Food Technology)
- (ii) M.E. (Chemical with Specialization in Environmental Engineering)
- (iii) M.Tech. in Material Science & Technology
- (iv) M.E. in Mechanical Engineering
- (v) M.E. in Electrical Engineering (Power System)

ITEM 37

That addition in Regulation 10.2 of Chapter III "General Regulations for Examinations" (effective from the session 2014-15), be made as under, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
10.1 Unless otherwise provided, a person who has already passed an examination of this or any other University shall not be permitted to reappear in that examination or a corresponding examination.	10.1 No Change
10.2 A candidate is allowed to appear in two examinations simultaneously, i.e. one	10.2 A candidate is allowed to appear in two examinations simultaneously, i.e. one

<p>for improvement and one regular full-time course, in addition to a Certificate/ Diploma/ Advanced Diploma course <u>offered in the evening session</u>, being pursued by him/her as a regular student/private candidate of the University teaching Department/ University School of Open Learning /Affiliated Colleges of the University /in private capacity, as the case may be. Appearance at the improvement examination will be allowed only after completion of the entire course as per the existing regulations/rules.</p>	<p>for improvement and one regular full-time course, in addition to a Certificate/Diploma/ Advanced Diploma/<u>Post Graduate Diploma courses offered in the evening session or through University School of Open Learning</u>, being pursued by him/her as a regular student/private candidate of the University teaching Department/University School of Open Learning/ Affiliated Colleges of the University /in private capacity, as the case may be. Appearance at the improvement examination will be allowed only after completion of the entire course as per the existing regulations/rules.</p>
---	---

NOTE: The page of P.U. Calendar Volume II has not been mentioned as the present Regulation has been sent to the Govt. of India for approval.

ITEM 38

xxx

xxx

xxx

ITEM 39

xxx

xxx

xxx

ITEM 40

xxx

xxx

xxx

ITEM 41

That Regulations for Post-Graduate Diploma in Cyber Crime (One-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **as per Appendix, be approved**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 42

xxx

xxx

xxx

ITEM 43

That amendment in Regulation 3.2 for BDS course (effective from the session 2015-16), **be made as under** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
3.2 The Candidate who has completed the prescribed course as laid down in these	3.2 No change.

<p>Regulations and is unable to appear in the examination, or having appeared has failed, may be admitted to subsequent examination, as under on payment of the prescribed fee on each occasion and on producing a certificate signed by the Principal of the Medical/Dental College in which he completed the course, that he has, subsequent to his last failure, attended a course of training in the subjects of the examination as the Principal may determine-</p> <p>For First Examination:</p> <p>The candidate may be allowed to take the next three consecutive examinations, a candidate who is unable to qualify in all the three subjects in four consecutive chances, including the first chance to which he was originally entitled, shall not be allowed to continue his/her studies for the BDS course.</p>	<p>For First Examination:</p> <p><u>Any students who does not clear the BDS course in all subjects within a period of Nine (9) years, including one year Compulsory Rotatory paid Internship from the date of admission shall be discharged from the course.</u></p>
--	--

NOTE: The page of P.U. Calendar Volume II has not been mentioned as the present Regulation has been sent to the Govt. of India for approval.

ITEM 44

xxx

xxx

xxx

- (ii) Regulations Committee dated 30.12.2015 (except item no. 7, 9, 10 and 17) (**Appendix- _**).

ITEM 1

That Regulation 1.3 for Masters in Remote Sensing & Geographic Information System, be amended as under and given effect to from the session 2015-16 in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1.3 Eligible candidates, except those sponsored by the government/ institution, will be required to undertake an admission/Entrance Test for assessing their geographic understanding and awareness of Computer Application. The test will carry 40 per cent weightage (written; 35% and interview: 5%). The other 60% marks will be assigned to academic record: 10+2(10%) Graduation (20%) and Post-Graduation (30%). To qualify, a candidate must obtain 50% of the marks assigned to the written test. Candidates will be</p>	<p>1.3 The candidates, except those sponsored by the government/ institutions, should have passed the written Entrance Test conducted by the Panjab University, Chandigarh. <u>The merit list will be prepared considering the marks obtained in the Entrance Test and the Qualifying Examination as per the following criteria:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Written Entrance Test: 50%</u> <u>Qualifying Examination: 50%</u></p>

admitted as per the merit, based on performance in the written test and academic record, put together.	Academic and other weightage(s), if any, will be based on the percentage of marks obtained by the eligible candidates in the Qualifying Examination as prescribed and admissible in Panjab University Rules. The candidates will have to appear for a personal interview as per the merit list. However, there will be no marks awarded for the interview.
--	---

ITEM 2

That Regulation 2.1 for Masters in Disaster Management, be amended as under and given effect to from the session 2015-16 in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>2.1 Eligible candidates, except those sponsored by the government/ institution, will be required to undertake an admission/entrance test for assessing their aptitude, ability and awareness about the Disaster Management. The test will carry 50% weightage (written 30% and oral 20%). The other 50% marks will be assigned to academic record: marks will be assigned to academic record: 20+2(20%) and Graduation (30%).</p> <p>To qualify, a candidate must obtain 50% of the marks assigned to the written test. Candidates will be admitted as per merit, based on performance in the written test and academic record, put together.</p>	<p>2.1 The candidates, except those sponsored by the government/ institution, should have passed the written Entrance Test conducted by Panjab University, Chandigarh. The merit list will be prepared considering the marks obtained in the Entrance Test and the Qualifying Examination as per the following criteria:</p> <p>Written Entrance Test: 50% Qualifying Examination: 50%</p> <p>Academic and other weightage(s), if any, will be based on the percentage of marks obtained by the eligible candidates in the Qualifying Examination as prescribed and admissible in Panjab University Rules. The candidates will have to appear for a personal interview as per the merit list. However, there will be no marks awarded for the interview.</p> <p>To qualify, a candidate must obtain 50% of the marks assigned to the written test. Candidates will be admitted as per merit, based on performance in the written test and qualifying examination put together.</p>

ITEM 3

That addition to Regulation 8.3 for MBA (Off Campus), be added as under and given effect to from the session 2012-13, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
8.2 Grace marks shall be given @ one percent of the aggregate marks of the external examination of the University	8.2 No Change

<p>for each semester (only the marks of external examination will be counted for the purpose of calculating the grace marks and marks obtained in internal assessment will not be counted). A candidate may avail of the grace marks either in the aggregate or in one or more papers as may be to his advantage. Grace marks shall, however, be given only for passing the examination or for earning the higher division and not for passing the examination with distinction</p>	<p>8.3(i) <u>A candidate, who is placed under reappear in 1st/3rd semester examination held in November/ December, will be eligible to reappear along with 2nd/4th semester examination to be held in next April/May examination.</u></p> <p><u>In case a candidate is unable to pass in reappear in April/May examination, he/she will be given another chance in November/ December examination to pass such papers.</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>A candidate who is placed under reappear in 2nd/4th semester examination held in April/May, will be eligible to reappear along with 1st/3rd semester examination to be held in November/December examination.</u></p> <p><u>In case a candidate is unable to pass in reappear in November/ December examination, he/she will be given another chance in next April/May examination to pass such papers.</u></p>
---	---

ITEM 4

That Regulation 8.1 (iii) for Master of Entrepreneurship and Family Business (MEFB), be amended as under and given effect to from the session 2015-16 in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>8.1 The minimum number of marks to pass the examination in each semester shall be-</p> <p>(i) 35% in each paper in the University examination separately as well as jointly with internal assessment;</p> <p>(ii) 35% in seminar, project, workshop and viva-voce;</p> <p>(iii) 40% in the aggregate of (i) and (ii) above.</p>	<p>8.1 The minimum number of marks to pass the examination in each semester shall be-</p> <p>(i) 35% in each paper in the University examination separately as well as jointly with internal assessment;</p> <p>(ii) 35% in seminar, project, workshop and viva-voce;</p> <p>(iii) 50% in the aggregate of (i) and (ii) above.</p>

ITEM 5

That eligibility condition for M.E. (Biotechnology) newly introduced at UIET be added in Regulation 1.4 meant for M.E./M.Tech. courses as under and given effect to from the session 2015-16, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1.4 A candidate, who has passed B.E./B.Tech. examination or any other equivalent examination as approved by the Syndicate in the relevant discipline recognized by the Panjab University, Chandigarh shall be eligible to join the course.</p> <p>Provided that a candidate must have obtained a minimum CGPA of 6.75 or 60% marks (where % marks are awarded) in the qualifying examination i.e. B.E./B.Tech. in the appropriate discipline or any other equivalent qualifying degree as approved by the Syndicate for admission to the first year M.E. and M.Tech. courses in all the University Engineering Department/Institutes. The candidates shall be admitted on the basis of OCET merit conducted by Panjab University Chandigarh. Due credit will be given to GATE qualified candidates as applicable and approved by the Syndicate.</p>	<p>1.4 No Change.</p> <p><u>Eligibility conditions for M.E. (Biotechnology) (effective from the session 2015-16)</u></p> <p>B.E. (Biotechnology) with at least 60% marks in the aggregate from Panjab University or any other University recognized by Panjab University as equivalent thereto.</p> <p>Admission will be made on the basis of GATE score.</p>

Note: The present Regulation has been sent to Govt. of India for approval, which is still awaited.

ITEM 6

That Regulation 2 (b) for B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Honours) 5- years Integrated course, be deleted and given effect to from the session 2015-16 in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>2. Minimum qualifications for admission to B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) first semester of the course shall be-</p> <p>(a) 10+2 examination with at least 50% marks (45% marks in case of SC/ST/BC) from any recognized Board/University.</p> <p>(b) The candidate must not be above 20 years of age as on 1st August of the year in which admission is sought to the First Semester (22 years in case of SC/ST).</p> <p>(c) The admission shall be on such criteria (academic merit or Entrance Test or both etc.) as may be prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time.</p>	<p>2. Minimum qualifications for admission to B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) first semester of the course shall be –</p> <p>(a) No Change</p> <p>(b) Deleted</p> <p>(c) No Change</p>

ITEM 7

xxx

xxx

xxx

ITEM 8

That the nomenclature and eligibility conditions for LL.M. (Evening-Shift) (Self-financed) newly introduced at University Institute of Legal Studies, be added as under and given effect to from the session 2015-16, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

Addition of the Nomenclature

<u>PRESENT NOMENCLATURE</u>	<u>PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE</u>
Master of Laws (LL.M.) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2009-10)	<p>(i) Master of Laws (LL.M.)(Two-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2009-10) in the Department of Laws; and</p> <p>(ii) Master of Laws (LL.M.) Two-Year Course(Four Semesters) (Evening Shift) (Self-financed) newly introduced from the session 2015-16 at University Institute of Legal Studies.</p>

Addition in the Eligibility Conditions:

<u>PRESENT REGULATIONS</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</u>
2.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible after qualifying the entrance test to join	2.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible after qualifying the entrance test to join

<p>the first semester class of the LL.M. Course.</p> <p>(a) LL.B. degree examination of this University; or</p> <p>(b) Any equivalent examination of another University recognized by the Syndicate for this purpose.</p>	<p>the first semester class of the LL.M. Course.</p> <p>(a) No change</p> <p>(b) No change.</p> <p>Special Weightage for LL.M. (Evening Shift) (Self financed)</p> <p>The special weightage shall be given to Advocates/Judicial officers/ Civil servants. The weightage will be up to a maximum of 10 marks with ½ marks for every completed year of practice/employment.</p>
---	--

NOTE:1. The page of the Panjab University Calendar Volume has not been mentioned as the Regulations for the LL.M. (Semester System) (effective from the session 2009-10) have been sent to the Govt. of India for approval.

2. As per decision of the Syndicate dated 19.7.2015, the Regulations & Rules for the said course would be the same as for the Master of Laws (Semester System) w.e.f. the session 2009-10 run by the Deptt. of Laws. Thus, only nomenclature and eligibility conditions (only special weightage) for the said course is to be incorporated/added.

ITEM 9

xxx

xxx

xxx

ITEM 10

xxx

xxx

xxx

ITEM 11

That the amendment in Regulation 10 for Master in Fashion Designing & Management (effective from the session 2016-17) in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
10. The medium of examination shall be English.	10. The medium of Instruction shall be English. However, the medium of examination shall be English/Hindi/Punjabi.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join M.Sc. (Semester System):-</p> <p>Anthropology xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>Botany xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>Physics xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>Chemistry</p> <p>(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 Semesters.</p> <p>(b) to (d) xxxx xxxx xxxx</p>	<p>2. No Change.</p> <p>Anthropology xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>Botany xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>Physics xxx xxx xxx</p> <p>Chemistry</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>Provided that a student who had not taken Mathematics as one of the subjects in B.Sc. examination should be admitted to M.Sc. (Two- Year Course) in Chemistry on the condition that he/she passes an additional paper in Mathematics (50 hours course) in the first year examination securing at least 40% marks.</p> <p>(b) to (d) xxxx xxxx xxxx</p>

ITEM 14

That Regulations for Master of Business Administration (Executive) introduced at University School of Open Learning, **as per Appendix**, be approved and given effect to from the session 2014-15 in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 15

That Regulations for (i) M.E. (Regular) Two-Year Course and (ii) M.E. (Modular) (Seven Semesters) Three and a Half Years Course **as per Appendix A and B respectively**, offered at NITTTR, be approved and given effect to from the session 2014-15, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 16

That Regulations for Master of Laws (LL.M.) (One Year Course) (Semester System) with two specializations i.e. (i) Law, Science & Technology and (ii) Commercial and Corporate Law newly introduced at University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS), **as per Appendix**, be approved and given effect to from the session 2015-16, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 17**xxx****xxx****xxx****ITEM 18**

That Regulations for Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing (DPN) (One Year Course), **as per Appendix**, be approved and given effect to from the session 2014-15, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 19

That Regulations for (i) Master of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology and (ii) Master of Philosophy in Psychiatric Social Work, **as per Appendix A and B respectively**, be approved and given effect to from the session 2014-15, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 20

That Regulations for Foundation Course in Human Rights Education (3 months), **as per Appendix**, be approved and given effect to from the session 2015-16, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 21

That Regulations for Bachelor of Ayurvedic Medicine & Surgery (B.A.M.S.), **as per Appendix**, be amended and given effect to from the session 2012-13, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 22

That Regulations for **B.A./B.Sc.(General & Honours) (Semester System)** examinations, **as per Appendix**, be approved and given effect to from the session 2014-15, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 23

That Regulations for (i) Bachelor of Hotel Management and Catering Technology (BHMCT) (Four-Year Programme) and (ii) Bachelor of Tourism and Travel Management (BTM) (Four-Year Programme) **as**

per Appendix (A and B respectively), be approved and given effect to from the session 2015-16, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 24

That Regulation 11(D)(ii) at page 138 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, be approved, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>11.(D) Earned Leave</p> <p>(i) Earned leave admissible to a teacher shall be:-</p> <p>(a) 1/30th of actual service including vacation plus</p> <p>(b) 1/3rd of the period, if any, during which he is required to perform duty during vacation.</p> <p>NOTE: For purpose of computation of period of actual service, all periods of leave except casual, special causal, special academic and duty leave shall be excluded.</p> <p>(ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall <u>be accumulated and leave encashment be allowed as prescribed by the Syndicate/ Senate from time to time.</u> The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement. If it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p> <p>NOTE: 1 and 2 xxx xxx xxx</p>	<p>11.(D) Earned Leave</p> <p>(i) No Change</p> <p>(a) No Change</p> <p>(b) No Change</p> <p>NOTE: No Change</p> <p>(ii) Earned leave at the credit of a teacher shall not accumulate <u>beyond 300 days.</u> The maximum earned leave that may be sanctioned at a time shall not exceed 120 days. Earned leave exceeding 120 days may, however, be sanctioned in the case of higher study or training or leave on medical certificate or when the entire leave or a portion thereof is spent outside of India. The competent authority may allow this leave to be availed of, subject to a maximum of 120 days on attaining the age of retirement. If it was applied for in good time and was refused in the interest of the University.</p> <p>NOTE: 1 and 2 xxx xxx xxx</p>

NOTE: The present Regulation has been sent to Government of India for approval, which is still awaited.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Regulations Committee needed to be appreciated as they have put in a lot of hard work to do such a large work for which it has to meet 2-3 times.

Referring to **Sub-Item 8**, Professor Emanuel Nahar said that it has been mentioned at page 36 (Regulations for Master of Laws (LL.M.) (Semester System) that “The special weightage shall be given to Advocates/Judicial Officers/Civil Servants. The weightage will be up to a maximum of 10 marks with ½ marks for every completed year of practice/employment.” He enquired as to how it could be given.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that it should be one mark for every completed year of practice/employment subject to a maximum of 15 marks.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would be referred back.

Referring to **Sub-Item 12**, Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that the last portion of the nomenclature of paper (Environment, Road Safety Education and Violence Against Women & Children) should be Crime Against Women & Children instead of Violence Against Women & Children.

Professor Anil Monga clarified that since it has come from the Punjab Government, it is not wise to change it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is suggest proposing whether the nomenclature of the paper could be Environment, Road Safety Education and Crime Against Women & Children because generally in Law it is always crime and not violence.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the word violence is more specific.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would check the nomenclature “Violence Against Women & Children” from where it has come and take appropriate decision.

Referring to **Sub-Item 13**, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they have amended the regulation for Master of Science (Semester System) in Chemistry to say that “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 along with any Science subject. Provided that a student who had not taken Mathematics as one of the subjects in B.Sc. examination should be admitted to M.Sc. (Two-Year Course) in Chemistry on the condition that he/she passes an additional paper in Mathematics (50 hours course) in the first examination securing at least 40% marks.” This meant, the student of B.Sc. (Medical) has to do additional paper in Mathematics. He enquired as to how it has come.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that earlier, candidates having done B.Sc. (Non-Medical) or B.Sc. Medical both were eligible for admission to M.Sc. (Physics and Chemistry). They also started a course namely B.Sc. (Computer Application) and they were not made eligible for the said course, but later on they made them eligible and the students concerned are now doing M.Sc. (Computer Science). Shri Raghbir Dyal has raised a valid point and the candidates having done B.Sc. (Medical) should not be asked to do additional paper in Mathematics.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the existing regulations, the B.Sc. (Non-Medical) students were required to study the paper of Biology and B.Sc. (Medical) study the paper of Mathematics in 1st and 2nd Semesters. However, in the proposed regulations, the subject of Biology has been deleted and it has been recommended the Mathematics is necessary. Meaning thereby, that M.Sc. (Chemistry) could be done without Biology but not without Mathematics.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that as per the proposed regulations, the students of M.Sc.(Chemistry) are not required to study Biology, which is wrong.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that it should be asked from the Department of Chemistry as to why earlier it was necessary to study Biology in M.Sc. (Chemistry) and why now it has been omitted from the regulations.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay", they would find it out from the Department of Chemistry and would come back.

Referring to **Sub-Item 38** (Regulations for B.C.A.), Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that in the proposed regulations 3.1 (i) to (iii) no change has been mentioned. He drew the attention of the House towards (iii) which says "The students who are placed under compartment at +2 examination in the Annual Examination and cleared the compartment examination up to the last date of admission of B.C.A. course in the Colleges be allowed admission as per merit and other conditions for admission to B.C.A. course". According this, they are giving only one chance to the students who are placed under compartment at +2 level, i.e., if their results of compartment examination are declared by the last date of admission with late fee with the permission of the Vice Chancellor, whereas in B.A. they give two chances. Though it was pointed out earlier also, it has not been changed.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that Shri Raghbir Dyal is right and it has also been decided in the Syndicate and Senate that they are giving two chances to B.A. students, and if they are unable to clear the compartment, their result of B.A. Part I was not declared. He pleaded that the students who are placed under compartment should also be allowed to be given admission, but with the condition that if they are unable to clear the compartment, their result would not be declared. Therefore, as is being done in the case of B.A. students, such a chance should also be given to B.C.A. students. He added that the CBSE declares the results of compartment examinations much early, but the Punjab School Education Board much later. Resultantly, the students of the State of Punjab are at disadvantage. He pleaded that it should be taken care of.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, as per the regulations, the students are placed under compartment, are not eligible for admission to B.C.A. course.

To this, Shri Raghbir Dyal and Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that such students are eligible for admission to B.C.A. course, provided their aggregate marks including compartment subject are 50%. However, here they are denying them second chance by imposing a condition that their result of compartment examination should be declared by

the last date for admission with late fee with the permission of the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that since the condition has been put that the result of the students placed under compartment must have been declared by the last date for admission with late fee with the permission of the Vice Chancellor, this meant, they are not eligible to seek admission to B.C.A. course. However, the students having compartment at +2 level are eligible to seek admission to B.A. Part I.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it could be verified from the guidelines issued by the Dean, College Development Council to the affiliated Colleges last year, wherein perhaps it has been written that the students placed under compartment are eligible for admission to B.C.A. course provided they have obtained at least 50% aggregate marks including the compartment subject, and this could be verified.

It was said that it would be verified.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, as per present regulations, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua is right that the students, who have been placed under compartment in +2 examination, are not eligible for admission to B.C.A. course because it says that "The students who are placed under compartment at +2 examination in the Annual Examination and cleared the compartment examination up to the last date of admission of B.C.A. course in the Colleges be allowed admission", which meant that without clearing the compartment, they are not eligible. That is why, they are saying if they are able to clear the compartment by the last date for admission with late fee with the permission of the Vice Chancellor, they are eligible to seek admission to B.C.A. course. Earlier, even if the result of the students placed under compartment was declared before the last date of admission with late fee with the permission of the Vice Chancellor, even then they were not eligible, and this concession was given.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council to ensure that such students take admission and not lose the year.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Regulation 3.1(i) mentioned at page of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007 says that a person who has passed +2 examination in any discipline with at least 50% marks and passed Mathematics as one of the subjects at Matriculation level is eligible to join the first year class of B.C.A. course.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had said that the guidelines of the Dean, College Development Council which were circulated to the affiliated Colleges in the year 2015-16 should be checked and seen as to what has been mentioned there.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council to check and verify.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he does not know as to how it escaped the attention of the University that although they have introduced Semester System, a girl student, who had appeared in B.A. Part I (Annual System) examination privately and got failed, she was denied to appear in the 2nd year examination under the Annual

System tell that she could not do so as they are not continuing with the Annual System. She was also told that it is best that she should appear in 4th Semester under the Semester System, but when she filled up the examination form for 4th Semester, she was not issued the Roll Number, and when she came to collect the Roll Number personally, she was told that she is not eligible as she had not filled up the examination form for the 3rd Semester. Firstly, she was told that she would be allowed to appear in the 4th Semester, but when she filled the examination form for the 4th Semester, she was declared ineligible, that too, just a day before the start of the examination. With a result, neither she was allowed to appear in the 2nd year examination under annual system nor in the 4th Semester under the Semester System. How the form was received and why she was not informed at that time needed to be enquired. He thinks that these are the practical difficulties being faced by the girl students, who wish to appear in the examination as private candidates. He added that there were four such cases.

It was clarified that the Regulations approved by the Standing Committee say that one has to complete the course in the system under which one has taken the admission.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not trying to find fault, but to say that such cases of hardships should be considered as a special case.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that if such candidates came, they should be allowed to appear in the special examination.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the Controller of Examinations should be authorized to take decision in such cases.

Referring to Sub-Item 12 (page R-34) (Regulations for M.Sc. (Mathematics) point (c) which says "B.A./B.Sc. (Pass) with Mathematics having either at least 50% marks in the aggregate or at least 45% in Mathematics of the Panjab University or from any other University recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, which is continuing as such since long. He thinks that it needed to be modified a little bit.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that such is the regulation for all M.A./M.Sc. classes that one has at least 50% marks in aggregate or 45% in the relevant subject.

The Vice Chancellor said that either he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) should attend the meetings of the Regulations Committee or come to him to sort out the problem. According to him, this percentage needed to be enhanced a little bit.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

1. the recommendations of the Regulations Committee meetings dated 29.10.2015, 3.11.2015 and 3.12.2015 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 36, 37, 41 & 43, and

- meeting dated 30.12.2015 (Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 & 24, be approved;
2. so far as item 8 of meeting dated 30.12.2015 is concerned, it be referred back;
 3. so far as item 12 of meeting dated 29.10.2015 is concerned, the nomenclature of the course be checked and the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate; and
 4. so far as item 13 of meeting dated 30.12.2015 is concerned, the matter be got checked from the Chairperson of Department of Chemistry, P.U., and the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Resignation of Dr. Z. Anupama Goel, Associate Professor, Department of Laws

Considered if –

- (i) the resignation of Dr. Anupama Goel, Associate Professor, Department of Laws, Panjab University, be accepted w.e.f. 21.12.2015, under Regulation 6, page 118-119, Calendar Volume I, 2007; and
- (ii) she be granted extension in Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 01.08.2015 to 20.12.2015, under Regulation 11 (G) at pages 138-140 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Anupama Goel, Associate Professor was granted Extraordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 01.08.2012 to 31.07.2013 extended from time to time up to 31.07.2015 to enable her to join as Associate Professor on contract basis at National Law University Dwarka, New Delhi. Dr. Anupama Goel has tendered her resignation from the post of Associate Professor w.e.f. 21.12.2015, as she could not join back on 1.8.2015 i.e. after completion of leave sanctioned to her up to 31.07.2015. She has requested that for the intervening period from 1.8.2015 to 21.12.2015 she may be considered on Leave of the kind due.

2. Regulation 6, page 118, Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

3. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXXIV)**.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the resignation of Dr. Anupama Goel, Associate Professor, Department of Laws, Panjab University, be accepted w.e.f. 21.12.2015, under Regulation 6, page 118-119, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007; and
- (ii) she be granted extension in Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 01.08.2015 to 20.12.2015, under Regulation 11 (G) at pages 138-140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**Resignation
Vaneeta
Assistant
University
School**

**of Dr.
Aggarwal,
Professor,
Business**

8. Considered, if the resignation of Dr. Vaneeta Aggarwal, Assistant Professor, University Business School, Panjab University, be accepted w.e.f. 06.05.2016 under Regulation 6, page 118-119, Calendar Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 6, page 118, Calendar, Volume I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before

resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

2. Dr. Vaneeta Aggarwal, Assistant Professor was granted duty leave for six months w.e.f. 10.1.2014 out of the duty leave applied for by her for period of two years, under Regulation 11 (C) at page 138 of P.U. Cal. 1, 2007, for pursuing the Research project at Central and State Universities of Tamil Nadu. In between she requested for conversion of Duty leave into that of Extraordinary Leave without pay for two years w.e.f. 28.5.2014, to enable her to join as Assistant Professor at Madras University, Madras, which was granted to her.
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXV**).

RESOLVED: That the resignation of Dr. Vaneeta Aggarwal, Assistant Professor, University Business School, Panjab University, be accepted w.e.f. 06.05.2016 under Regulation 6, page 118-119, Calendar Volume I, 2007.

Issue regarding 9. regularization of services of Dr. Kuldeep Singh as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biochemistry

Considered if –

- (i) the appointment of Dr. Kuldeep Singh, as Assistant Professor be regularized in the Department of Biochemistry, whose appointment was approved by the Vice Chancellor, w.e.f. 29.06.2010 (i.e. retrospectively) on notional basis upto 24.02.2014 without monetary benefits on the direction of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and financial benefit be given from actual date of joining i.e. 25.02.2014 up to 23.02.2015 (i.e. the date when his resignation was accepted by the Syndicate), and;
- (ii) the fixation of his salary at Rs.39100+GP of Rs.8000/- w.e.f. the date of his joining at Panjab University i.e. 25.02.2014 with the next date of increment as usual.

- NOTE:**
1. Earlier, the pay of Dr. Kuldip Singh was allowed to fix at Rs.39100+GP of Rs.6000/- in view of the last pay certificate submitted by him.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 20.9.2015 has approved the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, w.e.f. 29.06.2010 (i.e. retrospectively) a notional basis up to 14.01.2014 without monetary benefits on the direction of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and financial benefit be given from actual date of joining i.e. 15.01.2014. The Senate has also approved the recommendation of the Syndicate.
 3. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVI)**.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the appointment of Dr. Kuldeep Singh, as Assistant Professor be regularized in the Department of Biochemistry, whose appointment was approved by the Vice Chancellor, w.e.f. 29.06.2010 (i.e. retrospectively) on notional basis up to 24.02.2014 without monetary benefits on the direction of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and financial benefit be given from actual date of joining i.e. 25.02.2014 up to 23.02.2015 (i.e. the date when his resignation was accepted by the Syndicate), and;
- (ii) his salary be fixed at Rs.39100+GP of Rs.8000/- w.e.f. the date of his joining at Panjab University, i.e., 25.02.2014 with the next date of increment as usual. the services of Dr. Kuldeep Singh as Assistant Professor, be regularized in the Department of Biochemistry.

Item 10 on the agenda was taken up for consideration on 1.05.2015.

Issue regarding grant of benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension

11. Considered if, Dr. Ram Gopal, Professor (Retd.), Department of Sanskrit & Dr. Gurdev Singh Gosal (Retd.), Department of Geography, be granted the benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension, under Regulation 3.9 at page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 on the basis of other advertisements of the contemporary period as the advertisement vide which they were appointed are not available in the office.

NOTE: 1. The Dean University Instruction has observed that both Dr. Ram Gopal and Dr. G.S. Gosal were appointed "reader" directly, though the original advertisement against which they were appointed is not available, but in all other similar cases, it was observed that essential qualification of "reader" do include sufficient reader/teaching experience to qualify for benefit under 3.9 (ref. case of V.C. Nand, Sunderlal etc.). Hence, Syndicate may consider giving benefit to them under 3.9.

2. Regulation 3.9 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I at page 184-185 reads as under:

"An employee appointed to a service or post shall be eligible to add to his service, qualifying for Superannuation Pension (but not for any other pension), the actual period, not exceeding one fourth of the length of his service or the actual period by which his age at the time of retirement exceeded twenty five years, or a period of five years, whichever is less if the service or post to which he is appointed is one-

(a) For which postgraduate research of specified qualifications or experience in Scientific, technological or "Professional field" is essential, and

(b) To which candidate of more than twenty five years of age are normally recruited.

3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016 (Para 9) (**Appendix-XXXVII**) has approved the similar cases with regard to grant of benefit of addition in qualifying service to certain faculty members.

4. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVII**).

RESOLVED: Dr. Ram Gopal, Professor (Retd.), Department of Sanskrit & Dr. Gurdev Singh Gosal (Retd.), Department of Geography,

be granted the benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension, under Regulation 3.9 at page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 on the basis of other advertisements of the contemporary period as the advertisement vide which they were appointed are not available in the office.

Issue pertaining to deputation of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Training-cum-Placement Officer, UIAMS

12. Considered if, Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Training-cum-Placement Officer, UIAMS, P.U., be treated as on deputation basis from Punjabi University, Patiala and his pension contribution, leave encashment and gratuity share as per Panjab University rules be sent to the Punjabi University Patiala, as per their letter dated 21.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**).

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Marwaha joined the Panjab University as Training-cum-Placement Officer, on 30.05.2013 on probation for one year. His probationary period was extended for another year i.e. up to 30.05.2015 by the Vice Chancellor and the same was ratified by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 12.07.2014.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 20.09.2015 has not acceded the request of Dr. Marwaha for extension in probation period beyond 02 years i.e. up to 25.10.2015.
 3. Requests of Shri Amandeep Singh Marwaha dated 03.12.2015 and 21.01.2016, respectively (**Appendix-XXXVIII**), for seeking deputation with Panjab University, Chandigarh from Punjabi University, Patiala.
 4. The Sub-Committee dated 23.02.2016 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) to review the request of Dr. Marwaha with regard to consider his services on deputation from Punjabi University, has recommended that he be given his written consent that his regular services may be converted into deputation basis and only after the receipt of the written consent from Dr. Marwaha and his pension contribution, leave encashment and gratuity as per Panjab University rules be sent to the Punjabi University, Patiala as per their letter dated 21.12.2015 received in the Panjab University, Chandigarh.
 4. Consent dated 22.03.2016 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) of Dr. Marwaha seeking deputation with Panjab University from Punjabi University, Patiala is enclosed.

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

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that so far as the item is concerned, there is no issue at all, but he would like to add to it that whosoever wants to come on deputation in the University, must apply through proper channel. Secondly, even if the deputationist is eligible at his parent Institution/Organization, he/she should also be eligible for the post to which he/she has applied in the University as the eligibility conditions here might be different.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that when a person comes on deputation, he/she remains an employee of his parent Institution/Organization for all intents and purposes. If they advertise the posts, where they have sought people on deputation also, and in that case automatically the person would be taken on deputation only if he/she fulfils the qualifications, and there is no problem at all.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he is talking about people selected on deputation.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that in the case of deputation through selection, the person would be taken on deputation only if he/she is qualified for the post concerned. However, if they seek a particular person, who might be an expert in his/her area, on deputation, they would not see whether he/she is qualified or not.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that S. Pargat Singh, who is Director Sports, Punjab, might not be eligible as he may not be M.P.Ed. That means, they could not seek him on deputation even though he is prominent in his field. If they appoint him Director Sports in Panjab University, Dr. Randhawa means to say that he should also fulfil the qualifications for the said post, which is wrong. He does not think that if such a personality wants to come to the University on deputation, he/she should be desired to fulfil such qualifications.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is an arising out of matter, which they would discuss later.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that Dr. Nirmal Jaura, who is Director, Youth Welfare, is being asked to join back by his parent institution. Therefore, since his case is similar to Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, the same should also be considered.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that if there are more similar cases, the same should also be considered, and if need be, brought to the Syndicate for consideration.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to bring such cases one by one.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the parent institution of Dr. Nirmal Jaura is ready to send him on deputation or extend his deputation, the deputation of Dr. Nirmal Jaura should be extended.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why would the parent institution write that the deputation of such and such person should be extended. They could at the most write that if the services of this

person are required by them, his benefits should be transferred. So they have to ask that his services are required on deputation. Even the Punjabi University has also written in the letter that if they (Panjab University) required his services. As such, the University should write to the parent Institution/s that they required the services of these persons on deputation for some more period, which should be allowed, and so far the benefits for the said period is concerned, the same would be transferred to them. He enquired which are more such cases.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that one of the cases is of Shri Vineet Punia, Director Public Relations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the persons concerned have problem, the University could consider extension in their deputation period.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the problem is genuine because they have to leave the pension.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is why, he sought deputation from Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR) to join Panjab University, and his pension benefits are being transferred to TIFR.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the request from Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha has come, they are allowing him extension in deputation. If such requests are received in future, the same would also be considered and allowed.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would consider the requests case by case.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that whosoever request for extension in deputation, he/she should be allowed.

The Vice Chancellor said that several benefits are to go to the parent Departments of the deputationists and they are to accept those benefits. Therefore, the consent of the parent Departments is necessary. In fact, the deputation or extension of deputation could only be decided with mutual consent.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that they should approve the deputation policy as suggested by the Vice Chancellor and it would be applicable in all such cases.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that no, it could not be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is why, he is saying that they should consider the cases, case by case, or they should decide that as and when such a case is received, they would appoint a Sub-Committee of the given Syndicate to examine the case/s and make recommendation/s for consideration by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, that is where the gap is. It was discussed two years back that they could treat these people on deputation and he had given the example also that earlier Director, Youth Welfare, who was not taken on deputation in the beginning at the time of his appointment, but after two years or more than that as

they are doing in this case or Director, Youth Welfare, the same thing was done and when he said that these cases could be covered like this, it was said that whatever had happened in the past, had happened, and they would not discuss it. His idea at that time also was that they do not want intentionally to make these people suffer for whatever benefits they had earned in their parent institutions, just because they had been handicapped of giving those benefits. So it is for them to find a via media to see as to how their grievances are addressed to.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay", it is approved, and let us accept that, in future, he would constitute a Sub-Committee and let that Sub-Committee consider the case and the office note should come properly, so that fruitful discussion takes place here.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Training-cum-Placement Officer, UIAMS, P.U., be treated as on deputation basis from Punjabi University, Patiala and his pension contribution, leave encashment and gratuity share as per Panjab University rules be sent to the Punjabi University Patiala, as per their letter dated 21.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**).

Arising out of the above, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Pension cases are also needed to be looked into, especially those, who have joined Panjab University, but were on pensionable job before 01.01.2004, and there are about 35-40 such cases, where the University has said, "No", they could not be given pension.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not add people to the Pension as the Centre is not agreeing. As such, they could not give them pension here. In fact, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India, is saying that they could not add people to the Pension.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired has they taken up the matter with the MHRD?

The Vice Chancellor said that, formally, Professor A.K. Bhandari and he (Vice Chancellor) himself had gone there and the Secretary, MHRD, had told them that their pension matter is already very complicated. If they reopen it, it would be full of problems.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it could be done without reopening, then they must do it. There is a regulation that an employee who is recruited at the age of 35 years or more, may within a period of three months from the date of his appointment elect not to be governed by the Regulations of the Pensionary Scheme. In the absence of such an exercise, he would compulsorily be entitled to pension. So as per the existing Regulations, if a person like this man also, has joined the University at the age of 35 years or more, he is entitled for pension. There are certain persons who had joined above the age of 35 years. They are not doing that even because it has also been mentioned that this regulation would be applicable to those who joined service under the University before 01.01.2004. Another regulation is those who join the University beyond the age of 35 years, they would have to give the option as he told a couple of minutes before. Meaning thereby that it is for future entrants, and both the regulations are contrary. But instead of giving the benefit under the regulation of 35 years, they say they could not do it. If one argues

that this is the regulation, then they say that they have given commitment to the Centre. So as per existing regulation, he has suggested that those who have joined after 01.01.2004 at the age of 35 years or more, let them go to the Court and the University would have to admit them. He had also written a letter to this effect to the University in the year 2011. On enquiry, it was being told that the letter has been referred to a Committee and the Committee would look into it. Thereafter, several contradictory things happened, but they stand as it is. Another issue is that the persons joining the University above the age of 35 years are covered under the regulations, but the persons joining the University after 01.01.2004 below the age of 35 years are not entitled to pension, and no effort should be made to cover them. However, those who are covered under the regulation/s, should be given the pension. He urged the Vice Chancellor to call the Finance & Development Officer, as he knows everything, to discuss the issue in detail and try to accommodate as many persons as they could, as per the existing regulation/s.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would attend to it.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is another category, and he has been given to understand that some of the people have gone to the Court. There are two types of retirees – (i) those who retired without exercising the option for pension; and (ii) those who retired and expire also and the pension scheme was introduced later on. When their spouses applied for family pension, they were denied, and then they approached the Court. Those who are still surviving, and could not opt for pension by the stipulated date, they are being debarred for pension saying that they did not exercise the option within the stipulated date, whereas there is no date for survivors. It is simple for them that whenever they opt for pension, they would have to deposit the share of the University without interest, but they would not be given the arrears, and the same is also a part of the regulations. More than 50 such persons are there, and they could be given the benefit of pension as per the existing regulations, but under some impression that if these persons are given the pension, their own pension might be stopped, but they did not know that their pension could not be stopped. He thinks that they should be humanitarian in approach, considering that pension is very important so far as social security is concerned.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is why, the Secretary, MHRD, has a very serious issue with the Panjab University Pension Scheme because the pension bill of the Government is more than its salary bill. They are very reluctant to have any more load of the Panjab University Pension at all. Any attempt to add more people to the pension would be scrutinized. Anyway, they should be ready to get it scrutinized through the Board of Finance as they have the instrument of Board of Finance, which is also a way of governance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the person is covered under the regulation, how could he/she be denied pension?

The Vice Chancellor said that if there is any additional financial burden, the matter would go to the Board of Finance, where the representative/s of the Centre is/are there.

Issue regarding confirmation of Dr. Jagdish Rai

13. Considered the case regarding the confirmation of Dr. Jagdish Rai, who was appointed as Assistant Professor in the Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology w.e.f. 05.06.2014 (A.N.) on probation of one year and was due for confirmation w.e.f. 06.06.2015. His work and conduct report has not been recommended as satisfactory by the concerned department as per the enclosures (**Appendix-XXXIX**) and letters from the Head of the Department dated 30.11.2015 and 10.03.2016, which are placed before the Syndicate for consideration. The Regulation 5 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, reads as under:

“Every appointment whether by direct recruitment or by promotion or by any other method approved by the Senate shall be made on probation for a period of one year, which may be extended by the appointing authority for a period not exceeding one year. The appointing authority may, however, grant exemption in exceptional cases.”

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to how this item has come again. In fact, a decision was taken on this item in an earlier meeting. While discussing the item, they had said that if the complaint had not come before the completion of 12 months, the person concerned stood confirmed automatically.

The Vice Chancellor said that, thereafter, they received another letter dated 10.03.2016 wherein it has been mentioned that there are serious problem in the work and conduct of Dr. Jagdish Rai.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this very letter had come and they discussed it in the Syndicate meeting dated 27.02.2016/14.03.2016, and at that time the Vice Chancellor had said that how does he know as he has received the letter only yesterday.

The Vice Chancellor said that when it was discussed last time, it was concluded that the consideration of the matter be deferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thinks that it has been wrongly recorded because at that time when the Registrar had referred to so many facts, he (Vice Chancellor) himself had said that once the person has crossed the deadline, nothing could be done. But perhaps, they have recorded something else. Anyway, he (Dr. Jagdish Rai) stood confirmed.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the conduct of a teacher is of a questionable kind, then they have to take action against him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the procedure for taking action against a teacher before confirmation is different and after confirmation is different.

RESOLVED: That since the probation period of Dr. Jagdish Rai, Assistant Professor at Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology could not be extended within the stipulated period, it be recommended to the Senate that he be confirmed from the due date, i.e., w.e.f. 06.06.2015.

Issue regarding modification in decision of the Syndicate dated 27.07.2013 (Para 7) relating to promotion of Dr. Bakhshish Singh

14. Item 14 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

14. To review/modify the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.07.2013/13.08.2013 (Para 7) (**Appendix-XL**) and Senate dated 29.09.2013 (Para XVIII) (**Appendix-XL**), with regard to date of eligibility of Dr. Bakhshish Singh, School of Punjabi Studies, for promotion from Reader to Professor under CAS, 1996, be reviewed/modified as under, in order to meet with the objection raised by RAO as under:

Decision already taken by the Syndicate/ Senate	Proposed to be modified
Resolved that, in view of the Senate decision dated 22.12.2012/ 20.01.2013, Dr. Bakhshish Singh, School of Punjabi Studies, P.U., be promoted from Reader to Professor one year after his original date of eligibility.	That in view of the UGC clarification dated 8.10.2013, Dr. Bakhshish Singh, School of Punjabi Studies, P.U., be promoted from Reader to Professor under CAS, 1996 w.e.f. 05.11.2002 i.e. after one year from the date of his interview dated 05.11.2001 vide which his promotion case was rejected by the earlier Selection Committee.

- NOTE:**
1. RAO has observed that the date of eligibility of Dr. Bakhshish Singh for promotion has not been mentioned in the resolved part of the Senate decision, which should be as per the UGC clarification dated 08.10.2013.
 2. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XL**).

RESOLVED: That, in view of the UGC clarification dated 8.10.2013, Dr. Bakhshish Singh, School of Punjabi Studies, P.U., be promoted from Reader to Professor, under CAS, 1996, w.e.f. 05.11.2002, i.e., after one year from the date of his interview dated 05.11.2001 vide which his promotion case was rejected by the earlier Selection Committee.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 18.01.2016 relating to promotion of Dr. Suchi Gupta, Assistant Professor, UIET

15. Considered minutes of the Standing Committee dated 18.01.2016 (**Appendix-XLI**) constituted by the Vice Chancellor, relating to the promotion case of Dr. Suchi Gupta, from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), UIET.

RESOLVED: That, since API score of Dr. Suchi Gupta has been re-calculated for the period 17th July 2006 to 16th July 2010 and her score in category 3 comes out to 57, which is more than the required score (i.e. 40) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), she be granted promotion from the date of her eligibility, i.e. 17.-07.2010, as there are two publications (for which she was not the main author in both the papers) with a marked factor of 4.893 and, as a result of that with augmentation of the score on impact factor, each paper will get a score of 35 and she not being the main author gets 40% weightage for that which come out to 14 each.

**Recommendations of the
Committee dated
19.03.2016**

16. Considered inputs/recommendations of the Committee dated 19.03.2016 (**Appendix-XLII**) constituted by the Vice Chancellor, pursuant to decision of the Senate dated 27.09.2015 (Para LV) (**Appendix-XLII**), along with additional papers.

NOTE: 1. The Senate at its meeting held on 27.09.2015 has resolved that:

(i) the report of the Enquiry Committee, pursuant to a discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 26.04.2014, be accepted; and

(ii) a Committee, comprising members of Senate and the Syndicate, be constituted to give input/recommendations to the Vice Chancellor ensuring that no injustice is done to any individual and at the same time, the operating system in the University is made foolproof.

2. The report of the Committee dated 19.03.2016 along with additional papers were sent to the Fellows/Syndics vide letter dated 21.03.2016 (**Appendix-XLII**).

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee was appointed and the recommendations of the Committee are at page 127 of the attached report.

It was clarified that the University has taken certain steps, including that there is only one *pro forma* for appointment as Superintendent to be recommended by the Principal of the College. Then there is a despatch number, which was missing earlier. It was also suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal in one of the meetings of the Senate that there should be proper record of diary and despatch in the University, which they have done. It was also suggested by the Screening Committee that the data relating to Fellows, Principals and College teachers should be created, so that the data could be scanned very seriously. Now, they are accepting *pro formas* only from the Principals and none other. Further, they have devised an application which would be issued to all the teachers of the affiliated Colleges approved by the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has been mentioned in the enquiry report that “there is no reason to doubt that the entire part played by Mr. Verma was willful and he knew what he was doing. It is, therefore, concluded that the conduct of Shri Munish Verma is quite unbecoming as a Senator of the University”. Section 36 of Panjab University Act “Cancellation of appointment of Fellow” says “The Government may, on the recommendation of the Senate supported by at least two-thirds of the whole of number of Fellows, cancel the appointment of any person appointed or elected as a Fellow of the University. As soon as such order is notified in the official Gazette, the person so appointed or elected shall cease to be a Fellow,”. This is a matter which he could not do, and it would go to the Senate. As such, they have to take a call on it, so that it could go to the Senate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that since Senate is not a appointing authority of the Fellow, the Senate could not take any decision on the suspension of Fellows.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that as per the provision of the Act, if the Senate recommends with two-third majority, only then the Chancellor could take a final decision on the matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to take a call on the recommendation/s which has/have come from some Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the Committee has written suspension, but suspension does not exist anywhere in the Calendar. Therefore, they need to correct it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the suspension could not be done, and only cancellation could be done.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they could not suspend the Fellow, and for cancellation two-third majority is required in the Senate. According to him, there must be some ethics for the Fellows as are in the case of Members of Parliament. At the same time, they should also be given some privileges. He suggested that a Committee must be appointed so that such incidents do not recur. He suggested that guest faculty should not be appointed Centre Superintendents, Assistant Centre Superintendents, etc. and the system should be made foolproof.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that though the suggestion put forth by Shri Raghbir Dyal is right, but without the guest faculty, the Examination Centres could not be run smoothly.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that though the Controller of Examinations is doing a wonderful job, but only those persons should be appointed as Centre Superintendents and Assistant Centre Superintendents, who are on the rolls of the Colleges. They have seen several times that a person is appointed Centre Superintendent, but he/she is not on the roll of any of the Colleges.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that though there was no mistake of the official/s, but they were harassed a lot. No person could be appointed Centre Superintendent, Assistant Centre Superintendent, Invigilator, etc. without the recommendation of the Principal. The Principal, who has recommended the name of the person concerned, should be punished, instead of targeting the Fellow. The Principal has recommended the name of a person, who was not working in the College. The University officials were supposed to see only the recommendation of the Principal and nothing else as they do not know anything about the teachers of the Colleges. Therefore, the Principal should be awarded harsh punishment.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would check and find out as to what the Government has done as they have already written to the Punjab Government about the conduct of the Principal.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it has been written that incidentally two members of the Committee are sitting amongst them. It has also been written that the Committee has been informed that a First Information Report (FIR) has already been registered against

them and request that they be followed up actively. Should he know which are those FIRs and in which Police Stations the FIRs have been lodged. It should also be told as to who informed that the FIRs have been lodged.

Professor Anil Monga said that when it was asked specifically “has some action been taken”, the officials, who were present there, informed that the FIRs have been lodged and that is why, these lines have been written, but he does know the status.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired does the University has FIRs Numbers and copies thereof?

The Vice Chancellor said that the copies of FIRs might be there and the same might have been shown to the members of the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the copies of FIRs were not shown to the members.

Professor Anil Monga clarified that they were informed that FIRs have been lodged.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that had the FIRs been lodged, the copies of the same must have been in the office record.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the FIR contained number, date and the Police Station, where the same is lodged. Secondly, since FIRs has been mentioned, there must be more than one FIR.

It was clarified that, in fact, two FIRs were lodged – one at Nihalsingh Wala and another at Sikhwala.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there could not be two FIRs for one offence.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is difference between complaint and FIR. It meant, they are not sure that the FIRs have been lodged or not.

It was informed that the file is with them and they would check and verify from the correspondence.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what correspondence has taken place, they have nothing to do with it. How could they tell the Committee that the FIRs have been lodged?

It was informed that the members of the Committee might have been shown the FIRs.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Anil Monga, who is a member of the Committee, has told that the FIRs were not shown to them. Even if Shri Chadha was the Chairman of the Committee and the FIRs were shown to him, the other members of the Committee should also have seen the same as they are also the signatories. He stated that to his knowledge no FIR has been lodged.

The Vice Chancellor said that when this incident occurred, a DDR was filed at one place, but later on they thought it was done at a wrong place, i.e., at Nihal Singh Wala.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired that the DDR which has been filed at Nihal Singhwala had the same contents as of the DDR filed in the Chandigarh, as asked by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa.

It was clarified that “yes” the contents of both the FIRs are same. A DDR was also lodged at Sector 11, Police Station and a copy of the DDR lodged at Nihal Singhwala was also supplied to Sector 11, Police Station.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had the DDR been lodged at Sector 11, Police Station, someone might have visited the University. He further stated that the Committee says that this Committee has been assigned twofold task to give input/recommendation/s to the Vice Chancellor qua (i) to ensure that no injustice is done to anybody; and (ii) to make the operating system in the University foolproof. But to punish a person, and to write to Punjab Government in the case of Principal; and writing 3-5 paragraphs relating to making the operating system foolproof is not appropriate. A provision relating to cancellation of membership has been quoted in the recommendation and suspension has also been recommended, but without any provision. He does not think that it was the mandate of the Senate as per the resolution reproduced by the Committee itself because at that time the Vice Chancellor has said that they do not have any intension to punish anybody, but at the same time they have to find out the way that such things do not recur in future. The recommendation which has been made, of course, the camera is on he has to say on record, could only be implemented if the same is approved by the Senate with two-third majority. If they do not get two-third majority in the Senate to recommend cancellation of the membership of the Government, what message they would send outside. The intention was not to test, but to ensure that no such incident takes place in future. Are they not going in the wrong direction? Secondly, what has been mentioned here by the Committee, was discussed in the Senate itself. It is nothing but translating the report of Justice Garg into capsule form that such and such actions should be taken as if the members of the Senate were not in a position. In fact, the Committee was constituted because the Vice Chancellor said that the queries which are being raised now, neither he is answerable nor it is possible for him to answer all these things. The first two objections which were raised were that the genesis of Justice Garg Committee is that the flying squad which had gone on that day, informed about this and it was subsequently found out that no flying squad was deputed there and no flying squad has actually visited the place. So at that time it was said that what has happened, has happened and it should be left behind, but it should be ensured that such an incident do not recur in future; however, that portion has not been touched by the Committee. Therefore, he is saying that it should be only in the form of strengthening the system. Even if for a moment, they say that they accept the report of the Committee, could they initiate any action against anybody without giving him/her opportunity under the principle of natural justice. Could they afford to go through all these things and bring in more embarrassment for themselves?

The Vice Chancellor stated that when they say natural justice, natural justice to whom. There are three kinds of people involved –

(i) officials whose names have been given; (ii) Principal whose negligence has resulted into this, and (iii) a member of their Senate. The Principal was irresponsible. The conduct of the member of their Senate is also not above board as he should not have done this. The officials involved are also not without any fault. The fourth person involved is a teacher, who also got in this misdemeanour and he also committed the mistake. The Committee was supposed to go through all the things, so that such things do not recur. The Committee's view is that if a stricter action could be taken against the Senator, it could be taken if the Senate approves it. However, the Syndicate, in their wisdom, they decide that since the new Senate is going to be formed soon, it is not going to serve any purpose even if they pursue it because they would be causing a division in the House of a kind, which is not called for. As regards that teacher is concerned, he (Vice Chancellor) himself contacted him and told him that he would reinstate him, but he would not go to the same College. However, the teacher said that he would not accept that and also demanded the back wages and wanted posting in the same College. In fact, he (Mr. Karambir) told that he had filed a case in the Court and he would get everything through the Court. When Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether he has filed a case in the Court, the Vice Chancellor replied in affirmative. He could not persuade him to see the reasons. He also could not understand his (Mr. Karambir) behaviour because sometimes he is very adamant and sometimes apologetic. Justice Garg had told him at personal level that he should be spared. He (Vice Chancellor) told him (Mr. Karambir) that he could get him back, but he asked that he should be given the back wages and also posted in the same College. The only two actions which they could take cognizance of are – (i) what the Punjab Government has done against the Principal involved in this case, and he could enquire from the Punjab Government on behalf of the Syndicate and report back; and (ii) he could also enquire via Controller of Examinations whether action has been taken on the FIRs lodged by them or not. Taking it back to the Senate, is another option.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they have already done, whatever was required of them. In pages 1-5 it had been written that the FIRs have been lodged and these three persons have been held guilty. When they sent the complaint which they believe to have been converted into FIRs, the Police would be taken care of all those persons irrespective of whether they are University Officials or Principal or Fellow of the University or whosoever, but they do not know whether FIRs have been lodged or not. The Committee has not even bothered to recommend any action against the persons who are proved to be guilty. If the FIRs have been lodged, even the person whose membership has been recommended to be cancelled is also covered. Once he is convicted under some criminal procedure, the follow up of that would automatically follow. Therefore, they should accept that the operating system should be made foolproof, follow up the FIRs, and asked from the Punjab Government as to what action they have taken against the Principal.

This was agreed to.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he has some more input. Perhaps, the Officiating Principal was transferred, but he came back after a few months.

The Vice Chancellor said that then he would go back to the Punjab Government and inform them about the factual position.

Item 17 on the agenda was taken up for consideration on 01.05.2016.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if **Item 18** is not much important, its consideration should be deferred till they meet next time.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay", fine.

Letters received from Secretary and CVO and Deputy Secretary (Vigilance) UGC

19. Considered (i) the letter No. F.30-48/2012 (CVO) dated 1.02.2016 received from Secretary and CVO, and (ii) letter No.F.30-48/2012 (CVO) dated 1.02.2016 (**Appendix-XLIII**) received from Deputy Secretary (Vigilance) University Grants Commission, MHRD, Govt. of India, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi regarding Enquiry Report on the allegations against Principal of affiliated College of the Panjab University.

NOTE: The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 27.02.2016 (**Appendix-XLIII**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred till the adjourned meeting to be held on 14.03.2016, but the same could not be taken up.

It was informed that the University had written to the Secretary, UGC that the College had been asked not to offer Industrial Chemistry course. A letter was also written to Principal, SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur, on 29th January 2016 asking the College not to offer the course from the session 2015-2016, and the College was also asked to return the grant to the UGC. But they forgot to send information to this effect to the UGC. A letter was written to the UGC on 09.09.2015 stating that as a follow up action a Committee comprising Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha (Registrar), Professor S.S. Bari had visited the College and had recommended that the course of Industrial Chemistry should be withdrawn and the money should be returned to the UGC. However, action was to be taken after the approval by the University bodies. Thereafter, this letter was received stating that affiliation should be withdrawn and the money should be returned.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council to write to the UGC that they had written to the College that affiliation for Industrial Chemistry course stood withdrawn and had asked the College to return the money to the UGC. Now, the UGC should take up the matter with the College directly. The Vice Chancellor further said that now they should come to the enquiry report submitted by P.K. Khanna.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, Shri Khanna has analyzed the report.

The Vice Chancellor said that the last paragraph of the report says "complaint letter addressed to Delhi Police against Shri S.S. Randhawa, for cheating and misappropriating the Government funds on the basis of fabricated bogus/fake documents". He enquired who would do this?

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the fabricated documents have not been identified. On the other hand, the College has still to pay the retiral benefits to Shri S.S. Randhawa.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever they were supposed to do, they have already done. Somehow the matter has come back to them. They are duty bound, on behalf of the Syndicate, to reiterate whatever they had already done, so that they could say that they have already done this and the UGC should get back the money from the College.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that at page 163 of the report, it has been written "That, the amount of Rs.42.30 lacs was released by UGC without any authorization letter to the College Management. The grant amount was not transferred by Shri S.S. Randhawa in a separate bank account, as was required under UGC Rule/Guidelines, whereas the grant amount was transferred in a different self operated bank account of Shri S.S. Randhawa, Principal of the College". It has also be mentioned at page 166 "Therefore, it is established from the analysis of Enquiry Report that Shri S.S. Randhawa, Principal of SGGGS College, Mahilpur (Hoshiarpur), (Punjab) in connivance with the Officials of the Panjab University; fabricated a bogus/false proposal and got it authenticated and forwarded to the UGC with the sole intension to cheat and misappropriate the Government funds. In fact, UGC was made to believe that the proposal forwarded by the University was genuine and correct". When they are saying as a part of allegation and mentioning it as a final conclusion, then it becomes their duty to find out the guilty people. Therefore, they could not accept this report in this fractured manner.

The Vice Chancellor said that *prima facie* they could not say whether this analysis is correct or intended to be correct.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that so far as his memory goes, probably the enquiry was conducted by Justice Garg, and the enquiry report was placed before the Syndicate and also before the Senate. Thus, the Enquiry Report was discussed in the Syndicate as well as in the Senate, and there must have been some resolution also on the item. From the item which is under consideration before them, it transpires as if after taking the decision in the Syndicate and Senate on the Enquiry Report, only the report has been sent to the UGC and not the deliberations which were held in the Syndicate and Senate. If it was sent, why it has not found mention here? If it was not sent, why it was not sent because the Enquiry Report was yet to be considered by the competent body of the University, and thereafter it has to go along with the comments of the University? This needs to be checked if it was sent, what were the comments of the UGC, and if it was not sent, then why and under what circumstances it was kept here and only the Enquiry Report was sent. Why he is saying so because Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa has raised a very pertinent question that after analysis the conclusion is that Shri S.S. Randhawa in connivance with the officials of the Panjab University fabricated a bogus/false proposal and got it authenticated. If they accept this report, that means that they are accepting that Shri S.S. Randhawa has done this in connivance with the University Officials. He thinks this was also discussed when the report was considered.

It was informed that only the report was sent to the UGC and not the deliberations. Perhaps, this was done immediately after the decision of the Syndicate and the decision about the deliberation was taken in the Senate meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired even if the report was sent to the UGC immediately after the meeting of the Syndicate, why the deliberations, which had to be taken place in the Syndicate meeting, had not been sent.

It was clarified that the letter was written to Secretary, UGC, on 9.9.2015, whereas the matter was placed before the Syndicate later on, i.e., 20.9.2015. It was written in the aforesaid letter that they are sending the report and the action would be taken after getting the report considered by the competent bodies of the University. After the decision of the Syndicate, though the decision was conveyed to all, except the UGC. When Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what was the decision of the Syndicate, it was informed that the decision was "That SGGs Khalsa College, Mahilpur, be asked to refund the money to the UGC, the affiliation granted to the College for Industrial Chemistry course be withdrawn, if not already withdrawn; and a Committee be constituted to visit the College to verify whether the College has requisite faculty and infrastructure for running the course.

The Vice Chancellor said that since Shri S.S. Randhawa retired in between, perhaps, that was why, they did not do anything.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the Principal, Shri S.S. Randhawa, has already retired, no action is required to be against him and only these things required to be done.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that when Industrial Chemistry course was given to this College, the people from the UGC had inspected the College. When some dispute occurred between Shri S.S. Randhawa and faculty member/s, the faculty member/s might have given wrong information to the team, and the entire enquiry had been conducted thereafter.

The Vice Chancellor said that the thing written that "it is established from the analysis of Enquiry Report that Shri S.S. Randhawa, Principal of SGGs College, Hoshiarpur, (Punjab) in connivance with the Officials of the Panjab University; fabricated a bogus/false proposal and got it authenticated and forwarded to the UGC with the sole intension to cheat and misappropriate the Government funds", is an accusation. It could be all false or have some justification. They have to protect themselves and probably say that it is not justified.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they have to see this particular document because it has been signed by the University authorities, and it say in connivance with the University officials.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they on 20.09.2015 took those decisions, which the UGC asked them to take, and conveyed those decisions to various quarters except UGC. But probably the UGC was waiting for the decision/s of the University. Had they informed them (UGC) that after considering Justice Garg Committee report, the Syndicate, the Executive Government of the University, has taken these decisions, the matter would have been ended there?

The Vice Chancellor said that he thinks there was no connivance of anybody from the University.

At this stage, it was suggested that whichever proposals of the UGC for different Colleges came to them, all those come just a day before or the same day for countersigning and they have no time to check them minutely. It is a very serious issue. The office also thinks that the money is to be given by the UGC, the proposal might be right as the College is covered under 12(b) and they are just forwarding the proposal. Thereafter, there is interface and the proposal is evaluated by the experts, only then they give grants to the Colleges. Then it is direct dealing between the College and the UGC, and the University has no part in it. The utilization also is directly with the UGC. Therefore, they could issue a general letter to the Colleges that the report should be sent to the University at least 15 days in advance; otherwise, they do not have time to minutely check the proposal.

Professor Shelley Walia said that, it meant, that the word connivance has been wrongly used.

It was told that it could also be said that the UGC had connivance with the College. How it could be said that the College has done it in connivance with the University. University only sees 12(f) that the Colleges permanently affiliated with the University, and forwards the proposal of the College to the UGC. Thereafter, interface is there and the proposal is evaluated by the experts, and only then the course is sanctioned and grant given. University is just to see 12(f) that the College is permanently affiliated with the University and nothing else. Thereafter, there is direct dealing between the College and the UGC.

The Vice Chancellor stated that all this has happened on a letter written by Shri Raghbir Singh. It is a dispute between one person and other and the person has leveled wild allegations wherein it has been written and the same phraseology has been picked up by others and the phraseology is going round and round. The background is that Shri S.S. Randhawa had been appointed Principal in the year 2004. There was some dispute whether he is a regular Principal or non-regular Principal. The matter went to the Court and the Court granted him stay and with that stay, he continued a Principal. If the University wanted, the stay could have been vacated. The University does not have that kind of manpower as many cases have been filed against the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, earlier, there was no Law Officer, and only a Superintendent holding a law degree was asked to take care of the legal cases. In those days, there was an item relating to Port Blair College, and the Port Blair College was disaffiliated with the University w.e.f. 1986. But much after the disaffiliation of the Port Blair College, a student who had appeared in B.Sc. and has taken Chemistry as an elective subject from Port Blair College in Panjab University examination as a provisional candidate because he/she was short of lectures and the College had not recommended him/her issuance of Roll Number, after two years of cessation of affiliation, the Principal of that College wrote to Panjab University that they had inadvertently written that the student is short of lectures. Now, they have verified that record and found that the student had attended the requisite number of lectures. They requested the University to declare the result of the student concerned, but the declaration of result took

three-four years. However, when the result of the student was declared, the student was placed under compartment in the subject of Chemistry. The University asked the student to take the compartment examination and if the student is able to clear the compartment, the degree would be awarded. Instead of appearing in the compartment examination, the student applied for re-evaluation. To which, the University replied that they destroy the answerbooks after a period of two years. The student filed a writ petition in the High Court, and the High Court declared him pass. In that case, the Panjab University filed a SLP in the Supreme Court and the spirit was how could they declare the candidate pass, and the SLP was allowed and the year was 1991 or 1992? So they do not follow the legal cases in spite of the fact that they have now three Law Officers in the University. When the concept of Law Officer was introduced, and it was Shri Satya Pal Jain, who insisted that they should have a Law Officer, who should be able to handle the legal cases. After one year they were appointed, they said that they should try to see what is the difference in the situation and analyze whether the situation is better before the appointment of Law Officers or after their appointment. They come to the conclusion that now they have more pending cases where the stay has been granted and where even the *ex-parte* stay has been granted. So much so he has been crying in the Syndicate and Senate meetings a number of times that some of the Colleges, especially the Colleges of Education, filed the writ petition that they are not under obligation to pay anything more than the basic salary to the teachers and they are not under obligation to pay D.A. and other Allowances, and the Court said, "Yes". The *ex-parte* order has been passed and the University has not been able to get the order vacated till now. As a result, now the degree Colleges have also started saying that if they are not obliged to pay full salary, why should they pay? Should an enquiry be not conducted that why and where the lapse/s is/are? Hundreds of teachers are suffering. Are they ready to accept as a matter of principle that it is only the basic salary which is to be paid to the teachers? Slowly with the same step the Governments have also started the proposal that they would pay only the basic salary. What he is trying to say is that they should try to take at least those cases very seriously, which are filed against the University. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa would bear with him, the impression in the High Court is, that file a writ petition in the Court against Panjab University, and take a relief, the Panjab University would not contest. What do they lose, if so many persons get the relief? The University as an Institution has not suffered. But the teachers & non-teachers working in the affiliated Colleges are suffering on account of such stay granted by the High Court. If the University is not resisting the stay granted, then probably they are not doing justice to the teachers & non-teachers, who are working in the affiliated Colleges. There are so many such cases which, in fact, are bringing bad name to the University and are completely shaking the faith of the people in the University so far as court cases are concerned. Therefore, a statement showing the pending cases should be shown to them. Though the Secretary to the Vice Chancellor and the Registrar could take care of this, there should be monthly return, which has to be submitted to the Registrar and the Vice Chancellor, stating the status of the legal cases.

It was informed that from the last month, they have started preparing the list of pending legal cases and a monitoring system of legal cases has been put in place.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this would automatically bring results. There are so many cases, where even their Lawyer does not appear. He (Lawyer) would go only if they show him the urgency by following the case/s. At least they could mark very important, important, urgent, case/s, etc. If the Registrar has been able to do this, it is good and he needed to be congratulated for that, but despite their best efforts, nothing was done. In fact, it is not a difficult job as they have only to inculcate this feeling that this important thing and whenever there is anything against the University, they are pained. The same thing has been felt in this case, when it has been alleged that Shri Randhawa has done all this in connivance with the officials of the University.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if they send this for a criminal case against any of the Senior Officers of the University, what would be the status. He (Vice Chancellor) should know how to deal with them as they start demanding money out of this.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that when the Law Officers of the University are drawing hefty salaries, they should be made accountable.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa apprehended that if the DDR is registered as it is, they (Police) would identify 4-5 persons and would start interrogating and harassing them. They all know as to how the investigating agencies in the country work.

The Vice Chancellor stated that they have written a letter on 9th of September to Secretary, UGC. In fact, they have just picked up some contents from the letter written by the complainant and said that all this has been done in connivance with the University Officials. Whatever information they had, the same had been sent to the UGC. He read out the letter dated 09.09.2015 written to the Secretary, UGC, which reads as:

“...It is stated at the outset that a perusal of the referred complaint does not allege the names of the specific officials of the Panjab University. Therefore, the alleged complaint about the involvement of the University official is unfounded.

In fact, the complaint had alleged that there was rampant corruption and misappropriation of public money by Shri S.S. Randhawa in connivance with the authorities of the University and the UGC. The complainant further prayed that conclusive enquiry be ordered to be conducted in the matter to find a truth behind it.

The University had constituted an Enquiry Committee consisting of Justice G.C. Garg (Retd.), Professor V.K. Chopra and Professor M.M. Gupta to find out the truthfulness or otherwise of allegations in the complaint made by Shri Raghbir Singh to the CVC/UGC, New Delhi. The report of the Enquiry Committee is enclosed for perusal. The Enquiry Committee concluded as under:

- (a) The Principal had not been duly appointed and was ordered to be removed but he continued to work as such in view of the stay order granted by the Hon'ble High Court.
- (b) Mr. Sarwan Singh, the alleged Coordinator had neither signed the proposal for the course nor he ever acted as Coordinator. In fact, Coordinator had never been appointed for the course.
- (c) Allegation of purchase of Skoda Car from out of the UGC funds cannot be accepted though a car had been purchased.
- (d) The allegation that the grant amount had not been deposited in a separate bank account as was required by the UGC stands proved and in view of the Committee, a strict action deserves to be taken against the Principal/College authorities in that behalf. Interest earned on the grant amount had also not been credited to the account. Opening a separate account does not mitigate the action of the Principal/College.
- (e) Proper procedure for purchase of equipment and maintenance of records had not been followed.
- (f) It is up to the Vice Chancellor to consider whether affiliation to the Course, in question, should be continued or not

As a follow up action, the Committee consisting of Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar, Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council and Professor S.S. Bari (Professor of Chemistry) visited SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur on 22.8.2015 and inspected the equipments, laboratories, etc.

The action which is to be taken by the University is yet to be finalized by the appropriate bodies of the University. Needless to say that the University is taking the complaint very seriously and looking into the matter impartially.”

After this, they received a letter of Shri Jaspal Singh, Secretary, UGC, in the month of February.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in the meantime, the University bodies must have deliberated this issue.

It was clarified that the decision of the Syndicate should have been conveyed to the UGC, but the same could not be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had the decision of the Governing Bodies been conveyed to the UGC, this letter would not have been

received. They thought that five months have passed and the University has slept even though they are saying that they are taking it very seriously.

The Vice Chancellor said that the operative part is that they reiterate that they have written to them in the month of September that since names of the specific Officials of the Panjab University have not been given, they do not accept this as there is no connivance of their officials in this matter. If anybody make wild allegation/s, that does not mean that they should accept them. The letter to this effect could be written by either the Registrar, who is Secretary of the Syndicate or the Dean, College Development Council. They would have it sent from the Registrar, who is Secretary of the Syndicate. However, the matter would not go to the Senate.

It was suggested that a circular should be allowed to be sent to the affiliated Colleges that such proposals should be submitted in the University at least a week before the last date so that they could minutely check them before forwarding to the UGC.

At this stage, a statement showing the legal cases and status thereof was shown to Shri Ashok Goyal on the floor of the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that such documentation would definitely have an effect.

RESOLVED: That it be reiterated that the University had written to the UGC on 9th September 2015 that since no specific names of the officials of the University, who are alleged to be connived, the University does not accept that any of its official had actually connived with Principal S.S. Randhawa.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Registrar would write a letter to the UGC, clarifying the position and fill up all the gaps.

Items 20 & 21 on the agenda were taken up for consideration on 01.05.2016.

Confirmation of certain faculty members 22. Considered the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor that:

(I) the following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

(i) **University Business School**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
#1.	Dr. Luxmi	Reader	9.5.1978	1.12.2014	1.12.2015

Vide Senate Para VI dated 28.09.2014, her appointment as Reader was approved w.e.f. 29.6.2010 i.e. from the date of Syndicate decision vide which recommendation of Selection Committee were approved. The period from 29.6.2010 to the date of her actual joining has been treated as notional and probation period of one year has been treated w.e.f. the date of her actual joining i.e.1.12.2014.

(ii) Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
**1	Dr. Puja Ahuja	Assistant Professor	29.6.1971	23.1.2015	1.10.2012 (deemed)

** In terms of orders of Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 19285 of 2011 the deemed date of joining of Dr. Puja Ahuja as Assistant Professor is 1.10.2011 i.e. one day after the date of joining of all the candidates who were selected by the same Selection Committee dated 1.8.2011. She has actually joined w.e.f. 23.01.2015 therefore her appointment from her deemed date of joining and upto the date of actual joining has been treated as notional and she will be deemed to have confirmed as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 1.10.2012 i.e. after one year from the deemed date of joining.

(iii) P.U. S.S.Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Brajesh Sharma	Assistant Professor in Law	2.4.1978	1.12.2014 (AN)	01.12.2015
2.	Dr. Dharam Pal Singh Punia	Assistant Professor in Law	10.1.1979	1.12.2014 (AN)	02.12.2015

Sr. No. 1 to 2 above are in order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee. Their appointment is subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 24115 of 2014 vide which their appointment have been challenged by Ms. Rajni Nanda, who was one of the candidates for the said posts, therefore, their confirmation will also be subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court CWP No. 24115 of 2014.

(iv) History

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
^1.	Dr. Priyatosh Sharma	Assistant Professor	14.07.1980	02.01.2015	31.12.2015
^2.	Mr. Ashish Kumar	Assistant Professor	12.03.1985	01.01.2015	01.01.2016

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

(v) Sociology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
\$1.	Dr. Sipra Sagarika	Assistant Professor	22.06.1987	02.02.2015	02.02.2016

\$ Subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 26081 of 2014

(vi) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Jagjit Singh	Assistant	25.07.1982	24.12.2014	21.12.2015

		Professor (Mathematics/ Applied Mathematics)			
2.%	Dr. Sunil Bansal	Assistant Professor (Physics/ Applied Physics)	01.03.1983	31.12.2014	22.12.2015
3.@	Ms. Neelam Goel	Assistant Professor (IT)	04.08.1985	31.12.2014	23.12.2015
4.*	Dr. Vivek Pahwa	Assistant Professor (EEE)	25.07.1974	01.01.2015	24.12.2015
5.%	Dr. Suresh Kumar	Assistant Professor (Physics/ Applied Physics)	28.01.1982	01.01.2015	25.12.2015
6.*	Ms. Aditi Gupta	Assistant Professor (EEE)	29.03.1981	31.12.2014	26.12.2015
7.*	Ms. Sabhyata Uppal Soni	Assistant Professor (EEE)	22.11.1971	31.12.2014	27.12.2015
8.@	Ms. Yogita	Assistant Professor (IT)	01.06.1985	28.01.2015	28.12.2015
9.@	Ms. Nidhi	Assistant Professor (IT)	01.07.1989	30.12.2014	30.12.2015

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

NOTE: 1. Confirmation of all the above will be Subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

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

(II) the Vice-Chancellor has recommended that probation period of Dr. Sunaina and Dr. Ritu Salaria, Assistant Professor in Law, SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur, be extended by one more year.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following persons be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the dates mentioned against each:

(i) University Business School

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	date of Confirmation
#1.	Dr. Luxmi	Reader	9.5.1978	1.12.2014	1.12.2015

Vide Senate Para VI dated 28.09.2014, her appointment as Reader was approved w.e.f. 29.6.2010 i.e. from the date of Syndicate decision vide which recommendation of Selection Committee were approved. The period from 29.6.2010 to the date of her actual joining has been treated as notional and probation period of one year has been treated w.e.f. the date of her actual joining i.e.1.12.2014.

(ii) Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	date of Confirmation
**1	Dr. Puja Ahuja	Assistant Professor	29.6.1971	23.1.2015	1.10.2012 (deemed)

** In terms of orders of Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 19285 of 2011 the deemed date of joining of Dr. Puja Ahuja as Assistant Professor is 1.10.2011 i.e. one day after the date of joining of all the candidates who were selected by the same Selection Committee dated 1.8.2011. She has actually joined w.e.f. 23.01.2015 therefore her appointment from her deemed date of joining and upto the date of actual joining has been treated as notional and she will be deemed to have confirmed as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 1.10.2012 i.e. after one year from the deemed date of joining.

(iii) P.U. S.S.Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Brajesh Sharma	Assistant Professor in Law	2.4.1978	1.12.2014 (AN)	01.12.2015
2.	Dr. Dharam Pal Singh Punia	Assistant Professor in Law	10.1.1979	1.12.2014 (AN)	02.12.2015

Sr. No. 1 to 2 above are in order of merit as per API Score awarded by the Selection Committee. Their appointment is subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 24115 of 2014 vide which their appointment have been challenged by Ms. Rajni Nanda, who was one of the candidates for the said posts, therefore, their confirmation will also be subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court CWP No. 24115 of 2014.

(iv) History

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
^1.	Dr. Priyatosh Sharma	Assistant Professor	14.07.1980	02.01.2015	31.12.2015
^2.	Mr. Ashish Kumar	Assistant Professor	12.03.1985	01.01.2015	01.01.2016

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

(v) Sociology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	date of confirmation
\$1.	Dr. Sipra Sagarika	Assistant Professor	22.06.1987	02.02.2015	02.02.2016

\$ Subject to decision of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No. 26081 of 2014

(vi) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Jagjit Singh	Assistant Professor (Mathematics/	25.07.1982	24.12.2014	21.12.2015

		Applied Mathematics)			
2.%	Dr. Sunil Bansal	Assistant Professor (Physics/ Applied Physics)	01.03.1983	31.12.2014	22.12.2015
3.@	Ms. Neelam Goel	Assistant Professor (IT)	04.08.1985	31.12.2014	23.12.2015
4.*	Dr. Vivek Pahwa	Assistant Professor (EEE)	25.07.1974	01.01.2015	24.12.2015
5.%	Dr. Suresh Kumar	Assistant Professor (Physics/ Applied Physics)	28.01.1982	01.01.2015	25.12.2015
6.*	Ms. Aditi Gupta	Assistant Professor (EEE)	29.03.1981	31.12.2014	26.12.2015
7.*	Ms. Sabhyata Uppal Soni	Assistant Professor (EEE)	22.11.1971	31.12.2014	27.12.2015
8.@	Ms. Yogita	Assistant Professor (IT)	01.06.1985	28.01.2015	28.12.2015
9.@	Ms. Nidhi	Assistant Professor (IT)	01.07.1989	30.12.2014	30.12.2015

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

- (II) the Vice-Chancellor has recommended that probation period of Dr. Sunaina and Dr. Ritu Salaria, Assistant Professor in Law, SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur, be extended by one more year.

Issue regarding 23. treatment of period of absence as leave without pay

Considered if –

- (i) the period of Dr. Puneet Kaur, Assistant Professor, UIET absence from duty w.e.f. 23.2.2016 to 3.4.2016 be treated as leave without pay being absence for non-academic purpose; and
- (ii) the period from 15.8.2015 to 22.02.2016 she be treated on EOL without pay under Regulation 11(G) at pages 139-140 of P.U., Cal. Vol. I, 2007 being EOL availed for academic purpose i.e. to join the position of Senior Design Engineer at P.C. Prints, Bangalore, Karnataka as she was relieved from the said institute and has joined back with P.U., on 4.4.2016.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Puneet Kaur, Assistant Professor, UIET was granted Extra-Ordinary Leave without pay for two years vide Syndicate Paragraph 6 dated 24.08.2013, w.e.f. the date she is relieved from the Institute, under Regulation 11(G) at pages 139-140 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007 enabling her to join the

position of Senior Design Engineer at P.C. Prints, Bangalore, Karnataka. She relieved from the department on 15.08.2013.

2. Dr. Puneet Kaur requested for extension from 15.08.2015 to 15.12.2015, which was referred to Leave Cases Committee. The Leave Cases Committee did not recommend the extension and accordingly, she was informed vide office letter dated 19.11.2015 & 10.02.2016 to join back her duty within 15 days from the date of issuance of letter failing which the post of Assistant Professor held by her in UIET shall be declared vacant under the Regulation 11.9 at page 120 of P.U., Cal. Vol. I, 2007.
3. She again submitted her request for extension. The Vice-Chancellor after going through the matter, ordered to ask her to join back her duty within 15 days. Accordingly, she was informed vide office letter dated 17.03.2016.
4. An office note containing the brief history of the case enclosed (**Appendix-XLV**).

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the period of Dr. Puneet Kaur, Assistant Professor, UIET absence from duty w.e.f. 23.2.2016 to 3.4.2016 be treated as leave without pay being absence for non-academic purpose; and
- (ii) for the period from 15.8.2015 to 22.02.2016 she be treated on EOL without pay under Regulation 11(G) at pages 139-140 of P.U., Cal. Vol. I, 2007 being EOL availed for academic purpose i.e. to join the position of Senior Design Engineer at P.C. Prints, Bangalore, Karnataka as she was relieved from the said institute and has joined back with P.U., on 4.4.2016.

Master list of seniority of teachers

24. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 07.04.2016 constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to make master list of seniority of teachers in the University

The Vice Chancellor said that this item is a very important item as they needed the Dean of University Instruction. This is an issue about which all the members are aware of the complexities. They all knew as to what was the system of the University before and after the implementation of the 6th Pay Commission. The problems came only after the implementation of the 6th Pay Commission implementation. Earlier, the University had some system in place and the governing bodies had taken some conscious decision. Thereafter, new Regulations came in and the problems started from there. The issue was that the old seniority list should not be disturbed. There was also a legal opinion on this matter. Earlier the office would prepare a seniority list in which the date of confirmation was not there. The date of confirmation would be after one year for those who had been appointed. The date of eligibility of those persons who were appointed elsewhere and came into the University system, that person was to be confirmed and the eligibility was 3 years earlier. If a person was appointed promoted through CAS in 2005, the confirmation was to be done in 2006. Even if the eligibility was from the back date, now that person had gone back in the seniority list as the confirmation was not done. When the report of the 6th Pay Commission came, the UGC said that the seniority list should be such that whenever a person became eligible, even if he/she might get promoted at a later date, the seniority should be counted from the date of eligibility. When a new person is appointed, he/she would get confirmed after one year. Now the issue was that what decision they had earlier taken should be reset or should remain as it is. For future, they have to take a decision. The million dollar question was that should they give up whatever was written in the Panjab University Calendar where it is provided that the confirmation has to be done. As of date, they have to take a conscious decision that while accepting the UGC guidelines, the earlier seniority list should not be disturbed because the earlier appointment had been made according to that seniority list.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested that the seniority list should also be prepared.

The Vice Chancellor said that as had been discussed in the Senate, first of all, they have to prepare the seniority list of Professors as the term of the present Dean of University Instruction is over and a new Dean of University Instruction is to be appointed. Then they could prepare the seniority list of other categories. They need not disturb the old seniority list and as per that list those persons who have to become Dean of University Instruction, then they would like to settle that question. According to that list, they wrote to Professor P.S. Jaswal offering the position of Dean of University Instruction. If that seniority list is not to be taken into consideration, then why they made an offer to Professor Jaswal. Did they examine this question? They have faith on the earlier seniority list to take decision for the position of Dean of University Instruction. They are protective of what they had done so far. If they are protective of what they had done so far and as per that list as they had asked Professor Jaswal, some other person has to be given the offer and should be given the offer. They should go ahead and do not leave those things mid-way.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they were not considering the appointment of Dean of University Instruction but were considering the master seniority list. They were not preparing the seniority list only for the appointment of Dean of University Instruction but it is the preparation of master seniority list.

The Vice Chancellor put the practical problem before the members because these are governing issues. The blame of governance is not only on him alone but indecision is the responsibility on behalf of the governing body that they have to share, pluses as well as minuses. This was the first question. The second question was straight forward what do they give importance to: to the UGC guidelines or the Panjab University Calendar, which says that the confirmation has to be done compulsorily which is done after one year after a person assumes the responsibility. The UGC says that the date of eligibility is important, then they have to give up the confirmation. So, it was not a difficult question. If the members do not like to answer this today and want to have time, they could take time, it is okay with him. It was possible that the members would like to consult amongst themselves and come back. They could take time. The question was very easy. They had offered to Professor Jaswal as he was the senior from all points. If in the same manner, they have such a person, he requested the members to tell him and he would happy to reach up to that person and invite him/her to be the next Dean of University Instruction. And if they did not want to decide that today, it is okay with him. He wanted to pose a question consciously to all the members. Another issue was that the court case is going on the age of retirement which could also complicate the things. The decision of the court case has not come as yet and when the decision comes, the whole dynamics would be changed. As such, he wanted to pose these things but not force a decision. Let they recognise the problems.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it was only the Vice Chancellor who could solve this problem. And they wanted the guidance of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could not perform his duty without the guidance and participation of the members.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that they could wait for the decision of the court case and in the meantime they could form a Committee of senior members to look into the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate could be formed.

The Vice Chancellor suggested the names of the Committee comprising of Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Anil Monga and requested the name of one person from Law either Dr. Ajay Ranga or Mrs. Anu Chatrath to which the name of Dr. Ajay Ranga was finalised. The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to chair the Committee to which he agreed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in fact, the Panjab University Calendar is very clear that everybody has to be confirmed whether one was appointed through CAS or direct selection. It was in the year 2005. That was why he had told in the last Syndicate also that let

they not hush up this and take a decision in a hurry which might again create problems. In the year 2005, they took a decision that one year after the date of promotion under CAS, the confirmation was to be done after approval by the Senate. A person joined after the decision of the Syndicate and worked for 4 months and that period is not being counted. The problem is that there were some people who appeared under CAS and before appearing under CAS, they appeared for open post also. One person was not selected under open and some other person was selected. After not being selected under open post, that person applied for promotion under CAS and was promoted from back date and became senior to the person who was selected under open selection. Then there was problem. It was only on account of this problem that the Hon'ble Supreme Court had taken a decision that the directly appointed persons would be senior than those promoted under CAS. The case could not be taken up in the manner it should have been taken up. There was an example. It was very rare in earlier times that the people used to go to USA to do Ph.D. and only those who could get some grant used to go to USA. A teacher did Ph.D. from USA and she was the only scholar available in the country of that subject. During those days, the scheme of CAS was not available and there used to be no posts of Professor available. When the posts of Professor were created, the scheme of CAS was also started. Under CAS scheme, that teacher was to be promoted from a date 5 years back. The Selection Committee asked that teacher whether she wanted to become a Professor under CAS or open selection. When that teacher said that she did not have the knowledge of such things and asked the Selection Committee members, they said that it would be beneficial for her under CAS as she would become Professor from a date 5 years back and the other person was selected. After a period of 8 months of the selection, there was a judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. After the judgment, that teacher gave a representation that she was senior as the other teacher was selected under CAS. She felt insulted that she came under CAS and said that her case should have been quoted in the Supreme Court. But here a person who is rejected and gets the benefit from the back date, there would be a heart burning. In the year 2008, he had given a proposal that to take care of this problem, they could make a rule that anybody who is promoted under CAS would be treated to have been appointed from the date of eligibility and the seniority would counted from that date provided till his/her promotion under CAS, in the meantime he/she had not appeared for direct recruitment and got rejected. There was a consensus on this also which is a matter of record. This was not suitable to some persons. The idea was that if a person was eligible under CAS why did one apply for direct selection. There was a resolution from one of the members which came up in the Syndicate. What he was trying to say was that when they prepare the seniority list, at least they should try on their part that there might not be any lacuna.

The Vice Chancellor said that the governing body could gain more credibility in this way.

RESOLVED: That, a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal including Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Anil Monga and Dr. Ajay Ranga, be constituted, to make recommendations, with regard to preparation of master list of seniority of teachers, in the University.

**Grant of increments to
Col. G.S. Chadha,
Registrar**

25. Considered if higher start/appropriate advance increments be granted to Col. G.S. Chadha, Registrar, on the minimum of the pay of Rs.43000+GP Rs.10,000 in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000.

- NOTE:**
1. As per the orders of the Vice Chancellor the present pay of Col. Chadha has been fixed at the minimum stage of Rs.43,000/- in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000 plus GP of Rs.10,000/- as an interim measure till a final decision is taken with respect to grant of higher start.
 2. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 31.1.2012 Para (41) (**Appendix-XLVI**) has resolved that two increments be granted to Professor A.K. Bhandari on his appointment as Registrar on the analogy of Professor Paramjit Singh and Professor S.S. Bari.
 3. A copy of the decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 22.11.2014 enclosed (**Appendix-XLVI**).
 4. A copy of the Audit observations dated 31.3.2016 enclosed (**Appendix-XLVI**).
 5. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLVI**).

The Vice Chancellor said that the item was that if the Registrar could be given higher starting pay.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there were precedents in the past also when 2-3 increments had been given to the Registrar. The workload of the Registrar is also heavy.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not protect the last salary drawn of the Registrar and as an appreciation, if the Syndicate could agree to give him 2 increments.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that when they talk about the workload, the other officers like Controller of Examinations, Dean College Development Council and Finance and Development Officer also have very heavy workload.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what the Vice Chancellor had said is right. The way the item has come is not appropriate. As was said, there were precedents. It could be on the same lines as was done in the case of Professor A.K. Bhandari.

The Vice Chancellor said that that is a different background.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not needed. He had seen the office note from which he came to know that it is more than one year when the pay fixation of Registrar came up. The Vice Chancellor had constituted a Committee in which his name was also mentioned which appears on page 205. The Committee had not been notified till date and also there is no mention that the Committee could not meet. It seems as if the Committee was constituted more than a year back and the Committee did not bother to do the assigned work. It needed to be looked into.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would look into it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this Committee was constituted entirely for a different purpose.

It was clarified that the Syndicate decided to obtain the information from UGC and other neighbouring Universities on the issue when the Registrar was appointed from armed forces background whether the pay could be protected or not. Then they came to know about some clarification which was issued by Ministry of Finance for some banking organisations. Then it was thought appropriate that instead of seeking information various institutions, let it be clarified from UGC as well as Ministry of Finance whether the pay could be protected or not. After the discussions, the clarifications were sought from the UGC. Without getting the clarifications, the meeting of the Committee could not be held. Only after getting the clarifications, the meeting of the Committee could have been held. They have written letters to the UGC followed by reminders but till date there is no response from UGC. Then the clarification from the Ministry of Finance was also sought which said that the clarification should be sought from the UGC because UGC is the administrative and regulatory body. Ultimately, the UGC did not give any clarification on this point and accordingly the matter proceeded further. The meeting of the Committee could not take place. The notification of the Committee might not have been done by the Establishment branch.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the issue which was referred to the Committee was altogether a different one.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was hoped on the same pattern the Ministry of Finance had allowed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was not relating it to that. But the Committee which he is seeing for the first time on which his name was included as a member and the Committee was constituted more than a year back and was not notified and whether any meeting was held or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Ministry of Finance had replied that they had done this for the banks as the banks are under the control of Ministry of Finance and that the Universities are not under their control and the guidance should be sought from the UGC and whatever they had done did not apply on the Universities. Whatever the Ministry of Finance did, it did for its own banks and said nothing more. The UGC was also requested seeking the clarifications but no response has come. It is a relevant point that when a Committee was constituted, it ought to have been notified. The notification of the Committee could not be done as the information which was required to be given to the Committee was not received. Now, there is a new proposal that the Syndicate has, in exceptional cases, given extra increments to the people after appointment. They had also given increment to a teacher also. Once in a while, in exceptional cases, the Syndicate has given increments. Vice Chancellor shared that he had also been granted the extra increments by the then Vice Chancellor Professor R.P. Bambah, as he wanted him (Vice Chancellor) to stay in Panjab University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he was not against granting the increments. But he wanted to seek clarification whether it is two increments plus the basic pay of Rs.43,000/-. As Shri Ashok Goyal had said, the grant of two increments on the basis of precedent, is not applicable.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the only argument which could be given is that instead of saying higher responsibility, they could say too much burden because they were giving advance increments. But do they not have to think of other officers also, who are not only overburdened, but more than overburdened, they should be gracious enough to consider their cases also for grant of two increments. He did not know as to what is the position of Controller of Examinations, Dean College Development Council or the Finance and Development Officer. They should not feel that these officers are less burdened. He had seen these officers sitting in the office even if one visits their office at 8'0 clock. Let them try to make an impression that the University takes care of those officers who are overburdened whether it is the Registrar or any other staff member like the one which Professor Shelley Walia had pointed in the last meeting of the Syndicate that he wanted a particular Mali to be honoured because that person is always available whenever required. Let them try to give an impression that they take care of those who really take care of the University and discharge their duties very effectively. He thought that an item for grant of increments to other officers could be brought in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That Col. G.S. Chadha, Registrar, be granted higher start by granting two increments on the minimum of the pay of Rs.43000+GP Rs.10,000 in the pay band of Rs. 37400-67000 w.e.f. the date of joining.

Issue regarding appointment of Assistant Registrar

26. Considered the minutes of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Registrar-1 (reserved for SC) (Advt. No.4/2011).

NOTE: 1. Three posts of Assistant Registrars (General-2, SC-1) were filled up vide advertisement No.6/2009. Subsequently on verification of eligibility the two persons Shri Lalit Sood (General) and Shri Bachan Singh (SC) were found ineligible and their appointments were cancelled.

Accordingly, the two posts were re-advertised vide Advt. No. 4/2011 (Gen-1, SC-1) and further number of posts were increased to 3 (Gen.-2, SC-1) vide corrigendum dated 19.5.2011.

Meanwhile, Shri Bachan Singh challenged the cancellation of his appointment by filing the CWP No.9055 of 2011 and the Hon'ble High Court in the interim orders dated 20.05.2011 (**Appendix-XLVII**) ordered that selection process in pursuance of the

advertisement dated 25.04.2011, i.e., advertisement No. 4/2011, shall go on but the result of the scheduled caste category be not finalized and declared till the next date of hearing.

2. Now the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court vide order dated 08.01.2016 has dismissed the C.W.P. 9055 of 2011 (**Appendix-XLVII**).
3. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLVII**).

RESOLVED: That since the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, has dismissed the CWP No.9055/2011 (Bachan Singh Vs. P.U.)), Dr. Satish Patil be appointed Assistant Registrar {(Reserved for SC)} on one year's probation, in the latest pay-scale of Assistant Registrar plus allowances as admissible under the University rules, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of appointment to the appointee, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

- NOTE:**
1. A summary bio-data of the selected candidate is enclosed.
 2. It has been certified that the selected candidate fulfils the qualifications laid down for the post.

At this stage, some of the members said that since they are exhausted, only items of urgent nature, which either require no discussion or minor discussion should be taken up for consideration.

This was agreed to and hereinafter, the following items were taken up:

Appointment of Principals in P.U. Constituent Colleges

75. Considered minutes dated 10.05.2016 of the Selection Committee (**Appendix-XLVIII**) for appointment of Principals-3 (Advt. No.6/2015) at P.U. Constituent Colleges (Punjab) (Nihal Singh Wala, District Moga-1, Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib-1 and Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur-1).

The Vice Chancellor said that this is a proposal which was in the supplementary agenda of the adjourned meeting. There was some mistake which the office had admitted. The Committee had rounded off the marks in the template which could not be carried out by the office. However, that did not affect the result. He was happy that they have got 3 Principals for the Constituent Colleges who are very experienced persons. If those persons accepted the responsibility, the Colleges would stabilise. All three of them have been a part of the University governing bodies and could provide effective leadership to the Colleges. The recommendations of the Selection Committees be accepted.

Professor Emanuel Nahar suggested that the pay of the newly selected Principals be protected.

The Vice Chancellor said that the pay has to be protected. They would put it as a part of the resolved part that not only the pay be protected but also one increment be also given so that the selected persons could join the duty immediately.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to where those three selected persons would be posted.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has to take a decision in this regard. He would try to ask each one of the selected persons and would try to satisfy himself in a way that it should be convenient to them and they should be able to give their best. One of them is nearing retirement and hopefully they would be able to take a call as and when the situation arises regarding the enhancement of retirement age. As of now, the recommendations of the Selection Committee be accepted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to appoint the teachers also in the Constituent Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had started the process.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that in all the Constituent Colleges, the non-teaching staff is also suffering a lot and they should be regularised.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the regular Principals join these Colleges, they would meet together and do something so that the Colleges could rapidly progress.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the fee structure of the Colleges should also be taken care of.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that since they have got Principals in all the four Constituent Colleges and the tenure of Coordinator, who had been appointed for these Colleges, should be over.

The Vice Chancellor said that the role of the Coordinator is over with the appointment of the Principals. He would make an Advisory Committee and try to get some people from the University faculty who have some empathy for those regions and visit the Colleges and work for rapid progress.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired as to whom the Principals of the Constituent Colleges would be answerable whether the Dean of University Instruction or Dean College Development Council?

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, the Principals would be reporting to the Dean College Development Council. The Dean of University Instruction must also accept the responsibility of guardianship as these were the Constituent Colleges of the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Constituent Colleges would have the same issues as that of the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Dean of University Instruction has a special role.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would like to congratulate all the newly appointed Principals. He had been raising the issue of Constituent Colleges for a very long time. He would request that the teachers in the Constituent Colleges should also be appointed at the earliest. He had pointed out that the template should be clearly written and the cutting/overwriting should be avoided. In the column of interview, there appears to be an overwriting and this should be avoided as otherwise it could become an issue for some persons. He had no doubt on the wisdom of the Selection Committee and the calibre of the selected persons. He was confident that the selected persons would do a good job and give the much needed leadership to the Constituent Colleges.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Principals in Constituent Colleges of Panjab University in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.10000/-, on one year's probation, on the starting pay to be fixed and protected according to rules of Panjab University. Each of the candidates has to be given one increment, over and above their protected limit, while determining the additional starting salary:

1. Dr. N.R. Sharma
2. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
3. Dr. Kuldip Singh.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the appointment letters to the appointees, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. A summary bio-data of the selected candidates enclosed. It had been certified that the selected 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.
 4. The Principal appointed in a Constituent College can be transferred to any other P.U. Constituent College by the competent authority.
 5. 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.

Issue regarding grant of temporary affiliation to new College in Andaman and Nicobar, Port Blair

78. Considered the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor that the delay for submission of application for grant of temporary affiliation to the new proposed College namely-Multi Disciplinary professional College, Attam Pahad, Garacharma village, Andaman and Nicobar, Port Blair for (i) Architecture Planning (UG), (ii) Management (PG) and (iii) Fine Arts (UG), for the session 2016-17, be condoned.

NOTE: 1. Letter dated 22.04.2016 of Principal Secretary (Edu/UD/ Rev/DM), Andaman and Nicobar Administration, Secretariat, Port Blair along with affidavit is enclosed (**Appendix-XLIX**).

2. The Dean College Development Council has made the following observation:

“Since the Jurisdiction of Panjab University has been defined under re-organization Act of the 1966 of the Punjab Govt. as per regulation enumerated in P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, and the University has been conferred the special status of Inter-state body Corporate, the request of the U.T. Administration of Andaman and Nicobar for seeking of affiliation of the proposed courses with the P.U. can be considered subject to the required permission by way of notification of M.H.R.D. As a special permission on which process is under way as can be discerned from mark ‘A’ and ‘B’ which is a part of the Affidavit furnished by Chief Secretary Andaman and Nicobar Administration (A&N), Port Blair.

3. A survey-cum-affiliation Committee (**Appendix-XLIX**) has been constituted by the Vice-Chancellor. However, the process is subject to the required permission by notification/special permission of M.H.R.D. or appropriate authority as per section-39 of the Panjab University Act-1947.

4. The College authorities vide E-mail dated 06.05.2016 (**Appendix-XLIX**) has informed that they have deposited the affiliation fee of Rs.2,10,000/- through RTGS mode.

5. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLIX**).

The Vice Chancellor while giving the background of the item said that at one point of time, the colleges of Andamand and Nicobar Islands were affiliated to Panjab University before the Pondicherry University came up. The Andaman Administration has some issues with the Pondicherry University. The U.T. Chandigarh Advisor is

always a senior officer of AGMUT cadre and the officers of Andaman Administration think that Chandigarh is a place which has numerous other institutions which are not there in any other Union Territory and Chandigarh could take care of needs of other UTs. The Administration feels that they if Andaman colleges are affiliated to Panjab University, then those people could get an access to these institutions. Hopefully, it would pave the way for those students to take admission in other PG courses of Panjab University also and have the benefit of education hub of Chandigarh. The U.T. cadre officers get transferred from one UT to the other. The Education Secretary and the Chief Secretary of Andaman and Nicobar Islands are also very keen. The Chief Secretary had personally called him (Vice Chancellor) and hoped that these colleges should also start enjoying the benefit of branding of Panjab University and they want that if the Panjab University could help them and more than that the students would start coming to Chandigarh and take admission in the PG courses. The Advisor, U.T. Chandigarh called him (Vice Chancellor) personally and the Additional Chief Secretary of Andaman and Nicobar Islands also visited Chandigarh twice and so many other officers have also come and pleaded that Panjab University should help them. It was not easy but as the senior colleague agreed and A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction, Professor Naval Kishore, Dean College Development Council, Principal, College of Architecture and Principal of the Govt. College of Art, Deputy Registrar, Colleges visited the College. The Andaman Administration had also sent the report initially by e-mail and then a hard copy was also received and they had accepted some things. This is where they are now and if the members agree to it, the whole IAS cadre of AGMUT would be very happy including the U.T. Chandigarh Advisor that the University had accepted their plea because they were doing lot of things. The MHRD is also very keen that Panjab University should help the Andaman Administration. The AICTE and the local Member of Parliament (M.P.) is also pitching that the University should help in this matter.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it was not within their territorial jurisdiction and the issue is a complex one.

It was informed that the Government had agreed to grant special permission.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the IAS from MHRD, the local M.P. and the Administration are keen that Panjab University should help in this matter and they all would be very happy if Panjab University granted the affiliation and also have the reason to be happy since none of them would be held responsible and accountable for violating the norms. It is they who have to take a conscious call whether it is within their purview to do it or not. First of all, they have to keep this thing in mind that if they could not condone the delay in the case of Punjab Government in spite of the fact that the Chief Minister was himself interested for the College at Jalalabad, were they in a position to give the concession which is beyond their purview. Second is the territorial jurisdiction as the Committee has written subject to permission of Government of India. The Committee should not have moved even an inch till the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) took a decision. Whenever the MHA would be granting the permission and the date of notification would be mentioned on the same and the University would have completed all the formalities before that date for which they would be answerable. These things

were limited to Panjab University where it is clearly marked as to what is the territorial jurisdiction of Panjab University under Panjab University Act amended from time to time by the Government of India by issuing notification under Section 72 of the Punjab Reorganisation Act and as per the Act, they could not go beyond Chandigarh and some of the districts of Punjab. But they have to read it in consonance with the Pondicherry Act also that they have some problems which meant that the College had got some kind of legal or technical or otherwise problems within themselves and that is why the Andaman College is not with Pondicherry University. If that is so, they have to take care of this also that tomorrow Pondicherry University could also create problems for Panjab University. Citing an example, he said that if a College situated in Chandigarh prefers to seek affiliation from Delhi University, are they not going to ask the college as to how they have approached Delhi University. Similarly, the Pondicherry University could also ask as the jurisdiction must have been defined in the Pondicherry University Act also.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the colleges of Andaman and Nicobar Islands were with Panjab University taken away, was there any notification.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at that time, the Pondicherry University was not in existence. Shri Gurdial Singh Dhillon was the Speaker of Parliament and the M.P. representing Andaman and Nicobar Islands had a talk with Sh. Dhillon saying that they have heard that the Panjab University has a very high status. The colleges of Andaman were affiliated with University of Madras and the Andaman administration had no issue with the University and the Colleges were affiliated with Panjab University and the colleges remained affiliated probably up to the year 1986. The order attached with the documents for allotment of land is after getting approval from the Hon'ble Lt. Governor of Andaman and Nicobar Islands. In fact, the Lt. Governor is the only person who is authorized to give this approval or seek affiliation for any college in Andaman and Nicobar Islands with a University within the territorial jurisdiction. But in the documents, there is no such approval from the Lt. Governor. He was sure that if they had known it, they would have got the approval. If the Andaman Administration and the Pondicherry University are against each other, then Pondicherry University is definitely going to create problem that how without asking the University or how without the approval of the Lt. Governor, the Administration had approached the Panjab University and under what authority Panjab University entertained the request. Only after taking into consideration all these facts, if they feel that they were on the strong footing, they have no problem. Then he was not against granting the approval. These things needed to be taken into account and everybody would understand in a minute and if they explain the difficulty that Panjab University was equally keen to grant the affiliation but keeping in view the difficulties, the Administration could tell what was the way out so that they did not face any embarrassment.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment they need not take a decision. He would try to get the answers to the queries posed by the members within 2-3 days which could be considered by the Syndicate in the next meeting.

This was agreed to.

At this stage, Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the next meeting could be convened on Saturday, 28th May in the afternoon and if some of the items could not be taken up, the same could be continued on Sunday, 29th May.

The Vice Chancellor said that if some matters needed urgent attention, the same would also be taken up in the next meeting and they would finish all the agenda items on 28th and 29th May, 2016.

Some of the members said that they wanted to make any suggestion on the panel of lawyers. The Vice Chancellor requested the members to suggest the names which would be included in the panel.

At this stage, the members started general discussion.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that as he had earlier been requesting, the construction work of the Regional Centre be initiated.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was already on the work.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the facility of India International Centre be extended to the Senate members.

The Vice Chancellor said that the booking of India International Centre is available to all officers of the University including the members of the Governing Body. But it could not be extended to all former Fellows. He said that since IIC did not accept the bookings directly, an office has to be set up for that.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Ashok Goyal said that this responsibility could be assigned to the Registrar who could handle the same efficiently.

The Vice Chancellor said that the facility could be used as P.U. is one of the founding members of India International Centre and the University pay Annual membership fee whether they use the facility or not. Those who avail the facility should make it sure that they settle the bill on their own.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they could see the data, very few people visit the India International Centre.

The Vice Chancellor said that Tata Institute of Fundamental Research is also one of the founding members and had designated a person who used to keep a track on those who visited the IIC and it was made sure that no one should be denied to use the same for official purposes. But when it came to personal use, that official would ask the Director whether the facility could be provided for personal use or not. The sitting members of the Senate should not be refused the facility and let the Registrar handle this.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is a monkey menace in Sector-25.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the issue of affiliation of Colleges are lingering on for the last about 2 months in the agenda. What is happening that more cases of affiliation are also coming up and they could not consider the same. The condition of the Colleges is not good and the Colleges are not paying the PF. The Colleges pay

the salary only after taking back the money which had already been paid. When the Inspection Teams visit the Colleges, the forms are gotten signed from the teachers and after the visit of the Team, the forms are taken back.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not that they did not have the norms in place. The norms are in place and they should follow those norms.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that for the last two years, the grant of affiliation is brought only in the agenda as information item and not for discussion. If the same were discussed in the Syndicate, the same were not in the Senate agenda. He had been requesting that the Inspection Teams be constituted and the Colleges should be visited. Even some of the Colleges were not following the reservation policy of SC/ST. The Colleges were not following any norms.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is a serious lapse.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would need some volunteers for this purpose. They have enough number of Senators from Punjab and they should be willing to help the University.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he was ready to offer his services.

It was informed that earlier a list of Senators of Ludhiana was prepared and more such lists could be prepared.

The Vice Chancellor said that 3-4 pockets of areas could be identified and a list of the present and former Senators should be prepared.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that a centralised Committee should be formed and some more names should be added to it.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he wanted to add to what Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said. They had imposed a condition of fulfilling the requirement of Commerce teacher on a College and the College every time said that none of the candidates was found suitable. Last year, there was a request from the teachers and they had also made the request to the Committee to get this condition fulfilled. However, the College appointed the teachers and now the management is saying that they wanted to avail their services in some other College. The approvals were stopped but later on the same were cleared. The management is trying to throw those teachers out of service. He had requested the Dean College Development Council also to form the Inspection Committee for such colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they do things not by just pick and choose and apply uniform yardstick and are strict, the results would come as is the case with the case of GMT College of Education at Ludhiana against which they had taken strict action. The management of the College had reinstated the teachers.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that a 5-member Committee could be appointed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he endorsed what Dr. I.S. Sandhu was saying that as and when a request is received, the Committee could take care.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if they did not take action against the colleges violating the norms, others would take the same as precedence and would also not follow the norms on the pretext that since no action had been taken against the other colleges, they would also be spared.

The Vice Chancellor requested the Dean College Development Council to prepare a centralised Committee comprising Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Raghbir Dyal, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha, Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Ajay Ranga. The Committee earlier constituted would be expanded.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that at the time when the election to the Senate were to be held in the year 2012, the Syndicate took a decision that those candidates who were contesting the elections, would not be made members of the Selection Committees as if they were part of the Selection Committee, whenever they visited the Colleges, they would seek the votes. Even the contesting candidates should themselves avoid being members of the Selection Committees. A Code of Conduct should be imposed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at that time whenever a Committee was to be formed, the contesting candidates themselves requested not to be a part of the Committee.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested that the promotion policy of Dental Institute be also taken up.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in the proceedings of Syndicate dated 23.01.2016/06.02.2016, Item 16 four Assistant Professors of University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, namely, Dr. Jai Malik, Ms. Vandita Kakkar, Dr. Amita Sarwal and Dr. Sangeeta Pikhwal Sah were confirmed. In the case of candidates No. 2, 3, 4, remarks have been given subject to the decision of Hon'ble Court. In the case of the person at No.1, i.e., Dr. Jai Malik, no such remarks have been given whereas CWP No. 17712 is still pending in his case also. It should be got verified.

Concluding the meeting, the Vice Chancellor said that now they would meet on 28th May, 2016 at 10.00 a.m., try to consider the whole agenda and if some items remained to be considered, the same would be considered on 29th May.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE CHANCELLOR

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE, which was adjourned **on 1st May 2016 & 15th May 2016**, held on **28th & 29th May 2016 at 10.00 a.m. & 10.30 a.m.** respectively, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 1. | Professor A.K. Grover
Vice Chancellor | ... (in the Chair) |
| 2. | Dr. Ajay Ranga | |
| 3. | Professor Anil Monga | |
| 4. | Shri Ashok Goyal | |
| 5. | Dr. Balbir Chand Josan | |
| 6. | Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi | |
| 7. | Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa | |
| 8. | Professor Emanuel Nahar | |
| 9. | Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky | |
| 10. | Shri Harpreet Singh Dua | |
| 11. | Dr. I.S. Sandhu | |
| 12. | Professor Keshav Malhotra | |
| 13. | Professor Navdeep Goyal | |
| 14. | Shri Raghbir Dyal | |
| 15. | Dr. Shelley Walia | |
| 16. | Principal Surinder Singh Sangha | |
| 17. | Col. G.S. Chadha
Registrar | ... (Secretary) |

Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting on both the days. However, Principal B.C. Josan and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa could not attend the meeting on 29th May 2016.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he welcomes all of them to today's meeting of the Syndicate. Before they take up the agenda items, he wishes to sincerely thank his Syndicate colleagues, who met on behalf of them and have given them some guidance (**Appendix-L**) as which items need thorough discussion, which they could quickly dispose off and which need intermediate discussion. They need to attend to the agenda before them because they do not have a meeting in the month of June. Next time when the Syndicate meeting happens, they want to start with less backlog with them. It is in this spirit in which they had decided certain items. Let them see how they proceed. He once again thanked all those who have participated and given the guidelines. He would like to suggest that they should first start with Part-C, i.e., the items which need no discussion.

When Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has to give two names for the panel of Advocates, the Vice Chancellor said that they could do that.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that one name is to be given by him.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should give the name/s and he would do that. No issue at all.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that certain teachers are on the dharna and they want to give a representation.

The Vice Chancellor said that the representation has come to him. He has also sent them a message that he would meet them during the lunch time.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is no harm if two-three teachers come and give the representation to him (Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said that he would receive the representation and there is no issue at all.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the teachers would be unnecessarily sitting up to the noon.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is ready to meet them during the lunch time, but if they want to come and personally handover this to him, it is okay with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that this message could be sent that the Vice Chancellor would be available to them during the lunch time, but if they want to leave, they could do so. However, if they want to give the memorandum, 2 or 3 persons could come and handover the same to him or he (Vice Chancellor) should go and receive the memorandum from them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has no issue at all. He further said that he has already sent them the message and has also spoken to them twice. He is more than willing to respect the sentiments of the entire Syndicate. Thereafter, the Vice Chancellor along with certain members of the Syndicate went to the dharna site to receive the memorandum from the teachers.

After receiving the memorandum, when the Vice Chancellor came back, he said that this could not be done. They have to produce all those documents, separately on behalf of the different sections, which constitute a University. There are teachers, who teach in undergraduate Colleges, there are teachers, who teach in postgraduate Colleges, there are teachers, who teach in educational Colleges, and there are teachers, who teach in Engineering Colleges. They have to make the comparison with PEC, IITs. The point is that they have to fight this respectably and strategically.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it was in Engineering and now they have done this in Medical Colleges also.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever they have done, is wrong. They have to compete with the best of the peer institutions nationally. If they put them in a so much disadvantage in consuming them, then they would wipe off research from the Universities and the Colleges. On the one side, they are saying that the College teachers should do research, and on the other side, they are making conditions of a kind that a person could not do anything. So they have to fight it in a very effective way, and one place to fight is State Higher Education Council forum. In Chandigarh, he is the Chairman of that forum, and that forum has been created by the U.T. Administration. They have to make the U.T. Administration fight their cause. There is expectation from them that they should deliver on behalf of State Higher Education Council. If their parameters are spoiled, how would they deliver? So these people have done the thing/s in a hurry and *ad hoc* manner. As such, they have to fight for them in a strategic manner. First they should prepare the document so that when the document goes, it becomes the basis for rallying the other Universities around them. They have to rally the Universities and the Colleges around them. One of the English

Universities has a concept of Universities within a University. So they are exactly on the same lines, and are the Universities within a University because their organs are competing with their peers, which themselves are Universities. If University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET) is to compete with PEC, then UIET is a University. If University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS) is to compete with National Law University, then UILS is a University. So they have to just go with this trend. They should leave it to him. He would spend time to write a preface on behalf of this University as to why as a National Institution, where they are saying that they would compete with the best of the National Institutions, if they do like this, they would not be able to compete. If they are not able to compete, what would happen to other Universities, which are like them? As such, they have to fight this with some strategy and he is ready to sit with them, but they have to provide him the input.

Confirmation of certain persons working in Group I of Laboratory and Technical Staff

28. Considered the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor that the following persons working in the Group-I of the Laboratory and Technical Staff (Pay Scale Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs. 5400/-), be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Mr. Ram Chander Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Bio-technology	13.06.2014	13.06.2015
2.	Mr. Hoshiar Singh Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Physics	13.10.2014	13.10.2015
3.	Mr. Raj Kumar Dogra Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Physics	13.10.2014	14.10.2015

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

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following persons working in the Group-I of the Laboratory and Technical Staff (Pay Scale Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/-), be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Mr. Ram Chander Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Bio-technology	13.06.2014	13.06.2015
2.	Mr. Hoshiar Singh Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Physics	13.10.2014	13.10.2015
3.	Mr. Raj Kumar Dogra Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Physics	13.10.2014	14.10.2015

Confirmation of Senior Scientific Officer, CIL

29. Considered the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor that the following person working in the Pay Scale Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs. 6600/-, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned against his name:

Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
Shri Parveen Gupta Senior Scientific Officer Central Instrumentation Laboratory	07.04.2014 (A.N.)	08.04.2015

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

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following person working in the Pay Scale Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.6600/-, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned against his name:

Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
Shri Parveen Gupta Senior Scientific Officer, Central Instrumentation Laboratory	07.04.2014 (A.N.)	08.04.2015

Confirmation of System Managers

30. Considered the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor that the following persons working as System Manager, be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Ms. Mamta Computer Centre	02.02.2015 (F.N.)	02.02.2016
2.	Ms. Monika Rani University Institute of Engineering & Technology	02.02.2015 (A.N.)	03.02.2016

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

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following persons working as System Manager, be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Ms. Mamta Computer Centre	02.02.2015 (F.N.)	02.02.2016
2.	Ms. Monika Rani University Institute of Engineering & Technology	02.02.2015 (A.N.)	03.02.2016

Issue regarding presentation of synopsis through video-conferencing (Skype)

39. Considered letter dated 15.03.2016 (**Appendix-LIV**) recommended by the Chairperson, Department of Physics, that the synopsis presentation of research scholars, be held in RDC via video-conferencing (Skype). Information contained in office note (**Appendix-LIV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: There is no rule for holding the synopsis presentation in the RDC meeting for the Ph.D. students via video-conferencing (Skype).

The Vice Chancellor said that it came in the context of High Energy Physics people who have to remain outside of their field stations for a large part as if their place of duty is that field station wherever they have gone. This has come in the background that if such a situation is elsewhere, they should also be permitted. So this is a progressive measure, and this should be permitted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should not be made special, but it should be made general, so that such requests do not come to the Syndicate again and again. He clarified that the presentation of synopsis on Skype should be made applicable in general to all.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Director, Research Promotion Cell should be authorized to take decision on all such requests. However, the condition should be that the person is abroad, and not that the person is outstation and he/she should be permitted to present his/her synopsis through Skype.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the approval has to be given by the Dean.

The Vice Chancellor said that in such cases the approval has to be taken from the Director, Research Promotion Cell.

Professor Anil Monga said that if the person is on official assignment and is unable to make presentation of his/her synopsis, only then he/she should be allowed; otherwise, there is a scope of misuse of this provision.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that only the person/s, who is/are in the foreign countries, should be allowed to make presentation of the synopsis through Skype.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should also allow the candidates to make presentation of their synopses through Video Conferencing. Earlier, in one case they had conducted an interview through the Video Conference. This was done because the person came all the way from the USA to the interview, but the interview was postponed, and he went back. Later on, when the interview was again fixed, then he said that he would not come because he has already incurred so much expenses. Thereafter, the person was allowed to give interview through Video Conferencing.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could be done, but let him first set up the system.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this requires to be done because they used to postpone the dates of interviews more often than not.

The Vice Chancellor said that hitherto he has not changed the date/s of interview/s. When Professor Shelley Walia said that they should put the system in place, the Vice Chancellor said that they have to put the hardware as well as software in place. He added that they have to have good (internet) connection and two cameras. There has to be person as well who has to prompt the camera to the other side whenever a question is asked to him/her. It also requires some investment and somebody who has to coordinate all this. As a premier University of the country, they should be seem to be doing this and with the cooperation all of them, he is encouraged to do it.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Daisy Kalra and Ms. Jyoti Tripathi, Research Scholars, Department of Physics, be allowed to make presentation of their synopses in Research Degree Committee through video-conferencing (Skype).

Appointment of the House Allotment Committees

40. Item 40 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

40. To appoint the House Allotment Committees I and II (**Appendix-LV**) for the term from 01.04.2016 to 31.03.2018, under Rule 1 at page 52 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

NOTE: 1. The term of both the Committees had expired on 31.3.2016.

2. Rule 1 at page 52 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“The Syndicate may appoint two House Allotment Committees, i.e. one for houses up to ‘D’ type categories and the other for houses above ‘D’ type categories i.e. ‘E’ and above categories. The term of the Committee shall be for 2 years, beginning from April 1.”

After some discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the House Allotment Committees I and II for the term from 01.04.2016 to 31.03.2018, be appointed, under Rule 1 at page 52 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, as below:

HAC-I (for the houses of Higher than ‘D’ type houses)

5. Dean of University Instruction
6. Shri Ashok Goyal
7. Professor Keshav Malhotra
8. Professor Anil Monga
9. Dr. Ajay Ranga
10. Registrar
11. Finance & Development Officer

12. Professor R.K. Singla, Department of Computer Science & Application
13. Professor Pampa Mukherjee, Department of Political Science
14. Professor Sukhwinder Singh, UIET, P.U.
15. Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry
16. Dr. C.N. Kumar, Department of Physics
17. Dr. Shruti Bedi, University Institute of Legal Studies
18. Professor Emanuel Nahar, University School of Open Learning
19. Professor Preeti Mahajan, Department of Library & Information Science
20. Dr. Jatinder Grover, Department of Education
21. X.E.N.
22. S.D.O. (Electrical)
23. President PUTA,
24. President, Library Staff Association
25. Deputy Registrar (Estate)

HAC-II (for the houses of up to 'D' type houses)

1. Dean of University Instruction
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor Keshav Malhotra
4. Professor Anil Monga
5. Dr. Ajay Ranga
6. Registrar
7. Finance & Development Officer
8. Professor Rumina Sethi, Department of English & Cultural Studies
9. Professor Uma Sethi, School of Punjabi Studies
10. Professor Devinder Singh, Department of Laws
11. Professor Amrit Pal Toor, UICET
12. Professor Karamjeet Singh, University Business School
13. Professor Praveen Rishi, Department of Microbiology
14. Professor Venugopal, Department of Chemistry
15. X.E.N.
16. S.D.O. (Electrical)
17. President PUSA
18. President PULTA,
19. President PUCCSA
20. President Press Workers' Union
21. President PUSTA
22. President, Drivers' Union
23. Deputy Registrar (Estate)

Revised rate for Handbook of Hostel Rules

47. Considered minutes of the meeting of Hostel Committee dated 11.03.2016 (**Appendix-LVI**) regarding amendments/rate revision for the Handbook of Hostel Rule for Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur and minutes of the Committee dated 31.03.2016 (**Appendix-LVI**) with regard to rate revision for the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Amrita Shergil Girls' Hostel, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, and

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) recommendations of Hostel Committee dated 11.03.2016 (**Appendix-LVI**) regarding

amendments/ rate revision for the Handbook of Hostel Rule for Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, for the session 2016-17, be approved.

- (ii) the recommendations of the Committee dated 31.03.2016 (**Appendix-LVI**) with regard to rate revision for the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Amrita Shergil Girls' Hostel, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, for the session 2016-17, be approved.

Request of Shri Amitava Banerjee, regarding to complete his ME programme

51. Considered request dated 25.01.2016 (**Appendix-LVII**) of Shri Amitava Banerjee, candidate of ME Manufacturing Technology (Modular), NITTTR, Sector-26, Chandigarh, that he be allowed to complete his ME programme as he could not attend fifth and sixth spells in June, 2009 and December, 2009 respectively, on account of Sub-Arachnoids Hemorrhage in brain, as a special case.

- NOTE:** 1. Shri Amitava Banerjee took admission in Manufacturing Technology (Modular) programme in 2007.

The maximum duration for completing a ME Programme is six years with further two years extension in genuine hardship cases to be allowed by the Vice-Chancellor for submission of thesis, i.e. a total of eight years.

2. The Dean University Instruction has observed that:

“It is a genuine case. The person remained in coma for about 3 years. The director has recommended up to 8 years, the Vice-Chancellor could grant exemption. In this case it may be 9 to 10 years as a special case permission may be taken from Syndicate as a very special case.”

3. Treatment Summary of the candidate along with the letter dated 09.02.2016 of the Director, NITTTR, Sector-26, Chandigarh, is enclosed (**Appendix-LVII**)

RESOLVED: That the request dated 25.01.2016 (**Appendix-LVII**) of Shri Amitava Banerjee, a candidate of ME Manufacturing Technology (Modular), NITTTR, Sector-26, Chandigarh, that he be allowed to complete his ME Programme, as he could not attend fifth and sixth spells in June 2009 and December 2009, respectively, on account of Sub-Arachnoids Hemorrhage in brain, be acceded to, as a special case.

**Recommendations of the
Committee dated
08.04.2016**

53. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 08.04.2016 (**Appendix-LVIII**) that ICP Plasma Scan Model 8410 (lying in lab No. 102) at Centre of Advanced Study In Geology, Department of Geology, P.U. purchased on 26.02.1988 costing Rs.9,65,814/-, under DST project of Dr. Naresh Kochhar (Retd.), be written off as the instrument is obsolete, lying in a dilapidated condition and is beyond any repair.

NOTE: 1. As per P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 at pages 450-51, the competent authority to write off losses is as under:

1.	Vice Chancellor	Up to Rs.1 lac per item
2.	Syndicate	Up to Rs.5 lac per item
3.	Senate	Without any limit for any item

2. Letter dated 12.04.2016 of Professor Naveen Chaudhri, Chairperson, Centre of Advanced Study in Geology, P.U. enclosed (**Appendix-LVIII**).

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that ICP Plasma Scan Model 8410 (lying in lab No. 102) at Centre of Advanced Study In Geology, Department of Geology, P.U., purchased on 26.02.1988 costing Rs.9,65,814/-, under DST project of Dr. Naresh Kochhar (Retd.), be written off as the instrument is obsolete, lying in a dilapidated condition and is beyond any repair.

**Regarding grant of
extension of Partap
College of Education,
Hambran Road, District
Ludhiana**

56. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Partap College of Education, Hambran Road, District Ludhiana, for B.Ed. -1st and 2nd year (200 seats) and M.Ed. 1st and 2nd year (50seats) for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./NCTE.

NOTE: 1. The report of Inspection Committee dated 27.02.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, is enclosed.

2. An office note is enclosed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they have not formed any Committee for grant of affiliation and all the items for grant of affiliation were coming directly from the Colleges branch.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that it would be appropriate if these items were routed through the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the items are not considered, it could delay the process.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the documents related with the payment of salary were not attached with the inspection reports.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the appointments had not been made and the requirement is not complete. He said that till the time the certificate of compliance of the completion of requirement was not submitted, it could not be done.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha suggested that the approval could be granted subject to the compliance of the deficiencies pointed out.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could make a Committee to see that the compliances are met.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the approval of the Colleges, in the light of what had been stated in the case of first College itself, could not be given like that subject to conditions.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had accepted that the members could form a Committee and let these things go to the Committee.

RESOLVED: That a Committee comprising Shri Ashok Goyal (Chairman), Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Principal B.C. Josan, Shri Raghbir Dyal, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Principal S.S. Sangha, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. I.S. Sandhu and D.R. Colleges (Convener) be constituted to check the inspection report/s thoroughly and verify their compliance/s and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

A general discussion was initiated thereafter. This is collated as the last item, as the general discussion concluded only on May 29.

Inspection Report

57. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Shri Guru Ram Das College of Education, VPO Halwara, Pakhowal Road, Distt. Ludhiana for B.Ed. 1st and 2nd year-50 seats (1 unit) for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/ Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./NCTE.

- NOTE:**
1. Inspection Committee Report of the College along with office letter dated 23.03.2016, enclosed.
 2. An office note enclosed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the annexures have not been attached.

Dr. Ajay Ranga and Professor Shelley Walia said that the item should go to the 9-member Committee constituted under item No.56.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item be referred to the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspector report

58. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Mai Bhago College for Women, Ramgarh, District, Ludhiana for B.Com. 1st, 2nd & 3rd year (1 unit) (Semester) for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC.

NOTE: 1. Inspection Committee Report of the College along with office letter dated 17.03.2016, enclosed.

2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

59. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Shri Ram College, Dalla, Tehsil, Jagraon, Distt. Ludhiana for (i) B.Com. 2nd year (one unit)(semester) (ii) M.A. 2nd year (Punjabi) (Semester) (iii) P.G.D.C.A. (one year)(semester) for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/ Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC.

NOTE: 1. Inspection Committee Report of the College along with office letter dated 21.03.2016, enclosed.

2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

60. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh for Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing course with the maximum number of 10 students (Ten students per year) for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the Indian Nursing Council and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

NOTE: 1. The Inspection Committee dated 19.02.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, has recommended that proposed extension of affiliation be granted for the Diploma in Psychiatry Nursing course with the maximum number of students the College is allowed to admit 10 (ten students per year).

2. An office note is enclosed.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the item related to the medical education. The medical philosophy should be promoted and with proper procedure. The Syndicate twice rejected an issue and thereafter the same was allowed. It was not fair. The sanctity of the House should be maintained.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had already taken a decision that unless and until the College had got the mandatory approval of the apex body, the University would not send the Inspection Committee and that decision was specifically taken with regard to medical college. Now it has again started to come as subject to approval. If the approval from the Nursing Council had not received till date, then when it was expected to come.

The Vice Chancellor said all this was on 27th February and after that 3 months have passed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this item should also be referred to the Committee and let the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the item goes to the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

61. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Govt. Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32-B, Chandigarh for M.D. (Pulmonary medicine) course with the maximum number of 04 students (Four students per year) for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfilment of the conditions that the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the course/ subjects thereafter.

NOTE: 1. The report of Inspection Committee dated 09.03.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, has recommended that proposed extension of affiliation be granted for the M.D. (Pulmonary medicine) course with the maximum number of students the College is allowed to admit 04 (Four students per year).

2. An office note enclosed.

It was informed that the Medical Council of India (MCI) grants the approval only after the affiliation had been granted by the University on the lines of Bar Council of India.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the item could be referred to the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that 9-member Committee has enough wisdom to consider such things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a lot of difference between affiliation at the beginning and it is not a new affiliation but a continuing one.

It was informed that if the affiliation is not granted, the MCI did not consider the application. This one particular was time bound.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

62. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Devki Jain Memorial College for Women, Kidwai Nagar, Distt. Ludhiana, for (i) B.Com. 1st year (2nd unit)(semester) (ii) B.A. 1st year Physical Education (Elective) (iii) B.A. 1st year Computer Applications-E (semester) (iv) M.Com. 1st year (one unit)(semester) (v) M.A. 1st & 2nd year (English) (one unit) (semester) for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/ Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC.

- NOTE:**
1. Inspection Committee Report of the College along with office letter dated 12.03.2016, enclosed.
 2. An office note enclosed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the documents were incomplete.

The Vice Chancellor said that this could be referred to the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

63. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Gujranwala Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Civil Lines, Ludhiana, for (i) B.A. 1st, 2nd and 3rd year (Computer Science)-E (Semester), (ii) B.C.A.-1st, 2nd and 3rd year (One Unit)(Semester), (iii) B.Com. 1st year (3rd Unit) (Semester) for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/ Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC.

- NOTE:**
1. The report of Inspection Committee dated 26.02.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, enclosed.
 2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

64. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to National College for Women, Machhiwara, Distt. Ludhiana for B.Sc. 1st & 2nd year (Fashion Designing) (one unit)-40 seats (semester) for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/ Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC.

- NOTE:**
1. Inspection Committee Report of the College along with office letter dated 18.03.2016, enclosed.
 2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

At this stage, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that in the inspection report, the Inspection Committee had recommended temporary extension of affiliation to the College in spite of the fact that the existing faculty was being paid the scale of salary as Rs.15,600/-. The same scales are to be paid to the new faculty to be appointed.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to what amount was to be paid to the faculty to be appointed for the B.A.B.Ed. courses.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the Committee had recommended the salary of Rs.21,600/- as was given by the Punjab Government.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the matter is being misquoted. The mandate quoted of the Punjab Government was on the basis of court orders which had been filled up on contract basis and the same was being imposed on the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the payment of a salary of Rs.15,600/- is not allowed then the payment of Rs.21,600/- is also not allowed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Principal B.C. Josan was informing the Syndicate about a verbal discussion that a Committee, which was not empowered to take any decision in this regard, had taken a verbal decision. If they themselves could not take care of the Rules and Regulations, how could they expect anybody else to take care. He had earlier also raised the issue. The decision of the Punjab Government to pay only Rs.21,600/- was also not in conformity with the Regulations of the University and the UGC. He had specifically said that they have to take a conscious decision of not to approve the teachers who had been appointed by the Government as it was the violation of the Regulations of the University and they had taken a decision that those teachers appointed on contract on a salary of Rs.21,600/-, would not be approved. But to his utter shock, the approval had been given. If they did not follow their own Regulations, then all the Colleges would say that the University had approved the teachers appointed on contract basis by the Punjab Government at a salary of Rs.21,600/-, how could they stop the Colleges from appointing the teachers on the same salary. As the Vice Chancellor had said that if they could not stop them from appointing the teachers at a salary of Rs.21,600/-, how could they stop from appointing the teachers at a salary of Rs.15,600/- and then why not Rs.10,000/- also and then why a proposal not come from one of the members that let them be practical. Being practical and being custodian of their own statute is altogether different. He thought that they could change the statute. Let them take the decision that in supersession of all the Regulations/Rules of the University/UGC, let them say that any College was free to appoint any teacher at any scale whatever the College wanted. It was discussed in the last meeting and the Vice Chancellor had also shown the concern that some Colleges approached the Hon'ble High Court and got the stay that they were not supposed to pay DA on the basic pay and the stay had been going on for the last about 4 years and the University had not taken any steps to get the stay vacated. That was the case of Education

Colleges. Following the same, the Degree Colleges have also started to say that if the High Court had granted the stay in the case of Education Colleges, why should they pay the DA on the basic pay. Let them see from where they have started and where they have to go. It was a statement which was being made here that on account of whatever discussion was going that they were accepting that the payment of a salary of Rs.21,600/- was allowed.

The Vice Chancellor said that no, they would not allow it. When the Punjab Government took this decision, they were in a dilemma. The other two Universities of Punjab were doing so. If the decision of the Punjab Government is not implemented in the affiliated Colleges, then the posts in the category of grant-in-aid which were in the process of getting filled after a very long time, the Colleges affiliated with Panjab University would be left without teachers and the other Universities would get the teachers. It was only under that special choice that if they did not adopt that, the positions would not be filled up. That was why that they agreed not to raise their voice to the Punjab Government. Even though, it should not be encouraged. They did it consciously that initially the appointments were for a period of 3 years and after that the teachers would be regularised. Till the regularisation, the recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission would be implemented then the present basic pay would automatically increase. It was under those very special circumstances that they agreed to what Punjab Government was doing in the Degree Colleges. The matter of Education Colleges is a different one. He was personally not in favour of doing things of Education Colleges for the Degree Colleges. His concern at the moment was that as now the course of B.A.B.Ed., a 4-year course has emerged, is it to be treated under the situation of Degree Colleges or in the situation of Education Colleges. This was the central thing. These were Education College type things. These were the things which are there in the Education Colleges as well as in the Degree Colleges. The Education Colleges would continuously keep on saying that the Hon'ble High Court had given them the stay which could not be got vacated. Taking the advantage of that stay, the Education Colleges which are running the 4-year course are going on. Now the thing is that the Degree Colleges which joined that band wagon would also get the stay as the University was not doing anything against the other Colleges. This was the option before them. Therefore, the salary of Rs.15,600/- to be paid to the teachers is not to be accepted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University should not give the approval for those teachers who are being paid the salary of Rs.15,600/- or Rs.21,600/-. They had taken a decision in this regard in spite of that approvals have been granted and were in the process of granting approval.

Principal B.C. Josan said that if the approvals are not granted, the courses would not be granted by the Government.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that granting the approval to the teachers appointed on a fixed salary meant that everything was as per the terms and conditions of the University. If any such approval had been granted that was also subject to regularisation. Since the regularisation of the teachers appointed on the pay of Rs.15,600/- is to be done after a period of three years, what was the meaning of the approval. It meant that the approval would be valid only when those

teachers would be regularised. Could they grant approval to a person who is appointed on contract basis?

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, the reality was that there is no solution to it. They could go to the Colleges and do a survey of the affiliated Colleges. Were they recommending that they should close the University? They have to see the realistic situation and could not take a hard decision.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired whether any College who showed the inability to pay the full salary, had asked the University to take over the College.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they had inspected so many Colleges in the last 2-3 years and had checked the balance sheets and found that none of the Colleges was running in losses. If the balance sheet of the Colleges is not in loss, why the Colleges were not paying full salary to the teachers. It meant that they were themselves victimising the teachers. If a College says that it was going in losses, why the College was not closed and request the University to take over the College. The Colleges are earning huge benefits. The Colleges were taking the benefits of income tax and other benefits from the Government and the University. In one of the inspections done by the Committee of one of the Colleges which he had gone through, the University says that they did not have a particular course and the syllabus of a particular subject, even then the Inspection Committee had recommended that the course should be given to the College.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that whenever inspection of the Colleges is done and there is a complaint, they say that the salary should be protected. The Colleges give the cheques of salary of an amount which is actually not paid. There were so many complaints regarding this. Had they ever thought of taking stern action against the Colleges by forming a Committee? It is the violation of human rights and victimisation of labour. Strict action should be taken by an exclusive Committee.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the discussion of such kind was going on in the University for the last 10 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that as he had formed a Committee of the Syndicate members, it was for the members to sit together and have discussions.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if there was a complaint whether it related to the teachers or non-teaching staff that could be referred to the high powered Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this issue had been going on for more than 10 years and the University had taken some steps and the Vice Chancellor stated that they could not do anything. Earlier, the Colleges used to pay less salary. When the University objected to, the Colleges started paying full salary. But the Colleges would get the signature on the full salary and would get back the money from the teachers. Then a decision was taken that the Colleges would have to pay the salary by cheque. If the College teachers were paying back to the Colleges, how could the University take an action? The Colleges had found another way that they would pay the full salary but a person from the College would withdraw the money from the accounts

of the teachers by using the ATM on the day of crediting the salary. This came to the notice of the University. Unless and until the teachers who were being exploited started to protest this action of the Colleges, how the University could protect their interests? Then the teachers started protesting that since the Colleges were paying the cheque of the full salary and Form No. 16 is also given of the full salary for which they have to pay the income tax on the full salary, then the managements of the Colleges accepted that whatever extra income tax the teachers had to pay due to this, the management started paying the income tax. If in the income tax return, a person was claiming some income, how that person could say that he/she had got less salary. The fact of the matter is that it gives a message that in the University nobody is bothered. He had been talking for the last about 20 years that they were not following the mandate of the Calendar that all Colleges were supposed to send their balance sheet and all account statements to the University but none of the Colleges has done so. When some pressure was built on the Colleges, none of the Colleges showed any income from the hostels in their accounts as if the hostels are not a part of the College and were constructed from the funds sanctioned by the UGC. They had adopted such a lenient view of such things by which the teachers were at loss.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa asked if they could allow whatever was going on. He said that if they had taken stern action against the guilty Colleges, others would have automatically mended their ways. He said that there were thousands of teachers and whoever gives a complaint against any institution, action is initiated against a person who complains but not against the institutions. When those teachers are thrown out of service and at that time also they made the complaints, no action is taken. He reiterated that any teacher who had been thrown out of service and had made a complaint, that complaint should be handled by a very senior and high powered Committee which could filter such institutions which serve as a lesson for the others.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that a teacher from a College at Abohar had made a complaint but they neither took any action on the complaint nor the complaint was made the part of the agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Colleges have found a new way that on a complaint, the University would come with heavy hands and the College wanted to throw out of service the teacher because he/she was making the complaints and asking for full salary, if the teacher is thrown out of service, he/she would make a complaint to the University and the University would send a Committee. So, the Colleges design the things in such a way that they ask the University to grant the permission to close a particular course so that the course of a teacher who had made the complaints is closed. There have been complaints that a particular course is being closed down to throw out of service some teachers as they were asking for full salary. Even the complaints have been made by way of affidavit, let them admit that they have not been able to take any action.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if one increment of a teacher is stopped, they made a hue and cry. They should think of their fellow teachers.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that being a teacher, he could say that the College in which he is working is the best pay master and is paying full salary to all the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor requested the Dean College Development Council to ask for the compliance from all the Colleges for paying full salary to the teachers.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they could send a message that the University was ready to take over the College whether running in losses or in profit.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should conclude now as they have formed a Committee. The Committee could resolve about asking for the balance sheet, etc.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that he had gone as a member of the Inspection Committee. The College was neither paying the full salary nor was the PF being deducted. He had given one month's time to the College to comply with the requirements. He again visited the College but no action was taken to comply with the requirements. He had recommended for the disaffiliation of the College. The recommendation of disaffiliation should have come to the Syndicate. But in this case, another Committee was formed which found no deficiencies. He was not able to understand as to what change had come within a period of 15 days?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that such recommendations should have come to the Syndicate.

It was informed that in the year 2011, periodic inspection of the Colleges was done. Out of the 64 B.Ed. Colleges, not even a single College was complying with the Rules and Regulations of the NCTE or Panjab University. Then a report was sent to the NCTE and the NCTE issued the show cause notice as to why the affiliation should not be withdrawn under Regulation 17.1. The University had also submitted the affidavit that the Colleges were paying the full salary to the teachers as per UGC norms but not even a single College is paying the full salary. The periodic inspection of the Degree Colleges is to be done. The Colleges which had been opened in 1960s and got sanctioned one unit of B.Sc. but they are having more units having about 500-800 students and having only a couple of teachers. Those Colleges are one of the biggest Colleges. He pointed out that in the RSD College, Ferozepur which is having strength of 4000 students, there is only one teacher in the subject of English. The University did not send the affiliation team. When the University sends the affiliation team to an already affiliated College which asked affiliation for a new course, where it is found 100% compliance and the affiliation is granted. It is a serious issue. The approval of 560 teachers was withheld and the office had asked for the salary statement of those teachers. When the salary statements were received, it was found that those were not as per Panjab University rules. Then the University took a decision that the approval should be granted so that the teachers might not be victimised. If they take drastic steps, the Colleges could be closed down. When the approval of those 560 teachers was withheld, there was a hue and cry and they granted the approval subject to submission of Form 16 otherwise the affiliation stands automatically withdrawn. This would have given a way to the College to throw the old teachers out of service and in their

place appoint new teachers on lesser salary. So there is need to give serious thinking. Only the grant-in-aid and very few Colleges are paying the full salaries while others are not paying. It is in the knowledge of all.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had gone on inspection and found 2-3 types of Colleges, such as aided Colleges, self-financed Colleges which have come up during the last about 10 years and Government Colleges. Long time back, 1-2 units were sanctioned to the aided Colleges. There is no check on those Colleges due to the periodic inspections not being carried out by the University. He would like to bring it to the attention of the House that one of the Colleges where he had gone for inspection, there were 800 students in the subject of Mathematics at the undergraduate level. When he enquired about the intake capacity of B.Sc./B.A. 1st year, the College could not show the same. The College must be having the intake of 1-2 units which was sanctioned about 30-40 years ago. The College has admitted unlimited number of students on which the University did not have any check. As informed by the Dean College Development Council, those Colleges are very big Colleges. As per the strength of the students, there is a requirement of 9 teachers in a subject. He had pointed out the same in the inspection reports and he would be happy if the same could be placed before the Syndicate. Only 2 teachers were working in the College and some others were on ad hoc at a salary of Rs.8-10 thousand. This was the situation of the aided and Government Colleges where periodic inspection had not been done and he was just talking about the workload and not about the salary component. In the self-financed Colleges, whether Education or Degree Colleges, every time the Inspection Team visits the Colleges. He was not naming any particular person which could be a contentious issue as some of the members of the Inspection Team could ask for votes for the Senate elections. In the reports, it had been mentioned that the salary was being paid as per UGC rules and there was no mention that the Colleges had not made any regular appointment for the last 3-4 years. It was not known in which newspapers the Colleges advertised the posts and it was reported that no candidates applied for the posts. At the time of Selection Committee meeting, either the candidates were not available or no candidate was found suitable. This practice had become a chronic disease. He humbly requested the House that if they wanted to improve quality in the Colleges, there should be a check on the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members have to go and check.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that in spite of having checked, the deficiencies are not complied with.

The Vice Chancellor said that then it was a lapse of the governance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to remind the Syndicate that at least in the last 10 years, no such decision had been taken by the Syndicate which was supposed to be taken as per the mandate of the Calendar every year that in the month of July or August or any time as decided by the Syndicate, every College was supposed to send the information as detailed on page 162 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I. So, the Syndicate had also escaped its

responsibility. At least today, they could take a decision that in the month of July, every College as per Regulation 15 would send the information which they are otherwise also supposed to send as per section 27 for grant of affiliation which says that every affiliated College shall submit annually a report to the Syndicate indicating the changes in the management, the staff, changes in the teaching staff and qualifications of new members, number and distribution of students, income and expenditure of the previous financial year, results of examinations, scholarships, conditions of library, and number of students in the College hostel. This is the mandatory condition and the Dean College Development Council would agree with him that not even a single College has ever sent this information and he would also confess that the Syndicate had not taken any action. At least, they could resolve today that the Regulation 15 be followed and the information be provided in the month of July. Then everything would be clear that a College which had got just 10 rooms and has got strength of 4000 students, is having a strength of only 10 teachers. Then, in fact, this data would become the base for the Inspection Committee which would go to the College as a part of periodic inspection. This would help the members of the Inspection Committee to evaluate everything.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Sub-Committee should give all these things and he would place the same before the next meeting of the Syndicate. They should make a small beginning towards the improvement.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they have to see the role of the Inspection Committee. For the last 10 years, they have been talking about the role of the Inspection Team.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in the inspection proforma, the words are approved and disapproved where the same should be recommendation of approval or dis-recommendation of approval and they say that finally the Committee has to decide.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee would be notified and would start working. They were in the process of making a beginning and send a message that they were serious in governance.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they should try to get the stay vacated granted to the Education Colleges.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the year 2011, full salary was given to NET qualified candidates and Rs.25,600/- was paid to non-NET candidates. The situation has worsened as now a days, a salary of Rs.15600/- is given whereas it was expected to go up to at least Rs. 40-50 thousand.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as the Vice Chancellor had said that the Central Institutes had very cleverly made a provision for promotion from Pay Band 3 to 4 within a period of 3 years and the Vice Chancellor had said that how could they compete with those Institutes. Similarly, how could they expect the persons working in the Colleges getting a salary of Rs.15,600/- or Rs.21,600/- to be at par with the University. It was not a practical approach and they have to think in terms of academics also. They were saying that the Colleges would not be able to run. At least, the income and

expenditure statement from the Colleges should be sought and then they could come to know about it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had to provide the details to the Fact Finding Committee of the UGC. Similarly, the Colleges should be asked to provide the income and expenditure statements.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they could see role of the Dean College Development Council whether it is vigilant and empowered enough to take action against the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said the Syndicate is the empowered body and not the Dean College Development Council. It was with kind permission of the members that the Dean College Development Council was sitting in the House and not permitted to say anything.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the office of the Dean College Development Council should be vigilant enough.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the office of the Dean College Development Council is a helpless office. They have the DPI Colleges as an ex-officio member of the Syndicate and why they did not have the Dean College Development Council and Dean of University Instruction as ex-officio members of the Syndicate. If he (Vice-Chancellor) had to articulate something, he would say that the Dean College Development Council should be an ex-officio member of the Syndicate as they did not know the spirit in which they have to implement what the Syndicate decides.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that this issue should be put up to the Governance Reforms Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the decision of the governing body have to be implemented by the Controller of Examinations, Finance and Development Officer, Dean of University Instruction, Dean College Development Council.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the DPI Colleges of Punjab and Chandigarh did not attend the meetings and the persons involved in the University administration are not part of the governing bodies.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the DPI Colleges just look after their offices and do not give importance to the Syndicate meetings of Panjab University. The Syndicate members have chosen to do this job voluntarily and know what this job involves but still they have chosen to be here. The DPI Colleges have not chosen to be here but they are members in the capacity of ex-officio and do not attend the meetings. It is these officers of the University who have to perform on behalf of the University. If the Dean College Development Council did not perform his duties well, the Colleges could not function. If the Controller of Examinations did not conduct the examinations, there would be no output. The offices of the Registrar, Dean College Development Council, Controller of Examinations and the Finance and Development Officer are kind of punishment jobs as they could not participate in the discussion in the Syndicate, and they can clarify only, that also after taking the permission. They keep sitting in the meetings and have to prepare all the documents for the meetings, prepare the minutes and get the decisions implemented. It is his

concern that the government reforms should review such things also. The Dean of University Instruction gets to know the things through some other means as he did not know what are the discussions going on in the University. If he (Vice Chancellor) has to recommend, the Dean of University Instruction and the Dean College Development Council should be the ex-officio members of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor was right that there were practical problems. But the constitution of the Syndicate is at par with other constitutional bodies as even the Cabinet did not include the Secretary of the Ministry as a member.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate of Panjab University is not like a cabinet.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that these officers are playing the role of the Secretaries.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the position of Dean College Development Council was introduced in 1988. Before that they did not have the Controller of Examinations and the Finance and Development Officer. It was only the Registrar who had been made the Secretary of the Syndicate/Senate. The expansion of University had gone to so much extent that the Registrar was not able to cope up with all the work and that is why these positions had been created. It is not that these officers are at the mercy of the Syndicate, but the Syndicate needs their services.

Professor Shelley Walia said that that was exactly the idea that he advocated for empowerment of the Dean College Development Council and the empowerment should be in a way so that he could make suggestions to the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have formed a Committee to be chaired by a senior member of the Syndicate with a view to look at the compliances and concurrently also come up with some suggestions which are consistent with what is stated in the Panjab University Calendar to see that there were larger compliances to be met which were stated in the recommendations. There were some financially healthy Colleges while others were not. They would seek the information and they were entitled to seek information so as to create a data bank and then come up with more recommendations as to how they have to be seen to be complying so that the teachers are not exploited and they get the fair share of the income of the College and wherever the things are not financially viable at all, take cognizance of it and then revise the fee structure so that the teachers could get the full salary. This should be real governance. The task is a difficult one but they have to take an initiative otherwise it is an endless discussion year after year.

Professor Shelley Walia said that could they think of penal system.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the penalization would be understood in a way, that they wanted to penalize someone and that someone would like to penalize them. They did not want this confrontation to occur.

Professor Shelley Walia said that there were some delinquent Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should create only that much of confrontation around which the solutions might emerge.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that for the last 3-4 years, they have been increasing the fee in spite of that the Colleges were not paying full salaries.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they were not increasing the fee in the order the salaries are increasing. The Colleges find out the ways to increase their incomes.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they had increased the fee by about 15%.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was a decision of the Government to pay a salary of Rs.15600/- to the teachers for the first three years.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

65. Considered if temporary extension of affiliation for (i) LL.B. (3 years course) – 60 seats and (ii) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) -5 years integrated course – 60 seats; and temporary affiliation in new course i.e. B.Com LL.B. (Hons.) – 5 years integrated course, be granted to Baba Kundan Singh Memorial Law College, Jalalabad (East), Dharamkot, Distt. Moga, for the session 2016-17 subject to the fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/ Guideline/s of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC/Bar Council of India.

NOTE: 1. The inspection committee visited the college under reference on 09.02.2016 and submitted the inspection report in this office on 16.02.2016. **The inspection committee has recommended that the proposed affiliation in Labour Law and taxation be granted for admitting 60+60 students along with other courses, only if the College fulfils the conditions as laid down in the inspection report and submit the proof of having fulfilled the requirements. It is pointed out here that the University has not proposed to the inspection committee to grant affiliation to the College in these new courses i.e. Advance Diploma in Labour Law and Advance Diploma in Taxation for the session 2016-17.**

The inspection report dated 09.02.2016 was conveyed to the Principal, Baba Kundan Singh Memorial Law College, Dharamkot, Distt. Moga (Pb.) vide this

office letter No. Misc./A-4/2145 dated 29.02.2016 for compliance, but till date nothing has been received in this regard.

2. The report of Inspection Committee dated 09.02.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, enclosed.
3. A detailed office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Item 66 on the agenda was withdrawn.

Inspection Report

67. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to D.D. Jain College of Education, Kidwai Nagar, Behind Rose Garden, District Ludhiana, for B.Ed. -1st and 2nd year-100 seats for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will observe/follow the other Instructions/Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./NCTE.

- NOTE:**
1. The report of Inspection Committee dated 22.02.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, is enclosed.
 2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Appointment of Dr. Purnma Bhatnagar as Principal, Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College for Women, Kamalpura, District Ludhiana

68. Considered if, appointment of Dr. Purnma Bhatnagar as Principal, Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College for Women, Kamalpura, District Ludhiana on contract basis for two years w.e.f. 01.12.2015 on minimum salary equivalent last drawn be approved.

- NOTE:**
1. Photo-copy of letter dated 05.01.2016 of the Secretary of Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College for Women, Kamalpura, District Ludhiana along with proceedings of the Selection Committee is enclosed.
 2. A detailed office note enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item related with the appointment of a Principal who retired on 30.11.2015 whereas such an item was pending in the Syndicate and it was approved in the month of December. Whatever had been approved in December, this appointment did not fall under those rules. First of all, the College is supposed to advertise the position and if no eligible candidate was found in the first advertisement, they have to re-advertise the post and in the re-advertisement the Colleges could say that the retired Principals could also apply. The proper procedure had not been followed.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it was recommended by the selection panel.

The Vice-Chancellor said that once approved is changed before retirement from College to the other. After retirement that has no meaning. One could continue in the same College.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Issue regarding pledging of Organs/Eyes by University/College Students

71. Considered letter dated 11.04.2016 of Vini Mahajan, IAS, Principal Secretary, Department of Health & Family Welfare, Chandigarh, Government of Punjab, for making provision in the admission form regarding pledging of Organs/Eyes by College Students.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) letter dated 11.04.2016 (**Appendix-LIX**) of Vini Mahajan, IAS, Principal Secretary, Department of Health & Family Welfare, Chandigarh, Government of Punjab, for making provision in the admission form regarding pledging of Organs/Eyes by College Students, be adopted; and
- (2) the following provision/s be made in the original Admission Form of the University and affiliated Colleges:

“I want to pledge my eyes for eye donation after my death. My family members also support my decision.

This is to certify that the above-said information given by me is accurate and I know that my name will be displayed in the list of Eye Donors on the official website as I have chosen to pledge my eyes.”

Recommendations of the Committee dated 11.04.2016

79. Considered minutes dated 11.04.2016 (**Appendix-LX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to suggest enhancement of Rent/License Fee, Water Charges of Campus houses at Chandigarh as well as of Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 11.04.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Inspection Report

83. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to G.G.S. Khalsa College for Women, Kamalpura, Distt. Ludhiana, for B.Com-2nd (one unit) (Semester), for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will also observe/follow the other Instructions/Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./U.G.C.

- NOTE:**
1. Inspection Committee Report of the College along with office letter dated 19.03.2016, enclosed.
 2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

84. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Guru Nanak National College, Doraha, Distt.- Ludhiana, for i) B.Com. 1st (3rd unit) (Semester) ii) M.A. 1st year (Music)(Vocal) (One unit) (Semester) iii) M.Sc. 1st year (Physics) (one unit) (Semester), for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will also observe/follow the other Instructions/Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./U.G.C.

- NOTE:**
1. Inspection Committee Report of the College along with office letter dated 05.04.2016, enclosed.
 2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

85. Considered if, temporary affiliation, be granted to new proposed College namely- Sai College of Education, Sardulapur, Distt. Hoshiarpur, for B.Ed. Course-2 Units (100 seats), for the session 2016-17.

- NOTE:** Inspection Committee Report dated 14.03.2016 along with office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

86. Considered temporary extension of association, be granted to Shri Saraswati College, G.T. Road, Khanna, Distt. Ludhiana, for Prak Shastri-II and Shastri-II, with a maximum number of 150 students (One hundred fifty students per year) for the session 2016-17.

- NOTE:**
1. Letter dated No. A-5/4082 dated 26.04.2016 and the report of the Inspection Committee dated 24.03.2016 enclosed.
 2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Institution of Signature Award Gold Medal

87. Considered if:

- (i) the proposal (**Appendix-LXI**) of The Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI) for institution of “Signature Award Gold Medal” to be given to the topper of the University examination of Bachelor’s degree (B.Com.) in the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce, be accepted; and
- (ii) a draft agreement (**Appendix-LXI**) for the above-said purpose between The Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI) and Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved.

NOTE: The minutes of the academic Committee dated 20.04.2016 enclosed (**Appendix-LXI**).

RESOLVED: That

- (i) the proposal of The Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI) for institution of “Signature Award Gold Medal” to be given to the topper of the University examination of Bachelor’s degree (B.Com.) in the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce, as per **Appendix**, be approved; and
- (ii) the draft agreement for the above-said purpose between The Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI) and Panjab University, Chandigarh, as per **Appendix**, be also approved.

Institution of Award and execution of MoU

88. Considered if:

- (i) the proposal dated 10.05.2016 (**Appendix-LXII**) of Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal, Assistant Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, for institution of “Professor Gurdev Singh Gosal Award for Essay on Geographic Thought”, be accepted in the memory of his illustrious Grandfather late Dr. Gurdev Singh Gosal, Professor Emeritus, Department of Geography.
- (ii) the MoU (**Appendix-LXII**), be executed between Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal, Assistant Professor, Panjab University, Chandigarh (Grandson of Professor Gurdev Singh Gosal) S/o Professor S.S. Chahal, R/o 150, Sector-11 A, Chandigarh and Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that is a noble thought.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the essay on geographic thoughts is being proposed in Geography and the Judging Committee does not have a person from Geography as one of the members. He suggested that three senior most Professors of the Department of Geography should be on the judging committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the proposal is on the basis of essays in gravitation force. The international organization invites essays in the field of gravitation and those essays have to be written for general public. On the similar lines, the essays have to be written which is Geography related and what is Geography. On the planet we live, there is a life and they are a part of it. The human beings started to live on the plant and living necessitated moving around and it necessitated the measure of distance and understanding of the environment where they are living. The $\frac{3}{4}$ of the surface is water and $\frac{1}{4}$ is land which is divided into several continents. When the human beings started to move from the sea, then it was discovered that man is living not on a flat surface but on a spherical surface. They observe the sea water in the form of rain, going on in the smog, snows of the high altitude. The surface of the earth is land and sea. There are mountains on the equator, on the hemisphere. On the high mountains, there is a low temperature. All this is Geography. So part of every thought is Geography. All sciences are part of Geography thought. All thinking of the human beings is Geography thought. On the basis of those thoughts, one has to write essay which propagates this idea and that essay is to be judged and understood by the general public. That is why this Committee has been proposed. It is a matter of pride for them. He had a chance to read the book which was published posthumously. It is something defining the academic merits of the University. Right now, they were expecting that the students of Gurdev Singh Gosal would write these essays. This should become a national competition as is the case with the essays written by people on gravitation out of which only a few are selected. They hoped that this should become a national competition on behalf of the University. It is very wonderful and beautiful thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that some other persons could also be added as members of the Judging Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is no issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that because the persons of Geography wanted to be part of Faculty of Science. But in the University, Geography is a part of the Faculty of Arts.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Punjabi University, Patiala issues the degree of Master of Science.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that persons from languages, literature could also be added as members.

Professor Anil Monga said that some of the designations suggested for the Judging Committee did not exist as the same had been changed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he needed very good judges for this purpose and while forming the Judging Committee, he would consult the members.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) institution of “Professor Gurdev Singh Gosal Award for Essay on Geographic Thought”, be approved;
- (ii) the MoU (**Appendix-LXII**), be executed between Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal, Assistant Professor, Panjab University, Chandigarh, R/o H.No. 150, Sector-11 A, Chandigarh and Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh; and
- (iii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form the Judging Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Issue regarding the re-employment of Dr. Shveta Mahendra, Department of Indian Theatre

89. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 05.05.2016 (**Appendix-LXIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider the application for re-employment of Dr. Shveta Mahendra, Department of Indian Theatre, Panjab University.

- NOTE:**
1. Application of Dr. Shveta Mahendra is enclosed (**Appendix-LXIII**)
 2. Office note containing the brief history in this regard is also enclosed (**Appendix-LXIII**).

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 05.05.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Extension of provision made by the Syndicate dated 18.10.2015 for the session 2016-17 also

90. Considered if, the provision made in Syndicate decision dated 18.10.2015 (**Appendix-LXIV**), for admission for sons/grandsons/daughters/ granddaughters/ husband/ wife/ brothers/ sisters of persons killed/ incapacitated in November, 1984 riots and of persons killed/incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh, be extended for the session 2016-17 also.

RESOLVED: That the provision made in Syndicate decision dated 18.10.2015, for admission for sons/ grandsons/ daughters/ granddaughters/husband/wife/brothers/sisters of persons killed/incapacitated in November, 1984 riots and of persons killed/incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh, as per appendix, be extended for the session 2016-17.

At this stage, the items under part B were taken up.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that Professor Shelley Walia had done a good job of sorting out the items under different categories.

The Vice Chancellor said that the discussions had provided the members as to how to attend the important issues.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that while preparing the items for consideration, the order of items should be such that there could be no problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that let them learn a lesson. From the next Syndicate onwards, once the agenda items would get prepared, he be authorised to request 3-4 Syndics to put the agenda items in the same order as had been done for the meeting of this Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the year 2012, when Professor Arun Kumar Grover had joined as the Vice Chancellor, he had made a suggestion. All the Vice Chancellors, except Professor R.C. Sobti, used to discuss the items in advance with 2-3 Syndics and the Syndicate meetings used to be over sometimes in 1 hour or sometimes 2 hours. It is a very good idea to discuss the items in advance with some members which would facilitate that it takes lesser time for the meeting to conclude.

Deferred Item

27. Considered minutes dated 8.4.2016 of the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor to frame the Application Form & Template for the post of Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., as per UGC guidelines, 2010.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in view of the latest changed UGC guidelines, some changes needed to be incorporated in the application form and template and could not approve the application form and the template in its present form.

The Vice Chancellor said that the item be deferred.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 09.02.2016 regarding providing of examiners report to the Ph.D. candidate

32. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 09.02.2016 (**Appendix-LXV**) constituted by the Vice Chancellor, that Shri Anil Kumar Khajuria, Ph.D. candidate enrolled vide No.15902/Ph.D. dated 31.08.2006 under the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, be given examiners report (without disclosing names) and 2 years time to substantially improve his Ph.D. thesis and resubmit it for evaluation by the new panel of examiners. No further extension other than these 2 years be given under any circumstances. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-LXV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: Regulations 15.3 appearing at page 447 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, reproduced as under:

“If there is a difference of opinion between the two examiners i.e. one examiner recommends the award of the degree while the second recommends rejection or resubmission of the thesis. The Syndicate may refer the thesis to another examiner.”

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate he had said that the General Branch should be asked to prepare a list of the Ph.D. pending cases which could be considered in a single lot in the meeting as in the agenda of every meeting 2-4 cases for condonation of delay were coming up.

RESOLVED: That recommendation of the Committee dated 09.02.2016 (**Appendix-LXV**) that Shri Anil Kumar Khajuria, Ph.D. candidate, be given examiners report (without disclosing names) and 2 years time to substantially improve his Ph.D. thesis and resubmit it for evaluation by the new panel of examiners, be approved and no further extension other than these 2 years be given under any circumstances.

Issue regarding condonation of delay in the submission of Ph.D. thesis

33. Considered, if delay of 16 years, 03 months and 4 days as on 04.03.2016 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Sham Lal, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Languages, Department of Hindi be condoned w.e.f. 30.11.1999 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the following reasons:

- (i) The subject chosen for the research had been a very difficult one based on the Partition of India and the comparison between the Hindi and Punjabi stories written during those times.
- (ii) Stories and additional materials were very difficult to locate in libraries and other such external sources.
- (iii) The important materials were not locate due to demanding subject.
- (iv) He belongs from a very economically and socially deprived background. He has faced a continuous struggle to make the ends meet.
- (v) Due to administrative errors, it took the candidate three years between enrolment and registration.

NOTE: 1. Request dated 02.03.2016 of Mr. Sham Lal enclosed (**Appendix-LXVI**).

2. Mr. Sham Lal was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Languages on 01.12.1993. He was granted first extension for one year i.e. upto 30.11.1997 after normal period of 3 years. He was further granted second extension up to 30.11.1998 and third extension up to 30.11.1999.

3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-LXVI**).

RESOLVED: That, in view of the reasons given by Mr. Sham Lal, the delay of 16 years, 03 months and 4 days as on 04.03.2016 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis, be condoned w.e.f. 30.11.1999 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision.

Issue regarding condonation of delay in the submission of Ph.D. thesis

34. Considered, if delay of 4 years 01 month and 15 days as on 14.03.2016 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Gurdas Singh, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Languages, School of Punjabi Studies be condoned w.e.f. 30.1.2012 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis till date.

- NOTE:**
1. Request of Mr. Gurdas Singh enclosed (**Appendix-LXVII**).
 2. Mr. Gurdas Singh was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Languages on 30.01.2006. He was granted first extension for one year i.e. up to 29.01.2010 after normal period of 3 years. He was further granted second extension up to 29.01.2011 and third extension up to 29.01.2012.
 3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-LXVII**).

RESOLVED: That in view of the reasons given by Mr. Gurdas Singh, delay of 4 years 01 month and 15 days as on 14.03.2016 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis, be condoned w.e.f. 30.1.2012 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision.

Issue regarding condonation of delay in the submission of Ph.D. thesis

35. Considered, if delay of 3 years 02 months and 10 days as on 28.03.2016 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period of 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Radhika Rani, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Science, Department of Bio-physics be condoned w.e.f. 19.01.2013 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 20 days from the communication of the decision, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis till date.

- NOTE:**
1. Request of Ms. Radhika Rani enclosed (**Appendix-LXVIII**).
 2. Ms. Radhika Rani was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Science on 19.01.2007. She was granted first extension for one year i.e. upto 18.01.2011 after normal period of 3 years. She was further granted second extension up to 18.01.2012 and third extension up to 18.01.2013.
 3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-LXVIII**).

RESOLVED: That in view of the reasons given by Ms. Radhika Rani, delay of 3 years 02 months and 10 days as on 28.03.2016 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period of 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis, be condoned w.e.f. 19.01.2013 and she be allowed to submit her thesis within 20 days from the communication of the decision.

Issue regarding appointment of Secretary for the various Faculties

36. Considered the recommendation of the Faculty of Science (Item 15), Faculty of Arts (Item 17) and Faculty of Languages (Item 8) dated 19.12.2015 with regard to the appointment of Secretary for the various Faculties

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.10.2015 (Para 17) has resolved that in order to have input from the Faculties, the matter be placed before the Faculties concerned. In the meanwhile, the item be treated as withdrawn.
 2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 27.02.2016, and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred till 14.03.2016. However, the same was not taken up in the adjourned meeting of the Syndicate dated 14.03.2016.
 3. An office note enclosed.

The Vice Chancellor said that in some of the Faculties, there were Secretaries while in others not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the authority lies with the Syndicate, the Faculties have recommended it and the Syndicate has to take a call. They should approve the recommendations of the Faculties.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there were Secretaries in the Faculties Commerce & Business Management and Education having the knowledge of their subjects. But in the Faculty of Science, there are about 50 subjects and the Secretary might not be able to have control and knowledge of all the subjects which a Deputy Registrar having the office and staff could have the control.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the proposal had come from the Dean itself. The reason given was that the Faculty was a very large and the Dean would get additional help if a Secretary was also appointed.

The Vice Chancellor said that otherwise this work had to be done by the Deputy Registrar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that sometimes the Deputy Registrar might not be knowing something because in the Faculties all the matters are related with academics. The proposal was unanimously approved by the Faculty.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it was not so that a Deputy Registrar might not be having the knowledge. Even there were some Clerks who were having so much knowledge of such matters.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Secretary has to be an additional person.

Professor Anil Monga said that this was the recommendation of the Faculty and the Secretary would provide assistance to the

Dean. Therefore, the recommendations of the Faculty should be approved.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the reasons given by the Faculty are concerned with academics. Therefore, the academic person should be a Secretary and not a non-teaching staff member.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as the proposal was concerned, he had no objection that they wanted a person from the Faculty to be the Secretary. But what was the role which the Secretary was supposed to do. These were only the Faculties of Arts, Sciences and Languages where there were subjects more than one and there is only one subject in Faculties like Medical, Law, Fine Arts, Education, Commerce & Business Management. Suppose the Secretary, who is from the Department of English in the case of Faculty of Languages, was sitting in the meeting, he/she had to depend upon the office if some contribution has to be made in regard to Russian or to the member representing the Faculty. The job of the Secretary is only to give inputs to the Dean and the House. How the Secretary could come know as everything is with the office. If the same thing which the Deputy Registrar is doing as the Secretary of the Faculty and even if he/she has to do even after the Secretary has taken from the teaching side, then they have to evaluate what purpose they are solving. Then the Syndicate could appoint the Secretary. The Syndicate while taking this decision, probably they have no objection against it, they must evaluate that what purpose they were going to solve. He thought that the Vice Chancellor would be with him at least on this issue that they were still struggling on how to elect the Dean or nominate Dean or the senior most Professor, they were going to add another channel of election for the Secretary. This has to be kept in mind. Again, he had no objection against it because it related to the academic matters.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this matter could be referred to the Governance Reforms Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that let they see what all things evolve and if the whole process has to change.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter be referred to the Governance Reforms Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one of the major roles of the Secretary is note down the minutes and if there is a person from academic side, it would be comparatively better.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was a valid argument.

RESOLVED: That the item be referred to the Governance Reforms Committee.

Amendment of Rule

42. Considered minutes of the Core Committee dated 17.07.2015 of CIIPP (**Appendix-LXIX**) with regard to modify the following consultancy Rule No. 8 appearing at page 64-67 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009:

Existing Rule as per Clause V, page No. 64-67, P.U. Calendar, Vol.-III, 2009	Modified Rule
8. Once the terms of consultancy have	8. Once the terms of consultancy have

<p>been approved, contract signed and advance received, it becomes the duty of the Principal Consultant to ensure satisfactory progress and completion of the project in time. For this purpose, he may make temporary appointments of full time or part time staff for a period up to six months, draw advances and make expenditure in accordance with the requirements as the project progresses. Vice Chancellor's approval will be required for appointment of staff for a period of more than six months.</p>	<p>been approved, contract signed and advance received, it becomes the duty of the Principal Consultant to ensure satisfactory progress and completion of the project in time. For this purpose, he may make temporary appointments of full time or part time staff for a period up to one year, draw advances and make expenditure in accordance with the requirements as the project progresses. The permission to appoint a part time or a full time temporary staff for a period of one year should be given by the Director-CIIPP on the recommendation of the Head of the Department or by any other person authorized to do so. Vice Chancellor's approval will be required for appointment of staff for a period of more than one year.</p>
<p>The consultancy projects being undertaken by the faculty members have some components as department share to be used for the purpose of purchase of any equipment, repair of the existing equipment, organizing any activity encouraging industry interaction in the department.</p> <p>There are a few consultants who do not utilize their department share for the purpose as mentioned above, as the same in few projects is too small to be used for a meaningful purpose.</p>	<p>Department share of individual projects of the same investigator may be clubbed for the purpose of purchase of any equipment, repair of the existing equipment, organizing any activity encouraging industry interaction in the department, which may not be possible out of the department share of the individual project, but with the condition to utilize the same within a period of one year of the completion of the projects. The same, if not utilized within a period of one year after the completion of the project, would be credited to the CIIPP current account. The Director, CIIPP should be authorized to permit the consultant to club the department share.</p>

NOTE: Letter dated 29.02.2016 of Director (Honorary), Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme, P.U. enclosed (**Appendix-LXIX**).

RESOLVED: That Rule 8 with regard to consultancy appearing at page 64-67 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, be amended as under:

Existing Rule as per Clause V, page No. 64-67, P.U. Calendar, Vol.-III, 2009	Modified Rule
8. Once the terms of consultancy have been approved, contract signed and advance received, it becomes the duty of the Principal Consultant to ensure	8. Once the terms of consultancy have been approved, contract signed and advance received, it becomes the duty of the Principal Consultant to

<p>satisfactory progress and completion of the project in time. For this purpose, he may make temporary appointments of full time or part time staff for a period upto six months, draw advances and make expenditure in accordance with the requirements as the project progresses. Vice Chancellor's approval will be required for appointment of staff for a period of more than six months.</p>	<p>ensure satisfactory progress and completion of the project in time. For this purpose, he may make temporary appointments of full time or part time staff for a period upto one year, draw advances and make expenditure in accordance with the requirements as the project progresses. The permission to appoint a part time or a full time temporary staff for a period of one year should be given by the Director-CIIPP on the recommendation of the Head of the Department or by any other person authorized to do so. Vice Chancellor's approval will be required for appointment of staff for a period of more than one year.</p>
<p>The consultancy projects being undertaken by the faculty members have some components as department share to be used for the purpose of purchase of any equipment, repair of the existing equipment, organizing any activity encouraging industry interaction in the department.</p> <p>There are a few consultants who do not utilize their department share for the purpose as mentioned above, as the same in few projects is too small to be used for a meaningful purpose.</p>	<p>Department share of individual projects of the same investigator may be clubbed for the purpose of purchase of any equipment, repair of the existing equipment, organizing any activity encouraging industry interaction in the department, which may not be possible out of the department share of the individual project, but with the condition to utilize the same within a period of one year of the completion of the projects. The same, if not utilized within a period of one year after the completion of the project, would be credited to the CIIPP current account. The Director, CIIPP should be authorized to permit the consultant to club the department share.</p>

Number of seats and fee structure for LL.B. 3-Year Course being offered in the Department of Laws

43. Considered the recommendations of the Joint Academic and Administrative Committees dated 16.3.2016 (Item 3) (**Appendix-LXX**) of the Department of Laws with regard to revised/proposed fee structure (**Appendix-LXX**) of LL.B. 3- year course (under the head of Department Fund) from the session 2016-17. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-LXX**) was also taken into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it seems that the Department of Laws had a parallel system as two additional funds have been added which were not being charged earlier. If the convocation fee is to be charged by the Department of Laws, then the same would also be charged by the University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS). He could not understand as to for what the fund for up keeping of institution was meant. It seemed that this fund is basically separate from the University.

It was informed that the all the professional Departments were maintaining the students' funds. Accordingly, the UILS is also having these kinds of funds. The upkeep of the institutions is the

responsibility of the University as a whole and this should be part of the University funds. The other heads of funds are for the specific students' activities and rules in this regard have been approved by the Syndicate that the Departments could keep those funds for students' activities and manage the same on their own as per the guidelines.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the revised fee structure could be approved and the up keeping of institution fund should be a part of the University income.

The Vice Chancellor said that every student has to pay the upkeep fund.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that neither it should not be approved nor rejected as the Vice Chancellor said that they did not know the spirit of the decision by the Department.

Professor Shelley Walia said that all the other heads are right except point No. 7.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could have a clarification from the Department on point no.7. They could make a small Committee or the Vice Chancellor could be authorised to take a decision on point no.7.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the fund mentioned at point no.7 is not charged for a year, then what would happen. It could be that the Department wanted to have some funds which they were not getting. Let them find out the purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he understood that, he did not know the condition of other departments, but they could see the condition of the classrooms and the benches of the Department of Laws because there was no support from the University. Probably, the Department had sent this proposal. Then probably, they would have to approve it. The fans are not in working condition and if in working condition, runs very slow. If they see the condition of the teacher after one hour, it would look as if he has just come out of the gym and not from the class. If that was the purpose, they should seek the clarification from the Department.

It was informed that the funds so collected would not be provided to the Department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it was so, then the Department could withdraw the proposal. It seems that the Department had submitted the proposal because they wanted to spend this money for the upkeep of the Department.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Law Review Fee is being increased four times from the present Rs.120/- p.a. to Rs.500/- p.a. He enquired whether the departmental funds are being audited and what is the method of auditing? The Dinner & Social Function fund has been raised from Rs.180 to Rs.500/- and there is a lot of difference. This is a public money and how it is being audited.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he wanted to emphasise that if they could understand the spirit behind this kind of fund. It is planned to look after the students' activities and it is different and

separate from the Department funds and is managed by the students and the Chairperson and this money is utilised very well. They have in their Department the Literary Society Fund for the purchase of books, etc.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that a lump sum amount could be collected from the students and there was no need to have so many heads. He was not convinced with it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they could authorise the Vice Chancellor to get these verified and accordingly take action.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that when the money collected from the students is to be spent on the students, the students should have a say in it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that this money is going to the account of the Chairperson.

The Vice Chancellor enquired whether the University Institute of Engineering and Technology was charging this kind of fund.

It was informed that the UIET, UILS were charging this fund.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no department is charging the up keeping fee and the answer could not be 'yes'.

The Vice Chancellor said that Sr. No. 7 is not correct.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it might be correct because the demand is being made by the Department.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should try to find some way of up keeping of all the departments in a centralised way and it could not such that the up keeping of the Department of Law is not done and of others is being done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is very difficult to spend the money and difficult to get the work done.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested that could they postpone the item to be discussed after lunch so that they could discuss it amongst themselves and know the procedure of the Department.

The Vice Chancellor said, okay, fine.

RESOLVED: That recommendations of the Joint Academic and Administrative Committees dated 16.3.2016 (Item 3) (**Appendix-LXX**) of the Department of Laws with regard to revised/proposed fee structure **Appendix-LXX** of LL.B. 3- year course (under the head of Department Fund) from the session 2016-17, be approved except relating to Fund for Up Keeping of Institution for which the Vice Chancellor be authorised to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, after getting the feedback from the Department.

Recommendations of Students Aid Fund Administrative Committee

44. Considered minutes of the Student Aid Fund Administrative Committee dated 31.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXXI**) constituted by the Vice Chancellor, with regard to consider the applications of eligible

students of teaching Departments and USOL for financial assistance out of Student Aid Fund for the session 2015-16.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the financial assistance should be given to the students at the time of submission of fee otherwise it would not be useful as the students have to take the loan for paying the fee and have to pay interest on that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier, in principle, a decision was taken in this regard.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the guidelines for the income proof have been made very stringent and the students face a lot of problem in preparing the income certificate from the Tehsildar/Executive Magistrate. A Committee of the Department should be authorised in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the recommendations of the Committee, the students have to produce the income certificate issued by Tehsildar. He enquired whether the Tehsildar issues the income certificate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Tehsildar issues the income certificate on the basis of verification by the Patwari.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Patwari could only tell about how much land a person is having and is getting so much amount as contract amount for that land. If a person has a provision shop who would issue the income certificate?

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there is a process of getting the income certificate. A person prepares the affidavit which is witnessed by the Nambardar and Sarpanch of the Village. The Patwari certifies the same on the basis of voter identity card and then the person approaches the Tehsildar, who, on the basis of that affidavit, issues the income certificate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the affidavit stating the annual income could be taken from the father or the guardian of the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Dr. Ajay Ranga was saying is that the Tehsildar verifies the statement of the person to be correct. But in the recommendation of the Committee, it is written that the income certificate should be issued by the Tehsildar/Executive Magistrate/ Employer. An income certificate to be issued by the employer of the parents of the student is right but how the employer could issue the certificate to the students as they were not the employee.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it could be such that an affidavit should be taken from the father or guardian of the student stating his/her total annual income from all sources. On the basis of that affidavit the assistance could be provided and if that is proved wrong, action could be taken. The purpose is that the deserving students should not be deprived of the benefit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that under the governance reforms throughout the country, they were moving towards self attested

statement. But here they were saying that even the affidavit attested by Notary Public is not sufficient.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that in the category of means-cum-merit also, they take the affidavit of self attestation.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in the affidavit, another line could be added that if there is concealment of facts, action could be initiated.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if the line of taking legal action could be inserted and no one would conceal the facts.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they did not scrutinise the income. The form should be made stringent.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier they had taken a decision and now the Committee had imposed these conditions.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired whether the fund meant for this purpose was being utilised fully or there was more demand for funds. If the fund was underutilised and the number of applicants is less, then why such stringent conditions were being imposed?

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the reason behind the less number of applicants is that the process of getting the income certificate prepared is very lengthy. It takes a lot of time to approach the Patwari and fulfil the procedural requirements. Sometimes, the time and money involved in such formalities is so lengthy and heavy that the students get tired and they did not want to get the income certificate prepared. Therefore, some short-cut way out could be adopted. An affidavit could be obtained from the students which could have a condition that if there is any concealment of facts, then legal action could be initiated against the students.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the application form should have two parts. The first part should have an income bracket and the student would be eligible. In the second part, the student could say that he/she is eligible according to the income bracket and if anything is found against, then he/she would be liable to legal action.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there were some problems in this also as the student would say that he/she has no income and whatever income is of the parents and the parents do not pay him/her.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there was a solution to this also that they could ask for the disownment certificate from such students.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that one of the reasons for the less number of applications being received for the financial assistance is that the students are not aware of the scheme.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have imposed a condition that if the bill of canteen of a student is beyond a fixed amount, then he/she would not get the financial assistance.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Wardens should have the information as to who are the students who really need the financial assistance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had seen that some of the students having the annual income less than Rs.1 lac approaching for financial assistance were having costly mobile phones.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there were some students who were really poor were staying outside in the PG accommodation and were paying rent ranging between Rs.8-10,000 while the students who were having the cars costing about Rs.50 lacs were staying in the hostels.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is wrong to grant permission to keep the cars in the hostels.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this permission has now been withdrawn.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the students having the cars should not be provided the hostels.

The Vice Chancellor said that he needed a solution otherwise there would be no end to the discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there were two parts as said by Professor Keshav Malhotra. The first one is that the affidavit should be taken. The second one is that at the time of admission, the genuine students who did not have the money to deposit the fees be treated as is done in the case of SC/reserved category students, as per the Government of India and Government of Punjab instructions, as they are not charged fees and the University has to ask for reimbursement from the Government. Whether the money is received or not that is a separate issue. But they have to pay this financial assistance on their own. As was discussed last year that those students who were entitled for this concession be admitted and their fee be recovered from this fund instead of asking to pay the fee at the time of admission and then refunding the same. As per the information, out of the 95 applicants, 78 were found eligible. An undertaking from the student could be taken that they were being admitted under this category, but if they did not get the funds sanctioned from the body, then they would have to deposit the amount, otherwise the admission would be liable to be cancelled. But they have to serve the interests of the students as sometimes the genuine students are denied. So, they could make the admission without the fee subject to recovery from the Students Aid Fund.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at least some of the amount could be taken otherwise there could be misuse of this facility.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to how much they were giving the financial assistance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in some cases the fee is less and the financial assistance being given is more than the fee. Some nominal amount has to be taken from the students because some of the students leave the courses. Therefore, some modalities have to be worked out.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the modalities be worked out but in principle the decision is that they should avoid taking full fee from the students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that sometimes the teachers themselves pay the fee from their own pocket.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that awareness about this has to be made amongst the students.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when they increase the fee, then they say that the increased fee would be utilised for providing assistance to the students. They have distributed an amount of Rs.12 lacs only and the income from the increased fee is comparatively higher amounting to crores of rupees. The students take the education loan but the conditions of the banks are such that which require the student to obtain first division and the interest is about 14% on such loans.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since they were providing financial assistance after about a period of 8 months from the admission, it is too long period and not justified. It could be decided to provide this money within 30 days from the date of admission.

The Vice Chancellor said that since they have adopted the semester system, it should be decided by October. Let they charge half or 1/3 of the fee. The tuition fee in non-self financing courses is not much.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that as they increase the fee every year and have taken a decision that 50% of that would go for the scholarship, whether this is the same or a different fund.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this fund is a separate one.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that awareness could be created amongst the students to apply for assistance out of that fund also.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that a data for the last 2-3 years relating to how much money they had collected and how much was distributed to the students be made available by the next meeting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the clause in the admission form and the affidavit should be made stringent so that only the deserving students could get the benefit.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the language of the affidavit should be made stringent.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa to help the Dean, College Development Council in this matter to which Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he would help.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the same thing should be adopted for the scholarships being provided by the Dean, College Development Council as there were so many students who pay hefty fees in the

Colleges. There were students who were getting the scholarship by merely submitting an application even if they were in the higher income slab as there was no scrutiny of that. Stringent measures be put in place so that the students have a fear and did not submit the false information.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that could they get the information if a student had earlier studied by paying the higher fee, then this benefit should not be given to that student.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the language of the affidavit and the admission form should be stringent so that only the needy students could seek the financial assistance. He is ready to help in preparation of the affidavit along with Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would seek their help.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Students Aid Fund Administrative Committee dated 31.03.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That from the year 2016-17, half fee be charged from the economically weaker students at the time of admission and the financial assistance to be provided to such students out of the Students Aid Fund be finalised by the month of October.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 05.02.2016 regarding grant of CAS benefits to persons working in PRC

50. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 05.02.2016 (**Appendix-LXXII**) constituted by the Vice Chancellor, that the Associate Professor/Joint Director and Assistant Professor/Assistant Director in the PRCs, be given benefit of Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) to be followed as per the UGC guidelines, 2010 wherever the UGC scales adopted; otherwise CAS adopted by State or similar posts shall be applicable.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that some of the persons are retiring. Their cases for re-employment should also be taken up.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 05.02.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Recommendations of the (JCM) dated 29.12.2015

52. Considered the recommendations of the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) dated 29.12.2015 (**Appendix-LXXIII**) for Ministerial, Secretarial, Laboratory & technical Staff and Class 'C' staff of the University.

- NOTE:** 1. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 27.02.2016 adjourned to 14.03.2016 for consideration, but the same was deferred.
2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-LXXIII**).

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in the recommendations of the JCM, the 20 days casual leave has been

divided in two parts, it should go as per the prevailing system for the whole of the year.

It was informed that when a person proceeds on retirement. Before that if that person has bulk leave, then it facilitates to promote the next person. In case somebody proceeds on leave two months before retirement, he/she goes for one month. Now, neither the next person could be promoted thereafter he/she would come. There is a resentment that on leave vacancy, promotion should be given. The persons usually claim that once a person has gone on leave, the next person should be promoted. When a Superintendent goes on leave, the Senior Assistant expects to be promoted. There is a problem. In case a person wanted to go on leave prior to the retirement, it would facilitate the promotion and there is no denial of leave.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the retirement of a person is far away, then has he/she to take 10 days leave in the first six months and 10 days in the next six months.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that to divide the casual leave in six months each is not genuine.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could not understand what was the matter?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what they were talking about appears on page 369 of the agenda wherein it was written that the President, PUSA suggested that to resolve this issue, the 20 casual leaves allowed to all non-teaching employees may be divided into two parts i.e. the employees may avail their 10 casual leaves in the first six months and remaining 10 casual leaves in the next six months.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he was talking about the causal leave and not the earned leave.

It was informed that this was the proposal of the President, PUSA.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that but this should not be accepted as now they have represented against it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this was the proposal of Sh. Deepak Kaushik who was the President, PUSA at that time.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the second issue is of Deputy Registrar. Now the feedback has been received and in fact, at some places there is 100% promotion. The recommendation of 50:50 is right and they should accept the same.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is very good as the output of the best skilled persons coming from lower post is very good in comparison to coming from outside and taking time to understand the things. As such, it is a good decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could not understand.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is a good decision. They should take the recommendation item-wise.

The Vice Chancellor said that first recommendation is about the Deputy Registrar.

It was informed that there is no issue. It was initiated and accepted. But there is a serious problem, some promotion policy should be in place for their evaluating competence. Now, everybody from bottom of hierarchy gets promotion their performance cannot be taken at par. This is the perception and the management is facing serious problems. Persons are being promoted but nobody is willing to accept them. Such persons have even been told to tell the name of the department which could accept them, he/she would be posted there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked about their Annual Confidential Reports (ACRs).

It was informed that the ACRs are correct and everybody typically gets outstanding. Presently, they did not have a departmental promotion committee for this category while for other categories they are having.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would advertise some positions only for the internal candidates and 50% for the external candidates.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there would be problems as they would not be able to timely advertise the posts and fill up and keep hanging.

The Vice Chancellor said that 50% of the positions are advertised only for internal people. The 50% which are for external people, the internal people could also compete.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the officiating arrangement is going on. Then it is right.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is a court case. If the court case goes in favour of current selection, then there is no position. If the court case goes against them, then all the positions would be there and whatever internal promotions they were doing would do. Out of this, 25% would be advertised only for the internal candidates.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it meant that promotion as a matter of right would be up to the level of Assistant Registrar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for the post of Deputy Registrar, 25% would be for internal candidates.

The Vice Chancellor said that as on date, there is 25% promotion that would not be touched. Right now, there is 25% promotion and 75% through open. Suppose the court case does not come in favour of the University, then 75% would be there and 25% of this 75% they would advertised only for internal candidates and the remaining 50% in general in which the internal could also compete. Subsequently, the 25% which is left, it would be for internal.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that as said by the Registrar about the administrative problems, he disagreed with that.

There are promotion schemes for all the employees. If a person is recruited as a Constable, he/she could go up to the commissioned rank of NCO and JCO.

It was informed that there were tests for promotion for NCOs and JCOs.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they should make a departmental promotion committee.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the administrative problems are two sided. Some of the persons did not want to work with some officers, then where those persons would go. There could be some exceptional cases.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to find a solution in the background of the scene in front of them. As on date, they have 25% positions for internal promotion which would be through internal promotion for all times and 25% would be advertised for which internal candidates would compete and for the 50% all persons could compete. That is also a solution. By this, 50% of the persons would be such who would come from the internal system and of those 25% would come through the promotion and 25% would come through competition which would be for internal candidates.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right.

It was informed that a broader platform was being provided. From Senior Assistant to Deputy Registrar level if there is a departmental promotion committee in place which sits periodically every three months for those who are in that zone and scrutinises that ACRs and other things are right and eligible, the person be promoted, it is just to streamline the process. They could know that these were the persons who were going to retire and when the vacancies occur, the people would get promoted. It is to be an ongoing process.

Professor Anil Monga said that they need to specify certain qualifications.

It was informed that the qualifications already exist for these posts.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should not be changed.

It was informed that the qualifications were not being changed. The ratio was changed to 50%.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to find out a practical solution. It should be 50:50. 25% positions be kept for advertisement for internal candidates and for the remaining 50%, the internal candidates could also compete.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was for the post of Deputy Registrar. For the post of Assistant Registrar, it is 75% promotion and 25% open.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the proposal of the Vice Chancellor is right.

Professor Emanuel Nahar also endorsed the proposal of the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Ajay Ranga enquired the status of Restorers to be put at par with Clerks.

It was informed that the Committee had met and made the recommendation that the Restorers be put at par with Clerks.

The Vice Chancellor said that let them move and see the things which require decision on which they have a different perspective.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Controller of Examinations had observed that in the month of December, maximum employees availed their balance casual leave resulting in official work being suffered in main branches like Examinations and had given a very good suggestion that the leave could be availed in an academic year. In response to that President, PUSA had proposed that the leaves could be divided in two parts. It could be done on the pattern of teachers for academic year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the proposal of availing the casual leave may be taken to the JCM and come through JCM.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they could change the other recommendations of the JCM as in the case of Deputy Registrar, they could change the other things also.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Syndicate is the governing body and JCM is not a Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it could be done for academic year.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if a person had already availed the casual leave, then what would be the status.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that half of the leaves would have to be given for the six months and for future it would be academic year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if somebody had already availed, could they give more leave.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it could be so and while shifting from one system to the other, they would have to give the leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the solution could be that those who have already availed more than 10 casual leave by 1st July, they would be restricted only to the remaining leave up to 31st December. From 1st January 2016 to 30th June, 2017, there would be total 30 casual leaves and after that the academic year wise leaves would be permissible.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that till the next academic year, it would be 1½ years for which the employees have to avail 30 leaves.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if an employee had availed 17 casual leaves up to 30th June 2016, he/she would be having 13 casual leaves to avail up to 30th June 2017 subject to the condition that he/she would not avail more than 20 casual leave up to 31st December, 2016.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he wanted to get one clarification regarding the vacation to the non-teaching staff as they avail 50% of the vacation. If a person insists that he/she wanted to avail a specific period and the Chairperson did not allow the vacation, what is the rule in this regard.

It was informed that it is a mutual understanding between the employees and Chairperson is the moderator.

Professor Anil Monga said that it depends on the Chairperson.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no leave could be claimed as a matter of right and it is mentioned in the rules. Even if somebody has leave due to the credit, he/she could not say that he/she would go on leave. The Chairperson is within his/her rights to reject the leave. But this is to have healthy relationship in the Department that it should be done mutually. If it is not mutually agreed, then the Chairperson could take a decision.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he wanted to bring a case to the notice that a non-teaching person at 4.50 p.m. says that he/she was going on leave without it being sanctioned as the Chairperson is not available.

It was informed that till the sanctioning authority has not sanctioned the leave, the person is not on leave.

The Vice Chancellor said that the same was the case of Mr. Kulwant Singh.

It was informed that the leave was recommended but the sanctioning authority in this case was the Vice Chancellor and the leave could not reach the Vice Chancellor by that time and that person even did not get ex-India leave.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as some of the members were saying it goes on. Even when a teacher has to go to attend some course and had submitted the application about 15 days in advance and after getting approved from the Department, the office did not reply to the teacher and the course had already started and that person had to go in anticipation otherwise he/she would have to wait for a year. The process is so lengthy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it might be that the permission had been granted in time but the intimation reached the candidate later.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter related with the casual leave is resolved and now let them move forward to the Lab and Technical Staff demand.

It was informed that earlier the laboratory and technical staff was restricted to only one department like that there existed a post in a department and a person with the qualification was available in any

other department. To have a wider scope of promotion, this was the proposal that a person who was eligible in various departments, then he/she should get a chance.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that sometimes a person in one department could not get promotion for about 20 years while the other person in a department got promoted within 1-2 years.

It was informed that the persons should get the chance of promotion in whole of the University and not in a particular department.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he had made a request during the last to last meeting of the Syndicate that the JCM had made a committee regarding regularization of the services of the non-teaching employees. The recommendations had been made and the same was signed by all the members and for the last 3-4 months nothing is known about that. He wanted to know the status of that.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could find it out.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in the meeting it was committed that the status would be made available.

It was informed that the meeting of the JCM was held on 29th December, 2015 and the meeting of the Committee was held in January, 2016 and the minutes got delayed due to some reasons. The same would be traced and Dr. Ajay Ranga would be informed about the status.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Dr. Ajay Ranga says that the Committee was constituted in terms of the decision taken by the JCM. If that is so, that should have become part of the proceedings of the JCM and the Sub-Committee which had been constituted comprising Dr. Ajay Ranga, Finance and Development Officer and President, PUSA. Dr. Ajay Ranga says that the Committee was formed by the JCM which is not recorded in the minutes and the Committee took some decision.

It was informed that the meeting of the Committee took place subsequent to the meeting of the JCM.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it was decided in the same JCM and after that no meeting of the JCM was held.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would get it checked.

It was informed that the same would be got checked.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that till the regularisation is made, the employees who are presently being paid a salary of Rs.7-8,000/- for them they could take a decision that those who have completed 5 years, they should be paid the DA/DP.

The Vice Chancellor said that they were not giving increment to the people who were recruited at the minimum. If those persons have worked for 5 years and they want that they should be given a quantum jump. If the Syndicate has the power to give a quantum

jump and the Board of Finance has no issue and if the U.T. Administration is not interfering in it, it is okay.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier the Senate had taken a decision in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would have to be approved by the Board of Finance. He further wanted to know what is the difference between the DA/DP and D.C. rates.

It was informed that the minimum salary of D.C. rates about Rs.14,000/-, say Rs.15,000/-. The DA/DP salary would be around Rs.27,000/- and the enhancement would be about Rs.13-14,000 per person.

The Vice Chancellor sought the information regarding the salaries being paid to the lowest level of employees.

It was informed that the salary is around Rs.11,000/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that this information be prepared and the new pay commission recommendations would come. Let them get these numbers over a period of five years and at least give some increase as all the employees are getting 3% increment every year. So, over a period of five years, at least 3% increase should be given on the minimal. It should be found out at what rate every year this number is increasing over a period of five years. They should look at the enhancement in D.C. rates and then they could compute. Even if the U.T. is not giving, they could come up with their own recommendation and try it at the level of the Board of Finance if the bureaucrats accept it. He is okay with it. There were many organisations. In the University, they were appointing temporary teachers and after giving one day break, they are giving re-employment every year, they were not increasing the salary. But in Maharashtra, since 15 years ago, when every year new contract is given, they grant one increment. Since there were no regular jobs and whenever regular job would be advertised, then that person would compete in the open. If they have selected a person through open competition, that person should be given the benefit as that person would also get the same in the regular selection. It is not a correct thing not to give the increment as they have taken the full work from that person. Now they were doing walk-in-interviews. They should give the benefits in the sense of belonging as for regular employee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that where it was mentioned that they were making appointments in walk-in-interview that they could not give the increment.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not know as he had inherited the system. If they wanted to propose a new thing, it could be proposed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not that he was proposing a new thing. They appoint the teachers and those persons continue for 6-7 years.

It was informed that for the grant of increment, there should be no break in service.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Court also says that the one day break could not be treated as gap in service.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this one-day break matter came into being in 1970s when the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India judgement came that if somebody had completed 240 days, first it came that in a calendar year and then it was said that in any 12 months, that could be treated as regular. So, one day break came into being so that the persons could not claim for regularisation. Anyway, the people are working in the University and they have not gone to the court. This could be taken care of that after one day break, even some increase could be given which nobody could stop.

It was informed that it is a contract, at the time of renewal of contract, the employer could suggest the increase.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was talking about the temporary teachers as for the daily wagers, there was talk whether they could do something for them. He was talking about the teachers who have been working for years and without any increase.

It was informed that if those teachers are recruited as regular at any stage, they could consider giving some increase.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they employ some part-time employees which is an inferior quality to regular employees as the guest faculty is inferior to part-timers. First of all, they take those as part-time on lesser salary and on top of that they say that the workload is doubled. Syndicate should at least consider about those teachers and their service conditions so that they might get a feeling of belongingness in whatever capacity those have been appointed.

The Vice Chancellor said that they go back to it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has got the information that a Peon is getting a salary of Rs.9,700/- on D.C. rates and if DA/DP is paid it would come to Rs.15,000/-. Similarly, a Clerk is getting a salary of Rs.16,300/- which would come to Rs.25,000/-. If they could not pay the full pay, at least half the DA could be paid.

It was informed that the pattern of DA/DP is not available, it is now basic pay plus DA.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they could do an exercise that those completing 5/6 years, they could be paid the basic pay plus DA till those are regularised.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the work audit is going on. As now the session is to start, the requirement of teachers is increasing because of the increase in the number of intake. The part-time and temporary teachers are to be appointed, the Establishment branch says that the work audit is going on and they could not appoint the new teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not the related matter. He would talk to him about this.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the JCM dated 29.12.2015 be approved with the modification that –

- (i) the ratio of filling up the posts of Deputy Registrars by open selection and seniority-cum-merit be 50:50. 25% of the 50% of the promotional posts be filled through seniority-cum-merit and the remaining 25% through selection but only from amongst the internal candidates;
- (ii) the period during which the non-teaching employees could avail the casual leave be shifted from calendar year to academic year i.e. 1st July to 30th June to be effective from the academic year 2017-18. However, from the period commencing 1st January 2016 to 30th June 2017, an employee would be entitled to avail 30 casual leaves subject to the condition that he/she would not avail more than 20 casual leave from 1st January 2016 up to 31st December, 2016.

Resolution proposed by Professor Keshav Malhotra **54.** Considered the following Resolutions proposed by Professor Keshav Malhotra, Syndic/Fellow:

- A.** “that the Regulation under Section 13 Sub-Section 1(b) and 1(C) of the Panjab University Act be so amended as following:
 1. Five senior most Professors for a term of four years or till he/she retires or is in the job (by rotation).
 2. Three senior most Associate Professors for a term of four years or till he/she retires or is in the job (by rotation).
 3. Two senior most Assistant Professors for a term of four years or till he/she retires or is in the job (rotation)

EXPLANATION

At present, the assured representation of the University teachers in the Senate is insignificantly meagre - only 4 out of the total strength of 91. Keeping in view the fact that most of the business transacted in and by the Senate relates to the crucial issues pertaining to the governance and growth of University Campus.

Through nomination of the University teachers in the category of “Ordinary Fellows” the democratic participation of the University teachers in the governance of University will be assured.

- B.** “that the Regulation under Section 13 Sub-Section 1(b) and 1(b) and (c) of the Panjab University Act be so amended as follows:

13 Ordinary Fellows:

- 1(b) Four shall be elected by Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University from amongst themselves, provided that at least one member each from the Arts, Science and Professional Departments shall be elected.

- 1(c) Four shall be elected by Associate Professors and Assistant Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University from amongst themselves, provided that atleast one member each from the Arts, Science and Professional Departments shall be elected.

EXPLANATION

- (i) At present, the assured representation of the University teachers in the Senate is insignificantly meagre - only 4 out of the total strength of 91. Keeping in view the fact that most of the business transacted in and by the Senate relates to the crucial issues pertaining to the governance and growth of University Campus.
- (ii) There is no gainsaying the fact that, although over the years, number of teachers in the departments of professional subjects (other than Arts and Sciences) has increased tremendously, yet no assured representation has been given to the teachers (of departments of professional subjects) in the Senate. Hence, the anomaly ought to be rectified.

NOTE: The Vice Chancellor has referred the matter to Governance Committees headed by Justice B.B. Prasoan and Shri Satya Pal Jain”

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the matter could be referred to the Senate Reforms Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Part A of the Resolution could be referred to the Governance Reforms Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that last time when the nominations were made, if they look at those nominations, 12 of them are the Professors, re-employed and emeritus Professors. 2/3rd of them are actually serving. It is not implementable this year. He did not know how to do it; they could recommend, but the things which are related to governance reforms could be implementable only in 2020. This time, it is the same Chancellor and he made the nominations without asking them. They want to tell him to follow an algorithm. He had asked the University Senators to give an algorithm if there was an informal understanding, he would pass on the same to the Chancellor and leave the same to the wisdom of the Chancellor what he wanted to do. They could not dictate him or compel him (Chancellor) and he could not change the Calendar. Right now, the Chancellor had unfettered freedom to do what he wants. He had done it on his own and they were just making the suggestions and leave it to him. He said that he was not saying anything against it. He said that it could be left to the Chancellor and they could only provide the data to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, technically speaking that they could not even dictate the Chancellor to nominate President, PUSA and President, PUTA. It is also a suggestion or a request to him. After taking the decision in the Senate that Chancellor be requested to nominate, he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) wants that let it be taken to the Senate and let the Senate request the Chancellor because it is implementable and it was up to him whether he agrees to five senior most Professors or not. But this could be suggested.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the Governance Reforms Committee had a meeting and it was decided that they could not ask the Chancellor to nominate these 5 persons but it could be just a recommendation.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is a broad consensus.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the matter could be referred to the Governance Reforms.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that part-A could be referred to the Governance Reforms and part-B be referred to the Senate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there was a case in the Hon'ble High Court regarding the nominations. He had come to know that the University had filed the reply as the Court had asked the University to frame the guidelines. He enquired whether they have prepared any guidelines.

Professor Shelley Walia said that in the Governance Reforms Committee meeting held yesterday, the pressure came on the seniority part and he felt that the seniority should not be the criterion for nomination because many times there are many seniors. So, there should be another criteria.

The Vice Chancellor said that the number of Associate Professors is very small as the people remain Associate Professor only for a small transient time which is about 3 years. So, the Associate Professor and Professor is one category.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if there is discretion then discrimination is also there. That is why he had proposed the criteria of seniority. There were some people who had been serving for about 30 years while some juniors who had political backing had got the nomination. It was suggested after giving a thorough thought that the criteria should be seniority basis. In the Governance Reforms, they were saying that the Deans should be appointed through seniority. Similarly others, like the Warden should be appointed through seniority.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that all the stakeholders would not get a chance through this. They were talking about the governance reforms whether it is related to giving representation to women or others.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the comprehensive recommendation could go.

The Vice Chancellor said that everything was being recorded and could be sent to the Chancellor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, that would be for 2020 but it could be done now.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, it could be done only through nomination and not through any other way. Whatever the Chancellor did in the year 2012 and the same has been included and they were suggesting an algorithm and the same was not binding on him.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they could suggest a method.

The Vice Chancellor said that it depends on the Chancellor whether to accept the algorithm or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a recommendation from here could go for giving representation.

The Vice Chancellor said that formally his recommendation did not go anywhere.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recommendation from the Syndicate and the Senate could go.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Syndicate and the Senate had no right to recommend to the Chancellor. The minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate relating to the discussion on the matter, they would send the same without any comments. They could also send the minutes of the Committee on governance reforms without any comments to the Chancellor. The Chancellor is a very wise person and he had done the same thing last time and leave it to his wisdom so that the community is more happy.

Professor Shelley Walia said that whether the Vice Chancellor would agree that the seniority principle is the best.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could not comment on it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that so many people become Chairpersons by way of seniority.

The Vice Chancellor said that he respected what the members were saying.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Keshav Malhotra has rightly said and has given a very good suggestion that this is also to be considered on the same lines as nominations from College, this suggestion could be given. No. 2 by seniority that even if it does not serve the purpose but the concept of objectivity at least could not be challenged because they were not making any formula. Following the same formula, at least the two/three Chancellors have been asking the University while appointing the Vice Chancellor to send the names of 10 senior most Professors. Whether the Chancellor agrees with that or not, it is his power whether to follow the seniority formula or not? But if something goes from here, it should be based on some objective formula, so that it should not go as if they themselves are interested. If there is any informal communication from the Vice Chancellor or any other person, they are free to name anybody. But for this, they should think about all the stakeholders.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that as Professor Keshav Malhotra proposed and Shri Ashok Goyal had said that the names of five senior most Professors be sent, it is right. But by the time the recommendations for the senior most Assistant Professor would go, he/she would become Associate Professor and same is the case for the Associate Professor that one would become Professor by that time. The term of the membership of the Senate is four years. The senior most person would be who is having a service of about 7-8 years. So, this proposal for Associate Professor and Assistant Professor is not

right. If they wanted to consider the proposal of Professor Keshav Malhotra then it should be only for the senior most Professors and not for Associate Professor and Assistant Professor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. I.S. Sandhu had raised a very good point. The solution is that the senior most Professor who is of the age of 59 years and nominated on the Senate, that person would be there only for one year. It could be said that the senior most amongst those who have at least 4 years remaining service.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if the proposal in the current form is sent then only the names of Assistant Professors with maximum of 4 years' service could be sent and not of those who have 6-7 years service.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there could be problems that if one thinks that he would become a member of the Senate, then that person would not opt for promotion. Those persons think that after becoming a member of the Senate, would opt for promotion and they take the same from the back date and it is a fact.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Associate Professor and Assistant Professor could be clubbed and the number remaining the 5 and if an Assistant Professor becomes an Associate Professor, that person should continue. He said that the seniority formulate could be adopted for this year itself.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the reserved categories should also be included in it.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could be through nomination only and the nomination is to be done by the Chancellor on his own.

Professor Anil Monga said that specifying the numbers as five, three, two or four, two and one it is not viable.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that what he had in mind was that there would be 5 Professors. He had also come to the Senate from the junior faculty as an Assistant Professor.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point was that whether one came via the Assistant Professor or the Associate Professor, once a person had become a Senator, that person is supposed to be a Senator and supposed to do work for the entire community and not only with the constituency from which came to the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the ideas and the aspirations of all are different.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University teaching profession today is a job where there is one year's probation and one is teacher for life. There is no distinction between different ranks in IITs. That is why the IITs have changed the system, only the salary slips says that one is Assistant Professor or Associate Professor or a Professor, one is to be addressed as Professor in an IIT even if one is an Assistant Professor.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the opinion of the Vice Chancellor is right but practically it is not so.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if they wanted to make some category happy then his proposal is that in addition to 8 persons that have been suggested from the Professor and Associate Professor, 4 senior teachers from the Colleges should also be added. It is the prerogative of the Chancellor to nominate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the College teachers are already having more representation being 22 in number.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that there are 198 Colleges and the Campus is only one.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Colleges are administered separately and large number of issues that they were discussing related to the campus and the branding of the University, like that is done by NAAC and others, is largely based on the campus performance. When the NAAC visits, the offices of the Controller of Examinations, Dean College Development Council are taken into account. But larger weight when it comes to NAAC, NIRF rankings, it is campus performance. That is why the large fraction of agenda is relating to the campus. This becomes the governing body of the campus. This is a governing body of the Colleges in an indirect way that the Colleges need the approval and so on. But it is not the governing body of the Colleges in the same sense as it is the governing body of the campus. It is a historical thing. When the governing body was created, there was no campus. But today the campus has become a huge campus and the items relating to the campus are continuously enhancing and will keep on enhancing the way the UGC is trying to regulate this thing. Therefore, more of the issues would come, would be related to the campus. They should understand this balance. Colleges need representation because those are affiliated with the University and the large input to all the campus departments is from the affiliated Colleges and the income of the University is also generated by addressing and administering the examination duty of the University relating to 2.5 lac students. They would come to know soon how the income of the University is generated under different heads and then it would be clear to them that the income of the University coming from the Colleges at the moment is more than the income of the University from within the campus. It is not clear how the expense of the University is to be distributed in this way. They could not know whether it is right thing to do such microscopics. But it is necessary that they should think of it in a unified way and not get fractured between the Colleges and the campus. If they get so fractured talking in this kind, they would have differences and those differences would work against each other. Let them not bind that there are so many Colleges and teachers. It is their job to give to them all the input as to what the present system is.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he did not mean that. He meant that if they wanted to make happy some category, there could be no outcome. Out of the 15 nominated members sitting in the House, 4 are from the University. He has no objection. But as Professor Keshav Malhotra is saying that 22 are from the Colleges, the nomination from the campus is also not less. But the nomination could not be done through this proposal. He was not opposing the proposal. But it could be said as said by Shri Ashok Goyal for the senior most. As the categories proposed are being made happy, but nothing would happen and the time is being wasted.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if he wanted to make someone happy, then he would have suggested specifically. If the Presidents of the PUSA and PUTA could become members of the Senate for periods ranging from 6-8 months, then others could also become.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he did not agree that the criteria of nomination should be seniority. He wanted that there should be a ceiling on the University Professors through nomination as their number is more. He wanted to say that they could select 10 persons by putting it through governance reforms, he had no problem, they could increase the number and put 10 people from the University in the Senate, but it should come through direct election process. Without prejudice to any member, he knew that the Vice Chancellor had got nominated the members to this House and their contribution to the Syndicate and Senate is nothing. His opinion is that there should be ceiling on the nomination and seniority should not be the criteria. They could increase the number of teachers from the University, to which he had no problem. Although the matter relates to services matters, nothing to do with the Panjab University part. Presently, they have got 6 members – 3 from Professors and 3 from Assistant and Associate Professors. His opinion is that they could increase it to ten but that should come through governance reforms. There should be ceiling on the nomination.

The Vice Chancellor said that it had already been discussed. There is no need to send it to the governance reforms.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nobody had gone through the item. The note to the item says that the Vice Chancellor has already referred the matter to that Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that when last time the Chancellor made the nominations, it is not known whether he followed any formula or not. The factual position is that there are 8 Professors, one serving Associate Professor and one Assistant Professor. What this proposal amounts to is that it should be little bit more evenly distributed so that every age group is represented and it is a qualitative message that he could see.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the same people are saying that it is good and the same people are saying that they were trying to make some people happy because it is election year.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should not be personal. One has to compete as an individual. They should not make it as election meeting. They want a more even distribution. This is what seems to him. Let them leave it to the wisdom of the Chancellor what he does.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the seniority should be kept in mind.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could not recommend it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that how they were taking it to the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that along with the discussion, it would be sent to the Senate as an information item if the members

wanted it to go to the Senate. If they did not want it to be further debated otherwise the governance reforms is doing.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that in the form of Resolution the item should go to the Senate for consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said, okay. He said that but there is no resolved part.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the resolved part is that it should go to the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that alright.

RESOLVED: That the Resolution proposed by Professor Keshav Malhotra along with the explanatory note and discussions be referred to the Senate for consideration.

At this stage, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that two days ago, the Dean College Development Council in association with the R&S Branch had convened a meeting to frame the admission guidelines. There is PGDCA course of one year duration. The eligibility criteria for admission to that Diploma is Graduation with 50% marks. But in the newly prepared guidelines, it is Graduation with Mathematics at 10+2 level. He came to know that it was approved in the year 2013 which could not be implemented in the year 2014 and 2015. The Mathematics at 10+2 level is also not compulsory for admission to BCA course. In this way, the PGDCA course would be dead.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Board of Studies had recommended it.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that Shri Raghbir Dyal meant to say that Mathematics at 10+2 level should not be compulsory for admission to PGDCA as it is also not required for admission to BCA.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that MCA is a course with heavy Mathematics because, Computer Applications at a later stage, requires the knowledge of Differentiation and Integration.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that in PGDCA, there is no paper related with Mathematics whereas in BCA they have got a full subject of Mathematics.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Computer course requires the knowledge of Mathematics. Then they would have to figure it out from the Board of Studies.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the notification was of the year 2013. It should be reviewed otherwise, people could go to the Court.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that the students without Mathematics used to take admission in BCA and the results were very poor. That was why Mathematics was introduced.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the facts are other way round. For admission to BCA, Mathematics is not required which is creating

problem as pointed out by Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi. But still they have not introduced Mathematics as compulsory subject for admission to BCA. The only compulsion is that for admission to BCA, one has to have Mathematics at 10th level.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Mathematics at 10th level did not have the Matrices, Numerical Mathematics, etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when BCA was started in Panjab University, Mathematics was a compulsory subject. But for some reasons, subsequently, this condition was waived because Computer course was in fashion and everybody wanted to go for the degree. So the parents pressurised that Mathematics should be removed and perhaps then decision was taken. As on today, Mathematics is not compulsory at 10+2. Shri Raghbir Dyal is saying that Mathematics at 10+2 is not compulsory for admission to BCA where it has been made compulsory for admission to PGDCA.

Vice Chancellor said that they could understand. It is possible that if they could manage the BCA syllabus.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that 90% of the students of BCA have failed in the subject of Mathematics.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could understand why the people pressurised that, there used to be a subject called Information Technology which the students could do with Arts subjects combination and need not take Mathematics for IT course. If one had done Economics and IT and one could argue that why he was being prevented from doing BCA because BCA is an expansion of IT software packages for which no Matrices or Numerical Mathematics is required. But for Computer Applications advanced level Mathematics should be there.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that first they should try to have Mathematics for BCA level and only then they could think of having the Mathematics for PGDCA. Now for admission to BCA, Mathematics is not compulsory and for admission to PGDCA, it has been made compulsory. That is his point. He was not interested for the introduction of Mathematics for BCA.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was approved in the year 2013 but it was not implemented in the year 2014 and 2015. Why it was not implemented?

The Vice Chancellor said this was not to be done by the R&S branch but by the academics branch.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the decision was taken in the year 2013 but the office could not notice it in the year 2014 and 2015 came to their notice in 2016 and the people from the Colleges were surprised as to what has happened.

The Vice Chancellor said that now what is the solution?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the solution is that at least for this year, they should follow what they had followed last year as the admission guidelines are yet to be sent. As Shri Raghbir Dyal is

saying that if for admission to BCA Mathematics is not required then why for PGDCA.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that BCA is a degree course whereas PGDCA is just a diploma course. His suggestion is that first they should introduce Mathematics as a compulsory subject for admission to BCA. He had a habit to read thoroughly the Regulations because that affected the students.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as Shri Raghbir Dyal is saying that earlier for BCA Mathematics at 10+2 was compulsory. That condition was waived off.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that Mathematics should not be required for PGDCA.

It was informed that it could go to the Board of Studies and the status quo could be maintained.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it was an important matter, that is why he wanted to talk about it earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could be kept in abeyance.

This was agreed to.

**Request of the President,
Bhartiya Yogvidhya
Mahasamiti, Sector-20-D,
Chandigarh**

69. Considered request of the President, Bhartiya Yogvidhya Mahasamiti, Sector-20-D, Chandigarh, that a separate Department of Yoga and Yoga Board of Studies, be established in Panjab University, Chandigarh & affiliated Colleges.

- NOTE:**
1. The B.Ed. Yoga and the Postgraduate Diploma in Yoga Therapy are already being run in the Govt. College of Yoga Education & Health Education, Sector-23, Chandigarh and Brahmurishi Yoga Training College, Sector-19, Chandigarh..
 2. The Vice-Chancellor has observed that “No need to create a separate Department, instead the “Yoga” College in Chandigarh can be empowered to take if larger role on behalf of P.U.
 3. An office note is enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the separate department could not be opened. However, if there is no Board of Studies and if it is constituted then there is no harm in it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Board of Studies in Yoga is already there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the Board of Studies already exists, then it is okay.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if the Board of Studies already exists, then what they wanted and if a separate Board of Studies is not then it must be attached with some other Board.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Board of Studies is to be nominated by the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that when M.A. Music was started in the Colleges and the Department of Music in the University came into existence later. Many times, the Colleges initiated to sustain a subject. When the College of Yoga is already and all the related matters like Board of Studies, Research Centre, then the Department of Yoga should not be started.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the demand is that the Department of Yoga be set up. The representation is from an Organisation.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever work the University department has to do related with Yoga like teaching, research, the same could be done by the Colleges of Yoga already in existence. The University should give the support to Yoga as a serious pursuit. Let the Yoga be seriously pursued not at the Panjab University campus but in the Colleges of Yoga, one in the Government sector and the other in private sector and whatever support they need and if they need the support of the governing body to conduct their business, they should do this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the letter written by a Society which is like a NGO and basically the idea is to promote yoga and the Society must not be aware that there are already two Colleges offering yoga.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is in their knowledge. He had gone to the Yoga College for convocation which was presided over by the Hon'ble Governor, Professor Kaptan Singh Solanki and it is in their knowledge. Whatever responsibility a Department in the University could take, why not the Colleges could take that responsibility like all research activities related to yoga. For higher pursuits of knowledge, the University is having the Department of Vivekanand Studies where teaching of spiritual aspects, philosophical aspects is done. They have already a Chair related to matters which they want to pursue. There are exercises which are something like yoga protocol. There are so many medical issues related with yoga. They have a Chair for philosophical study and the Colleges could interact with the Vivekanand Studies and take the help and whatever the Colleges wanted to do, could do that. U.T. Administration has taken the help of Professor Nandita Singh, Professor O.P. Katare and few others and Yoga Department of Bombay University is building a national event in which academic part of the yoga would be discussed so that a document emerges which is academic nature on behalf of AYUSH which they could use year after year. If national yoga day has to emerge as part of the annual calendar of U.T. Administration and the event of 2016 is just a start of this process, and adopting this is a part of the enlightened city agenda, smart city agenda and if they are worried about the higher aspect of yoga, it should be a part of the larger agenda. On behalf of all of them, they could say that they could do it for the city and the Colleges should accept the responsibility and whatever support they need, the University could provide for which the Colleges should provide the proposal.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that he would like to inform the background of it. A paper on yoga which is a compulsory has not been made a part of the syllabus of yoga and the Board of Studies said that the methodology should be studied and by deleting that, one paper has been reduced. Since that paper has to be again taught, that is why the Board of Studies in Yoga is required. When the degree of B.Ed. is to be given then the methodology has to be studied. It is not a matter of Department and otherwise they could do as they like.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that as Principal Surinder Singh Sangha is saying that the demand could not be fulfilled and whatever help is needed that could be provided by the University.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the Mahasamiti in their letter has written that yoga is being considered as a poor child of Department of Education and Department of Physical Education under Panjab University. Since it is a part of Department of Physical Education, their help could be sought in this matter and there is no need of a separate department.

It was informed that the Diploma course could be given.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha and Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the Diploma course could be granted.

Professor Shelley Walia said that why they could not have a component of yoga in the M.A. courses also.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Directorate of Sports is for the entire University campus. They have an outreach to the Society for yoga, because it is good for health and enlightenment. Since there is no pension in the government as well as the private companies and the persons have to work hard whole of the life and only then one could have a good material life. To stay healthy, one has to have these good habits. It has become a must that everyone should be conscious about the health. It is a part of healthy and enlightened agenda.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that even in choice based credit system, one of the subjects is yoga.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the Ph.D. in it could also be started.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could be. Let the proposals come. There are people who are doing yoga all throughout the year.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that they could not leave everything to the two Yoga Colleges and the University should take some initiative.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Vivekanand Studies Centre of Panjab University is doing seminars on yoga.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that Vivekanand Studies Centre is a different thing and yoga is a different thing.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now they were not in a position to establish a Department of Yoga in the University as firstly they have to take care of the already existing departments.

RESOLVED: That request of the President, Bhartiya Yogvidhya Mahasamiti, Sector-20-D, Chandigarh, for establishment of a separate Department of Yoga and Yoga Board of Studies in Panjab University, Chandigarh & affiliated Colleges be not acceded to at the moment.

Regarding promotion Policy of teaching faculty working in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., Chandigarh

70. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 18.03.2016 with regard to policy for promotion of teaching faculty working in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., Chandigarh.

NOTE: A detailed office note is enclosed.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the Dental Institute was started, they had recruited the persons with B.D.S and M.D.S. as they are running the department like any other department of the University and the salary structure etc. would be as per the Punjab Government. Those who were M.D.S., they were put ahead in an ad hoc manner and after that they started doing everything commensurate with the Dental Council of India and whatever the DCI directed, they were doing. They recruited them as University teachers and if they have shifted them to Punjab pattern, there is no policy. So they deprived their teachers of a promotion policy and it is their moral duty to provide a promotion policy. After so many deliberations a promotion policy came which looked reasonable. But the drawback of that policy is that 3 teachers who were having the B.D.S. qualification were not fitting in this promotion policy. Out of those 3 teachers, one has done the M.D.S. and the other one is doing the M.D.S. They could provide relief to those teachers so that they are not left behind others. A solution could be thought of by forming a Committee. The third one has not taken the admission in M.D.S. So, he is the only person who is left behind.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there 14 other teachers also who are working on contractual basis. They could consider of a promotion policy for them also.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not fit those contractual teachers. They could devise such things of having them on the post of Demonstrators. They could ask them to do M.D.S. by taking leave or some of the seats of M.D.S. course could be given to those persons. They have to find some pro active way to take care of their career. At the moment, they have to have a promotion policy and then they could attend to the left out cases one by one. The third person when he joined after B.D.S., he is in the same cadre. When they shifted him, they did not ask that person. They should have a separate career profile for him. They should not deprive him of a career because when they inducted him, made a promise that he would be University teacher. He is also entitled for career progression. As the University had done so many special things, they could also find a solution to the problem. This governing body should seek a solution. They should also find a solution for those people who are having B.D.S. qualification. At the moment, his personal recommendation is that the promotion policy proposed after great deal of discussion should be accepted and a process would start and a

promotion policy would be there. Thereafter, only the Ayurvedic and Homoeopathic Colleges would be left without the promotion policy. They could try to have a promotion policy for those Colleges also though they are not a part of the University. In the first instance, the promotion policy should be accepted, form a Committee and find a solution.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the promotion policy document contains a comparative statement of 8 different organisations. When the Dental Institute was set up in the year 2005, at that time B.D.S. was the minimum requirement to be a teacher in the Dental Institute and the advertisement in the year 2005 for the post of teachers in the Dental Institute was issued with BDS qualification. The Selection Panel gave the preference to MDS candidates. When the MDS candidates were not available, then the persons having the BDS qualification were appointed whereas the basic requirement was BDS. When some of the teachers started to leave the Dental Institute, in order to retain them in the Dental Institute, they were given the GP of Rs.7,000/- after one year.

The Vice Chancellor said that they were given the Punjab pay scale.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that those with basic qualification of BDS are Assistant Professor even now after having a service of 10 years. There is a solution to that as they were promoting from State-1 to Stage-2, as new appointment of faculty for Dental Institute is being made, they could make the appointment in the GP of Rs.7,000/-.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that now it has been done at GP of Rs.6,000/- as per UGC scales.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the appointments are being made in the GP of Rs.7,000/-.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they if follow the Punjab Government, then there is no promotion policy. Therefore, it was decided that the appointments be made at GP of Rs.7,000/- since it was a backlog, but for future the appointments be made as per UGC rules.

The Vice Chancellor said that there was no such decision.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there was no such decision and the appointments of the faculty at Dental Institute is being made at GP of Rs.7,000/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that first they have a promotion policy for the people who are on the Punjab pattern. Then they would address the remaining. He understood what they were saying. But, first they should see the first part.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that from stage-2 onwards, everything is right.

Dr. Ajay Ranga also endorsed the viewpoints of Professor Navdeep Goyal.

The Vice Chancellor said that did they approve the things above stage-2. Then they could address the other issues.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that for stage-1 to stage-2, the teachers who are already MDS, they had been given the GP of Rs.7,000/-. Those with BDS qualification are in the GP of Rs.6,000/- even after a duration of 10 years service. He suggested that the BDS teachers should be given the GP of Rs.7,000/- after 2 years, those having MDS were given two increments and the GP of Rs.7,000/- was given after one year. The BDS even after 10 years have been appointed as Assistant Professor in the GP of Rs.6,000/-. Whatever they have already done, that could not be changed. There is a way out to this problem that the MDS should be given after one year which they have already given and which is continuously going on. For those with BDS qualification, from stage-1 to stage-2, they could give after 2 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that from a back date, no transaction could be made. This is not permissible and this would not be allowed by the finance persons. Those persons were taken as Lecturers with BDS and after 6 years of service either they are entitled to promotion under UGC scheme or under a new scheme. If there is any disadvantage that they were going from stage-1 to stage-2 after 6 years after having done the MDS and those with earlier MDS have entered into that with less interval, then from going stage-2 to stage-3, those who would enter stage-2 after doing MDS, their interval for going from stage-2 to stage-3 could be reduced so that there should be no disparity which they could decide by forming a small Committee so that there is no disadvantage and the suggestion of members could not be accepted and it would not be approved by the Board of Finance that those who were appointed about 4 years ago as Lecturer with BDS qualification at stage-1 whereas in the University system for going from stage-1 to stage-2, a minimum interval is required.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they had done this for 99% of the person by giving the GP of Rs.7,000/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was his (Dr. Ajay Ranga) opinion. Whatever he had the understanding of the government system, to solve this problem, nobody would permit it from the back date. However, notionally some things could be done but physically and the promotion from back date could not be possible. Notional meant that for going from stage-2 to stage-3 there could be some adjustment in the number of years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the scheme, the total period from stage-1 is 20 years. For those with MDS qualification and coming directly, which is almost equivalent to Ph.D. as per UGC, the period is 14 years. For BDS, the total period could be fixed at 17 years. As the Vice Chancellor was saying that the adjustment in period could be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had a lot of thought on it and found that there is no other way out. He had met those BDS teachers.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they had no power as there is a change in the policy and the Board of Finance could take a decision.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it the Syndicate could recommend it to the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor said that what is the need to take it to the Board of Finance as it had already been approved by the Board of Finance.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired what was resolved in the Board of Finance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a difference. It was also earlier discussed that it should go to the Board of Finance through Syndicate. It is the other way round that it is coming from Board of Finance to Syndicate. The recommendation has been brought for consideration. He did not know whether by mistake or through an oversight, it has been brought to the Syndicate though the Vice Chancellor had approved the recommendation of the Committee for taking the recommendations to the Board of Finance. The Committee said that it should be taken to the Board of Finance as recommended by the Committee dated 18.3.2016. Probably, through an oversight it has come to the Syndicate and what Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that this proposal could also be taken before the Board of Finance that in this policy they have not been able to cover some of the cases and as the Vice Chancellor is saying and Professor Navdeep Goyal is also saying that they would not give the benefit from back date but they could give some notional benefit for financial benefits to be given from the prospective date and other benefits could be given on notional basis. Even otherwise also, this recommendation has to go to the Board of Finance. He felt that the Finance and Development Officer would also endorse that it would go to the Board of Finance and then come to the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is before them that it goes to the Board of Finance. They could say to wait for the Board of Finance. He would like to ask each one of the members whether this promotion as it is, read it in two things and taking care of the BDS teachers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they do not to offer any comments to go to the Board of Finance. He wanted the Board of Finance to pass it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) could share his concern.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there were few things which could come in the way and since the matter has to go to the Board of Finance as it is being financial implications. He would suggest that whatever Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that a small Committee should be formed to take care of the BDS teachers.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this should be approved and there is a lacuna which the Committee could look into. This promotion policy was his proposal in the year 2007.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the problem is that what is the history of converting these persons into Punjab Government scales? Whether it was known at that time or not that there is no promotion policy in Punjab Government. They had a conscious decision at that

time also. Now to say that those teachers were given the benefit just because they were retained by the University and that was also not considered, the consideration was something else.

The Vice Chancellor said that whether it was recorded in the Syndicate minutes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that is why he is saying that it is not recorded.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is their moral duty to provide the promotion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had some reservations that the Committee met on 15.01.2016 and the said that let the recommendations go to the Board of Finance. The recommendations were taken to the Board of Finance and the Board of Finance made some suggestions and said that after working on the suggestions, the item be brought back to the Board of Finance. After that the Committee met and the same person is saying that there is no need of taking the item to the Board of Finance though the opinion was not accepted by the Committee. So, the Committee resolved unanimously that the matter be taken to the Board of Finance which is duly confirmed by the Dean of University Instruction, the Chairman of the Committee, which is approved by the Vice Chancellor. As per the recommendations of the Committee, the item should have gone to the Board of Finance. But it is good that through an oversight it come to the Syndicate and some suggestions are coming and those suggestions could be put forward. If they say that let they pass it first and then their concern probably that they might not succeed.

The Vice Chancellor said that even if they pass it unless there is a financial implication. When he asked the members did they approve the promotion, some of the members said, 'yes'. Then the Vice Chancellor said that it meant that they have unanimity that they should have a promotion policy.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the policy which is implementable.

The Vice Chancellor said that if something is not implementable, that could not be implemented. That should not negate the first thing that they should not have a policy. Challenge is before the governing body to give an implementable policy. There is a proposal. One is if this policy is reasonable, then the thing is the policy is reasonable it is not implementable, then it is fine. Then it is their responsibility to point out to him why it is not implementable. It is their collective responsibility to see that if there are lacunae and to fill up those lacunae, they should have an implementable policy. Let they break it up in various parts. They have a near unanimity and it is their responsibility to help their colleagues to have a promotion policy. They have a proposal. Now, they take it to the Board of Finance on the premise that they would check whether the financial aspect of this makes sense. Board of Finance has members from various quarters. The Syndicate, the Senate, other stakeholders of the University have a representation. Most importantly, the Punjab Government has a representative as well because in this particular case they have done something. They have a promotion policy which is not in Punjab Government and it is their own innovation. It must

have an acceptance from Punjab Government, MHRD, U.T., to say from all bodies. There could be reservation of one or two. But it is a collective body that the Board of Finance should be okay with it. This is the one test of implementability. If something is not implementable then it will not say that. But if it goes through that then it has the potential of implementability. If it comes to the governing body and when they find lacunae at that stage and when they find lacunae at that stage, then they have to find a solution also. As far as Board of Finance is concerned and as far as the financial part of it is concerned, they have no issue at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let them have clarification from the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members have to help him if not at this forum but as one to one, they could tell him why it is not implementable so that when it goes to the Board of Finance, he could have confidence.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that four of the members of the Board of Finance are here. It becomes their responsibility to discuss, find out the lacunae and polish and if there are some lacunae that should be sorted out and a Committee could be formed in which Shri Ashok Goyal could guide them and Professor Navdeep Goyal and other members of the Board of Finance could discuss it. Shri Ashok Goyal could chair the Committee. He would support it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they would also involve the members of the Board of Finance from the Senate which would be totalling the members to six.

The Vice Chancellor said that whosoever has the time to convene this meeting and could do this job efficiently.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they would do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has to hold a meeting of the Board of Finance in July and he would like to get it approved from the current Senate and not leave it to the next Senate. Professor Keshav Malhotra would convene the meeting.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they would take the report of the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever is they complete that thing as they have to put it in the agenda of the Board of Finance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that after discussion, it was resolved to form a Committee and refer the matter to the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor said, okay. He said that all members of the Board of Finance from Syndicate and Senate and add to it is the Chairman of the Committee.

RESOLVED: That a Committee comprising Shri Ashok Goyal (Chairman), Dean of University Instruction, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Ms. Anu Chatrath, Shri Raghbir Dyal, be constituted to go through the

promotion policy recommended by the Committee and suggest the required changes, if any.

Regarding grant of extension of Government College of Medical College, Sector-32-B, Chandigarh

73. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Government College of Medical College, Sector-32-B, Chandigarh, for M.B.B.S. course, for the session 2015-16 and 2016-17 (with maximum number of students-100), subject to the fulfilment of the conditions as listed in the inspection report (if any) as well as with the condition that College will obtain the mandatory approval from the MCI before making admissions in the said courses/subjects.

NOTE: 1. Inspection Committee Report of the College along with office letter dated 01.03.2016, is enclosed.

2. An office notes enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the temporary extension of affiliation could be granted to the already going on M.B.B.S. course.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the matter related to the session 2015-16 and it is coming late.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why there is delay.

It was informed that the Medical College did not ask for the Inspection Committee from the University. The permission from the Medical Council of India (MCI) came late and the course was started.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this could have been got approved from the Vice Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate. Now the Syndicate has no choice.

The Vice Chancellor said that the College had clubbed this with the session 2015-16.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the temporary affiliation was not granted then how the examination was conducted.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that such items for seeking affiliation were also there for some more Colleges.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that a Committee was formed to revisit the Colleges to check the compliance. The Committees are visiting nowadays and there could be problems in granting the affiliation.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there are cases of 2015-16 which are also pending.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired whether there was any problem in compliance.

It was informed that the College applied late to the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could be sent to the Committee.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the item related with the Medical College should be approved.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is not right that the College did not ask for the affiliation and started the course on its own.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whether they have to grant this affiliation soon or it could wait as it was related with the session 2015-16. If the College could start the course in 2015-16, then they could also start for the session 2016-17. It should be referred to the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the matter to be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Inspection Report

74. Considered if, the permanent affiliation for B.Com course (3 units) and BBA course (2 Units), be granted to Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management, Village- Jhande, P.O. Threke, Distt. Ludhiana, w.e.f. the session 2015-16.

- NOTE:**
1. Earlier, the item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 vide (Para 26) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item, be deferred and SLQAC, on behalf of Panjab University, be asked to collate data on affiliation status of Colleges affiliated to Panjab University in U.T., Chandigarh as well as Colleges in Punjab State.
 2. Request dated 07.04.2016 and 23.04.2016 of the Principal, Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management for grant of permanent affiliation are enclosed.
 2. An office notes enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter to be referred to the Committee constituted under item No. 56.

Request of Contractual Lecturer

77. Considered minutes dated 22.01.2016 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider the request of contractual Lecturers working in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital for regularization of their services.

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue is that there are some Lecturers working on contract basis in the Dental Institute and how to provide them relief.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should not have come to the Syndicate because as per the minutes of the Committee, it is said that the Principal should move a proposal for consideration of the competent bodies of the University, i.e., Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate and accordingly this should have been taken to the Board of Finance and they could not ask the Principal to move a proposal. The item should be withdrawn and the Principal, who has been a part of the Committee, be informed that in view of the recommendations of the Committee, a proposal could be moved.

The Vice Chancellor said that should the Syndicate ask the Principal to prepare the proposal so that it might not happen that a proposal which comes from him might not be held up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate has said it. It meant that they were asking the Principal to submit the proposal and they have already granted the sanction. There could be problems in this as the matter has to go to the Board of Finance. The earlier case of promotion policy would also go to the Board of Finance. But the Principal could submit the proposal.

The Vice Chancellor said, okay, fine. He said that the item as such is withdrawn and the Principal could be asked to submit a proposal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that otherwise also the Vice Chancellor could constitute a Small Committee including the Principal to move a proposal so that the House could go through the same before going to the Board of Finance and that the Syndicate has asked it and the Vice Chancellor has formed the Committee on the basis of the recommendation of the Committee. He is ready to be part of the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said, okay, fine.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is mentioned point no. 7 that as per DCI Regulations only 25% of Lecturers, Tutors, Assistant Professors need to be with MDS qualification while 75% could be with BDS qualification. They were making a policy keeping in view the MDS only whereas the Regulations say otherwise.

The Vice Chancellor said that then they should not have changed it on Punjab Government pattern.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would tell after the meeting why it was changed to Punjab pattern.

The Vice Chancellor said that they tied it in knots.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they knew that they were tying the knots. At that time, it was thought nobody could see the future aspects. If that nobody wanted to be one sided that presently there is a benefit but after four years there could be loss also. As the Vice Chancellor had said that the Atomic Energy Institutes had prepared the policy that after 3 years of service, the faculty would be in pay band-4. So, those were far sighted. But they were interested only for the present that something is beneficial today and the same be given. That is the only difference.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could tell why the Central Institutes had done so. He had understood that in the 6th Pay Commission, the Professors in the Atomic Energy Institutions were left behind the Professors of IITs and IIMs because they accepted the pay commission earlier than those. So, when the next Pay Commission came, they thought that there would be problems again. He made a proposal that in the atomic energy system, people with Ph.D. with 5 years' service could be directly inducted in the pay band-4.

RESOLVED: That the item be withdrawn and a small Committee, including the Principal of the Dental Institute, be constituted to submit a proposal to be placed before the Board of Finance.

**Recommendation of the
College Development
Council dated 05.04.2016**

80. Considered minutes of the meeting of the College Development Council dated 05.04.2016 (**Appendix-LXXIV**).

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that first of all, he appreciate his (Vice Chancellor's) two statements relating to scholarships that any of the candidate under this category be not refused for scholarship. Therefore, the amount be increased. It is good that they had increased the amount of scholarship to Rs.50 lacs, but again his humble submission is the self-attestation or the affidavit should be made slightly stringent, so that only deserving students get the scholarship. It is right that they had allowed self-attestation, but through him (Vice Chancellor), he would request Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa to bring such a format which ensures that the scholarship goes to only deserving students. Secondly, he also welcomes the statement made by the Vice Chancellor that the Senate elections, especially to the Registered Graduates' Constituency would be conducted with open spirit and professional way. Videography would be done and officers would be appointed for checking the polling booths. Checking of identity cards would be done properly. If they are able to do all this, then it would be very good. His one more humble submission, though he has also said in the Senate, is that the subsidy which they are giving for National Seminars, it is very good, but they need to check the quality of the National Seminars, and a mechanism should be developed for the purpose. On several occasions, they are less National Seminars, but more District Seminars. They should impose condition that there must be at least 1-2 Professors as Resource Persons so that the Seminars have quality. They conducted a National Seminar in Mathematics in their own College and spent a sum of Rs.1.25 lac. They invited five Professors as Resource Persons – one each from Guru Jambheshwar University, Hissar, Devi Lal University, Sirsa, Longowal and one from NMIT. Professor A.K. Bhandari could not come because there was a petition on that day in Gidderbaha. Meaning thereby, they invited 4-5 Professors, but he went to 2-3 Colleges in his own city and he felt depressed on seeking the quality of Resource Persons, and the same could have been better. The Colleges take about Rs.40,000/- to Rs.50,000/- from the College Development Council and some they might be incurring from their own sources, but he could put it on record that his College, even though it is a Government College, it spent Rs.1.20 lac on the Seminar, and they got the subsidy from the Dean, College Development Council after submitting all the accounts and meeting all other formalities. His only humble submission is that there must be some quality checks, even though a sum of Rs.50,000/- is given as subsidy.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they want the University Professors to be encouraged to go the College Seminars, alright, whosoever invites the University Professor/s as Resource Person/s, the University could pay T.A./D.A. of those persons.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the payment of T.A./D.A. to the Resource Persons is being made by the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is just saying that if the Colleges invite the University Professors as Resource Persons for the Seminars, the University could pay their T.A./D.A. out of a fund separate from this. In this way, they would have additional grant to call quality persons, so they are encouraging them to call University Professors.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since funds are taken for the National Seminars as also these are got sponsored, if the Resource Person/s came from Sri Lanka or the Bangladesh to the Seminar, it become International Seminar, but the person/s come from the District or Chennai, then it is National Seminar. They could themselves see the quality of those Seminars, but the persons say that they have attended the National Seminar. If they put condition/s, the Colleges say that they are being discouraged from holding the Seminars. They could see what types of persons are coming to the National Seminars being conducted by the Colleges. He thinks that this is the job of the University to help the Colleges and out of CDC Fund they could give some funds, in addition to what they are already getting.

The Vice Chancellor said that with the CDC Fund alone, the Seminar/s could not be held as these are very expensive. As such, some funds are raised by the Colleges themselves.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is true that the Colleges raise some funds, but if they direct them that they must invite at least these persons.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would not ask the Colleges. They are only saying that if they call a University Professor (Professor of Panjab University alone), they (the University) would pay T.A./D.A. to him/her as they could not pay to others.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that what Shri Ashok Goyal has said is right, but there is no other way. They give a subsidy of Rs.30,000/- and they have approved in the Committee of which he is part and parcel, but still he would like to suggest that the Resource Persons should be from the University not only from the Panjab University, but from any University and the payment of T.A./D.A. to them could be made by the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that he does not want to share the burden of other Universities.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that perhaps, he has not been able to make it clear. In fact, he want to say that for grant of subsidy of Rs.30,000/-, their first condition should be that the payment of T.A./D.A. to the Resource Persons should be out of this subsidy, and only then the subsidy should be released.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this could be done that a sum of Rs.30,000/- has been sanctioned for the Seminar, provided at least one Professor of Panjab University is invited as Resource Person.

The Vice Chancellor said that one Professor could be from any University might be called, but over and above, if they want to invite another Professor from Panjab University, he would make payment to T.A./D.A. to him/her as well.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professors should be called from any University out of those Rs.30,000/- only.

The Vice Chancellor said that at least one Professor should be called as Resource Person out of Rs.30,000/- maybe from any University, and if the Professor is called from Panjab University, the University would make payment of T.A./D.A. to him/her. In this way, they would get at least two Professors – one from Panjab University and another from other University. He added that in their neighbourhood, there are six Universities which have 'A' Grade (Guru Nanak Dev University, Punjabi University, Patiala, Hissar, Kurukshetra, Central University of Bhatinda and their own University, i.e., Panjab University). When they have 'A' Grade Universities which have very good Departments, they could invite Professors from here and one more from other Universities. With this, the Seminars would have somewhat national character.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Shri Dyal's concern is genuine, but why this problem started is because of the compulsion of the UGC. They could check the Seminar organized before the new guidelines of the UGC and after that also. All this was being done under some compulsion. Quality was being done earlier and now also it is being done, but the number of papers and number of seminars would change. Rs.1,500/- was being charged for National level Seminar/local level Seminar. In the end of the day, when the number of candidates was seen, 200-300 persons were registered there. If they multiply Rs.1,500/- by 300, they would find the figure of Rs.6,50,000/-, where does this money goes.

The Vice Chancellor said that he knows that now they are digressing. He urged the members not to convert it into zero hour.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the College Development Council dated 05.04.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved, with the modification that for National Seminar at least two Professors (one from any University and one from the Panjab University) be called as Resource Persons. Payment of T.A./D.A. to the Resource Person from other University be made by the College concerned out of Rs.30,000/- and the payment of T.A./D.A. to the Professor of Panjab University be made by the University.

Endowment of Rs 21 lac made by family of Late Dr. Urmi Kessar, Professor (Retd.),

81. Considered if, an endowment of Rs.21 Lac made by the family of Late Dr. Urmi Kessar, Professor (Retd.), Department of Arts History and Visual Arts, P.U. Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of an Endowment to fund an annual lecture/oration in the memory of Professor Urmi Kessar in the area of Arts History and Appreciation, at Panjab University, Chandigarh, the interest of the amount be utilized as under:

- (i) An honorarium of upto Rs. 1 lakh for the lecturer.
- (ii) Contribution towards his/her travel expenses, normally upto Rs.30000/-, local hospitality to be provided by the University.
- (iii) Cost of printing the lecture, upto Rs.20000/-.

NOTE: The oration speaker will be chosen by a Committee comprising of:

- (a) Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University or his nominee.
- (b) A member or nominee of Urmi Kessar family.
- (c) A renowned scholar in the area chosen by constitution amongst (a) and (b).
- (d) Department of Arts History will be involved in making local arrangement for the Oration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the family had given another amount of Rs.4 lacs, thereby totaling the amount of endowment to Rs.25 lacs.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the contribution towards travel expenses, normally upto Rs.30000/- and only ordinary class fare. The interest on an amount of Rs.25 lacs @ about 8% interest comes to about Rs.2 lacs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would consult Professor Keshav Malhotra. This is a good gesture. They are going to prepare an event that one lecture would be held in Chandigarh and another would be held in some other city where the PU alumni of the nearby areas could participate. This has to be done in a very grand and a different way.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he would submit the note given by the family of Professor Urmi Kesar.

Professor Shelley Walia said that wherever seminar/conference is held, they should get a soft/hard copy of the same so that the press could publish a book of such collections.

RESOLVED: That an endowment of Rs.21 Lac made by the family of Late Dr. Urmi Kessar, Professor (Retd.), Department of Arts History and Visual Arts, P.U. Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of an Endowment to fund an annual lecture/oration in the memory of Professor Urmi Kessar in the area of Arts History and Appreciation, at Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Issue regarding selection panel to the Colleges for issued by NCTE for B.A./B.Sc. integrated course

82. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 07.04.2016 (**Appendix-LXXV**) constituted pursuant to discussion held in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 14.03.2016, to discuss the modalities for issuance of selection panel to the Colleges to whom L.O.I. has been issued by NCTE for B.A./B.Sc. integrated course

NOTE: A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-LXXV**).

Principal S.S. Sangha said that those which were in accordance with the NCTE guidelines, the same were prepared by them, but which was technical that was to be applied by the Colleges, they did not do that, because they have to apply before October, and that has been done by only three Colleges and others have not. The last date for applying for any course, is 31st October, thereafter with late fee of Rs.1 lac up to 10th January; and perhaps after that 15 days

could be granted by the Syndicate. Most of the Colleges did not apply and it was not under their purview.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what does he recommended now.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it has been written that six Syndics have given with signatures.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu intervened to say that this issue was raised in the meeting of the College Development Council that their NOC should be treated as application for affiliation. Thereafter, certain Fellows and other friends had met him (Vice Chancellor) and he allowed them to proceed, and after proceeding, the Committee, though he could not attend the meeting of the Committee, recommended that if the application has not come, no problem. He thinks that thereafter, he (Vice Chancellor) had allowed.

The Vice Chancellor enquired what the operative part now is?

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the issue is when they apply for NOC, it is a part of that it should be got from the University. Thereafter, the Colleges have to apply separately, and several Colleges have applied after 10th January, but they did not consider them. Whether it is a special course or normal, rule is the same. Therefore, they were not empowered to take this decision. They had prepared the guidelines. He (Vice Chancellor) has said that those who have obtained NOC, they should be considered. Three Colleges alone have applied. Either all Colleges did not apply, then also they could have taken some decision. Secondly, they have rejected courses of certain Colleges, which have applied after January and fine have also been imposed on certain Colleges. As such, it is a technical issue.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Tell me, what is the operative part".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the operative part is simple that as recommended by the Committee, it could not be done because the Colleges which could not apply within the stipulated date, they could not be granted affiliation. But as what cannot be cured, must be endured, they (Committee) very clearly referred the matter to the Vice Chancellor. The thing which they (Committee) could not do as per the regulations unless and until an enabling regulation is there, how could the Vice Chancellor do that? If as per the Regulations, the Vice Chancellor could do, what was the need to refer the matter to the Committee? However, the note says that it has been recommended by six Syndics, and the Vice Chancellor said that they could proceed to give them the panel to assist them. At the moment, the operative part is, the Committee says that as per regulations, it could not be done, and the Vice Chancellor has been authorized. Six more persons went to the Vice Chancellor and they pleaded that their NOC be treated as application for affiliation. The Vice Chancellor did not say anything whether to give or not to give, he just asked them to give panel, and the rest of the item would be taken to the Syndicate. That is what, he could understand.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, the Syndicate could say that something should not have been done, so that it does not happen in future.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that is already there.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that whatever has been done should be disallowed. The Syndicate could say let it be okayed, but in future it should not be done. Anyhow, there has to be an operative part today. If something has to be reversed, it could be reversed. Which ought not to have been done, let them reverse it.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired could it be reversed?

The Vice Chancellor said that if it could not be reversed, what should they do?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they do not know as to what has been done.

It was informed that the University has already given the NOC and after the NOC, the Colleges should have applied for extension of affiliation along with the prescribed fee. The Colleges thought as if the NOC is the application for extension of affiliation, but three Colleges out of 46 Colleges have applied for extension of affiliation along with the requisite fee. The remaining College thought they have got the NOC and applied to the NCTE and the NCTE issued the LOI and given directions to the Registrar to help them to recruit the faculty. When the issue of faculty came, the Committee said that they have not applied for extension of affiliation, and the matter was referred to the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that applications could be asked from these Colleges retrospectively.

It was further informed that thereafter, the panels were given and made the selections on the recommendations of Selection Committees constituted by the University. The proceedings of the Selection Committees have also been sent to the NCTE because the process had started. On the basis of those recommendations of the Selection Committees, certain Colleges have received recommendations from the NCTE. Now, the Colleges are asking for Inspection Committees, and again the problem of date has come in the way.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to draw their attention to page 39, the first line is: keeping in view the above facts, the Committee authorized the Vice Chancellor to take decision as per the rules/regulations, but later on, as per rules/regulations has been struck down and has been replaced with in the light of stated facts. He appreciates his (Vice Chancellor) gesture that he says that what should not have been done, say it openly that it could not have been done, it should not have been done. If it could be reversed, let them reverse it; and if it could not be reversed, let them take decision that in future, it should not be done. He wonders where was the need for the Committee not to be so frank and blunt that as per the regulations, it could not be done. What Dean, College Development Council, has explained, nothing could be reversed because selections have been made, the names of the teachers have been sent to the NCTE, though all is in violation of the regulations because if they start treating NOC as an application for affiliation, then probably they are forgetting all the provisions of Section 27 of the Act, which says as to what are the documents which are required to be attached with the application for

affiliation along with Rs.2000/- as fee. Rs.2,000/- could be taken care of as that is not a problem, but what about the documents relating to the extension of affiliation. But now everything has been done and according to the Dean, College Development Council, as he understands, nothing could be done now. Does the Syndicate have the power even to regularize it? Neither they have the power to regularize nor to disallow nor to allow nor to approve, what could they do?

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that all this has been done at the initiative of six Syndics. If the members of the Governing Body turn out to be ignorant, then what would happen?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thinks the duty of the Governing Body is, in fact, to assist the Vice Chancellor about what the regulations/rules say. But practically, if he has an interest and go to Professor Navdeep Goyal and request him to sign, he would never say no, because the ball is in the court of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that the reality is that he is just presiding over their meeting. He remains so busy, tight and he could not think of doing so many microscopic of the University. He requested the members to understand that he is also a human being like them. He has not so much leisure. They have to collectively be as conscious as he is, and anything wrong done by him as a Chairman of the Syndicate, each one of them has to share the blame. They might not get the credit for doing good on behalf of the Syndicate, but blame would be there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that they are thinking otherwise that blame would be on the Vice Chancellor and the credit to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have see practically that if someone came with a letter, it is very difficult to deny.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to continuously think that when they are doing anything. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) told him that the Syndicate is a Cabinet. How could the Cabinet people be so irresponsible?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is why, he is asking that the names of the six Syndics should be disclosed to them as only they would be able to tell as to what its solution is.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if he (Shri Ashok Goyal) or any other member of the Syndicate comes with a proposal, it is possible, that he signs the same, but whenever some other person/s came, they definitely make queries.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Section 27 of the Act says that "A college applying for affiliation to the University shall send a letter of application to the Registrar and shall satisfy the Syndicate". They have send the letter, when NOC was issued. It is natural that the remaining would be fulfilled later on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he does not want to go through the Calendar because otherwise also he could tell without reading the Calendar, but he does not want to get into this controversy. He

knows what Section 27 says and also what Regulations under Section 27 say. When Professor Navdeep Goyal said that then the NOC should be accepted as application, Shri Ashok Goyal said how could they accept the NOC as application for extension of affiliation? If he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) says that there is no difference between NOC and application for affiliation, then let them take a decision. If somebody says give him NOC, and he does not apply for affiliation or he does not get any No Objection, what would he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) consider.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that all this process is to be completed through the office of the Dean, College Development Council.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that but it has not been completed.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that, earlier, the NOC was being taken from the Government, but they have started taking NOC from the University. In fact, it is a part of the application, and until NOC is not given, the College could not apply. But which they have to apply to the University for affiliation or extension of affiliation, it is a separate one and there is a stipulated date for the purpose, which is 31st October. If one does not apply by 31st October, then there is a provision of fine of Rs.1 lac up to 10th January, and several Colleges had paid the fine. Thereafter, if some Colleges had applied, the University had rejected their requests. If this was to be allowed, all the Colleges should have been given the opportunity/relaxation of at least one week, so that no one could raise objection.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let him confess. Why he is pained because somebody asks him (he is also a member of the Syndicate and is bound by the Regulations/Rules) and he told the person concerned that it could not be done, and the College concerned withdrew their request. But after many days, he (Goyal) said that it could not be done as per the Regulations/Rules, here is the advertisement for appointment of teacher/s for the same course, and he had no answer; and he does not have any answer even today. In fact, he would like to be guided as to under what provision/s, the six Syndics requested the Vice Chancellor that this could be done like this. The Vice Chancellor has done it in good faith as if six Syndics are saying there must be some substance in that.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said the since the affiliation/extension of affiliation fee of Rs.2,000/- is much less, it should be enhanced to at least Rs.20,000/-.

It was clarified that the provision of NOC has been started by the NCTE this year only as earlier it was not there. This all has happened perhaps due to this. For the time being, the prescribed fee should be taken from the Colleges and Inspection Committee sent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Dean, College Development Council, has said that the fee is Rs.2,000/-. The Colleges which applied after 31st October and before 11th January, they would pay a fine of Rs.1 lac, but these Colleges had sent their applications in the month of May, for them the fine is only Rs.2,000/-.

It was suggested a fine of Rs.1 lac should also be taken from these Colleges.

Principal S.S. Sangha informed that at that time all the Colleges were saying that, if need be, a fine of Rs.1 lac should be imposed on them for submitting the applications late. However, when they get it done from the Vice Chancellor, they asked the Dean, College Development Council, as to what the fine is.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the Colleges concerned were saying that if it is more late, more fine should be imposed on them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if they are to be allowed, a fine of at least Rs.2 lac should be imposed on them.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the proposal of Composite Colleges had come, at that time also, he had said that this should not be done in such a haste because out of these, some of those, whose even Arts Colleges are also not functioning properly where they did not fulfil the conditions of affiliation. Even on the day of the meeting, the details of the Colleges were not available with them as to which were those 40 Colleges. Despite raising in the Syndicate as also in the Committee meeting, these Colleges have been permitted without seeing anything.

It was clarified that the Affiliation Committees would be going.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when they would issue NOC, on what basis, it would be given that the College is doing a very good job, including that it is taking some portion of the salary back from the teachers. Whether they would be giving NOC on this basis?

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if all these Colleges, which wish to start course/s, are to be allowed, since there are conditions of appointment of 15 or more teachers, they could not save anything. Even the big management are saying that they would pay only Rs.21,600/-. Therefore, it must be checked that if they pay full salaries to the teachers, only then they should offer the course; otherwise, not.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua remarked even though everything, including the proposal, is before them, still they have allowed them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a big wrong is being committed.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that it should be taken to the same Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what would the Committee do?

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that if his friends agree, a fine of Rs.1 lac should be imposed on such Colleges because it has come through the Vice Chancellor or the six worthy members of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested that the list of those six members should be given to them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the fine of Rs.1 lac is too less.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is if they have to send a message that it should not be done, then the fine has to be greater than Rs.1 lac.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua informed that other Universities do something else. In fact, they take back the fee of the students for the entire one year.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that it is new course (4-Year B.A.B.Ed.). Otherwise, in their system no College would be there and they would not be seen to be participating in the new course.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired would the Inspection Committee, which are supposed to go, ensure that the regulations are followed in letter and spirit.

It was said, "Yes, as per the regulations of NCTE and UGC".

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that a note should be given that if full salary is not given to the teachers, the course would not be allowed to be offered next year. The Government proposal of 1925, which they have adopted, due to that all the Colleges are paying only Rs.21,600/- to the teachers. All the Colleges, which are proposed to start B.A.B.Ed., they are determined to give only Rs.21,600/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that because of the financial constraints they are unable to pay to the existing staff, but are starting new courses and later on say that they should take a practical view.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if they took the stand, all would pay.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him give a practical solution. The 7th Pay Commission is due on 1st of January 2016 and whatever would be the basic of 7th Pay Commission, that has to be paid by all the Colleges. Either they should pay current full pay or the basic of the 7th Pay Commission.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that in addition to the fine of Rs.2 lac, it should also be seen if these Colleges are paying full salaries to the teachers in the already existing Colleges/course, only then they should be allowed. He suggested that a two members Committee should be sent to verify this.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that whenever a College seeks extension of affiliation for a new Course, it knew whether it is financial viable for it or not. The Colleges seek courses after making all the calculations, and if they are taking the course, they must pay full salaries to the teachers. Their job is to ensure that the Colleges must pay full salaries to the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is if DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh is taking this course, is it proposing to give Rs.21,600/- only to the teachers appointed for this course or it is paying Rs.21,600/- to all the teachers, who have been appointed earlier. If they are paying full salaries to all the teachers, then they should not be permitted to pay half salary to the newly appointed

teachers. Since DAV is a strong institution, they could bear the loss for some time.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that some persons having guts should be made members of the Inspection Committee, who could say that at least this must be done; otherwise, affiliation/extension of affiliation would not be recommended.

The Vice Chancellor said that B.A.B.Ed. is a new course, whosoever would not give full salary to the teachers, let that institution not start the course.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Inspection Committees which are supposed to visit the Colleges, must do this.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that for a College (SDP College) in a city like Ludhiana, he has gone as a member of the Selection Committee and found that only three candidates applied for the post and none was eligible. They should themselves see how they would comply. He does not know in which papers they give the advertisement and no one apply or the reputation of the College might be so bad.

The Vice Chancellor said that whichever College is paying full salary, it/they should not be allowed to pay half or less salary.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that at least new course should not be given till the College concerned pays full salary to the existing teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that in any case, they have to give full salary after the implementation of the 7th Pay Commission, that is why, they should start paying full salary now because they are already in the domain and period of 7th Pay Commission.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that up to 2015 Gurusar Sadhar was also paying full salary to the teachers. When in the year 2016 they allowed them, despite writing letters, they did not reply and were able to pass one year. Now, all the teachers are being paid Rs.21,600/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not permissible, especially for a new course. He added that because they are not permitting DAV, they are not permitted others as well.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua again said that the managements which are already running Arts Colleges and are not paying full salaries to the teachers, they should not be allowed to start this new venture/course.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, after this decision, the Inspection Committees have to go to all the Colleges, and if during the inspection they find that neither they are paying full salary to the existing staff nor they intend to pay to the newly recruited staff, do not recommend extension of affiliation.

The Vice Chancellor said that at least for this course (B.A.B.Ed. course), full salary is must; otherwise, do not start it.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that though the Vice Chancellor is getting irritated, because he does not know as to what is the

position of the teachers. While deliberating for 10 minutes, he (Vice Chancellor) feels as if it is a big problem, but the person who face every month, his problem is much larger than him (Vice Chancellor). They are talking to him peacefully.

The Vice Chancellor said that what is he suggesting.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it does not matter if the Vice Chancellor again allows as he has done on the request of six Syndics.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is just mixing and digressing the issue.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he (Vice Chancellor) is saying whatever they are already doing, let them do.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not said that whatever they are doing, they should allow them to do so. It is his (Dua) interpretation only. What did he say, he request Shri Dua to repeat.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he has said that which are already running Art Colleges, and in the same campus, they after representation of their teachers as also the inputs that they have kept the ATMs of their teachers with them and also taking back salary from them. Even if they knew it, they are allowing them on the pretext that when they would do this next time, they would see them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not said this.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua asked then why they are giving them.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they want to close all the Colleges of Punjab, please go ahead and pass the resolution and he is okay with it. He is just presiding over this meeting. They all know how many Colleges in Punjab are sick. The number of sick Colleges is 80% to 90%. Do they recommend closing down of 80% to 90% of the Colleges?

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that from where this data have come.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dua) himself is saying.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that no College is sick.

The Vice Chancellor said that sick in the sense that they are not pay full salaries to the teachers.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, in fact, the teachers are sick. There is no problem in the balance sheets of the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should get the balance sheets of all the Colleges. He has given the freedom to do whatever they want.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that to start with while going for this course, if the Inspection Committees feel those who are already not paying full salaries and do not intend to pay, do not recommend affiliation/extension of affiliation to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the Inspection Committees feel those who are already not paying full salaries and do not intend to pay, do not recommend. Where he is coming in the way?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that but the Inspection Committees have to function honestly and made recommendation/s honestly.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that instructions to the Inspection Committees in this regard should be issued by the Dean, College Development Council.

The Vice Chancellor said that they made a beginning. This is a new course and let this new course be not started, if they could not pay full salaries.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that a directive should be given by the Dean, College Development Council, to the Inspection Committees that this is the decision of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are forcing them to start this course. If they have to start this course, they should do this consciously and recruit teachers of quality, and if they employ teachers of quality, they have to pay full salary. This course is supposed to be a successful course, and successful course in the sense that it should generate teachers, shortage of which is there in India. That is why, this course has been suggested. This course is a future nursery for training teachers. Let it be given good teachers, and good teachers would come only if they are paid properly.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) A fine of Rs.2 lac be imposed on the Colleges, which have to submitted their application for affiliation/extension of affiliation beyond the stipulated date;
- (2) to start with while going to the Colleges for this course, if the Inspection Committees feel those who are already not paying full salaries and do not intend to pay, do not recommend affiliation/extension of affiliation to them; and
- (3) instructions be given by the Dean, College Development Council, to the Inspection Committee.

Letter of Under Secretary, UGC, New Delhi regarding reservation of not less than 3% to disabled persons

91. Considered letter dated 02.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXXVI**) of the Under Secretary, UGC, New Delhi, pursuant to letter dated 04.12.2015 (**Appendix-LXXVI**) of Deputy Chief Commissioner, Court of Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities, Department of Empowerment of Persons with this Disabilities, New Delhi, regarding

reservation not less than three per cent (3%) seats to the persons with disability (PWD) for admission in higher educational courses such as M.Phil. and Ph.D. as per Section 39 of PWD Act, 1995. Information contained in Office Note (**Appendix-LXXVI**) was also taken into consideration.

After some discussion it was –

RESOLVED: That letter dated 02.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXXVI**) of the Under Secretary, UGC, New Delhi, pursuant to letter dated 04.12.2015 (**Appendix-LXXVI**) of Deputy Chief Commissioner, Court of Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities, Department of Empowerment of Persons with this Disabilities, New Delhi, regarding reservation not less than three per cent (3%) seats to the persons with disability (PWD) for admission in higher educational courses such as M.Phil. and Ph.D. as per Section 39 of PWD Act, 1995, be adopted.

The Vice Chancellor said that now, they would go back to Item 41 on the agenda.

Proposal of the Director, Physical Education & Sports with regard to election of Executive Committee of PUSC

41. Considered proposal dated 29.3.2016 (**Appendix-LXXVII**) of the Director, Physical Education & Sports with regard to election of Executive Committee of Panjab University Sports Committee for the session 2016-17.

NOTE: The Dean University Instruction has observed that:

“The constitution of PUSC, clearly mentions that no two lecturers from same College can be member of the PUSC and same is the case of members of Executive Committee (Page 26 of PU Calendar, Volume III). Though the election procedure for ten men and ten women Lecturers does not specifically mention this condition; however, election being by “single transferable vote” (i.e. indicating preferences) this aspect is taken care of, as the first Lecturer from a given College to be declared elected renders other from the same College as “out of election process” and their votes then are transferred to other running candidates (same as Senate election). So, there is no anomaly as such. However, if the number of candidate is less than 20 and includes multiple candidates from the same College, there can be problem. The same seems to be the case here, also the opposite genders of President and Senior Vice-President is also a rule; however, the general body has unanimously approved these elections. As the rules are framed by the Syndicate, the Syndicate may, as a

special case for this year 2016, approve this constitution of Executive Council. However, if Syndicate does not approve, then re-election has to take place, strictly as per rules. Even the forming of PUSC has to be done again (in parts) to comply with the rule of “not more than one from same College”.

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that Professor Naval Kishore was also present there. First of all, the note, which has come from the Director Sports, it contains no name and only a complaint has been made on phone. Somebody has talked on phone and the matter has been placed before the Syndicate. Though they have raised two points, but actually three points were raised there. The Principals of the all the Colleges as well as teachers of physical education were present there at the time of election. One is elected as President, and as per Calendar President is to be elected from the entire University, but for the last about 20 to 25 years, they have made four zones, i.e., Chandigarh, Hoshiarpur, Ludhiana and one zone of Muktsar, Ferozepur and Moga, which is not a part of the Calendar. The President is elected from these zones, rotation-wise. Secondly, 10 Lecturers each of Physical Education, i.e., 10 men and 10 women, filed nominations and the rule is that not more than one from a single College is allowed. But there instead of 10, only nine nominations were received. Meaning thereby, that the number of teachers were less. Therefore, the House unanimously decided that all these nine should be accepted. He added that every year such things happen. Third was the election of Senior Vice-President. Out of these four zones, from one zone President is elected, from one Senior Vice-President and there are 12 Principals, i.e., six men and six women. And out of the other two zones, four each are to be elected – one from the zone from where President has been elected; from the zone from where Senior Vice-President one from that zone. That means, 2+2+4+4 total 12 is elected. What happened is. This year was the turn of Ludhiana District, their President was elected. There were three ladies in the Chandigarh zone. Principal B.C. Josan came and suggested that they should elect one more women and they should give one of their seats to them, which they readily accepted. There was no female from Hoshiarpur, and they elected two male persons from there. So far as Senior Vice-President is concerned, if the President is male, the Senior Vice-President is female and *vice versa*. Since Chandigarh did not opt and there were only male members, the other zones decided to elect male member as Senior Vice-President. All this has been approved by the General House. The complaint to the Director Sports has been made on phone, but when the General House has approved it without any objection, there is no question of entertaining the complaint.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Principal Sangha has told that 10 male and 10 female members have to be elected. At the same time, rule is there that there could not be two persons from a single College. Suppose two persons (one male and one female) apply from a College, since there is independent voting, who would be eliminated. As such, the rule is very strange that there could not be two from a College. They could say that there could only be one male and one female from a College. As such, this rule needs to be amended to the effect that there cannot be more than one male and one female from a single College. Since the rule is framed by the Syndicate, they should

amend the said rule. Secondly, Principal Sangha has rightly said that it is not there, but the rule is that the Senior Vice-President should be female. It would not be good if they now change it, but in the next meeting, a new proposal be taken that one more should be made for this year, as a special case. If they ask the Syndicate, they could do this.

Principal S.S. Sangha said, "Okay", they have to make amendment in the Calendar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that would be only for this year, but for this amendment in the Calendar has to be made.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired why it is the exclusive domain of Principals and teachers of Physical Education. Why the people or Fellows who have good record in sports, could not be made a part of this Committee?

Principal S.S. Sangha said that in the Senate also they had done that if 1-2 members of the Syndicate is included, there would be not harm.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there are certain teachers and Fellows, who are former players and members of professional bodies at the State/National level, why could they not contribute to this.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it was accepted in the Senate meeting that Shri Raghbir Dyal would be made a member of the Panjab University Sports Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has been approved, but when it would go to them, his name would be included. He added that this year Shri Raghbir Dyal should be made Senior Vice-President of PUSC and it should be recommended that next year a lady should be made Senior Vice-President of PUSC.

Principal S.S. Sangha clarified that from a Zone from where the Senior Vice-President is elected, from there only one member is to be elected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for this year they should appoint a lady as Senior Vice-President, as a special case, but from a next year the amended rule would be implemented. When Principal S.S. Sangha enquired whether there would be two Senior Vice-Presidents this year, he said that what is the harm.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that all these development have taken place after the meeting of the General Body. Had a lady wished to become a Senior Vice-President at the time of the meeting of the General Body, she would have been definitely elected.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since it is a decision of the General Body, it should be kept as it is.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the decision of the General Body should not be altered.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it should be kept as it is. Secondly, it should be conveyed that the Syndicate is considering an

item which is based on telephonic call of an anonymous person as the name of the person, who has made the call, has not been mentioned, and on what date the call was made, what is the *locus standi* of the caller and what is the grudge of the caller, nothing has been mentioned. Simply a call came, the item has been placed on the agenda of the Syndicate. The Syndicate is the rule making body and in view of what has been explained by Principal S.S. Sangha, everything was done unanimously. He thinks the good message would be that let the Syndicate regularize this because Syndicate could not regularize something which is not within anybody's power, and not within the provision of the Act, the Syndicate probably should not do this. Therefore, they should not appoint somebody as Senior Vice-President on the basis of a call made on the telephone.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are not doing this. He is just saying that if in the next meeting a lady should be asked whether she becomes Senior Vice-President of PUSC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could be done.

RESOLVED: That the decision of the General Body with regard to election of Executive Committee of PUSC, be not altered.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That steps be taken to amend Rule 1.(i) at page 24 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

At this stage, the members started general discussion.

1. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the schools affiliated to CBSE the number of students in 10+2 (Commerce Stream) increased, they distributed the sections and introduced the subject of Entrepreneurship. As per the University guidelines weightage of 4% marks is given to the students who studied Economics or Commerce at 10+2 level. The weightage to the students for PSEB is 16% and for CBSE it is 12%. The students who are coming after studying the subject of Entrepreneurship, they are not being given the weightage of 4%. After consulting Dean, College Development Council, it should be ensured that whichever subjects it is clubbed, weightage should be given. Meaning thereby, if one has studied Economics he/she should be given the weightage of Economics and if Entrepreneurship, then weightage of Entrepreneurship should be given because the difference of 4% marks is too much and affect the merit of the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Entrepreneurship is, in fact, the latest addition in Commerce, but it was not taught at +2 level earlier. So what he has said that Entrepreneurship should be included in that list to be given weightage at the time admission to B.Com. subject to maximum of 16%. If need be, the Dean, Faculty of Business Management & Commerce should be taken into confidence.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it should be done after taking into confidence the Dean, Faculty of Business Management & Commerce.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Entrepreneurship is the latest subject, which has been introduced.

The Vice Chancellor asked Dean, College Development Council to take care of this.

2. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as admissions to B.Com. is Centralized in Chandigarh, earlier, the admissions to B.Com. in the Colleges situated in Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana Colleges was also Centralized. Though the admissions in Chandigarh are continued to be made through Centralized, in Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana the practice of centralized admission has been discontinued despite there being more students in Ludhiana. If there are 16 Colleges, a student has to purchase 16 prospectuses for applying, and the cost of each prospectus is not less than Rs.500/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that now it is too late.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that till now, they have not done anything. They have not yet even appointed the Coordinator.

The Vice Chancellor said that since Madam has refused, he has requested Professor Sanjay Kaushik to continue to act as Coordinator.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier they were making centralized admissions to B.Com. course in Ludhiana Colleges also.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the students have to purchase 16 prospectuses for getting admission to B.Com. course in Ludhiana. He does not know as to why the centralized admissions to B.Com. in Ludhiana were discontinued.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Syndicate had decided to discontinue with the process of centralized admission in Ludhiana.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired then why they are continuing with the centralized admission to B.Com. Course in Chandigarh.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said the number of students for B.Com in Chandigarh is less than Ludhiana, even then the Centralized admission to B.Com. is continuing in Chandigarh, but not in Ludhiana.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, earlier, it had come to the Syndicate and, since somebody has objection that there should not be centralized admissions to B.Com. in Ludhiana, the Syndicate decided to discontinue with the centralized admissions in Ludhiana. If the Chandigarh people also do not want, here also the centralized admissions should be discontinued.

The Vice Chancellor said the centralized admission to B.Com. in Chandigarh also could be discontinued.

To this, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are saying that in Ludhiana also, there should be centralized admissions to B.Com., but some members are suggesting discontinuation of centralized admissions in Chandigarh also.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that several times, the interviews or personal appearance of the students' clashes, due to which the students faced a lot of problems.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that moreover the students have to bear the extra cost of prospectuses.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if the reference has been given to last year, then let him remind that it was very hotly debated last year (in the year 2015) and finally it was resolved that no centralized admissions to B.Com. in Ludhiana, and simultaneously it was also resolved that in every College of Ludhiana, there would be an Observer to be appointed by the University to supervise the admissions so that no meritorious student is denied admission. Let the University tell, whether a single Observer was sent there. He is saying what is the harm in making the centralized admissions?

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not against it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no decision should be taken on the spot.

The Vice Chancellor said that a meeting of all the Principals should be convened to take the decision. Otherwise, two members of the Syndicate should go to Ludhiana and convene the meeting of all the Principals at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, take a decision and come back.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, in fact, instead of going to Ludhiana, it needed to be seen whether there is a need for centralized admission in Ludhiana or not. Why the people get the centralized admissions discontinued is because books for admissions to B.Com. course has already started. A sum of Rs.10,000/- is being taken for reserving the seat.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Dua) should go there and check it. There are only two ways.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua intervened to say where is need to check when he already belonged to Ludhiana.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether the Observer should be sent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Observers were never sent.

The Vice Chancellor said that two of them should go and convene a meeting of the Principals at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, take some decision and come back.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the help of Commerce Section should be sought to making centralized admissions in Ludhiana.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should go and do it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it would take a lot of time, but the admissions are going to start soon. When something was said by Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that nobody would agree.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that then as said by Shri Ashok Goyal, Observers should go.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they even did not provide them (University) the list of applicants. They do not display the list of applicants on the notice board.

The Vice Chancellor enquired whether Commerce is a subject in the Government College, Ludhiana.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Yes".

The Vice Chancellor said that the Government College, Ludhiana is not selling the B.Com. seats.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No".

The Vice Chancellor said that they should go and convene a meeting and he is okay with it (centralized admissions), but they have to find a Coordinator. They should go and find out a Coordinator. If they do it without adequate preparation, then also there would be problem. While trying to solve the problem, they could not create more problems. So few of them should go there and hold a meeting of the Principals at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, take some decision and come back.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in fact, there was no problem of centralized admissions to B.Com. to the people of Ludhiana. They were doing centralized admissions and it was in 2013 when Aurobindo College was also included in the centralized admissions to B.Com. course, to which they said no on the plea that they are out of the urban agglomeration of Ludhiana. So they could not be considered for centralized admissions. But probably they put them in the centralized admissions and they approached the Court. Thereafter, the other Colleges said that if they (Aurobindo College) do not accept, why should they accept? For one College, they have to completely disband the centralized admissions system, which was running successfully. In Chandigarh also it was running successfully, but there was a lot of pressure to discontinue it. They discontinued with the centralized admission and for several years in remained discontinued. And due to which reason, it was earlier started, with the same reason, it was again started here as there was no other solution. Therefore, whosoever is the Vice Chancellor receives a lot of complaints from the local people that though there are so many vacant

seats, the College/s concerned are not giving the same. To that the Vice Chancellor says that he is not the one who has to make the admissions, and finally he suggests that admission should be made centralized. Several complaints the Vice Chancellor received from the Ludhiana also.

The Vice Chancellor said that, earlier, they did not have full time Director, but now they have a full time Director at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana. Go there, convene a meeting and arrive at a consensus in which the Society has a confidence. They are the only persons who could do it. They have also the logistics, they should go and do it. He added that if one College, namely Aurobindo College, remains outside the Centralized admissions as the Court has given it the relief, let it remain outside.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in Centralized admissions, less complaints are received and fairness is more.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that besides this, the quality of admissions improves a lot through Centralized admissions.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if Aurobindo College is to remain outside the centralized admissions, then there is no problem in the centralized admissions.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is if they want to do it, they have to be practical. If they include Aurobindo College in the centralized admissions, it would again get relief from the Court.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired that whether Aurobindo College falls within the limit of Municipal Corporation, Ludhiana. If no, since they are not doing the entire District Ludhiana but only Ludhiana City, let it remain outside the centralized admissions.

The Vice Chancellor said that anyhow, if they want to re-introduce the system of centralized admissions, first they should do it for Ludhiana City. Get along Professor Mukesh Arora, who is one of the local Senators. When Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier centralized admissions were done by Professor Karamjeet Singh, the Vice Chancellor said that he is okay with it if Professor Karamjeet Singh or Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, who has also got done centralized admissions at onetime.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the Committee comprising Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Professor Mukesh Arora, be constituted to hold the meeting at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana. If need be, help of Professor Sanjay Kaushik and Director, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, be also taken. The Committee should examine the whole issue at the earliest and make recommendations quickly as they are left with a very short time.

When the meeting resumed on 29th May 2016 at 10.30 a.m., the Vice Chancellor said that they have finished with Part-C and Part-B (**Appendix**) and would now take up Ratification and Information Items, and thereafter Part-A and other items.

Routine and formal matters

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

(i) To ratify that Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, be treated as on duty w.e.f. 15.01.2014 as he has been performing all the duties of Assistant Professor while retaining the Ramalingaswami Fellowship as well.

NOTE: 1. The Vice Chancellor has observed that these are new developments in the Indian University System. They need to be welcomed and ratified.

2. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 12.07.2014 (Para 10) (**Appendix-LXXVIII**) has resolved that Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be allowed to continue with 'Ramalingaswami Fellowship' and retain the fellowship amount as per norms of DBT. As far as other benefits, including contribution towards the Provident Fund and other consequential benefits, are concerned, all the benefits be granted to him on his notional salary fixed as Assistant Professor in the University as per rules, for which he is entitled in accordance with the service conditions of Panjab University.

3. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 20.09.2015(Para 29) has resolved that the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, as Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, be approved w.e.f. 29.06.2010 (i.e. retrospectively) on notional basis up to 14.01.2014 without monetary benefits on the directions of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and financial benefit, be given from actual date of joining i.e. 15.01.2014.

4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-LXXVIII**).

(ii) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Naresh Kumar, Assistant Professor in Punjabi (temporary), Baba Balraj P.U.

Constituent College, Balachaur, Distt. Nawanshehar, w.e.f. 29.10.2015 (A.N.) and his salary for the month of October, 2015 i.e. upto 29.10.2015 will be adjusted & he will deposit two days salary in lieu of not giving one month notice under Rule 16.2 given at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 as he has been paid salary upto September, 2015.

NOTE: Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar Volume III, 2009 is reproduced below:

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

(iii). The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Shri Manu Bansal, Assistant Professor (temporary), University Institute of Engineering & Technology (U.I.E.T.), P.U., w.e.f. 18.02.2016 (A.N.) and he will deposit one month salary in lieu of falling short of one month notice period w.e.f. 19.02.2016 to 03.03.2016, as he requested for resignation on 04.02.2016, under rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

NOTE: Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, reads as under:

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

(iv) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has re-fixed the pay of Dr. Vishwa Bandhu Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, at Rs.20610+6000 (GP) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000/- w.e.f. the date of his joining as Assistant Professor i.e. 19.03.2013 as proposed by the Accounts Branch.

NOTE: The Senate in its meeting held on 26.04.2015 (Para XXVIII (R-9)) (**Appendix-LXXIX**) had resolved that the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate,

has fixed the pay of Dr. Vishwa Bandhu Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, at Rs.22010/- + G.P. of Rs.6000/- in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + G.P. of Rs.6000/-, after adding one increment w.e.f. the date of his joining as Assistant Professor i.e. 19.03.2013 with next date of increment as usual.

- (v) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/ Senate, has extended the term of appointment of Professor Anil Monga, as Dean Alumni Relations for another year w.e.f. 01.03.2016, on the same term and conditions.

NOTE: 1 Regulation 1, page 109 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007 which reads as under:

“The Senate on the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate may appoint a Dean of Alumni Relations, such appointment may be made for a year to year but the maximum period for which a person may hold this office shall not exceed five (consecutive) years”.

2. Professor Anil Monga, Centre for Police Administration was appointed as Dean Alumni Relations for one year w.e.f. 01.03.2014 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.03.2014 vide Para 9 and Senate in its meeting dated 28.09.2014 vide Para IX under above quoted regulation.

Further, he was given extension for one year w.e.f. 01.03.2015 by Syndicate in its meeting dated 8.03.2015 vide Para 48-I(ix) and Senate in its meeting dated 27.09.2015 vide Para LXII (I-30), thus his present term has been expired on 29.2.2016.

- (vi) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has included the names of the following Advocates in the existing panel of Legal Retainers/Advocates (**Appendix-LXXX**) of Panjab University.

FOR LEGAL RETAINER

@ (RS. 11,000/- PER MONTH)

SR. NO.	ADVOCATE NAME	ADDRESS	CONTACT NO
1.	GIRISH AGNIHOTRI, (SR. ADVOCATE) (Z-20)	# 215, SECTOR-9/C, CHD	9357660001 (O) 2741640

FOR HIGH COURT PANEL @ (RS. 12,500/- + CLERKAGE @ 10% & MISC. CHARGES

SR. NO.	ADVOCATE NAME	ADDRESS	CONTACT NO
1	CHARANPREET SINGH, (X)	#291-C, SECTOR-51-A, CHD	9988911507, 0172-2646823
2	GAUTAM BHARDWAJ, (L-8)	#1552, SECTOR-7C, CHD	9872971552
3	KANICA SACHDEVA, (Z-5)	#29,SECTOR-7/A, CHD	7589212222, 9888138921
4	HITESH KAPLISH, (Z)	#266, ADVOCATE SOCIETY, SECTOR-49/A, CHD, PIN CODE-160047	
5	GURDEEPINDER SINGH DHILLON (Z-11)	# 1, MAIN ROAD, NAWA GAON, CHD	9814002884, 9814143951
6	SURAJPREET SINGH KAANG,(Z-16)	F-34, SECTOR-14, PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHD	0172 25f385, 9855493346
7	DIVYASTUTI PARSOON (Z-19)	# 3401,SECTOR-24, CHD	8558803118
8	DEEPAK AGNIHOTRI (ADVOCATE) (Z-21)	# 215, SECTOR-9, CHANDIGARH	
9	VIJAY PAL (ADVOCATE) (Z-22)	FLAT NO. 102, GH-31, MDC, MANSA DEVI COMPLEX, SECTOR-5, PKL	9915566888
10	KSHITIJ SHARMA ADVOCATE (Z-23)	# 291, SECTOR-21 A, CHANDGARH	9646610940
11	MANISH CHOUDHARY ADVOCATE (Z-24)	# 503, JUNCTION-9, \ LANE N-1 THE I.A.S/P.C.S. COLONY VILLAGE MULLAN PUR GARIB DASS, DISTRICT S.A.S. NAGAR	7837700775
12.	SHRI SHIV CHARAN BHOLA (P-1324-2015)	# Kothi No.2218, Sector 15-C, Chandigarh	76960-1876 98141-99441
13.	Shri Amrit Grewal (P-2208-2013)	# 602, Hollywood Height-II VIP Road, Zirakpur Pb.	98888-80301

FOR DISTRICT COURT PANEL @ (RS. 10,000/- + CLERKAGE @ 10% & MISC. CHARGES

SR. NO.	ADVOCATE NAME	ADDRESS	CONTACT NO.
1.	MRS. ANITA AHUJA, (Z-4)	72, SECTOR-16/A, CHD	9888279278

(vii) The Vice Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, has ordered that Dr. Rakesh Khullar, Medical Officer (on contract), BGJ Institute of Health, P.U. be retained for further period of three years w.e.f. 02.04.2016 (as his previous contractual term is up to 01.04.2016) or till he attains the age of 65 years (i.e. up to 16.09.2018), whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions.

(viii) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of contractual appointment of Shri Rishi Kaushal (A.R.) (Retd. on 31.01.2012), for another six months i.e. from 05.03.2016 (with one day break on 04.03.2016) as O.S.D. (Exam.) @ half of the

salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100, out of the Budget Head "General Administration- Sub Head-Hiring Services/Outsourcing Contractual/Casual or Seasonal Worker".

(ix) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Shri Pritam Chand, Technical Officer (G-I) (Retd.), Department of Physics, on contract basis for six months or till post is filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on fixed emoluments i.e. half of the salary last drawn (excluding HRA, CCA & Other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100 irrespective of the fact whether he has opted for pension or not, w.e.f. 04.04.2016 or the date he reports for duty after 04.04.2016, whichever is later. His salary be charged/paid against the post of Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), Department of Physics vacated by him.

(x) The Vice Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/ Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Charan Singh, Sr. Technician (G-II), Department of Bio-Physics as Senior Scientific Assistant/ Scientific Officer (G-I), in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+GP 5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Department of Bio-Physics. His pay be fixed as per University Rules.

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

(xi) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has modified the clause 2 of the Syndicate decision dated 04.01.2014/ 06.01.2014 (Para 24) as under:

Existing decision of the Syndicate	Modified decision of the Syndicate
2. the case of the candidates, who do not fulfil the minimum requirement of 30% or 33% lectures (according to the criteria of each department), be not considered for condonation of shortage of lectures;	2. the case of the candidates, who do not fulfil the minimum requirement of 33% lectures (according to the criteria of each department), be not considered for condonation of shortage of lectures;

(xii) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Committee dated 19.02.2016 (**Appendix-LXXXII**) that the admission to LLM (One year) course in all the Regional Centres, UILS and Department of Laws of Panjab University, on the basis of minimum requirement of 55% marks for General Category and 50% marks for SC/ST Candidates would continue. This criteria shall also be applicable to the LLM (Two year) course of the Panjab University from the session 2016-17.

(xiii) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendations of the Faculty of Arts:

1. from the academic session 2016-17, Master of Library & Information Science (Two-Year Integrated Course) be converted into Bachelor of Library & Information Sciences (Semester System) and Master of Library & Information Sciences (Semester System) as two separate degrees of one year duration each.
2. the Regulations/Rules for Bachelor of Library & Information Sciences (one year duration) (Semester System) w.e.f. the academic session 2016-17, **as per Appendix-LXXXIII**, be approved. However, Regulation **9** relating to medium of instruction and examination be approved with the stipulation that the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor for the purpose finally recommend the approval of the same for further approval by the other/higher statutory Bodies.
3. the Regulations/Rules for Master of Library & Information Sciences (one year duration) (Semester System) w.e.f. the academic session 2017-18, **as per Appendix-LXXXIII**, be approved.
4. The number of seats for the said courses be approved as under:
 - (i) B.Lib.I.Sc.: 40 seats along with 5 additional seats for NRI along with other additional seats as decided by the University from time to time.
 - (ii) M.Lib.I.Sc.: 20 seats along with 5 additional seats for NRI along with other additional seats as decided by the University from time to time.

(xiv) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has allowed one eligible candidate (SC Category) to be called for interview, recommended by the Screening Committee for the post of Associate Professor-1 (Reserved for SC Category) in the Department of Geography advertised vide Advt. No. 4/2014.

- NOTE:**
1. The Vice Chancellor has observed that the validity of Advt. 04/2014 was up to 30th April, 2016 and let the interview proceed before the end of the validity.
 2. The Senate at its meeting held on 12.10.2003 (Para XV) **(Appendix-LXXXIV)** has approved

the following recommendations of the Syndicate contained in item No. 24 in its meeting dated 23.05.2003 (Para 8) with the proviso that in such subjects where it was difficult to find candidates with the requisite qualifications the minimum number of eligible candidates for General category for holding interview be one after advertising the post twice:

“That for holding the interview, the minimum number of eligible candidate/s for the posts of Professor/Reader/Lecturer in the University Teaching Departments be as under:

- (i) General Category For posts of Professor/Reader/Lecturer: Two Candidates
- (ii) Reserved Category (SC/ST) For posts of Lecturer only: One Candidate

- (xv) Already ratified in Syndicate meeting dated 1.05.2016.
- (xvi) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the revision of rates/remunerations (**Appendix-LXXXV**) of Flying Squad Officers/Inspectors, Zonal In-charge, Chief Coordinator/Superintendents and Supervisory Staff (Annual/Semester Exams)-2016 onwards.
- (xvii) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following MoUs (**Appendix-LXXXVI**) between:
 - (i) Panjab University, Chandigarh (India) and The Foundation Le Corbusier, Paris, France.
 - (ii) Terminal Ballistics Research Laboratory Sector 30, Chandigarh and Panjab University, Chandigarh.
 - (iii) Panjab University and Valaya Alongkorn Rajabhat University Under The Royal Patrong, Thailand.
 - (iv) Antioch University, Seattle, U.S.A. and Panjab University, Chandigarh.
 - (v) Panjab University, Chandigarh and National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (NIPER), SAS Nagar, Mohali.

(xviii) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to:

- (i) transfer bank balance of Rs.29,49,205.26 from the Depreciation Fund Account No. 10444978037 to the Development Fund Account No. 10444979664.
- (ii) transfer the total STDR's of Rs.2,48,00,000/- in hand from the Depreciation Fund Account No. 10444978037 to Development Fund Account No. 10444979664.
- (iii) close the Account No. 10444978037 and Cash-book of the Depreciation Fund.

(xix) The Vice Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following proposed amendment in Rule 4.1 (b)(i) at page 27 of Panjab University Accounts Manual with regard to receipt of cash at SBI P.U. Fee counter/University counter:

Existing Rule	Proposed Rule
4.1(b)(i) When money is paid in cash at SBI P.U. Fee Counter/ University Counter it shall be accepted by the Bank/ University Cashier and a receipt shall be issued by the Bank/University Cashier to the depositor. The bank shall prepare receipt in triplicate. The original copy of the receipt shall be given to the payer, while second copy to the Accounts Branch (Income Section) and the third copy shall be retained by the bank itself. The SBI P.U. Fee counter shall not issue an any duplicate copy of the receipt to the depositor.	4.1(b)(i) All money is paid in cash at SBI P.U. Fee Counter/ University Counter it shall be accepted by the Bank and a receipt shall be issued by the bank to the depositor. The Bank shall also supply a consolidated statement of each amount deposited by the candidate containing all particulars of the students as per the details on the fee slip being issued to the students duly stamped and signed on each page of transaction to the Accounts Branch (Income Section). The statement supplied by the bank shall be considered as authentic document for all purposes. The SBI Bank to retain a copy of the Statement supplied to Accounts Branch at their end. The SBI P.U. Fee counter shall not issue any duplicate copy of the receipt to the depositor.

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

(xx) To ratify the decision of the Vice Chancellor that the full rent (100%) from the shops at Student Centre/Hostels and Departmental Canteens be deposited in the Centrally Operated Estate Fund Account from 2015-16 onwards. The maintenance expenditure of these shops/areas would be met out of the income of Estate Fund.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.2.2002 vide Para 14 decided as under:

- (i) The rent of respective shops operating in the Students Centre shall be paid to the D.S.W. who in term shall deposit 75 percent of the rent in the University Estate Fund.
- (ii) For commercial shops operating in the Hostels, rent shall be collected by the Warden concerned 75 percent of the rent shall be deposited in the University Estate Fund; and
- (iii) The Chairperson of the concerned Departments where Departmental canteens exists shall collect the rent of the canteen and deposit 50 percent of the rent in the University Estate Fund.
- (iv) That 75 percent of the rent of S.T.D. booths and Photostat Machines installed in the Departments by private parties shall be deposited in the University Estate Fund.

It was noted that the remaining rent would be retained by the D.S.W./ Warden/Chairpersons of the concerned Departments for maintenance of the shops and related infrastructure.

- 2. In terms of the discussion held during meetings of Fact Finding Committee at UGC, it was desired that full rent be deposited in the Centrally Operated Estate Fund.

(xxi) The Vice Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to refund the affiliation fee of Rs.4,50,000/- to the President, Ghubaya Educational Society, Jalalabad, District Ferozepur, after deducting processing fee of Rs.25000/-, who had applied to the University for opening three new colleges along with fee of Rs.4,75,000/- and later on withdrew/back off to open them.

(xxii) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur, student of B.Ed.-1st Sem. (2 year course) (Roll No. 15057650) enlisted at Sr. No. 4 (**Appendix-LXXXVII**), Malwa Central College of Education for Women, Ludhiana, to appear in Theory paper: C-6 & 7 (xv): Teaching of Fine Arts (8250) of B.Ed.

Examination held in March 2016 as an exceptional case, due to clash of her two Exams (i) Pedagogy of Social Studies and (ii) Pedagogy of Fine Arts on 28.12.2015.

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of letter dated 07.12.2015 of Principal, Malwa Central College of Education for Women, Ludhiana enclosed **(Appendix-LXXXVII)**.
2. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-LXXXVII)**.

(xxiii) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32-B, Chandigarh, for the following courses along with No. of seats for the session 2017-18, subject to condition that the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the MCI before making admissions in the said courses/subjects:-

Sr. No.	Name of Course	No. of Seats
1.	MD (General Medicine)	09
2.	MD (General Surgery)	06
3.	MD (Paediatrics)	07
4.	MD (Anaesthesia)	12
5.	MD (Psychiatry)	04
6.	MS (ENT)	03
7.	MD (Dermatology)	03
8.	MS (Orthopaedics)	06

(xxiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of B.Sc. (HS) Chemistry & M.Sc. (HS) Chemistry for the session 2015-16:

Class	Name of the Students	Sr. No.
B.Sc. (HS) 1 st year 2 nd Semester May 2016 examination	Amanpreet Singh Mahmi Garima Garg Mohd. Hassan	2,5 & 9 (Annexure 'A')
B.Sc. (HS) 2 nd year 4 th semester May 2016 examination	Aman Kumar Harshit Sandhu Jyoti Jaswal Lovedeep Kumar Manpreet Kaur Rishab Dua Rubledeep Singh Shivani Sumit Nain	1,3 to 6, 8, 10, 12 & 13 (Annexure 'B')
B.Sc.(HS) 3 rd year 6 th Semester May 2016 examination	Harsimran Singh Jyoti Sharma Nitish Kumar Shamal Kishore Surbhi Bansal	7,9,13,18 & 19 (Annexure 'C')
M.Sc.(HS) 1 st year 2 nd Semester May 2016 examination	Kalyani Mer Rahul Vasudeva	2& 3 (Annexure 'D')
M.Sc.(HS) 2 nd year 4 th Semester	Oshin Sharma	1 (Annexure 'E')

May 2016 examination		
----------------------	--	--

(xxv) Since interim orders dated 11.02.2016, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh in CWP No. 11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs Panjab University and Another) and subsequent orders passed in CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. 7491 of 2016 (Dr. Raj Kumar Vs Panjab University and Others) have now been adjourned to 03.05.2016, the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has passed the following orders:

- (i) Dr. Raj Kumar, Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, PU be allowed to continue to work as such after 30.04.2016 (the date on which he completes the age of 60 years) till the stay orders granted by Hon'ble High Court remains in force in his case (CWP No. 7491 of 2016: (Dr. Raj Kumar Vs Panjab University and Others) in terms of the interim orders passed by the Court in CWP No. 11988 of 2014.
- (ii) The retirement benefits already sanctioned to Dr. Raj Kumar, Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, PU, which have been conveyed to all concerned vide No. 5623-28/Estt. Dated 21.04.2016, be treated as withdrawn till the stay orders remains in force in his case.

(xxvi) In partial modification to office orders No.6508-20/Estt.-I dated 02.08.2013 (**Appendix-LXXXVIII**), the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has promoted Dr. Monika Randhawa, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to (Stage-3) under CAS w.e.f. 04.04.2012 i.e. actual date of her eligibility instead of 21.12.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course on 20.12.2011.

NOTE: The Senate in its meeting dated 29.09.2013 (Para XIV) (**Appendix-LXXXVIII**) has resolved that Dr. Monika Randhawa be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfillment of U.G.C. conditions) with effect from her original date of eligibility instead of **21.12.2011 (i.e. one day after completion of Refresher course, i.e. 20.12.2011)**, in the pay-scale of ₹15600-39100 + AGP ₹ 8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

(xxvii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted voluntary retirement to Ms. Kiran Kashyap, Superintendent, USOL, from the University services, w.e.f. 30.06.2016 (A.N.) and has sanctioned the following retirement benefits:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

(xxviii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Ved Prakash Dindoriya, Assistant Professor, V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, w.e.f. 28.03.2014, under Regulation 6 at page 118-119 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, as he has been confirmed as Associate Professor at University of Delhi w.e.f. 28.03.2014.

NOTE: Regulation 6, page 118, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

(xxix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of M.A. 2nd and 4th Semester in Department of Sanskrit, for the session 2015-16:

Class	Name of the Students	Sr. No.	
M.A. 2 nd Semester	Vikas Sharma	9	} (Annexure ‘A’) (LXXXIX)
M.A. 4 th Semester	Phool Chand	3	
	Shiv Kumar	5	

(xxx) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures

(Annexure-A-XC) of Shri Mandeep Singh student of B.A. B.Ed. (Semester II), Institute of Educational Technology & Vocational Education, P.U., Chandigarh.

(xxxix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Future Hitech Batteries Ltd. SAS Nagar, Punjab **(Appendix-XCI)**.

(xxxixii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Julius Maxmilian University of Wurzburg, Germany along with Student Exchange Agreement **(Appendix-XCII)**.

(xxxixiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and The University of Hull, U.K. **(Appendix-XCIII)**.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(vi), Professor Navdeep Goyal said that certain more names are to be included in the panel of Legal Retainers/Advocates, for which the Vice Chancellor should be authorized.

The Vice Chancellor said that some of the members have to give him the name/s along with a small write-up of the person/s concerned, which he had taken from everyone to know about the strength of the person/s. Many of the persons might not be working independently, but might be assisting very Senior Advocate/s. He just wants that everyone, who makes an application, must give some justification via a short write up, so that there seems to be some threshold in merit and no discrimination.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he had also made a request in this regard, but perhaps the same has escaped the attention of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Ajay Ranga to send the request again along with a small write-up of the person/s concerned. If he has overlooked something, just sent him a reminder, he would check up whether the name of the person concerned is there, and if not, he would seek the CV again. In nutshell, he said that the member/s could send the CV of the person/s along with small write up, so that he could take appropriate decision and incorporate in the list and would send the list to them again before the minutes are written.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(ix), Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether the re-employment is given to non-teaching employees after the age of superannuation, i.e., 60 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is a very special category person/case, and they are re-employing him for a period of only six months. Though the person is attached to Cyclotron, he is like a Research Officer because he is making the specific kinds of instruments available to the researchers. However, if the exception is not to be made, it would be fine. He had just accepted the plea of the

Department of Physics coming on behalf of a very specialized person. The Department of Physics had written that Mr. Pritam Chand, Technical Officer, is the main person who is responsible for the maintenance and operation of the Machine. The Joint Administrative and Academic Committee (JACC) has recommended the extension of service of Mr. Pritam Chand for a period of six months or till the two posts – one post of Electrical/Electronic Engineer; and one post of Mechanical Engineer, are filled in. He added that though he had ordered advertisement of the post, but the same could not be filled in.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the post could not be filled in due to manpower audit being done by the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the manpower audit does not come in the way of filling up of this position as this position relates to running of a Machine.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have been told by the Establishment Branch that, if at all, this position is to be filled up, it would be filled up after the manpower auditing.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that that is what he had been saying that even the essential positions, including the teaching position, are not being filled up under the garb of manpower auditing.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not halt the Machine, unless they say that nothing is being done with this Machine. In fact, there has to be some exceptions on case to case basis. They should take up this matter with the Board of Finance and seek permission that under exception circumstances, the Vice Chancellor be empowered to take recommend to the Syndicate, which should take appropriate decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired is the manpower audit applicable only in the case of non-teaching staff.

The Vice Chancellor said that the manpower audit is applicable both in the case of teaching and non-teaching staff.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the manpower audit is applicable in both the cases, how they are going ahead with the appointment of teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that no new teaching positions are being advertised. When Shri Ashok Goyal said that why the teaching positions are not being advertised, the Vice Chancellor said that someone halted the process reasoning manpower audit.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is not doubting this person, but the argument, which has been given by the Department is just not sustainable, that since Mr. Pritam Chand is retiring, there no one to take care of the work handled by him. Whose fault is this?

The Vice Chancellor stated that the Department said that about two years back, the Department sent the request the fill up two posts – Mechanical Engineer and Electrical/Electronic Engineer and the qualifications of these posts had already been approved by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 26.04.2014 and the advertisement for these two positions is still awaiting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the concept of manpower audit is only recent. Why the post/s has/have not been advertised during the last two years, especially knowing fully well that the man is going to retire?

The Vice Chancellor said that this came to him only on 27.11.2015 requesting him to kindly give at least six months extension to Mr. Pritam Chand after his retirement. So it in that context that six months re-employment has been given to him.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if this person is given re-employment for six months, the other people might also seek re-employment.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are two ways for handling such things – one the way these things are handled in Government organization where the age of superannuation is also 60 years and they appoint the person as a Consultant for a fixed period at a fixed salary, but the fixed period is not generally extended, so that there is a continuous pressure on the system that it should become routine for such re-employments.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to bring to his kind notice that, maybe, it is not in his knowledge that there are certain people, who had got the capacity to go and act as the market agents, ensuring that they would get the same done. Persons like him, who feels that there is not such provision, how it is being said that it would be got done, and he is completely shocked that the same is also got done. Even where the Vice Chancellor said that it could not be done, people assure that they would get it done from the Syndicate or the Senate. He further said that there are so many people, whom the Department/s is/are not ready to relieve. Even the other day, the Registrar was saying that it is being said that the whole system would collapse if this person is allowed to go. When the retirement age is there, even the best of the people have to leave.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that he is of the view that one good man goes and another comes.

The Vice Chancellor said that today is 31st May, and let the post be advertised and the same could be filled up within a couple of months. Therefore, they would keep this person only for four months.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the exercise to fill up the post should be taken up and the post be filled up by 31st July 2016; and if there are more such cases, which are anticipated, those should also be considered because nobody is interested that the work of the University comes to a standstill.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would find out from the Establishment as to how many such requests of technical people or others are pending, which are of essential nature. Thereafter, he would form a Sub-Committee to review such cases, which are pending and are of extremely essential kind/nature where the research of the University or service of the University is likely to be affected.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xi), Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have brought down the minimum requirement of attendance of lectures to 33%, but their students, who participate sports/extra

curricular activities, faced problem as they are not given internal assessment on the basis of full attendance even though they are given the benefit of participating in sports/extra curricular activities. He added that 9 students out of 13 were from his departments, who participated in Balwant Gargi Play.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Committee had been constituted to consider this issue and date and time for the meeting was also taken, but the Committee could not meet due to some exigency. The meeting would be held shortly and the problem would be sorted out.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the teacher concerned should be asked to give benefit of such activities to the students for the internal assessment also.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they had a student, namely Mr. Vishavjeet, who got medal in Shooting at International level, but he was also not given the benefit while awarding marks for Internal Assessment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that rules for giving benefit for participating in sports/extra curricular activities for Internal Assessment also required to be framed; otherwise, the departments do not agree.

Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi said that in the Colleges, the Sports In-Charge keeps record of the sports/extra curricular activities of the students and informs the teachers about the same so that they could give benefit to the students.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that after a long discussion, they have decided to form a Committee. Whichever case comes, the same should be referred to the Committee for taking a decision.

Professor Shelley Walia said that could they not make a rule and leave it to the Department concerned to decide instead of getting it decided by the Syndicate. The Departments are very particular about taking the attendance, and then condone 10% or 15%. He, therefore, suggested that they should make the matter simple and let the Department take a decision and the Syndicate or anyone else do not interfere in it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the permission of the Department would be needed to go and participate in the University recommended activities.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the rule should be framed by the Syndicate instead of by the Department so that there is uniformity; otherwise, one Department might frame rule according to its condition/s and the same might not be adopted by other Department/s. Resultantly, there might not be uniformity. He added in a case, one teacher awarded 4 marks for internal assessment and another only 1½ marks, and the students approached the Court for justice. Therefore, they should have guidelines for giving benefit of sports/cultural activities to the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that meeting of the Committee should be convened to which the person/s from Professional Colleges, UIET, UILS, UBS, etc. should also be invited.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Central Idea should be that whatever rule they frame, the students should not be able to exploit.

The Vice Chancellor said that they also need to make a provision that the University participants, who bring credit by engaging in these activities, should be given the benefit.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that there are very few students, who got medal/s at the national and international level. If they make provision only for national and international medalists, the number would be drastically decreased.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that one of the students, Ms. Manpreet secured 90 marks out of 100 in the subject of Economics, but she was awarded only 5 marks as internal assessment out of 10 marks. Had she been given 8 marks, she would have topped?

Professor Shelley Walia stated that there are several teachers in the University, who do not take role call thinking that the condonation would be there. On the other hand, the students are complaining against him. There were certain students who had attended 90% or more lectures, but the teacher concerned awarded 5% marks to all students across the board. They say that they are the ones who attended the classes regularly and there are some who never attended the classes. Thus, it is very serious problem.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they have implemented the assessment of the teachers. But there is a practical problem that the internal assessment of the students, who regularly attend classes, are equal to those who do not attend the classes.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the rule should be framed in such a way that the students, who regularly attend classes, are not penalized.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that whatever rule they framed, ultimately, the same is to be implemented by the teachers, and what would the teacher do, who does not even bother to take role call. What could the Syndicate do?

Dr. Ajay Ranga remarked that the problem is that there is no proper implementation of the rule/s.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could attempt to have a proper implementation done. In the very first meeting of the Chairpersons in the next session, he would highlight this.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there are certain Departments where the attendance is taken in a register and the same is submitted in the Chairperson's Office. There are certain Departments which are already following the norms and it is office which has to assess and display the attendance on the notice board/s. If somebody does not take the role call, wherefrom the attendance record existed?

The Vice Chancellor stated that the Central IQAC should use the Departmental IQAC to enforce these things. So he would get a comprehensive note prepared, which would include whatever recommendations would from them and it would also that some responsibility is assigned to IQAC to solicit from the Departmental IQAC, and during the mid of the semester, all these things are reported back to all the Departments via displaying on the notice boards and also being uploaded on the IQAC Website. So let they try to attempt it. He would also put the minutes of this meeting of the Syndicate in the first meeting of the Chairpersons' for information. He would also have to address the Governing Body of the Academics at the commencement of the new session and there also, he would make reference of this issue. They could say that the Governing Body of the University has enjoined that the academic standards are maintained. After the first half is over, they could ask him and the entire information could be placed before the Syndicate in a given meeting as an information item.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Item 117-R-(i) to R-(xxxiii)** on the agenda, be ratified, with the modification that –

- (i) the members could send the names of Advocate/s along with their CVs and small write up for inclusion in the panel **(Sub-Item R-(vi))** to the Vice Chancellor, and the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision on those names, on behalf of the Syndicate;
- (ii) Shri Pritam Chand, Technical Officer (G-I) (Retd.), Department of Physics, **(Sub-Item R-(ix))** be re-employed on contract basis for four months or till post is filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on fixed emoluments i.e. half of the salary last drawn (excluding HRA, CCA & Other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100 irrespective of the fact whether he has opted for pension or not, w.e.f. 04.04.2016 or the date he reports for duty after 04.04.2016, whichever is later. His salary be charged/paid against the post of Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), Department of Physics vacated by him; and
- (iii) steps be initiated to fill up the post of Senior Technical Assistant/Technical Officer (G-I) in the Department of Physics, vacated by Shri Pritam Chand, within a period of two months.

Routine and formal matters

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

- (i)** To note the contents of letters/email received from the following with regard to accept of Chair Professorship:
- (i) letter dated 26.03.2016 received through Email dated 27.3.2016 **(Appendix-XCIV)** of Dr. Manmohan Singh, Former Prime Minister of India,
 - (ii) Email dated 16.03.2016 **(Appendix-XCIV)** of Professor Yoginder K. Alagh.
 - (iii) Email dated 25.03.2016 **(Appendix-XCIV)** of Ms. Ela Bhatt.
 - (iv) letter dated 23.03.2016 **(Appendix-XCIV)** of Shri Gulzar.
 - (v) Email dated 07.04.2016 **(Appendix-XCIV)** of Shri Kailash Satyarthi.
- (ii)** Since the interim orders dated 31.03.2016, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (5011 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Subodh Kumar Agrawal, Associate Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.
- (iii)** Since the interim orders dated 31.03.2016, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (5362 of 2016), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Parbhat Singh, Professor, V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.
- (iv)** Since the interim orders dated 11.02.2016, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (2775 of 2016) have now been adjourned to 14.03.2015. The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. (Mrs.) Neeta Sharma, Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, be allowed to

continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

- (v) Since the interim orders dated 11.02.2016, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (2775 of 2016) have now been adjourned to 14.03.2016. The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Indu Bhushan Prashar, Professor, Department of Botany, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

NOTE: The orders issued vide letter dated 15.02.2016 and 19.03.2016 with regard to re-employment and retiral benefits respectively in respect of Dr. Prashar have been withdrawn.

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor has kept pending the promotion of Shri D.C. Patial, Senior Assistant, General Branch, as Officiating Superintendent till such time his Annual Confidential Reports are received, under the Chapter VII, Delegation of Authority, Sr. No.15 appearing at pages 587-588 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 reads as under:

Subject	Authority under the Regulations	Delegated by Senate/ Syndicate to
15. Approve the panel of Clerks/Assistants drawn from time to time, in the order of seniority for making promotion as Assistants/ Superintendents, proposed to ignore anyone, the matter would be reported to the Syndicate	Syndicate	Vice-Chancellor

- NOTE:**
1. Last three ACRs are considered for promotion but in the case of Shri D.C. Patial his ACRs w.e.f. the year 2010-11 onward have not been received.
 2. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XCV**).

- (vii) Pursuant to report of the Committee (**Appendix-XCVI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to probe into the circumstances, the Vice-Chancellor has constituted the following Committee to propose guidelines for actions to be initiated by offices of DCDC, Estt. Section, DRG, D.R./A.R.

(R&S), Law Department and Registrar and Vice Chancellor's Office with regard to retirement of Fellows:

1. Professor A.K. Bhandari
2. Professor Naval Kishore
3. Professor B.S. Bhoop
4. Professor Navdeep Goyal
5. Professor Parminder Singh
6. Deputy Registrar (General) (Convener)

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor has desired that feedback be provided by May 15, 2016.

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor, has ratified the template **(Appendix-XCVII)** for the post of Principals in P.U. constituent Colleges.

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

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits in respect of Late Ms. Sarita Sharma, Senior Assistant, Women Hostel No. 6 (who expired on 30.10.2015, while in service) to Miss Ankita Sharma, Daughter, who is the nominee of the deceased employee:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of death) : Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 (while in service)
2. Ex-gratia grant : Rule 1.1 at page 136 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009
3. Earned Leave Grant : Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009

(x) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed that the:

- (i) Student Medical Fund Account No.10444978457, be merged to Non-Plan Budget, and the last available balance, be transferred to Non Plan Account.
- (ii) Expenditure for the payment of Medicines which is to be provided to the Health Centre for the students, be made from Non-Plan Budget by creating a budget for the same.
- (iii) Cash Book of the Student Medical Fund A/c No. 10444978457 be closed accordingly and in future the fee under this head be deposited in current account.

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

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

Roll No.	Name of the candidates	Father's Name	Faculty / Subject	Title
3270	Dipendrasinh Chandrasinh Jadeja	S/o Chandrasinh S. Jadeja	Science/ Biotechnology	EXPRESSION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF Rv2970c AND Rv1184c GENE PRODUCTS FROM <i>MYCOBACTERIUM TUBERCULOSIS</i> H37Rv
3271	Arbind Kumar	S/o Surj Kumar Tiwari	Science/ Biotechnology	CHARACTERIZATION OF A CELL WALL ANCHORED PUTATIVE ESTERASE, Rv 0774c AND ITS POSSIBLE ROLE IN THE INTRACELLULAR SURVIVAL OF <i>MYCOBACTERIUM SP.</i>
3272	Prerna Sharma	D/o O.P. Sharma	Science/ Env. Science	A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF GROUNDWATER QUALITY IN PARTS OF MUKTSAR AND FARIDKOT DISTRICTS OF SOUTHWEST PUNJAB, INDIA IN RELATION TO HUMAN HEALTH AND AGRICULTURE
3273	Shruti	D/o Raj Kumar	Science/ Biophysics	CHRONIC INFLAMMATION ASSOCIATED COLON CANCER AND ITS CHEMOPREVENTION BY CELECOXIB A COX-2 INHIBITOR
3274	Mandip Singh	S/o Baldev Singh	Science/ Physics	PHENOMENOLOGY OF CP VIOLATION AND FERMION MIXINGS
3275	Gurinder Pal Singh	S/o Resham Singh	Arts/ Pol. Science	IMAGES OF PAKISTAN IN INDIAN MEDIA: A STUDY OF FOUR NEWSPAPERS DURING 2001-02
3276	Nadereh Attarian	D/o Hassan	Arts/ Sociology	MODERNITY AMONG FEMALE STUDENTS: A STUDY OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN IRAN AND INDIA
3277	Manveer Kaur	D/o Gulzar Singh	Arts/ History	URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN POST INDEPENDENCE INDIA: A CASE STUDY OF CHANDIGARH
3278	Manju Hooda	D/o Ranvir Singh Hooda	Education/ Physical Education	COMPARATIVE DIFFERENTIALS BETWEEN MEDALLIST AND NON-MEDALLIST ATHLETES AS RELATED TO THEIR SELECTED PSYCHOLOGICAL PARAMETERS

3279	Radhika Visalam Krishnamoorthy	D/o S. Krishnamoorthy	Education/ Education	LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS WITH DIFFERENT EMOTIONAL AND SPIRITUAL INTELLIGENCE IN RELATION TO WORK MOTIVATION OF STAFF
3280	Satish Kumar	S/o Satya Narain	Law/Law	PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGES AND POWERS OF THE HOUSE ON EXPULSION OF MEMBERS: A CRITIQUE
3281	Kishan Lal Meena	S/o Ram Chandra	Engg. & Tech	AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF NON-TRADITIONAL MACHINING OF Al/SiC-MMC'S
3282	M. Sivanandini	D/o M. Anandam	Engg. & Tech	PROCESS PARAMETERS OPTIMIZATION FOR IMPROVING SURFACE CHARACTERISTICS OF RING LASER GYRO MIRROR
3283	Amita Sharma	D/o S.K. Sharma	Science/ Biotechnology	STUDIES ON CARBOXYMETHYLCELLULOSE (CMCase) FROM BACTERIAL ISOLATE: ENZYME PURIFICATION, CHARACTERIZATION, GENE CLONING AND SCALE UP
3284	Radhika Trikha	D/o Rajan Trikha	Science/ Biotechnology	ANTI- <i>SHIGELLA</i> ACTIVITY OF PROBIOTIC <i>LACTOBACILLI</i> ISOLATED FROM HUMAN INFANTS
3285	Reenu	D/o Ram Avadh	Science/ Chemistry	COMPUTATIONAL STUDIES TO EXPLORE THE ROLE OF ELECTRON-CORRELATION IN QUANTITATIVE STRUCTURE-ACTIVITY RELATIONSHIPS
3286	Pushpa Devi	D/o Ramji Dass	Arts / History	DEVELOPMENT OF WOMEN EDUCATION IN PUNJAB IN THE 20 TH CENTURY: A CASE STUDY OF ROPAR DISTRICT
3287	Navdeep Kaur	D/o Balbir Singh	Arts/ Psychology	A STUDY OF PSYCHOSOCIAL CORRELATES OF RESILIENCE AMONG INSTITUTIONALIZED ADOLESCENTS
3288	Baninder Rahi	D/o Inderjit Singh	Arts/Mass Communication	EFFECT OF MEDIA CONSUMPTION AND USAGE ON THE HEALTH OF SCHOOL STUDENTS: A CHANDIGARH BASED STUDY
3289	Sunaina Jain	D/o Rajinder Kumar Jain	Languages/ English	CHANGING CONFIGURATIONS OF SPIRITUALITY: MAPPING ECOFEMINISM IN THE SELECTED NOVELS OF ALICE WALKER

3290	Prem Prakash Sharma	S/o Mian Ram Sharma	Engg. & Tech.	TECHNO-ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND MODELING OF STAND-ALONE VERSUS GRID CONNECTED SMALL HYDROPOWER SYSTEMS FOR OPTIMIZATION OF SYSTEM PERFORMANCE AND COST EFFECTIVENESS
3291	Raman Singh	S/o Jai Bir Singh	Engg. & Tech.	DEVELOPMENT OF MALWARE DETECTION TECHNIQUE WITH NETWORK TRAFFIC PROFILING
3292	Veenu Mangat	D/o Jagdev Singh Mangat	Engg. & Tech.	DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF A SYSTEM FOR MINING QUALITY ASSOCIATIONS FROM PATIENT DATA
3293	Sonika Raj	D/o Raj Kumar Bansal	Science/ Public Health	DETERMINANTS OF UTILIZATION OF HEALTHCARE INFORMATION BY VARIOUS STAKEHOLDERS IN CHANDIGARH
3294	Shally Girdhar	D/o Ranjit Lal Girdhar	Science/ Chemistry	AN INSIGHT INTO HYPERVALENT ORGANOSILICON COMPOUNDS: PREPARATION, CHARACTERIZATION AND REACTIVITY PATTERNS
3295	Simanpreet Kaur	D/o Thakar Singh	Science/ Nanoscience & Nanotech.	PHOTOPHYSICAL EVALUATION OF ORGANIC NANOPARTICLES AND INORGANIC MATERIALS DECORATED WITH ORGANIC RECEPTORS
3296	Moibungkhong bam Damudor Singh	S/o Ibomcha Singh	Arts/Geography	DEVELOPMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN AN INDIAN HILL STATE (A CASE STUDY OF MANIPUR IN NORTH-EAST)
3297	Amandeep Dhaliwal	D/o Sukhdavinder Singh Romana	Arts/ Women's Studies	WIDOWS IN PUNJAB: A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY
3298	Ratika Datta	D/o Ashok Datta	Arts/Economics	SCHEDULED COMMERCIAL BANKS' NET INTEREST SPREADS: DETERMINANTS AND RISK HEDGING IN THE POST-REFORM PERIOD (1991-2011)
3299	Gurveen Kaur	D/o Balwant Singh	Arts/Public Admn.	ROLE OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT TOWARDS EFFECTIVE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION- A STUDY OF PUNJAB AND CHANDIGARH
3300	Sonali Narang	D/o H.R. Narang	Arts/ Political Science	GEPOLITICS OF FEAR AND 'CLIMATE CHANGE MIGRATIONS': IMPLICATIONS FOR BANGLADESH AND INDIA

3301	Amrita Bhullar	D/o Trilochan Singh Bhullar	Education/ Education	CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES OF UNDER GRADUATES IN RELATION TO THEIR EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SPIRITUAL INTELLIGENCE AND PERSONALITY TYPES
3302	Rasan Billing	D/o Charanjit Singh	Education/ Phy.Edu.	PHYSICAL ACTIVITY ATTITUDE, EATING BEHAVIOUR AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF COLLEGE WOMEN STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR LEVELS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS
3303	Sunita Bist	D/o Dharam Singh	Education/ Education	PEER CICTIMIZATION PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND ADJUSTMENT AMONG STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES
3304	Sandhya Rohal	D/o Hanumant Singh	Law/Law	PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY AND RULE OF LAW: A STUDY
3305	Narkhede Mahesh Sakharam	S/o Sakharam	Engg. & Tech.	MODELLING, MULTI OBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION AND ANALYSIS OF A VIRTUAL POWER PLANT

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

Roll No.	Name of the candidates	Father's Name	Faculty / Subject	Title
3306	Shadil Ibrahim Wani	S/o Mohammed Ibrahim Wani	Science/ Biochemistry	CLONING OF PUTATIVE EPOXIDE HYDROLASE AND CHARACTERIZATION OF THE RECOMBINANT PROTEIN FOR BIOCATALYSIS
3307	Surabhi	D/o Chopal Singh	Science/ Env. Sc.	INVESTIGATING THE AMELIORATING POTENTIAL OF TWO OXYGENATED MONOTERPENES AGAINST THE PHYTOTOXIC EFFECT OF DIVALENT CADMIUM [CD(II)]
3308	Shikha Sharma	D/o Subhash Chander Sharma	Science/ Botany	SCREENING OF SOME PHARMACEUTICALLY IMPORTANT MEDICINAL PLANTS OF COMMERCE FROM CHANDIGARH
3309	Minu Singh	D/o Deonath Singh	Science/ Human Genome	STUDIES ON MODULATION OF APOPTOSIS BY p53 PROLINE RICH DOMAIN UNDER DIVERSE CELLULAR CONTEXT

3310	Ankita Kansal	D/o Rajinder Kansal	Science/ Anthropology	AGE RELATED CHANGES IN BODY COMPOSITION AND BONE MINERAL DENSITY AMONG RURAL AND URBAN BANIA FEMALES OF DISTRICT PANCHKULA
3311	Tejinder Kaur	D/o Amrik Singh	Science/ Anthropology	APPRAISAL OF HEAVY METAL CONTAMINATION OF GROUND WATER AND HEALTH RISKS AMONG THE PEOPLE LIVING ALONG SOME SELECT WASTE WATER DRAINS OF PUNJAB
3312	Anu Singla	D/o Om Parkash Singla	Science/ Anthropology	CULTURAL TRAJECTORIES AND GENDERED DISCOURSE ON REVIVAL OF AN ETHNIC CRAFT AND ITS COMMODITIZATION: A CASE STUDY OF TEXTILE, DESIGN AND CHANGE IN 'PHULKARI' EMBROIDERY TRADITION OF PUNJAB
3313	Sonica	D/o Narayan Saini	Science/ Microbiology	A NOVEL EXTRACELLULAR THERMO-ALKALI-STABLE BACTERIAL LACCASE: PRODUCTION CHARACTERIZATION AND INDUSTRIAL APPLICATIONS
3314	Rini Sharma	D/o Dharamvir Sharma	Arts/ Psychology	STUDY OF NEGATIVE COGNITION, PERSONALITY AND FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AS CORRELATES OF SUICIDE IDEATION IN NON-DEPRESSED COLLEGE STUDENTS
3315	Ramandeep Kaur	D/o Sukhjit Singh	Arts/ A.I.H.C.& A.	HUMAN RIGHTS IN ANCIENT INDIA: A STUDY (FROM 300 B.C. TO 300 C.E.)
3316	Komal Sharma	D/o S.R. Sharma	Arts/ Sociology	WIVES LEFT BEHIND BY NRI GROOMS IN PUNJAB: A STUDY OF ANTECEDENTS, CONSEQUENCES AND INTERVENTIONS
3317	Ranjeet Singh	S/o Sukhpal Singh	Arts/Pub. Admn.	INSURANCE SECTOR REGULATION: A STUDY OF THE INSURANCE REGULATORY AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF INDIA
3318	Ritu Kumari	D/o Kamal Dev	Languages/ Sanskrit	VĀLMĪKĪYA RĀMĀYAṆA ME TRIVARGA VIVECANA EVAM USAKĪ UPĀDEYATĀ: ĀDHUNIKĀ PARIPREKṢYA ME
3319	Maghsoud Alizad Farrokhi	S/o Yadollah	Languages/ English	AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF LISTENING STRATEGIES OF IELTS CANDIDATES

3320	Ranjeet Singh	S/o Gurcharan Singh	Languages/ English	SEMIOTIC REPRESENTATION OF MIDDLE CLASS INDIA: A STUDY OF <i>CHACHA CHOUDHARY</i> COMIC BOOK SERIES
3321	Gurpreet Kaur	D/o Gurchet Singh	Languages/ Punjabi	SAMKALI PUNJABI NATAK (1980 TON BAAD) VICH MYTH RUPANTARAN: CHEHAN VIGIYANAK ADHIYAN (AJMER AULAKH, ATAMJEET, CHARAN DASS SIDHU ATE SWARAJBIR DE NATAKAN DE VISHESH SANDARBH VICH)
3322	Shikha Bahri	D/o Sardari Lal Bahri	Education/ Education	LIFE SATISFACTION AMONG WOMEN SCHOOL TEACHERS IN RELATION TO TECHNOLOGY READINESS AND MODERNITY
3323	Komal Sharma	D/o Ashok Kumar Sharma	Education/ Education	QUALITY OF LIFELONG LEARNING AND READING INTEREST AMONG IN-SERVICE AND PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS IN COLLEGES OF EDUCATION OF PUNJAB
3324	Anita Rani	D/o Munshi Ram	Education/ Education	SUBJECTIVE WELL BEING OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THEIR EMOTIONAL LABOUR, EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION AND WORK - FAMILY CONFLICT
3325	Anu Jalpot	D/o Pawan Sharma	Science/ Biotech.	STIMULATORY EFFECT OF PLANT GROWTH PROMOTING BACTERIA ON GROWTH AND CONTENTS OF MEDICINALLY IMPORTANT PLANT - <i>Stevia rebaudiana</i> BERT
3326	Deepika	D/o Baldev Krishan	Science / Biochemistry	STUDIES ON THE ANTILITHIATIC METABOLITE(S) OF <i>BERGENIA LIGULATA</i>
3327	Geeta Devi	D/o Kripa Ram	Science / Botany	ETHNO-MEDICINAL PLANTS OF TRIBAL DISTRICT KINNAUR, HIMACHAL PRADESH
3328	Garima Sood	D/o Pardeep Sood	Science / Math	A STUDY OF ROGERS-RAMANUJAN-MACMAHON TYPE IDENTITIES
3329	Preet Kanwal	D/o Jagjit Singh	Science / Computer Sc.	COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION TOOLS AS DETERMINANTS OF PROGRESS IN F/OSS PROJECTS: A LONGITUDINAL STUDY

3330	Nidhi Bhargava	D/o S. K. Bhargava	Science / Biotech.	<i>IN VITRO</i> STUDIES ON ATTENUATION OF <i>ACINETOBACTER BAUMANNII</i> VIRULENCE BY <i>GLYCYRRHIZA GLABRA</i> LINN
3331	Mayanglambam Lilee Devi	D/o Mayanglambam Achouba Singh	Arts / Sociology	RESERVATION AND EMPOWERMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SCHEDULED CASTE AND NON-SCHEDULED CASTE LOIS IN MANIPUR
3332	Munish Kumar	S/o Beli Ram	Languages / Hindi	VAISHNAV BHAKTI KE SANDARBHA MEIN LAXMINARAYAN SHARMA KA SAHITYA
3333	Ritu Sharma	D/o Veer Bhan Sharma	Languages / English	POETRY AS PROTEST: A STUDY OF SELECTED POEMS OF NIRALA, FAIZ AND PASH
3334	Vipul Sharma	S/o Suresh Kumar	Engg. & Tech.	DEVELOPMENT OF SEMANTIC GAP REDUCTION TECHNIQUES FOR MEDICAL IMAGE RETRIEVAL SYSTEM
3335	Suchita Kohli	D/o Vinod Kohli	Engg. & Tech.	SYNTHESIS AND CHARACTERIZATION OF SOL-GEL DERIVED IONIC SUBSTITUTED NANODIMENSIONAL HYDROXYAPATITE
3336	Supriya	D/o Jugal Kishore Sodhi	Design & Fine Arts / Music	RAATRIYGEY RAAGON PER ADHARIT HINDI CHITRAPAT GEETON MEIN SHASTRIYA SANGEET KA UPYOG EVAM ADHUNIK PRAYOG: EK SAMIKSHATMAK ADYAYAN
3337	Japinder Kaur	D/o Arvinder Bir Singh	Science/ Chemistry	SYNTHESIS CHARACTERIZATION AND PROPERTIES OF ZnO BASED NANOPARTICLES AND THEIR APPLICATIONS
3338	Monika Mittal	D/o Kewal Krishan Mittal	Science/ Physics	STUDY OF $Z \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- +$ JETS WITH VBF IN PP COLLISIONS AT LHC USING CMS DETECTOR
3339	Kirti Negi	D/o Kartar Singh Negi	Science/ Env. Science	INVENTORIZAZION, ASSESSMENT AND INVESTIGATION OF THE MEDICINAL AND AROMATIC PLANTS OF SANGLA VALLEY (DISTRICT KINNAUR, HIMACHAL PRADESH, INDIA)
3340	Shivani Singla	D/o Kirpa Ram Singla	Science/ Zoology	EVALUATION OF POLLEN AND PROPOLIS AS MODULATORS OF DOXORUBICIN PRODUCED CYTOTOXICITY IN RATS

3341	Suruchi Aggarwal	D/o Sunil Kumar Aggarwal	Science/ Human Genome	STUDIES ON 5-ALPHA REDUCTASE TYPE II GENE REGULATION IN PROSTATE CANCER CELLS
3342	Saurabh Kumar	S/o Ram Naresh Sinha	Languages/ Hindi	21VI SADI KE HINDI UPANYASON MEIN VYANGYA
3343	Rajni	D/o Amarjit	Languages/ Hindi	JEEWAN DARSHAN KE SANDARBH MAIN MEERA BAI AUR MAHADEVI VERMA KE KAVYA KA TULNATMAK ADHYAYAN
3344	Dinesh Chandra	S/o Mahesh Prasad	Languages/ Hindi	KAVYABHASHA KI DRISHTI SE KAVI SARVESHWAR DAYAL SAXENA KE KAVYA KA VISHLESHAN
3345	Gaurav Sood	S/o Satish Kumar	Languages/ English	MAPPING OF URBAN CULTURE: A STUDY OF CINEMATICSCAPES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DELHI, MUMBAI AND KOLKATA
3346	Raghavender Pottabathini	S/o Sathaiah Pottabathini	Pharm. Sciences	STUDIES OF NEUROPROTECTANTS IN EXPERIMENTAL NEUROPATHY AND NEPHROPATHY: POSSIBLE ROLE OF INFLAMMATORY AND APOPTOTIC MECHANISMS
3347	Anand Kamal Sachdeva	S/o Subash Chander Sachdeva	Pharm. Sciences	ELUCIDATING THE NEUROPROTECTIVE POTENTIAL OF ANTIOXIDANT PHYTOCHEMICALS IN EXPERIMENTAL PARADIGMS OF ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE
3348	Rajni Sahota	D/o Madan Lal	Arts/ History	SHAIKH NIZAMUDDIN AULIYA, HIS KHANQAH AND DARGAH: A STUDY OF CULTURAL ASSIMILATION
3349	Vinod Kumar	S/o Tirlok Chand	Arts/ Pub. Admn.	POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION OF E- GOVERNANCE IN HARYANA
3350	Amit Sharma	S/o O.C. Sharma	Arts/ A.I.H.C.&A	ART AND ICONOGRAPHY OF VISHNU IMAGES IN HIMACHAL PRADESH FROM EARLIEST TIMES TO C. 1200 A.D.
3351	Harmilap Singh	S/o Ajaib Singh	Arts / Public Admn.	AGRICULTURAL ADMINISTRATION IN PUNJAB: ROLE OF SECLECT AGENCIES i.e. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PUNJAB AND PUNJAB AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY, LUDHIANA

3352	Manju Chahal	D/o Rajbir Singh	Education/ Phy.Edu.	EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, METABOLIC EQUIVALENT OF TASK, AND EATING BEHAVIOUR AMONG OBESE AND NON-OBESE COLLEGE WOMEN
3353	Jasjit Kaur	D/o Gurcharan Singh Buttar	Education/ Education	PROBLEM SOLVING ABILITY OF ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO GENDER, PARENTING STYLES AND RESILIENCE
3354	Navdeep Singh Raji	S/o Rajinder Kumar	Education/ Education	CAREER BELIEFS OF ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR INTERNET SAVVINESS FAMILY ENVIRONMENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND CAREER INDECISION
3355	Prasant Kumar Mahapatra	S/o Panchanana Mahapatra	Engg. & Tech.	NANO POSITIONING ERROR COMPENSATION BY AUGMENTED IMAGING USING BIO-INSPIRED COMPUTING
3356	Amol P. Bhondekar	S/o Purushottam Bhondekar	Engg. & Tech.	DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN IMPEDANCE-TONGUE (iTongue)
3357	Ritu Puri	D/o J.M. Puri	Law/Law	IPRS AND REGULATORY ISSUES IN HERBAL MEDICINES: THEIR GLOBAL RAMIFICATIONS
3358	Gurpreet Kaur	D/o Jarnail Singh	Law/Law	NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCE ACT: ITS OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE STATE OF PUNJAB
3359	Neha Sharma	D/o Sushil Chander Sharma	Science/ Biophysics	STUDY ON THE NEUROINFLAMMATORY MECHANISMS IN PATHOGENESIS OF LIPOPOLYSACCHARIDE INDUCED PARKINSON'S DISEASE MODEL
3360	Anuprabha	D/o Ramphal Singh Kushwaha	Science/ Botany	ON ASSESSMENT OF ASYMBIOTIC SEED GERMINATION AND REGENERATION POTENTIAL OF SOME COMMERCIALY SIGNIFICANT BUT ENDANGERED INDIAN ORCHIDS: A STUDY <i>IN VITRO</i>
3361	Rekha Pandey	D/o H.D. Pandey	Science/ Botany	INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENT ARBUSCULAR MYCORRHIZAE ON PHYSIOLOGICAL AND BIOCHEMICAL RESPONSES OF <i>CAJANUS CAJAN</i> (L.) MILLSP. (PIGEONPEA) GENOTYPES UNDER SALT STRESS

3362	Nidhi Sharma	D/o Subhash Chand Sharma	Science/ Botany	PHYSIOLOGICAL AND BIOCHEMICAL BASIS OF L-DOPA (L-3, 4-DIHYDROXYPHENYLALANINE) IMPAIRED RHIZOGENESIS AND ROOT GROWTH
3363	Anchal Ghai	D/o Kuldeep Ghai	Science/ Nuclear Medicine	CHARACTERIZATION AND RADIOLABELING OF DENDRIMERS WITH ⁶⁸ Ga FOR MOLECULAR IMAGING OF TUMOR ANGIOGENESIS
3364	Neha Sabharwal	D/o Arun Kumar Sabharwal	Science/ Microbiology	<i>PSEUDOMONAS AERUGINOSA</i> FLAGELLIN EXPRESSION AS PART OF GLOBAL QUORUM SENSING RESPONSE: ROLE OF FLAGELLIN IN IMMUNOACTIVE PROPHYLAXIS OF URINARY TRACT INFECTIONS (UTIs)
3365	Shivani	D/o Raj Kumar Chopra	Science/ Microbiology	PHAGE BORNE ENDOLYSIN: PRODUCTION, PURIFICATION, CHARACTERISATION AND ITS POTENTIAL IN TREATING MRSA BIOFILMS AND BURN WOUND INFECTION
3366	Shashi Kala	D/o Budh Rattan Singh	Arts/ Pol. Science	POLITICS IN SLUMS OF CHANDIGARH CITY
3367	Jony Ranta	D/o Bhopender Ranta	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	GANDHI AND AMBEDKAR ON UNTOUCHABILITY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY
3368	Jasbir Kaur	D/o Gurdeep Singh	Languages/ Punjabi	GURBAKASH SINGH PREETLARHI DIAN KAHANIAN DA SHAILI-VIGIANIK ADHIYAN
3369	Swaranjit Kaur	D/o Gurmail Singh	Languages/ Punjabi	SAMKALI PUNJABI NOVEL VICH PRAMPRAK, ADHUNIK ATE UTTER-ADHUNIK KEEMTAN DA TANAQ
3370	Charu Dureja	D/o S.C. Dureja	Law/Law	PROTECTION OF COPYRIGHT AND NEIGHBOURING RIGHTS IN DIGITAL AGE UNDER INDIAN LAW: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS
3371	Esmaeil Shahsavandi	S/o Ahmad	Law/Law	LEGAL DIMENSIONS OF CORRUPTION IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE
3372	Yaser Hamidi	S/o Kasir	Law/Law	INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL LAW RELATING TO AIR AND OUTER SPACE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO INDIA: A STUDY
3373	Hesamaddin Rahbari	S/o Abolhasan	Law/Law	INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION RELATING TO PETROLEUM PRODUCTS AGREEMENTS DISPUTES: A STUDY

3374	Seema Sobti	D/o M.L. Sobti	Design & Fine Arts/Fine Arts	CONTINUITY AND CHANGE:MINIATURE PAINTING IN CONTEMPORARY TIMES
3375	Neha Soni	D/o R.K. Soni	Design & Fine Arts/ Fine Arts	ICONOGRAPHICAL STUDY OF HARITI
3376	Samriti Mona	D/o Vipin Kumar	Education/ Education	EFFECT OF INTERVENTION STRATEGIES ON ATTENTION AND IMPULSIVITY OF STUDENTS WITH ATTENTION DEFICIT HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER
3377	Sonia Sharma	D/o Sohan Lal	Buss. Mgt. & Com.	BOARD CHARACTERISTICS AND FIRM PERFORMANCE-AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED INDIAN COMPANIES
3378	Neelam Sidhu	D/o Harjit Singh Sidhu	Science/ Env. Sc.	IMPACT OF URBAN PRESSURE ON NORTH CHOE CHANDIGARH: AN ENVIRONMENTAL APPRAISAL
3379	Rajkumar Herojeet	S/o Rajkumar Surjeet	Science/ Env. Sc.	IMPACT OF INDUSTRIALIZATION ON WATER AND SOIL REGIME IN PARTS OF SIRSA WATERSHED, NALAGARH VALLEY, HIMACHAL PRADESH, INDIA
3380	Rajni Bansal	D/o Krishan Bansal	Science/ Physics	STUDY OF COLLECTIVE FLOW, ITS DISAPPEARANCE AND NUCLEAR DYNAMICS USING ISOSPIN - DEPENDENT QUANTUM MOLECULAR DYNAMICS MODEL
3381	Richa Aeri	D/o Kapil Dev Aeri	Science/ Anthropology	ESTIMATION OF STATURE AND SEX FROM HAND, DIGIT, PHALANGE, FOOT, HANDPRINT AND FOOTPRINT DIMENSIONS OF ADULT BRAHMINS, BANIAS, KHATRIS AND JATSIKHS OF PARTS OF MALWA AND DOABA REGIONS OF PUNJAB
3382	Amita Sahni	D/o Suresh Kumar Sahni	Science/ Maths	SOME GLIMPSES OF ALGEBRAIC CODING THEORY
3383	Vatankhah Ardestani Sarah Sadat	D/o Sayed Mahdi	Arts/ Public Admn	HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN UNITED INDIA INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED: A CASE STUDY OF REGIONAL OFFICE CHANDIGARH
3384	Laxmi Devi	D/o Kishor Chand	Arts/ Geography	AGED POPULATION IN INDIA: A GEOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

3385	Paramjeet Kaur	D/o Major Singh	Languages/ Punjabi	PUNJABI KAVITA VICH HARE INQLAB UPRANT SABHIYACHARAK RUPANTRAN DA ADHIYAN (JOGA SINGH, PASH, LAL SINGH DIL, RAM SINGH CHAHAL, DEVNEET DI KAVITA DE SANDARBH VICH.
------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	---

(xii) 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. Meena Sehgal, Professor Department of Psychology	01.07.1982	31.03.2016	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007 (ii) Furlough as admissible, under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 121 of P.U. Cal., Volume-I, 2007 (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/her 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).

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Rajinder Parshad Sharma Deputy Registrar Examination Branch	20.07.1973	29.02.2016	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Kuldip Kumar Gupta Assistant Registrar Examination Branch-III	01.04.1977	31.03.2016	
3.	Shri Harish Kumar Mehra Assistant Registrar Accounts Branch (G&P Section)	16.08.1976	30.04.2016	
4.	Shri Pritpal Singh Superintendent Examination Branch-II	24.02.1977	31.03.2016	
5.	Shri Hari Om Superintendent Examination Branch-II	03.07.1972	31.03.2016	
6.	Shri Sushil Kumar Bhandari Stenographer Department of Education	20.05.1978	29.02.2016	
7.	Shri Sunder Lal Senior Machine man P.U. Press	06.06.1977	31.03.2016	
8.	Shri Hoshiar Singh Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Physics	17.11.1980	31.03.2016	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
9.	Shri Pritam Chand Senior Technician (G-II) Department of Biotechnology	31.10.1985	30.04.2016	
10.	Shri Kamal Singh Jamwal Superintendent UIHTM	18.02.1982	31.03.2016	
11.	Shri Ashok Rampal Superintendent UIET	30.03.1982	30.04.2016	
12.	Ms. Sarjiwan Soni ASO (Stenography) Computer Centre	18.10.1985	30.04.2016	
13.	Shri Pritam Chand Technical Officer (G-I) Department of Physics	31.07.1987/ 16.06.1994	31.03.2016	
14.	Ms. Prem Sarita Senior Assistant General Branch	14.01.1985	29.02.2016	
15.	Shri Mangat Singh Painter (Technician Gr-II) P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	31.03.2016	

16.	Shri Janam Singh Sr. Lineman-cum-Groundman Directorate of Sports	14.09.1984	30.04.2016	} Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
17.	Shri Ramesh Chand Security Guard Boys Hostel No.1	06.09.1988	31.03.2016	
18.	Shri Dharam Pal Security Guard Security Staff Panjab University	01.09.1969	31.03.2016	
19.	Shri Rajmani Singh Daftri Accounts Branch	05.11.1969	30.04.2016	

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

(xiv) 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 Ms. Sarita Sharma, Senior Assistant, Women Hostel No. 6	Terminal benefits already sanctioned under item No. I- (ix)			} Gratuity and Ex-gratia grant as admissible under the University Regulations and Rules.
2.	Late Sh. Ram Phal, Head Mali, P.U. Construction	28.10.1987	21.10.2015	Smt. Shimla Devi (wife)	

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

(xv) To note the contents of the letter dated 06.04.2016 (**Appendix-XCIX**) received from Shri Satish Kumar, Under Secretary, University Grant Commission, New Delhi, with regard to observations of Local Audit Department of UT Administration on the recent promotions made by Panjab University under CAS.

NOTE: An office note containing the observations of Local Audit Department of UT Administration enclosed (**Appendix-XCIX**).

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors (already working on temporary basis) at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management (UIHTM), P.U., to work as such up to 25.05.2016 with one day break as usual on the same terms and conditions:

1. Mr. Gaurav Kashyap
2. Mr. Abhishek Ghai
3. Ms. Lipika K. Guliani
4. Mr. Amit Katoch
5. Mr. Manoj Semwal.

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned the following benefits to Professor Manmohan Singh Chauhan, Department of German, on account voluntary/Pre-Mature retirement, w.e.f. 01.02.2016, under regulation 17.5, at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mrs. Suman W/o Late Shri Om Parkash S/o Dass Ram, Vikas S/o Shri Om Parkash, Pinki and Neha daughters of Late Shri Om Parkash, resident of H.No. 1400/1 Mori Gate, Manimajra U.T. Chandigarh in terms of succession certificate issued by the Court in Succession Case No. 88/2014 (Case Code No. 201300058232014) decided on 23.9.2015/16.11.15, in respect of Late Shri Om Parkash, Cleaner, A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, who expired on 01.06.2014, while in service:

1. Gratuity (In the Event of 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 Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009
3. Earned Leave Encashment up to the prescribed limit : Rule 17.4 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009

- (xix)** The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Rural Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, working purely on temporary basis up to 31.05.2016 (with one day break), on the same terms and conditions on which they are working earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person & Subject
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

- (xx)** The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Vishal Agrawal as Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, P.U. up to 30.06.2016, with one day break on 02.05.2016 (i.e. 01.05.2016) being Sunday, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled up on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

- (xxi)** The Vice-Chancellor has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Neha Singla as Assistant Professor, Department of Biophysics, P.U., up to 30.06.2016, with one day break on 02.05.2016 (i.e. 01.05.2016) being Sunday, purely on temporary basis or till the posts are filled up on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

- (xxii)** The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Harsimran Kaur Boparai as Assistant Professor in Anesthesia at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., against the vacant post, purely on temporary basis for the period of one year in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000/- +NPA and allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 (a) 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.

(xxiii) To note letter dated 29.02.2016 (**Appendix-C**) of the Superintendent (A), Government Rehabilitation Institute for Intellectual Disabilities that Chandigarh Administration vide orders dated 14.08.2015 (**Appendix-C**) has changed the name of Regional Institution for Mentally Handicapped, Sector-31 Chandigarh to that of Government Rehabilitation Institute for Intellectual Disabilities (GRIID), Sector-31, Chandigarh with immediate effect.

(xxiv) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed that the roll numbers of the students of the ongoing B.Ed. course, G.M.T. College of Education, Jalandhar Bye-Pass Chowk, Ludhiana, be issued as an interim measure keeping in view of the academic interest of the students, as requested by the Chairman of the College vide letter dated 08.05.2016 (**Appendix-CI**).

(xxv) The Vice Chancellor has postponed the date for making the supplementary Register of Graduates available on 10.06.2016 instead of 30.05.2016 so the same be sent to Press in time on 06.06.2016 for final printing.

NOTE: Regulation 12.2 appearing at page No.64 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, is reproduced below:

“The Vice Chancellor may, in case of an emergency and for reasons to be recorded, postpone at any stage the date of election or elections or the dates for transaction of any business connected with the election, and the matter shall be reported to the Syndicate.”

Referring to Sub-Item I-(xxv), Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that they have postponed the date for making the supplementary Register of Graduates available from 30.05.2016 to **10.06.2016**. There is no problem in it, but with this, the last date for change of address is also to be postponed a little bit, which earlier was cut down by 10-15 days. He pleaded that at least 7-15 days are required for change of address after the availability of Supplementary Register.

When after detailed discussion, the members decided that the last date for change of address be fixed 22.06.2016, Shri Ashok Goyal said that now, there is no scope for changing anything.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that along with the change of address, there is another problem. Suppose a candidate originally belonged to Abohar, but is staying in Chandigarh for quite some years. Since he/she would not go to Abohar to cast his/her vote, he/she would get his/her address changed. So they have to find some ways through which he/she could cast his/her vote at the present address.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the address could be got changed by attaching the identity proof.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the candidate concerned is residing at Chandigarh and is studying or working somewhere, he/she must be possessing the identity proof.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Item I-118** on the agenda, be approved, with the addition in **Sub-Item I-(xxv)** that the last date of change of address be extended up to 22nd June 2016.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have finished with Part-B, and would now take up the Items under Part-A.

Proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dean of Student Welfare, for creation of position of Associate Dean of Student Welfare

18. Considered proposal (**Appendix-CII**) of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dean Student Welfare, Member of Syndicate & Senate, for creation of position of Associate Dean Student Welfare and its duties and functions.

NOTE: Due to increase in number of hostels, introduction of new accounting procedures in the University and hostels, the workload of DSW has increased manifold. It is advisable that instead of continuing with the present accounting system, where Warden is responsible for complete control and upkeep of hostel accounts, a central accounting system if followed in all the hostels as most of the wardens may not understand the finer details of the accounting procedures required for running a hostel.

The Vice Chancellor said that his opinion is that let it first go to the Board of Finance, and thereafter, it be considered by the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that there is a popular saying that too many cooks spoil the broth. Before placing the matter to the Board of Finance, there must be some discussion on the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that before 2002, they used to have only the position of Dean of Student Welfare, and in the year 2002, they created the position of Associate Dean, which was subsequently converted to Dean of Student Welfare (Women); and since then they are continuing with that. For all practical purposes, there are two Deans of Student Welfare, and it was felt that Dean of Student Welfare (Women) is required because the number of girl students had reached equal to that of boys. Now, he thinks that the Dean of Student Welfare must be remembering that the proportion between the girl students and boy students is too much, i.e., 60:40 or 70:30.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, the proportion between the girls and boys is 55:45.

The Vice Chancellor said that occasionally, he sends the Dean of Student Welfare to P.U. Regional/Rural Centres. Secondly, there are so many girls Colleges, where he sends Professor Nandita Singh, Dean of Student Welfare (Women). He suggested that the item should be allowed to be taken to the Board of Finance.

Professor Keshav Malhotra reiterated that before putting sending the item to the Board of Finance, there must be some discussion on the issue. He stated that the experiment of Associate Dean was also there in the College Development Council, and later on the Syndicate decided that the Associate Dean, College Development Council, is not required. Though they are saying for the last so many years that admissions to the hostels should be made on-line so that the same are made transparent, they are willingly not doing so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, last year, at this particular time, a decision was taken that admissions in the hostels with effect from the academic session 2015-16 would be made on-line. However, he does not know whether they are ready even this year.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that firstly, they have to develop the system and make it strong, so that, in future, it functions smoothly. He does not think the system is working properly in the hostels. Instead of appointing Associate Dean, they should appoint Programmer or Computer knowing person/s. Even if they appointed Associate Dean, later on, he/she would demand supporting staff as well as office, which would result into financial implications. Either the Deans of Student Welfare should be strengthened by giving them more powers or main work should remain with Dean of Student Welfare and the Dean of Student Welfare (Women) should be given some independent/exclusive work without any interference.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could be other way as well.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that either a Programmer should be provided in the office of the Dean of Student Welfare or the persons employed there should be given computer training and the software should also be developed for the accounting purpose. He added that they had prepared a data base in the Department of Evening Studies and everything could be seen/provided with a click of a mouse. If the Department of Evening Studies could do such a job, why could not the Dean of Student Welfare Office, which has such a huge manpower. If everything is streamlined, one has no discretionary power. No student could come to him for fulfilling the shortage of lecture/s because everybody knows that the system is in place. He suggested that everything relating to girls hostels should be exclusively handled by the Dean of Student Welfare (Women) and boys hostels by the Dean of Student Welfare.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the reason as to why he has given this proposal is that he has been facing the problems as also that because of the Fact-Finding Committee recommendations, they have completely changed their accounting system. When they talked about the changing of accounting system, it was the duty of the Dean of Student Welfare as well as Dean of Student Welfare (Women), but somehow she said that she is not in a position to do so because she does not know anything about the accounting procedures. So whether they are talking about the Boys Hostels or Girls Hostels, the whole burden was on Dean of Student Welfare only. So much so they had taken so many sessions for training Warders and the staff for doing so many things and in spite of that they are still facing problems even though they are continuously working on it for the last one and half years or so. That part is extremely important because when they talk about any accounting system, proper knowledge is required and also not only the Deans of Student Welfare have to know

about this, but the Wardens and their staff should also know as to how to handle the accounts. He is confessing that there is difficulty. For that reason, they have a lot of meetings, including the Finance & Development Officer, where it was suggested that slowly there is a need to shift to the Accounting System from Hostel-wise to Central Account System. If they do that, probably additional person is required for coordinating the work. However, they could not do it in one go. In fact, they need a person, who would initially coordinate with all the hostels because so far as Dean of Student Welfare is concerned, he is not for hostels alone.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Dean of Student Welfare is an office which has been created for the welfare of the students and accounts is an essential part of his duty, but it not primary criteria, which would determine who has to be Dean of Student Welfare and Dean of Student Welfare (Women). Already on behalf of the office of Dean of Student Welfare, there are two Deans of Student Welfare and both actually enjoy the same status. It is not that Dean of Student Welfare (Women) enjoys less status. Now, the two Deans of Student Welfare have to decide between themselves as to how they would handle these things. What they are articulating is that there is a need of having a person, who would coordinate between the different offices, including the hostels because these two Deans of Student Welfare have not been picked up on the basis whether they understand this or not. An additional person is needed, who understand the accounts and could coordinate with the Wardens because they do not put even a Deputy Registrar or an Assistant Registrar with this objective. As such, an additional person is needed, who understands these things, and for that either a new post be created or additional charge be given to someone. Anyhow, the financial sanction is required.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that why it is confusing because he does not know what was in the mind of the Dean of Student Welfare while making this proposal. The proposal starts with the difficulties which are anticipated by the office of the Dean of Student Welfare because of change in the system of accounting. That since the Wardens of the hostels might not be knowing the finer points of accounting. He does not know which system they are going to change. The Accounting System is not going to change at all. It is also said that to assist the Dean of Student Welfare who has expertise in Accounts, but they could see the "Duties and functions of Associate Dean Student Welfare". (1) Coordinating the curricular and co-curricular activities of all hostels; (2) To look after the NSS and other student welfare activities; (3) Online allocation of hostels; (4) To deal with the matters related to discipline among University students on the campus; (5) Any other work given by Dean of Student Welfare and Dean of Student Welfare (Women); and (6) Financial Powers of Associate Dean Student Welfare will be same as that of head of the Teaching Department of the University. Nowhere the purpose, for which the proposal for appointment of Associate Dean Student Welfare has been put, has been mentioned that he/she has to take care of the finer points of accounting, which is supposed to be taken care off, as per the Dean of Student Welfare. The idea is to take care of the proposed accounting system of the hostels, they need somebody who would assist the Dean of Student Welfare office and he/she could be named Associate Dean, Deputy Registrar, anybody having some expertise for the purpose for which he/she is to be appointed. Then the proposal is like the Vice Chancellor has posed a specific question

that how that appointment is to be made. The proposal which has been made here is that part-time Associate Dean be appointed, and in the same breath it is being said that Rs.3,000/- honorarium would be paid to him/her. Could they pay to anybody who is a part-timer? In fact, they have to pay salary to the part-timer.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Wardens are also part-timers and they are paying honorarium to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Wardens are not part-timers, but are holding additional charge of the hostels. The teachers of the University have been given certain additional charge. Similarly, certain teachers of the University have been given the additional charge of the hostels.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even the letter, which is being issued to the Wardens, is issued part-time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if the Wardens are issued letter as part-time, how could they pay honorarium to them?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that before making the proposal, he has gone through the provisions of the Calendar, and made the proposal accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that there is a provision in the Calendar for appointment of full-time Wardens, and it was only an *ad hoc* arrangement that the charge could be given to a teacher also but not above the rank of Reader/Associate Professor.

The Vice Chancellor said that now it has become a norm.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that now that has been abolished. When they are getting the work done by giving the additional charge, why should they appoint Warden from the outside. In the process, they are saving the cost also. But if they are saving the cost, maybe, they are compromising on the quality also.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that they are appointing teachers as Wardens, who have so many responsibilities, and then teachers have to work for their promotions.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that, that meant, either the teaching is being compromised or the hostels. Anyway, at the cost of that compromise, they are continuing with the present system. As far as account is concerned or the Dean of Student Welfare Office which needs a lot of assistance, where is the need of Associate Dean. Let they put such persons in the office of the Dean of Student Welfare, who could take care of all these things, including the accounting. He is not against this proposal or rejection of this proposal. Maybe, he is not able to understand what difficulties are being faced by the office of the Dean of Student Welfare, but from the note, it is contradictory. Secondly, if at all, any additional hand is required, it has to be in the form of any nomenclature with any lady to be appointed. As far as equating of both the Deans of Student Welfare is concerned, it could simply be said – Dean of Student Welfare (Men) and Dean of Student Welfare (Women). Now, what they are saying is Dean of Student Welfare, and thereafter, Dean of Student Welfare (Women). If they say Dean of Student Welfare (Men) and Dean of Student Welfare (Women),

both would be automatically equal, and both could coordinate to run everything smoothly, so that the women affairs are completely handled independently by the Dean of Student Welfare (Women) and the boys sections by the Dean of Student Welfare (Men).

The Vice Chancellor said that sometimes one Dean of Student Welfare has to go out and the other takes care of everything. Right now, they have good understanding.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that understanding would also be there after their becoming independent as there are several things where they have to coordinate, including the Amalgamated Fund. Though both should be equal, the impression is as if Dean of Student Welfare is the Head.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not equal because Dean of Student Welfare by office has been made a member of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Dean of Student Welfare has been made member of the Senate now. Earlier, Dean of Student Welfare (Women) was not there. The concept of Dean of Student Welfare (Women) did not develop here because the Dean of Student Welfare has to deal with the Police several times, which preferably is not possible for a woman. That is why, it should remain within the domain of male Dean of Student Welfare.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that for welfare activities, they are appointing two Welfare Officers in the University. Secondly, he has a good experience of NSS, and they are also appointing a Coordinator for NSS. In fact, they should look after these NSS activities.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that NSS Coordinator is for coordinating the NSS activities of all the affiliated Colleges.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that so far as accounting procedure is concerned, it is being taken care of by the clerks in his Department (Department of Evening Studies), for which they had taken the help for the Finance & Development Officer and had also got the orientation done.

The Vice Chancellor said that they do not want to recruit any additional person; rather, they are hoping to give additional charge to a teacher to do this, who would be given the honorarium. Let him get the honorarium of Rs.3000/- per month for that particular teacher, who would assist the office of the Dean of Student Welfare, approved from the Board of Finance. There is no issue at all whether they would call the person concerned as Associate Dean or some other nomenclature.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one of the reasons is being given that the Wardens are not familiar with the changed accounting procedure.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that from the existing Wardens, at least 5-7 are those, who are familiar with the accounting procedure.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why not they appoint only those persons as Wardens, who are familiar with the accounting system? Secondly, what is the accounting system which they were earlier adopting, and now they are going to change.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in future, while appointing Warden/s it could be taken care of. Earlier, they were adopting the accounting system of receipt and payment only, whereas now they have shifted double entry accounting system.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if the Dean of Student Welfare or the Controller of Examinations or the Dean, College Development Council think that they need additional hand/s to assist them, the same must be provided to them.

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that, practically, as far as his experience goes, there is no role of the University in the NSS activities of the affiliated Colleges. A NSS camp is held in PU Campus, but nobody from the University has ever participated in that. So far as activities held here at the Campus is concerned, they could themselves seek the record and find as to how activities have taken place. Even if 2-3 camps are organized, the NSS is sufficient to hold. So far as youth welfare is concerned, earlier, there was no post of Assistant Director, but for the last five years or so, there is a post of Director as well as Assistant Director. However, the University has never organized Inter-College Youth Festival, and the same is always organized by the Colleges. Only Jhankar is held by the University, and the same is organized at a time when no College could participate in it, and only 2-3 Colleges, that too, from the Chandigarh alone participate in that. Resultantly, one team gets Gold Medal and another team Silver Medal, and they were given weightage, though the Inter-Zonal students are much better. Why do not those students participate in the Inter-Colleges or Inter-Zonal. He suggested that the minimum number of teams should be fixed and only then the Certificate should be issued.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that no weightage is given to the students, who participate in Jhankar.

Continuing, Principal S.S. Sangha said that if any activity is to be organized, for that the Assistant Director is there. If the activities are to be organized in the hostel/s, it should be assigned to the Warden/s. As such, the activities, which have been listed in the proposal, could be taken care of by the Assistant Director, Department of Youth Welfare, Wardens, etc. However, if the Dean of Student Welfare is too much burdened, one person could be provided to assist him.

The Vice Chancellor said that as he sees, the Dean of Student Welfare and Dean of Student Welfare (Women) is required, which is a minimum requirement. They also need one additional person to do all the nitty-gritty.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

The Vice Chancellor said that a system has to exist and continue beyond individuals.

At this stage, again a din prevailed, and in that din Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is willing to do this job without any office and honorarium. He further said that no system is difficult, provided the person/s has/have will and sincerely to perform the job. Nobody is thinking for the poor and reserved categories students. He suggested that, if at all, the Associate Dean is to be appointed, he/she should be from reserved categories.

The Vice Chancellor said that alright, there is no reservation when it comes to Dean of Student Welfare and Dean of Student Welfare (Women). Let they appoint someone from reserved categories as an Associate Dean to do these things. They would look for someone (a faculty member), who would look after the things, which are online, accounting, etc. He further said that they had received a directive that whatever shortage they have from the reserved categories in the positions of Professors and Associate Professors, that should be met, and they are committed for the same. They are sure that they would meet the condition as several good candidates belonging to reserved categories are available. There is no shortage of completion for this University.

It was informed that currently they are maintaining separate account of each hostel. But the total income and expenditure of all the hostels has to form a part of the consolidated balance sheet of the University. They are facing so much problems from the hostels as each hostel is maintaining the accounts in its own way. Resultantly, the whole balance sheet of the University is pending because of the hostel account/s. As such, centralized accounting of all hostels is needed to be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what the centralized accounting is?

It was clarified that Centralized Accounting means one account for all hostels.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how would they be able to differentiate the accounts hostel-wise.

It was informed that one account for each and every Department, but the centralized account is in the Administrative Office. In the same way, the centralized account for hostels could either be at the Dean of Student Welfare Office or Administrative Office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why could not it be at the Administrative Office, where there could be better control and coordination and for that they need at the most one or two additional hands.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that is why, he had said that they would first develop the system and it would not be done in one go.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that a Committee should be formed for the purpose.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that as the proposal has come from the Dean of Student Welfare that an Associate Dean should be

appointed, what problem they had faced at the administrative level that they need another post to help Dean of Student Welfare and Dean of Student Welfare (Women), and that too, Associate Dean. They are talking about only maintaining the accounts by way of centralized account system, but on the other hand, they are talking about appointment of Associate Dean. At the same time, they are also talking about computerization of hostels seats and for that they need an Associate Dean. If the number of hostels has increased from 12 to 14, the number of papers has also been increased due to implementation of Semester System and the work of Controller of Examinations has almost doubled. Would they create the posts of Dean with every post? In fact, this proposal ought not to be there from the Dean of Student Welfare. However, as contemplated by the 2013 Syndicate that these officers are required, if they were having any problem, the Syndicate could have thought and made the proposal keeping in view that the work with the Dean of Student Welfare has increased. It is not appropriate that one should himself/herself make the proposal that Associate Dean is required since the work with him/her has increased. Tomorrow, they might say that Associate Deans are required for Finance & Development Officer, Dean, College Development Council, Controller of Examinations, Maintenance, etc., and it would be an unending process. The number of hostels has not increased since 2013, though it is true that one International Women Hostel has been constructed. However, the number has not increased exorbitantly due to which they need Associate Dean. This Syndicate does not feel that the post of Associate Dean is required.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it is humble request that the admissions in the hostels should be made online.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has already been accepted.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that but the admissions in the hostels are not being made online. Secondly, after seeing the distribution of hostels seats on the University Website, he felt that there are certain Departments, which have been allocated less number of seats in comparison to their students' intake. Similarly, certain Departments have been allocated more seats even through the total number of students in those Departments are less than other Departments, which have been allocated less number of hostel seats. Whichever Committee allocates the seats in the hostels, should be asked to examine this and allocate the seats uniformly.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that earlier, there was only one office of Dean of Student Welfare, but with the passage of time, the number of students increased and they decided to appoint Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

The Vice Chancellor said that majority of the persons have expressed that there is a need of an additional person, and there is no debate on it; and only few persons are saying no, but by and large there is consensus that there is a need for an additional person.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that, at one point of time, there only 5000-6000 students studying at the Campus, but there are about 20,000 students studying at the two Campuses. Everyone knows how burdened the office of the Dean of Student Welfare is as the number of hostels as also the work has increased enormously.

Whenever they telephoned him (Dean of Student Welfare), they always find him busy. If they telephone him ten times, only then either the phone is connected or he calls back them because he has to attend to so many duties. If they are trying to make the Accounting System centralized, there is no harm in it as with it the work/system would only improve. Earlier, it was being alleged that the funds of hostels are not being properly managed, but with the centralized accounting system, the checks and balances would automatically come into play. Thus, there would be no harm if Associate Dean is appointed as somebody is required to share the burden of the Dean of Student Welfare.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that one of the major problems which they are facing is one discipline and that is due to increase in number of students' organizations. Since the students' organizations hold activities almost everyday, there is a need for Associate Dean to maintain the discipline amongst the students.

The Vice Chancellor stated that there is no doubt that both the Deans of Student Welfare are very much over burdened in the background of the fact that they are Professors also, they have to take care of the students and other activities as well. Since they are Professors and Deans of Student Welfare, they sometimes become public persona. They get hundreds of invitations from the affiliated Colleges of the University because they are well identified people and the Colleges invite them. He (Vice Chancellor) also invited them on different Committees. As such, there is no doubt that both of them are really over burdened. Whenever one goes, another looked after the activities.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that he does not feel that the accounting procedure is a big problem, but through several Committees they are making so many administrative reforms, especially relating to hostels; however, the same could not be executed because these persons are over burdened irrespective of whether the reforms related to SC/ST scholarships or whether rich students need hostels or the poor students, who could not afford accommodation outside the campus. The policies could not be implemented because they could see them minutely. The students make complaints that the bathrooms are in bad shapes, the quality of food in the hostels is of low standards, because the Dean of Student Welfare could not see all these himself. As such, somebody is required to see all these things on regular basis.

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that instead of appointing an Associate Dean, they should appoint a Bursar.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have found a very nice solution. They would have another person from the reserved categories. So they could not have 3rd Dean of Student Welfare, and they are just accepting the concept.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the accounting problem could be sorted out in coordination with the Finance & Development Officer or a Committee could be formed for the purpose.

When Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item is approved and it is not that after such a lengthy discussion, the item is not approved, the Vice Chancellor said that it is approved, but he

(Vice Chancellor) has to work it out and make a proposal and everything would be placed before the Board of Finance.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that they have several poor students, their interests should also be watched.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would send a nice message for this thing.

RESOLVED: That a position of Associate Dean of Student Welfare, be created and the proposal be, placed before the Board of Finance in its next meeting.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a person belonging to the reserved categories, be given the charge of Associate Dean of Student Welfare.

Recommendations of Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 26.03.2016 & 25.02.2016

37. Considered –

- (i) minutes of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 26.03.2016 (Item No. 13 and 27) (**Appendix-CIII**).
- (ii) minutes of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 25.02.2016 (Item No. 5, 7 and 14) (**Appendix-CIII**)

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 25.02.2016 (Items 5, 7 and 14) and 26.03.2016 (Items 13 and 27), as per **Appendix**, be approved.

At this stage, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that recommendations of the Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee (Item 31 – page 270) also needed to be looked into, especially the recommendation pertaining to purchase of 40-50 seater Academic Council Bus along with Driver and Cleaner.

It was clarified by the couple of members that the recommendation of Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee relating to additional seat/s in all the courses (except the courses governed by AICTE, NCTE, BCI, MCI, DCI, etc.) being run at Panjab University campus including Constituent Colleges/Regional Centres/affiliated Colleges was approved, but the other recommendations were not approved.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 10.03.2016 regarding complaint of sexual harassment against Mr. Daljit Singh

38. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 10.3.2016 to discuss the complaint of sexual harassment against Mr. Daljit Singh, Senior Technician, Department of Physics.

The Vice Chancellor stated that this is something, which is not acceptable. The Committee has given a verdict which is against the person concerned. There has to be some displeasure shown to the person concerned, on behalf of the Syndicate, commensurate with the recommendations of the Committee. The person is about to retire and the only thing recommended is that his one increment should be withdrawn, which is a very small punishment. There is not also a very pleasant thing about the functioning of the Legal Cell, and both need cognizance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is true that the Committee has indicted Shri Daljit Singh, and according to him the punishment suggested is also commensurate with the offence.

The Vice Chancellor said that is it withdrawal of an increment and also withholding of gratuity.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that as per service rules, gratuity could not be stopped.

It was informed that gratuity is given for rendering good service, and gratuity is given only if one fulfils this condition.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky enquired that is the copy of the complaint is not available?

Professor Shelley Walia said that they could not deliberate on the issue as the relevant papers have not been annexed with the item.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they neither new the whole case nor the person concerned. Secondly, the procedure followed in the case is also wrong. The Vice Chancellor had approved the minutes of the Committee in July 2015 and thereafter, the case was sent to the Legal Cell for processing the case as per the rules and in terms of disciplinary action and procedures, but the Legal Cell did nothing. Thereafter, it seems a Committee had been constituted, because somebody might have brought to the notice to the Vice Chancellor that the person is going to retire in May, but nothing has been done till date. So the Vice Chancellor constituted the Committee to look into the complaint of sexual harassment against Shri Daljit Singh in the office of the Dean of University Instruction. Does the Committee have power of punishing authority? Who are they to recommend that one increment may be stopped and the person be fixed at a lower stage. The Sexual Harassment Committee has given its report and thereafter, it is for the employer to decide the punishment against the person in terms of service rules. Who is the employer in the instant case? If he is Class 'A' employee, then the Senate is the Punishing Authority. These are not only technical, but everything is illegal. The moment, it is proved that the punishing authority has not applied its mind independently before awarding the punishment as it is recommended by some Committee, automatically whatever decision is taken by them, it would become bias.

When Professor Shelley Walia suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred, the Vice Chancellor said that it is not to be deferred. Even if it is to be deferred, some operative part has to be decided by the Government of the University. Secondly, whatever they would do, it would have to be taken to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to who had issued the show cause notice as nothing has been appended with the item.

It was informed that the show cause notice was issued by the Registrar, on behalf of the prescribed authority, and the prescribed authority in the instant case is the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what was the show cause notice.

The Vice Chancellor said that the show cause notice was issued to the person concerned on 4th February. In fact, the file was missing as it had been sent to the Legal Cell and the Legal Cell did not do anything; rather, they kept the file under the carpet.

It was informed that the file was not available for quite long time.

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that let all the relevant papers be provided to them so that they could discuss it.

The Vice Chancellor said that this needs serious consideration by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they do not want that the person, due to some technical lacuna/lacunae, if he is guilty, is allowed to go scot-free.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that in the case of Ms. Manju Mathur of UCO Bank, it has been decided by three Judges of Hon'ble Supreme Court that if the person is not compulsorily retired by the employer before the original date of retirement, his/her gratuity could not be stopped. As such, they have to retire him compulsorily before his date of retirement; otherwise, they could not withhold his gratuity.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that the case to which Dr. Ajay Ranga is referring to, there the finding was that no punishment cease to have been awarded to him as is seen from the record, because had he been retired compulsorily by way of punishment, then he was not entitled for gratuity, but they say he has been allowed to retire without any punishment/stigma, then how could they deny him the benefits. However, if they are taking some action in terms of moral turpitude or serious misconduct and bringing him down to the lower stage, then probably, that judgement is not applicable in this case.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if the allegations against this man relating to moral turpitude are proved, then they have to take action.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this case not seems to be of moral turpitude.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that, if not, then action could not be taken against him. Gratuity could only be withheld if the allegation of moral turpitude is proved against him; otherwise, not.

It was clarified that if somebody does not get the certificate of exemplary service, which they normally give, gratuity could not be given to him/her.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky suggested that the seriousness of the conduct as well as the gravity of the offence should be checked before awarding any punishment.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to make available all the relevant documents so that they could consider the item at a later stage of the meeting. In the meanwhile, they should move to the next item. The item could not be taken up thereafter.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 5.01.2016 regarding promotion of research in affiliated Colleges

48. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 05.01.2016 (**Appendix-CIV**) constituted by the Vice Chancellor in pursuance of the Syndicate decision dated 18.10.2015 (Para 3) (**Appendix-CIV**) for promotion of research in the Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired how many Colleges are being approved as Research Centres.

The Vice Chancellor said that some cases of the Colleges might be pending, but all the cases, which had come to him, the same are being approved.

Principal S.S. Sangha pointed out that the Committee has not concluded anything.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it has been written that several applications are pending. That meant, the issue has become chronic, and there is no solution to it. Only the hegemony of the departments is prevailing, especially of the University Business School.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that some of the departments feel that research could not be done by the Colleges. There are many cases where the time is not being given for inspection by the Colleges. Wherever it seems that they are not clearing the case/s, if the Committee is required to be changed, the same must be changed.

The Vice Chancellor said that then let him suggest them a solution. Two-Three persons (two College teachers and one University Professor) should chase the pending cases and get the Committees formed from him.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, in fact, it had been decided in one of the meetings of the Syndicate, to associate him with the Committee, but somehow, he was not associated with the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee comprising Principal S.S. Sangha, Professor Anil Monga and Dr. I.S. Sandhu would be constituted to chase and consider all the pending cases and make recommendations to him. All the cases would be cleared before the commencement of the next academic session. Simultaneously, all the approval cases of College teachers should also be got cleared.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that it should be put on the Dean, College Development Council's Website as to how many Research Centres, the University has approved and how College teachers have been allowed to act as Supervisors/Co-Supervisors of the Ph.D. students.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a reasonable demand, and the same would be met.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it varies from Department to Department. At one point of time, the Vice Chancellor had said that the representation of affiliated Colleges in research is 60%. However, only those College teachers are being allowed to guide Ph.D. students, who had been allowed in the year 1985. He is sorry to point out that

no representation of College teachers is there on the Pre-RDC and Research Degree Committee. Resultantly, sometimes the students are got harassed as they are asked incorporate unnecessary changes at the time of pre-Research Degree Committee; however, at the time of Research Degree Committee those changes are again deleted.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal S.S. Sangha to give him a note so that he could take necessary action on the issue.

RESOLVED: That the following Committee be constituted to chase and consider all the cases, which are pending for approval of Research Centres, and make recommendations to the Vice Chancellor:

1. Principal S.S. Sangha ... (Chairman)
2. Professor Anil Monga
3. Dr. I.S. Sandhu

Principal S.S. Sangha would convene the meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendation/s of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Qualification for the post of Electronic Typewriting-cum-photo composing Machine Operator

72. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 18.02.2016 (**Appendix-CV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the following proposed qualification for the post of Electronic Typewriting-cum-photo composing Machine Operator in the pay-scale of 10300-34800+GP Rs.3200/-, in P.U. Press be amended as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Post	Existing qualification as approved by the Syndicate vide Paragraph 23, meeting held on 24.09.2005	Proposed Qualification
1.	Electronic Typewriter-cum-photo composing Machine Operator (10300-34800+GP Rs.3200/-)	Internal Promotion by Seniority-cum-merit among the mono operator, compositors, Junior Compositors subject to qualifying the trade test.	-B.C.A./B.Tech. (Computer Science) OR -Graduate with Computer Science as subject and 1 year experience in Desktop Publishing Desirable:- Experience in Press working, Knowledge of Coral Draw, Page Maker, Photoshop, and MS Office etc. Subject to qualifying the trade test.

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

NOTE: The Manager, P.U. Press has urged that the post of Electronic Typewriting-cum-photo composing Machine Operator in the pay-scale of 10300-34800+GP Rs.3200/- be filled in at the earliest on regular basis and till such time it may be filled in by engaging a suitable person on contract basis as per the proposed amended qualifications.

Professor Shelley Walia said that, in fact, the Press needs a person, who is expert in Page Maker, Photoshop, etc. As such, they need a person, who could sit on the computer, and do this. This kind of person could work on Rs.10,000/- or Rs.20,000/-, but not a B.Tech. In fact, the B.Tech. person is not going to do this kind of job. This work could be done by a person, who has basic knowledge of computer. Even if they take a B.C.A., he/she is more than enough.

The Vice Chancellor stated that thousands of Engineers are passing from the Punjab Technical University (PTU) every year, and they are not having job. However, they are good at these things as they have developed these things at their own. B.Tech. is a degree, which is equivalent to a Bachelor Degree. What is the status in the country today? Even today, the parents preferred their wards to either go in for engineering or medical courses though they did not get jobs. Resultantly, 40% of the people are still living below poverty line. The students before enrolling themselves in the degree Colleges, preferred to enrol in the Engineering Colleges, and that is why, the Engineering Colleges are mushrooming. So they have a large number of Engineering Graduates in the country, who are looking for jobs. These Engineers are willing to do any job, which is available to any graduate. So any job, which is available to any graduate, should be made available to Engineering Graduates. When Professor Shelley Walia said that B.Tech. is an over qualification, the Vice Chancellor said that it is not an over qualification because they have such a large number of Engineering Graduates, who are without jobs. However, since it is a specialized job, they could enhance the grade pay.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the majority of the people, who are working in the Press, are at the verge of retirement. The Press is unable to do the University work, because the person/s having such skills is/are not available.

The Vice Chancellor stated that recognizing that the parents forced their children to enrol for Engineering in comparison to Science Subjects, people have aptitude and creativeness. Hence, they could be good researchers in Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and so on. He took initiative to make Ph.D. Entrance Examination compulsory in all subjects. They might not believe that 40% of the researchers at TIFR are Engineers. There are Engineers who are doing research in pure Mathematics. They should allow such people to do research.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that son of Professor D.V.S. Jain did not take admission in PEC, and preferred to take admission in the Department of Chemistry, with which all were astonished. Now, he is a world renowned Chemist.

The Vice Chancellor said that he knows several B.Tech. candidates who had cleared the Mathematics Entrance Examination, and they have become really good Mathematicians. Therefore, today the B.Tech. should be considered only a Bachelor's degree. It is a license to do whatever one wanted to do.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that even the simple graduates, who have technical experience, could prove to be good candidates for the job.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he thinks that Dr. Ajay Ranga would be able to guide them as he was the Chairman of the Committee which has recommended the qualification for the post of Electronic Typewriting-cum-Photo Composing Machine Operator. There are certain positions for which they need experienced people, and similarly, there are certain positions for which they need qualified people. There are certain positions where qualified people for inferior to the experienced people. This is a position where they have to look for skills instead of qualifications. The qualifications which were proposed were 10+2 with 2-5 years experience, what he wonders that the Committee has proposed the qualifications – BCA/B.Tech. (Computer Science) or Graduate with Computer Science as subject and one year experience in Desktop Publishing. If they keep 10+2 qualification and five year experience, that does not debar the B.Tech. candidates to apply for this post, provided he/she got the required skills; otherwise, a might not get the desired person. Ornamentally, it might look very good that they had got an Operator, who is B.Tech., but that is only ornamentally. He does not know what does it mean as it has been written existing qualification as approved by the Syndicate dated 24.09.2015 (Para 23) were “Internal promotion by Seniority-cum-Merit among the mono Operator, Compositors, Junior Compositors subject to qualifying the trade test”, but in the proposed qualifications they are also changing the channel of employment. Earlier, it was by way of promotion, but it is by way direct recruitment. Maybe, the reason is given that all the retiring, whosoever might be eligible for promotion and they do not have a Page Maker. He thinks that 10+2 with 3-5 years experience is no definition as that meant above 5 years experience is not eligible. Therefore, it should be properly worded and while interviewing they should look for even if a person is 10+2 because he sees not only in this University, but also in other organizations, there are some technical persons, who are just 10+2, but are doing much better job than the Engineers. He is no hesitation is saying that much better job than the Associate Professors, who are teaching at UIET in the subject, the person is more expert, especially in the case of Computers (Hardware and Software). The Engineers might not be that good as those who are just 10+2 and have sufficient experience. Therefore, they should not make it 10+2 with at least 5 years' experience.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they make it with at least five years' experience, then the B.Tech. candidates would not be able to apply.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that then the experience should be reduced to 3 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that the engineering graduates are typically very good in these things. When the students do

engineering, they do these things at their own. As such, all engineers are very good in such things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the page making is completely a specialized job.

The Vice Chancellor said that their engineering graduates, in addition to their subject/s, they learn so many things. In fact, they do not learn from their teachers, but from each other. It is the peer group that teaches these things.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that then it should be graduation in any discipline.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they make the scope a little bit wider, better candidates would apply.

The Vice Chancellor said that 10+2 with experience should be made eligible.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would not be able to give this grade pay to the candidate having done only 10+2. So it should be graduation in any discipline with at least two years' experience.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the test should also be conducted before interviewing the candidates.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the number of candidates is large, they have to conduct the test.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the experience should be reduced to one year as they are going to conduct the test.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that one year's experience is too less.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that Shri Ashok Goyal has raised two issues – one relating to qualification, and another relating to procedure of appointment. They have proposed the qualifications as B.C.A., B.Tech., etc. because the requirement is of page maker, photoshop, printing, etc., which need computing and designing work. In fact, these are the part of syllabus of B.C.A. and B.Tech. The students study and learn these things in their course/s, and it is not being taught in 10+2, B.A., etc. These are the things, which are upgraded after every 2-3 months. As such, the candidates having done B.C.A. or B.Tech. would be able to get themselves updated with the new technologies. This was the major reason that the persons appointed in the Press were not able to do the work as these things are changing very frequently. The Committee was comprised of technical persons and it also included Manager Press, who were of the considered opinion that candidates having done B.C.A. or B.Tech. should be made eligible because the others are unable to do this job. So far as experience is concerned, they have proposed experience in Press working, knowledge of Corol draw, Page Maker, Photoshop and M.S. Word subject to qualifying the trade test, and the experience has been kept desirable, that too, a specialized person, who has experience of Press. There are several shops in the Campus, and they had taken feedback from them, and they have been told that the less

qualified persons become experts within a very less time, and disappear after six months or one year because they could not cope up with the changed technologies, and they have to spend six months or so for learning the changed things. To have an effective person so that he/she could work here in the Press according to the requirements, they have proposed B.C.A. and B.Tech. qualifications.

The Vice Chancellor said that he thinks that these are minimum qualifications, and thus, should be accepted.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they do not want that a less qualified person should be appointed, but he would like to clarify that several persons who are doing graduation in the morning, they usually do such job in the evening, and they are very good in it. Whether it is B.A. or B.Tech. or B.C.A., if one does not update himself/herself, he/she would not be able to cope with the work as the technology is changing at a very fast pace, i.e., fortnightly. As such, every candidate has to update himself/herself even if he/she has done B.C.A. or B.Tech.

Professor Shelley Walia said that one thing which needs to be kept in mind is that sometimes the person/s has/have to working in the night as sometimes the work is to be completed within a stipulated time. As such, they need such persons who are willing to working till late night.

RESOLVED: That the following qualification, be prescribed for the post of Electronic Typewriting-cum-photo composing Machine Operator in the pay-scale of 10300-34800+GP Rs.3200/-, in P.U. Press:

Sr. No.	Name of the Post	Proposed Qualification
1.	Electronic Typewriter-cum-photo composing Machine Operator (10300-34800+GP Rs.3200/-)	B.C.A./B.Tech. (Computer Science) OR Graduate with Computer Science as subject and 2 year experience in Desktop Publishing Desirable:- Experience in Press working, Knowledge of Coral Draw, Page Maker, Photoshop, and MS Office etc. Subject to qualifying the trade test.

Transfer Policy of faculty within the University System

76. Considered the policy for transfer of faculty within the University System (**Appendix-CVI**).

NOTE: The recommendations of the Committee dated 02.11.2015 (**Appendix-CVI**) with regard to framing a policy to consider applications for transfer of faculty within the Panjab University System were approved by the

Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate.

The matter was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016/ 14.03.2016 for ratification and it was resolved that the ratification of Item No. 64-R(i) be deferred **(Appendix-CVI)**.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is the transfer policy, which is existing in the system, which they are having at the moment. He read out the recommendations of the Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is a lot of heart burning amongst the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that he understands what he (Professor Malhotra) is saying.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had said several times, that they should transfer anybody or appoint anybody, but a substitute of Dr. Jasbir Singh must be provided at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is already on the job, and he has already spoken to the Director, P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni. He has told him (Director) that session would not commence, without the faculty members in place.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that appointment/s should be made there, irrespective of whether the same is/are on regular basis or on *ad hoc*/contract basis.

The Vice Chancellor said that even though he had talked to the Director, he would pursue it further.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is a person at the Regional Centre, whom they could not face. They should try to find the solution to the problem. When Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred, he said that the consideration should not be deferred, but a solution should be found.

The Vice Chancellor said that alright, they would form a small Sub-Committee of the Syndicate to suggest as to what are the exceptional circumstances, which could be accepted; otherwise, they accept the recommendation/s of the Committee.

Professor Anil Monga said that since it is written in the appointment letter, if there is a requirement of the University, the transfer should be done by the University itself, instead of on the request of any individual.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it should not be done by the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee was free to recommend anything, and the Committee was also aware of all these things; and the Committee has chosen to recommend only this. The Committee consciously did not answer these questions.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is sure that he (Vice Chancellor) would not make any more transfers. The former Vice Chancellor (Professor R.C. Sobti) had also made certain transfers, and he knew from where the pressure was exerted on him. But somehow when he realized that he has opened a Pandora's box, he cancelled those transfers and saved his life.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they had framed this transfer policy, but if it is challenged in the Court of Law, he is 100% sure that it would be scrapped. When there are transfer policies of Central and State Governments, why they are going for this policy. He is neither against nor in favour of this policy, but he wants only transparent and feasible transfer policy. Citing an example, he said that if there is a couple case or a medical emergency case or any other compelling reason, they have to make the transfer. They should have transparent and effective transfer policy to avoid man-to-man politics so that one might not have to go after any member of the Syndicate or the Senate, and the transfer should be made automatically, as per the rules.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that why there is a need to write in the appointment letter that his/her services could be utilized in another allied Department/Institute, especially when the P.U. Regional Centres, P.U. Constituent Colleges, Institutes, etc. are all part of the University.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, as said by Dr. Ranga, in couple cases, the transfer could be made.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee has made recommendation/s in accordance to its wisdom. To have more thought on it if they want to constitute a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate to examine it and make recommendation/s, he is okay with that.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That a small Committee, including Dean of University Instruction and President, PUTA, be constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to look into the whole issue; and the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Deferred Item

78. Considered the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor that the delay for submission of application for grant of temporary affiliation to the new proposed College namely-Multi Disciplinary professional College, Attam Pahad, Garacharma village, Andaman and Nicobar, Port Blair for (i) Architecture Planning (UG), (ii) Management (PG) and (iii) Fine Arts (UG), for the session 2016-17, be condoned.

- NOTE:**
1. Letter dated 22.04.2016 of Principal Secretary (Edu/UD/Rev/ DM), Andaman and Nicobar Administration, Secretariat, Port Blair along with affidavit enclosed.
 2. The Dean College Development Council has made the following observation:

“Since the Jurisdiction of Panjab University has been defined under re-organization Act of the 1966 of the Punjab Govt. as per regulation enumerated in P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, and the University has been conferred the special status of Inter-state body Corporate, the request of the U.T. Administration of Andaman and Nicobar for seeking of affiliation of the proposed courses with the P.U. can be considered subject to the required permission by way of notification of M.H.R.D. As a special permission on which process is under way as can be discerned from mark ‘A’ and ‘B’ which is a part of the Affidavit furnished by Chief Secretary Andaman and Nicobar Administration (A&N), Port Blair.

3. A survey-cum-affiliation Committee has been constituted by the Vice-Chancellor. However, the process is subject to the required permission by notification/special permission of M.H.R.D. or appropriate authority as per section-39 of the Panjab University Act-1947.
4. The College authorities vide E-mail dated 06.05.2016 has informed that they have deposited the affiliation fee of Rs.2,10,000/- through RTGS mode.
5. An office note enclosed.

The Vice Chancellor stated that this is an application made to them by a Union Territory, which is located far away, which was once a part of their University. But when the University of Pondicherry came into being, this got disaffiliated from them and got affiliated to University of Pondicherry; and from many years they are with the University of Pondicherry. Now, they are facing certain difficulties and he had an opportunity to learn as to what are their difficulties. In fact, the University of Pondicherry is not cooperating with them, and now they want to affiliate with Panjab University, of course, they have to seek approval from the AICTE and other regulatory bodies, and the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) is helping them to get the approval from the regulatory bodies. As such, now they want to explore the possibility of getting affiliation from Panjab University. Alright, they had sent a Team, which has recommended the affiliation, but they could go to this extent, that until the Central Government helps them via the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) to let Panjab University affiliate that College, legally they would be in a trap. Meaning thereby, till they did not get approval from the Centre, whatever they have conveyed to them, it is just in principle, and is not implementable. There is a provision in the Calendar that the Centre could do it. They could inform them that they are not hesitant to do it, but that is all about, as they could not go beyond this.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that someone posed a question to him and he wants a clarification from them that if a group wants to open a College in Panchkula or in the interior of Haryana, whether it could have an affiliation from Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not have, until the Centre comes into the picture. If the Centre says that they could do this within such and such radius, and their Governing Body accepts the same, only then it could be done. As such, there are two parties involved in it. One could argue that till the Centre does not permit them, they should not process it. But this argument has become theoretical because he has permitted them to do it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired is there not the requirement of revisiting the territorial jurisdiction of Panjab University, and if so, it should be got considered by the Governance Reforms Committee so that the Colleges situated in Mohali and Panchkula could be affiliated to Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should voice their opinion and see as to how the society reacts to it. He further said that they have formed the Chandigarh Regional Innovation and Knowledge Cluster. Tomorrow, when Chandigarh goes into a Metropolis, though it is already a Metropolis, then there would be a Chandigarh Capital Regional (CCR) as is National Capital Region (NCR), but at the moment, they could not do anything. So the item is before them, but to the extent that if the Centre allows the territorial jurisdiction, only then this College could be affiliated to Panjab University; otherwise, it is just theoretical. If they failed to get it done from the Centre, they would not be able to do anything. His guess is that whatever their difficulties were with the University of Pondicherry, they would all disappear with the appointment of Ms. Kiran Bedi as Lt. Governor of Pondicherry.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to what they should do about this item.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not do much about it.

Some of the members suggested that the consideration of the item be deferred and the matter be referred to the Government of India as it is not within the purview of the Syndicate, and they do not have the mandate to do this because it is their current jurisdiction.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him propose a midway that if the Government of India issues a notification, and the College has to commence from middle of July 2016; and in view of the fact that they not having a meeting of the Syndicate in the month of June 2016, they could authorize him to take a decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had expressed his viewpoints in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, and perhaps, he might not be able to clear the things. In fact, he had stated that the bureaucrats, who are wishing to have this, should be told that these are the difficulties.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already inform Shri Vinay Sheel Oberoi in Delhi.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is no response from them because the item as it is brought to them, in fact, could not even be considered by them as that would be violative of not only the Panjab University Act, but also violative of Punjab Reorganization Act. To even show that they have done all this, it is violative and he has said this in the last meeting also. Now, to say that subject to, he wonders wherefrom the Dean, College Development Council, has written that this could be considered subject to required permission by way of notification from the MHRD. He wonders whether MHRD issues such notifications. In fact, such a notification is issued by the MHA. Secondly, the recommendation of the Inspection Committee says that by way of notification/permission from MHRD. They do not have any jurisdiction and subject to required permission by way of notification from the MHRD.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was in a conversation in Delhi where all these persons were there, including the Chief Secretary of Andaman.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has also been written 'Reorganization Act of Punjab Government', whereas Reorganization Act is a Parliamentary Act, but they are calling it a Punjab Government Act. So it is all confusing. Right now, they should not proceed with this. They have done inspection and other home work. Let the required permission come from the Centre. Secondly, since they wish to start the course/s from July, there is no hurry in it.

The Vice Chancellor said that alright, if need be, they would convene an emergent meeting of the Syndicate for the purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if an emergent meeting of the Syndicate is to be convened, it should not be convened before July. But take it granted that no such notification is going to be issued as it is not easy, reason being that everything is political. So far as grant of affiliation by the University to the Colleges situated in Panchkula and Mohali is concerned, it has also very big political ramification, and nowhere the Haryana Government has said that they want the Colleges in Panchkula should be affiliated to Panjab University. Show him any communication issued by the Haryana Government in this regard as also from the Punjab Government that they wish that the Colleges situated in Mohali should be affiliated with the Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no written communication, but he has been spoken to by Additional Chief Secretary of Haryana.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is all, in the air alone. He further said that, that is the practical approach, but when he (Vice Chancellor) has to evaluate the same thing from political angle, then everything vanishes; otherwise, practically there is no doubt about it that the Colleges situated in Panchkula and Mohali should be affiliated to Panjab University.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky suggested that State Capital Region (SCR) should be got made.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that whether the Colleges situated in Gurgaon, which is part of NCR, are affiliated with the Delhi University.

The Vice Chancellor said, 'Alright', they defer the consideration of the item.

RESOLVED: That the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision with regard to condonation of delay in the submission of application for grant of temporary affiliation to the new proposed College namely-Multi Disciplinary professional College, Attam Pahad, Garacharma village, Andaman and Nicobar, Port Blair for (i) Architecture Planning (UG), (ii) Management (PG) and (iii) Fine Arts (UG), for the session 2016-17, after obtaining the necessary permission from the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, relating to jurisdiction of Panjab University.

Promotion from Assistant Librarian (Stage-1) to Assistant Librarian (Stage-2) (Senior Scale), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at A.C. Joshi Library

92(i). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CVII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Librarian to Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage 1 to Stage 2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Mona Pall be promoted from Assistant Librarian to Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage 1 to Stage 2) at A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **01.04.2011**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of History, P.U.

92(ii). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of History, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Jasbir Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department of History, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **07.07.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Laws, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana

92(iii). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Laws, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rajnish Saryal be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) at University Institute of Laws, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **12.09.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib

92(iv). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rajneesh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **28.07.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib

92(v). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Monica be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **18.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib

92(vi). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Angrej Singh Gill be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **30.08.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Medical Physics, P.U., Chandigarh

92(vii). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Medical Physics, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vivek Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), at Centre for Medical Physics, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **01.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Deptt.-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, P.U., Chandigarh

92(viii). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ranvir Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), in the Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **10.04.2010**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Deptt. of Computer Science & Applications, P.U., Chandigarh

92(ix). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Anuj Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **20.12.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Mathematics, P.U. Chandigarh

92(x). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Mathematics, P.U. Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Surinder Pal Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), in the Department of Mathematics, P.U. Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **24.10.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U., Chandigarh.

92(xi). Considered minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXVII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Ms.) Amandeep be promoted from Assistant Professor in English (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in English (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **19.03.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Centre for Instrumentation & Microelectronics, P.U., Chandigarh

92(xii). Considered the minutes dated 25.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Centre for Instrumentation & Microelectronics, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Er. Ramesh Kumar Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), at University Centre for Instrumentation & Microelectronics, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **06.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professor at UIAMS, P.U., Chandigarh.

92(xiii). Considered minutes dated 26.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXIX**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor-1 (Gen.) Advt. No. 4/2014, at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Ms.) Monika Aggarwal be appointed Associate Professor (General) in at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, P.U., Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.

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

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. (Ms.) Nishi Sharma be placed on the Waiting List.

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.

2. A summary bio-data of the selected and waitlisted candidate enclosed. It had been certified that the selected and waitlisted 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 Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UBS, P.U., Chandigarh

92(xiv). Considered the minutes dated 26.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXX**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, P.U. Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Purva Kansal be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), at University Business School, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **29.01.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000+ AGP Rs.9,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Geography, P.U. Chandigarh

92(xv). Considered minutes dated 27.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXXI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Geography, P.U. Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Ms.) Simrit Kahlon be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), in the Department of Geography, P.U. Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **30.04.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000+ AGP Rs.9,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in

compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, P.U. Chandigarh

92(xvi). Considered minutes dated 27.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXXII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Renu Thakur be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, P.U. Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **26.09.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000+ AGP Rs.9,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, P.U., Chandigarh.

92(xvii). Considered minutes dated 27.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXXIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Associate Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Paru Bal Sidhu be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **26.05.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U., Chandigarh

92(xviii). Considered minutes dated 27.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXXIV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Chander Mohan be promoted from Associate Professor in Punjabi (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) in Punjabi, in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U.,

Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **19.07.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000+ AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letters of promotion/ appointment to the persons promoted/ appointed under Items **92(i) to 92(xviii)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Issue regarding appointment of new Dean of University Instruction

93. Considered the appointment of new Dean of University Instruction, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one year, w.e.f. the date of joining, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

- NOTE:**
1. Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

“The Senate, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, may, from time to time appoint one of the University Professors to hold the office of the Dean of University Instruction. The term of appointment shall be for one year which may be renewed for one year more. *The amount and nature of the allowance to be granted to the Dean of University Instruction for performing the duties attached to this office shall be as determined by the Syndicate at the time of appointment”.

2. Professor A.K. Bhandari, Department of Mathematics was appointed as Dean University Instruction, w.e.f. 1.2.2014 and his term was extended for another year w.e.f. 1.2.2015, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 vide Senate Para VIII dated 29.3.2015. His term as such will be ending on 31.1.2016.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.1.2016/6.2.2016 (Para 12) (**Appendix-CXXV**) has resolved that:

- (1) since Professor P.S. Jaswal is the senior-most Professor in both the lists, it be recommended to the Senate that Professor P.S. Jaswal, be appointed the next Dean of University Instruction of Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date he joins, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007;
 - (2) Professor P.S. Jaswal be given the formal offer of DUIShip, and wait for the outcome. However, if he declines, the matter be again placed before the Syndicate along with the final/approved seniority list of Professors of Panjab University. In the meantime, the correct seniority list of Professors of the University be prepared; and
 - (3) until the next Dean of University Instruction joins, Professor A.K. Bhandari be requested to continue as the Dean of University Instruction of the University.
4. Accordingly, a letter No. 2891-92/ Estt.I dated 21.3.2016 (**Appendix-CXXV**) was sent to Professor P.S. Jaswal for his consent whether he would consider to accept the appointment as Dean of University Instruction, Panjab University, with immediate effect.
 5. In response to above letter, Professor P.S. Jaswal vide letter dated 25.1.2016 (**Appendix-CXXV**) has informed that he would prefer to continue with his present assignment as the Vice-Chancellor of RGNUL, Punjab. Hence, it will not be possible for me to join as Dean of University Instruction in P.U., Chandigarh during the period of leave as sanctioned to him
 6. List of Professors in Panjab University enclosed (**Appendix-CXXV**).

The Vice Chancellor said that he has said that he would like to propose the name of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, University Business School, as the next Dean of University Instruction.

To this, a few members gave their nod.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he thinks that they had discussed in detail in the last meeting, and it was the Vice Chancellor, who had said that it does not matter even if the matter is delayed for a few months, but they should first prepare the master seniority list of teachers. According to that, he had received a message from the Registrar to convene the meeting. Though he was waiting for the minutes to come, he received a message to convene the meeting of the Committee at the earliest. He does not know whether any notice for the meeting has been issued or not, but he has not received any such notice. What is the change they had undergone?

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever master seniority list would be there, but the seniority of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta is not going to change.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that even the seniority of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta is also going to change. He has done some rough homework, whereby his seniority is going to be shifted. However, it depends what the Committee recommends and what the Syndicate decides as to how it is to be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the seniority of the persons appointed/promoted before 01.01.2006 would not be affected in any manner.

The Vice Chancellor said that, earlier, they had offered the DUIShip to Professor P.S. Jaswal on the basis of that very seniority list. When Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Jaswal's seniority is not going to be affected in any manner, the Vice Chancellor said that the seniority of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta is also not going to be affected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are persons, who would become senior to Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, if they have to go as per the UGC.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could not shift back to 01.01.2006.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not go back from 01.01.2006.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then what is the idea of making the Committee?

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to simply apply the rules of the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that means, they have already taken the decision that – (i) they would not touch anybody before 01.01.2006; and (ii) they have already adopted the formula that they would do after 01.01.2006, but from which date they would do, it is to be decided by them. That means, the purview of the Committee is only to decide this.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is if the Court judgement has come that the age of superannuation has been made 65 years, but that has not come and they did not know when it would come. When further argued by Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor

Keshav Malhotra, the Vice Chancellor said that personally he is not hopeful when the Court judgement would come, and he does not want the University's administration to be dependent on the judgement of the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not concerned about the judgement, and instead they are only concerned as to how to make the master seniority list. If they prepared the master seniority list, the same would be placed before the Syndicate, and that is what was discussed in the last meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now, they are doing as per the old seniority, and the seniority of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, which is of before 2006, is not going to change. In the background of that he would like to propose the name of Professor Dinesh Gupta as DUI.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the seniority of persons before 2006 is also going to change. Citing an example, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if somebody is appointed before 1996, and somebody who is promoted in 1998 w.e.f. 1995, as per UGC the person promoted with effect from 1995 is senior.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the new guidelines of the UGC came in 2009, but only w.e.f. 2006.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that does not mean, that if somebody has been declared earlier junior, he/she would remain junior during the entire service.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not want to open the issue to such an extent. Secondly, he has been asked by the Senate to accomplish this job within a stipulated period. The Vice Chancellor said that anyway, it is not written anywhere that the senior-most Professor has to be the Dean of University Instruction. Since Professor Dinesh K. Gupta is amongst the senior-most Professors, he would like to propose the name of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta as the next Dean of University Instruction.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that at one point of time, when Professor R.P. Bambah was the senior-most Professor, he had been offered the DUIship.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to propose the name of Professor Dinesh Gupta for the DUIship.

Some of the members said, "Right Sir".

The Vice Chancellor sought the opinion of the members one by one.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky, Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Anil Monga, Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi (7 members) favoured the proposal.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they had said several times that the members should not be asked to say 'Yes Sir' or 'No Sir'.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if they do not make the master seniority list now because of the expediency, then they would never ever be able to make the seniority list.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could make the seniority list, and since the tenure of the Dean of University Instruction (DUI) is only one year, they could appoint the next DUI as per the seniority list which would be prepared by the Committee and approved by the Syndicate and Senate. He further said that, at the moment, they appointed the DUI only for a period of one year. The Vice Chancellor said that he is proposing the name of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta and asked Professor Shelley Walia to give his specific opinion, and he is not willing to explain more than what he has already done.

Professor Shelley Walia said that, usually, he does not vote.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever he (Vice Chancellor) said.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Professor Dinesh K. Gupta is his friend.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a question of friendship. He knew that Professor Dinesh K. Gupta is an experienced Professor and he has standing amongst his peer group; and he is happy to work with him. There is no issue at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that Professor Dinesh K. Gupta was experienced six months earlier also. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if the Syndicate has taken a stand to prepare the master seniority list, the same should be honoured. Once the master seniority list is prepared, they would themselves see that changes in the seniority are there. They have already done enough study in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Keshav Malhotra to give his specific opinion only.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that why could they not wait up to July 2016.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not proposing that they should wait up to July.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, "Alright".

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is also of the opinion that they should wait up to July 2016.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that he is also of the same opinion as expressed by Shri Dua.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that because of this their master seniority list would be ready. What is going to happen in a month? If this was with them before six months, why did not appoint the DUI six months before. What has happened now, that they are suddenly proposing to appoint the next DUI?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if this how the Vice Chancellor keeps on changing his stand, he wonders what would happen in future.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that sometimes the Vice Chancellor said that they become arbitrary, but now he himself is changing his stand. Today what has happened that they are proposing, but six months back they were not ready for this?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, in fact, 15 days before they were saying that they could wait for two months, and in the meantime, prepare the master seniority list of teachers.

RESOLVED: That Professor Dinesh K. Gupta, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be appointed the next Dean of University Instruction of Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date he joins, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, and he be issued appointment letter, in the anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Withdrawn Item

94. Considered request dated 29.03.2016 of Shri Sudhir Mehra, Assistant Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U., with regard to extension of the date of registration of voters for Senate election 2016.

NOTE: The observation of the DUI reproduced below:

“There is no need to extend the date of registration. However, the facts stated in the representation are not fully correct. For defence personnel there is special provision in Calendar Volume I, page 68. Also the regulations regarding election of Senate do not prohibit creation of a polling booth anywhere. The allocation of voters to any suitable booth is also possible under the existing regulation, only all the booths have to be got approved from the Syndicate.”

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired why and under which provision it has come to the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction, has written that the allocation of voters to any suitable booth is also possible under the existing regulation, only all the booths have to be got approved from the Syndicate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that allocation of booth/s means change of address.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the item for consideration of the Syndicate is with regard to extension of the date of registration of voters for Senate election 2016. Whether they could extend the date of registration of voters for the Senate election 2016, and if not, the item should be withdrawn.

RESOLVED: That Item C-94 on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn.

Confirmation of Dr. Parminder Singh as Director, Physical Education & Sports

95. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the following person working as Director, Physical Education & Sports, Directorate of Sports, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned against his name:

Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
Dr. Parminder Singh Director Physical Education & Sports Directorate of Sports, P.U., Chandigarh	10.03.2015 (A.N.)	11.03.2016

Information contained in Office Note (**Appendix-CXXVI**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following person working as Director, Physical Education & Sports, Directorate of Sports, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned against his name:

Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
Dr. Parminder Singh Director Physical Education & Sports Directorate of Sports, P.U., Chandigarh	10.03.2015 (A.N.)	11.03.2016

Confirmation of certain Programmers

96. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following programmers working in the Departments mentioned against each, be confirmed on completion of one year of probation in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, under Rule (viii), page 128, P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2009:

Sr. No.	Name/ Department	Date of Joining	Date of completion of one year probation	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Shri Mohinder Singh Negi Programmer Department of Computer Science & Application	30.05.2014	29.05.2015	30.05.2015
2.	Shri Ankur Kukreja Programmer Computer Centre	09.07.2014	08.07.2015, L.W.P. 63 days (2 months 3 days)	12.09.2015
3.	Shri Balram Sooden Programmer Computer Centre	19.08.2014	18.08.2015	13.09.2015

- NOTE:** 1. Rule (viii) appearing at page 128, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 is reproduced below:

“the members of the University staff will be confirmed from the date of successful completion of probationary period without prejudice to the inter-seniority recommended by a Selection Committee and approved by the competent authority.”

2. Earlier the above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.11.2015 (Para 11) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred and the matter be re-examined, if need be, legally also.
3. An office note containing brief history of the case and legal opinion of the Senior Law Officer enclosed (**Appendix-CXXVII**).

Professor Anil Monga said that one person should not be made to suffer due to the cause of other. However, in the case under consideration, a person is going to suffer because his (Balram Sooden) confirmation is being deferred for about 25 days as the person, who is senior to him has been granted leave without pay for 63 days.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the person, who is placed higher in the merit/rank, should not be allowed to harm the person, placed lower in the merit, because of some action of the person placed higher in the merit. As there is a provision, they could confirm Shri Balram Sooden w.e.f. 18.08.2015 (i.e. from due date), and to keep Shri Ankur Kukreja senior to him, he should be confirmed w.e.f. 08.07.2015 (i.e. from due date) by reducing the probation period.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following programmers working in the Departments mentioned against each, be confirmed on completion of one year of probation in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, under Rule (viii), page 128, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009:

Sr. No.	Name/ Department	Date of Joining	Date of completion of one year probation	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Shri Mohinder Singh Negi Programmer Department of Computer Science & Application	30.05.2014	29.05.2015	30.05.2015
2.	Shri Ankur Kukreja Programmer Computer Centre	09.07.2014	08.07.2015, L.W.P. 63 days (2 months 3 days)	17.08.2015

3.	Shri Balram Sooden Programmer Computer Centre	19.08.2014	18.08.2015	18.08.2015
----	---	------------	------------	------------

Amendment of Rules

97. Considered if following amendment in Rule 2 (a) and (b) and Rule 13.1 at page 434 and 436, respectively of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, with regard to submission of online re-evaluation forms, under Semester System for under graduate and post graduate examinations:

Existing Rule 2 (a) and (b) at page 434	Proposed Amendments
<p>2(a) An application for re-evaluation on the prescribed form along with requisite fee shall reach the University office under a registered cover within 21 days from the date of declaration of the result of the particular examination (for this purpose the date printed on the result gazette/notification shall be taken as the date of declaration) or within 15 days from the date of dispatch of result card by the University Office whichever is later.</p> <p>2(b) In the case of foreign students who leave for their countries before the declaration of the their results, the candidates of Correspondence Studies as also for the candidates from Port Blair, Arunachal Pradesh, students of Sikkim and other States/Union Territories of North-Eastern region, Military Personnel, Para Military forces i.e. B.S.F., C.R.P.F. & I.T.B.P. etc. and wards of Military Personnel the last date for receipt of applications and fee for re-evaluation is 30 days from the date of dispatch of the result card by the University Office to the College/candidate.</p>	<p>2(a) A candidate who wishes to seek re-evaluation under semester system of his/her answer-book/s may apply for re-evaluation through online process only within 21 days from the date of declaration of results of the particular examination (for this purpose the date printed on the result gazette/notification shall be taken as the date of declaration) and there is no submission of re-evaluation form with late fee as well as date of dispatch of D.M.C.</p> <p>2(b) In the case of foreign students who leave for their countries before the declaration of the their results, and the candidates from Port Blair, Arunachal Pradesh, students of Sikkim and other States/Union Territories of North-Eastern region, Military Personnel, Para Military forces i.e. B.S.F., C.R.P.F. & I.T.B.P. etc. and wards of Military Personnel, the last date for submission of online applications and fee for re-evaluation is 30 days from the date of declaration of results.</p>
Existing Rule 13.1 at page 436	Proposed Amendments
<p>13.1 All entries in the application for re-evaluation should be completed and corrected in all respects. The office will not be responsible for the delay/rejection of the case, if the form is not complete in all respects or not accompanied by full fee and/ or detailed marks card/ certificate. No change in the entries once made by the candidate shall be allowed after the receipt of application by the University office. However, a candidate shall be allowed</p>	<p>13.1 All entries in the online applications for re-evaluation should be completed and corrected in all respects. The office will not be responsible for the delay/rejection of the case. No change in the entries once made by the candidate shall be allowed after submission of online fee.</p>

<p>for deletion/addition of one or more subject (s) paper (s) for which application for re-evaluation has been received within the due date along with requisite fee (for addition of subject(s)/paper(s). The refund of fee shall not be granted.</p> <p>However, if a candidate requests for return of the detailed marks card/certificate to apply for admission elsewhere, the detailed marks card/certificate be returned to the candidate after getting an undertaking that his/her result for re-evaluation shall be declared only when he/ she returns the original detailed marks card/ certificate.</p>	
---	--

Information contained in Office Note (**Appendix-CXXVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That Rules 2(a) and (b) and Rule 13.1 at page 434 and 436, respectively of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, with regard to submission of online re-evaluation forms, under Semester System for under graduate and post graduate examinations, be amended as under:

Existing Rule 2 (a) and (b) at page 434	Proposed Amendments
<p>2(a) An application for re-evaluation on the prescribed form along with requisite fee shall reach the University office under a registered cover within 21 days from the date of declaration of the result of the particular examination (for this purpose the date printed on the result gazette/notification shall be taken as the date of declaration) or within 15 days from the date of dispatch of result card by the University Office whichever is later.</p> <p>2(b) In the case of foreign students who leave for their countries before the declaration of their results, the candidates of Correspondence Studies as also for the candidates from Port Blair, Arunachal Pradesh, students of Sikkim and other States/Union Territories of North-Eastern region, Military Personnel, Para Military forces i.e. B.S.F., C.R.P.F. & I.T.B.P. etc. and wards of Military Personnel the last date for receipt of applications and fee for re-evaluation is</p>	<p>2(a) A candidate who wishes to seek re-evaluation under semester system of his/her answer-book/s may apply for re-evaluation through online process only within 21 days from the date of declaration of results of the particular examination (for this purpose the date printed on the result gazette/notification shall be taken as the date of declaration) and there is no submission of re-evaluation form with late fee as well as date of dispatch of D.M.C.</p> <p>2(b) In the case of foreign students who leave for their countries before the declaration of their results, and the candidates from Port Blair, Arunachal Pradesh, students of Sikkim and other States/Union Territories of North-Eastern region, Military Personnel, Para Military forces i.e. B.S.F., C.R.P.F. & I.T.B.P. etc. and wards of Military Personnel, the last date for submission of</p>

30 days from the date of dispatch of the result card by the University Office to the College/candidate.	online applications and fee for re-evaluation is 30 days from the date of declaration of results.
Existing Rule 13.1 at page 436	Proposed Amendments
<p>13.1 All entries in the application for re-evaluation should be completed and corrected in all respects. The office will not be responsible for the delay/rejection of the case, if the form is not complete in all respects or not accompanied by full fee and/ or detailed marks card/certificate. No change in the entries once made by the candidate shall be allowed after the receipt of application by the University office. However, a candidate shall be allowed for deletion/addition of one or more subject(s) paper(s) for which application for re-evaluation has been received within the due date along with requisite fee (for addition of subject(s)/paper(s). The refund of fee shall not be granted.</p> <p>However, if a candidate requests for return of the detailed marks card/certificate to apply for admission elsewhere, the detailed marks card/certificate be returned to the candidate after getting an undertaking that his/her result for re-evaluation shall be declared only when he/ she returns the original detailed marks card/ certificate.</p>	<p>13.1 All entries in the online applications for re-evaluation should be completed and corrected in all respects. The office will not be responsible for the delay/rejection of the case. No change in the entries once made by the candidate shall be allowed after submission of online fee.</p>

Recommendations of the Standing Committee to oversee the effective implementation of policies and programmes of GoI for SC/ST 98. Considered minutes –

- (A) dated 11.12.2015 (**Appendix-CXXIX**) of the Standing Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to (i) oversee the effective implementation of policies and programmes of Government of India, U.G.C. and State Government for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and (ii) to suggest follow-up measures for achieving the objectives and target laid down in respect of these reserved categories.
- (B) dated 21.12.2015 (**Appendix-CXXIX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to supervise the work of Scholarship/stipends/free-ships to be conferred to the SC/ST students under various schemes.

Information contained in Office Note (**Appendix-CXXIX**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the –

- (1) Standing Committee dated 11.12.2015 (**Appendix-CXXIX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to (i) oversee the effective implementation of policies and programmes of Government of India, U.G.C. and State Government for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and (ii) to suggest follow-up measures for achieving the objectives and target laid down in respect of these reserved categories, be approved; and
- (2) Committee dated 21.12.2015 (**Appendix-CXXIX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to supervise the work of Scholarship/stipends/free-ships to be conferred to the SC/ST students, under various schemes, be approved.

Recommendations of the Committee with regard to 5% penalty levied upon M/s A.K. Gupta Construction Pvt. Ltd.

99. Considered minutes of the Committee of the Senior Tender dated 18.03.2016 (**Appendix-CXXX**) with regard to the 5% penalty levied upon M/s A.K. Gupta Construction Pvt. Ltd. for construction of Medical Institute and Hospital (100 Bedded) in P.U. South, Chandigarh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in fact, 10% penalty was imposed on the M/s A.K. Gupta Construction Pvt. Ltd. for the delay in the construction of Medical Institute and Hospital (100 Bedded). Since the contractor had died during the construction of the building, they decided to decrease the penalty from 10% to 5%. Moreover, some amount of the Contractor has already been deducted. Therefore, the penalty of 5% should be approved.

Professor Anil Monga said that since in the papers 2.5% has also been mentioned, it should be clarified whether the penalty is 5% or 2.5%.

It was clarified that at one point of time, they had decided to impose a penalty of 2.5%, but later on, they finally decided to impose the penalty 5% for the delay in construction.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he had sent an e-mail to the Registrar regarding an online tendering case.

It was informed that the rates were prior approved.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that but the rates were not uploaded on the Website. Anyhow, whatever clarification he sought about the XEN office, the same is not being provided to him. He stated that he is continuously writing to the Registrar about the functioning of the XEN office, but he is not being replied to. He is raising for the last about four years, but why action is not being taken against the XEN office. Whenever they raised the issue, it is said that the reply would be given, but actually the same is not given. If it is happening to a member of the Syndicate and the Senate, what would be happening to an ordinary person?

It was clarified that necessary directions for implementing e-tenders had been issued to XEN-I Office. Other issues raised by Dr. Ajay Ranga have also been addressed. Making allegations to office of Registrar is not acceptable.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Ranga) is expecting answer either from the Registrar or the Vice Chancellor. Is he accusing both of them that they are the guardians of the XEN?

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that why the reply is not being given to him for the last about two years. He is just asking the authority that when a problem is being raised again and again, why the same is not being addressed.

The Vice Chancellor asked Dr. Ranga as to what problem is not being addressed to. He does not want this to be dual. Let him proceed with the agenda, and he would see him (Dr. Ranga) after the meeting. He requested not to indulge in such things and use the forum of Syndicate for this purpose.

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Committee 18.03.2016 (**Appendix**), 5% amounting to Rs.13,73,965/- earlier deducted penalty, be remain as such and the balance 5%, i.e., Rs.13,73,965/- penalty, be waived off.

Deferred Item

100. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 30.03.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to review rent and allied charges for all Guest Houses of the University namely Panjab University Main Guest House, Golden Jubilee Guest House, Faculty House, Teachers Holiday Home, Shimla, Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan, Teachers Holiday Home, Dalhousie, etc.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that the University Guest House, Faculty House, etc. are being used by the outstation persons, and few teachers and Principals of the affiliated Colleges should have been associated with the Committee. Only two persons were associated with the Committee (one belonging to Registered Graduates' Constituency and another Principals' Constituency), but both could not attend the meeting of the Committee on the given day. However, no teacher from the affiliated Colleges was associated with the Committee. Since the facility is used by the teachers of the affiliated Colleges maximum, it would have been better, had few teachers of the affiliated Colleges were also associated with the Committee? If they (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Principal S.K. Arora) were absent on the day of the meeting, the meeting should have been called again. Anyhow, he has two-three objections. Referring to the proposed rate of Rs.200 for Room and Rs.300 for Suite for Panjab University Fellows/Ex-Fellows for personal visit, Dr. Sandhu said that whenever they come and stay in the University Guest House or the Faculty House, they come here to do some work, maybe, of their fellow colleagues, whom they are representing. He does not feel that anybody comes here for to personal work alone. He suggested that for the existing Fellows, the rate should not be changed (kept at Rs.65) as had been done at Sr. No.1. So far as Ex-Fellows are concerned, for them the rates should be increased nominally.

The Vice Chancellor said that the personal visit/s has/have to be distinguished.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he does not feel that a Fellow comes for his own personal work. However, they could not keep Fellows and Ex-Fellows in the same category. These recommendations have been made by his friends from the University alone, who do not know the factual position about the Guest/Faculty Houses. He vehemently pleaded that the Committee should be reconstituted in which a few teachers and Principal of affiliated Colleges should be associated so that appropriate recommendations are made.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they want to reconsider it, it is okay with him. He added that it is very expensive to maintain the Guest/Faculty Houses.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the Committee should be enlarged to consider the issue again.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that at least two teachers and two Principals of the affiliated Colleges should be made members of the enlarged Committee.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the condition of electric/electronic gadgets, which have been provided in the Guest House, has deteriorated as they are very old. A person of the XEN Office should be asked to make the survey and identify the items which need replacement immediately. In fact, a lot of improvement is required in the University Guest/Faculty Houses.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the Committee come back with the rates in the first phase and in the second phase make suggestions as to what is to be done. When Professor Keshav Malhotra raised the issue of quality of food items provided in the Guest House, the Vice Chancellor said that he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) should assume the responsibility for suggesting the changes and ensure that it is completed by this Syndicate and is not left to the next Syndicate. They should look at all the things comprehensively, and in the first phase give him just the rates of rent for the next 12 months. When they consider that more changes are required as also that the Guest/Faculty Houses need to generate more revenue, and they want to revise it 12 months later, they could revise that also.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that they are given a daily allowance of Rs.160/- per day, but it is impossible to have meal thrice a day with this meagre amount. He urged that they should not be paid any DA and in lieu of that they should be provided free meal.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee should take into consideration all these things and make recommendations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if any revision to take place, it should be based on the occupancy and what additional revenue they would be able to generate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would provide them everything, including how many are official visits, how many personal, etc., so that they are able to know the ups and downs. Whatever is in the electronic form, the same would be provided to the members of the Syndicate.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the booking of the College Bhawan should be made online.

The Vice Chancellor urged the members to look at the things one by one.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That a Committee comprising Dr. I.S. Sandhu (Chairman), Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky, Principal S.S. Sangha and A.R. Estate (Convener), be constituted to make recommendations with regard to the rent, in the first instance and thereafter other allied issues.

Recommendation of the Committee regarding minimum stay in the University/Research Centre by the Research Scholars

101. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 06.04.2016 (**Appendix-CXXXI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding an issue for provisions for doing any job during the tenure of Ph.D. programme by a Research Scholar.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether the teachers, who are working at UIET or UICET have to be present in the Institute concerned or an approved Research Centre for a minimum period of 36 weeks.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that it is for those students, who in between join some job, they have to be present in the Institute concerned or an approved Research Centre for a minimum period of 36 weeks; otherwise, they face problem on this count.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that earlier, they deprive the teachers from the Ph.D. on the basis of Course Work, and now they would deprive them on the basis of this 36 weeks condition also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that they are doing this because they are facing problem on this count.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that firstly, all the Research Centres, which have applied, should be approved, and only thereafter, this should be approved.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is disadvantage in not approving it. If they do not approve this, the existing rule would prevail according to which the requirement is 3 years. Use this as a ploy that all the Research Centres are approved quickly.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that as per the existing rule, the Ph.D. candidates are required to be present for three years.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he does not feel that a candidate, who is doing Ph.D. in the subject of History, is required to be present in the Department of History, Panjab University. Maybe, the science students are required to be present in the main Department.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they must frame the rules first so that they are able to solve the problems which are experienced from time to time. When further clarified by Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, in fact, the problems are being faced on in the cases of JRFs. If they want to frame any rule/s to sort out such

kind of problems, the rule/s should be made applicable only to the JRFs. The problem is whether the Ph.D. candidate could do a job during the Ph.D. Programme. There was a problem of time, and the time has been fixed.

Some of the members said that it should be made applicable only in the case of JRFs.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to help the person/s in drafting the resolved part.

RESOLVED: That every Research Scholar (JRF – Ph.D. student) is required to be present in the University Department or an approved Research Centre for a minimum period of 36 weeks, including the course work. They be allowed to take-up a job after taking leave from the University or an approved Research Centre.

Qualifications & duties for the post of Youth Development Officer

102. Considered if the following qualifications and duties for the post of two Welfare Officers (Male & Female) on fixed salary of Rs.15000/- per month, under budget head “Contractual Services” out of Youth Welfare Fund, be approved, as proposed by the Committee dated 25.01.2016 (**Appendix-CXXXII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor:

Qualifications for the Welfare Officers:

1. First Class Graduate or Second Class Postgraduate from any recognized University.
2. Candidates must have participated in National Youth Festival organized by Govt. of India or Inter-University Youth Festival organized by AIU or Punjab State Inter University Youth Festival organized by Punjab Government.
3. The candidate having administrative experience to organize Cultural Program or Youth Welfare Activities or Youth Training Camps in University or College will be preferred.

Duties for the Welfare Officers:

1. To assist the Director Youth Welfare during the Zonal/Inter Zonal Youth and Heritage Festivals, Seminars, Workshops, Meetings, Rehearsal-Meetings, Cultural Programmes, Production and distribution of Annual Magazine, publications and other functions to be organized by the Department time to time.
2. To plan, arrange and conduct the Youth Training Camps.
3. To look after the Youth Hostels/Students Holiday Home of the University.
4. To accompany the University Contingent during Inter University Festivals/Cultural Tours/ Youth Camps etc.
5. Any duty assigned by authority time to time.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it could not only a graduate. In fact, the candidate should at least be a postgraduate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is background of this proposal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the background is that the Director, Youth Welfare, says that they conducted so many Youth Festivals, and their hostel has also become very big; and they need person/s for that.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Youth Festival/s is/are held only during a limited period.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that usually the coaches accompany the teams.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should not be rejected out rightly. In fact, they should ask the Director to send the requirements along with the justification.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that they have already written that the duties of the Welfare Officers are to assist the Director Youth Welfare during the Zonal/Inter-Zonal Youth and Heritage Festivals, Seminars, Workshops, Meetings, Rehearsal-Meetings, etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is not a justification.

The Vice Chancellor enquired that do they have office staff.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have office staff.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they have the office, what the office staff is doing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it needs to be referred back. Secondly, the nomenclature of Welfare Officer is not appropriate at all. The nomenclature could be Youth Welfare or Youth Development Officer.

The Vice Chancellor said that since the salary of the person/s is only about Rs.15,000/-, they could not be even called Officers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been written that the persons concerned would be paid a fixed salary of Rs.15,000/- per month under budget head "Contractual Services". On the contract, what work they would get from them. Whether the requirement would be for the whole year or only for few months? He thinks these things needed to be clarified. As such, the item should be referred back and placed before the Syndicate again along with the clarifications. In fact, it needed to be discussed. He was always keen during all these years to be a member of the Youth Welfare Committee, but despite is request for six times or more, he was never made a member of the Youth Welfare Committee. They need to concentrate on Youth Welfare because it is the most neglected one. However, what purpose would be served by engaging the persons on a paltry sum of Rs.15000/- per month. It seems they would get work from these persons from here and there.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that the nomenclature should be changed to Field Officers.

The Vice Chancellor said that since the matter has to go to the Board of Finance, it should be properly worded.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that, technically 12 Youth Festivals are held and the same are conducted by the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that with the appointment of Director, Youth Welfare, a lot of improvement has been made.

Continuing, Principal S.S. Sangha said that earlier, Director, rarely came to the Youth Festivals at the Zonal level. Secondly, the Assistant Director, Youth Welfare is there for the last 4-5 years. Their main work is to take the students to the Inter-University and to hold a camp for the purpose and they also hold a summer camp. Thirdly, the requirement of these persons is not for the whole year. Therefore, it needs a review.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that it should be approved because the Director, Youth Welfare, got very less time to visit as so many Colleges hold Youth Festivals at a time. Since there are several technical problems, the presence of the technical person is required.

The Vice Chancellor said that alright, they accept that he (Director, Youth Welfare) needs help, but it has to be appropriately worded. When it was pointed out that it has been approved by the Board of Finance, the Vice Chancellor said, "Okay", then it should be appropriately written in the minutes of the Syndicate.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the nomenclature should be either Youth Development Officer or Coordinator.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That, as proposed by the Committee dated 25.01.2016 (**Appendix**), the following qualifications and duties, be approved, for the post of two Welfare Officers (Male & Female) on fixed salary of Rs.15000/- per month, under budget head "Contractual Services" out of Youth Welfare Fund:

Qualifications for the Welfare Officers:

1. First Class Graduate or Second Class Postgraduate from any recognized University.
2. Candidates must have participated in National Youth Festival organized by Govt. of India or Inter-University Youth Festival organized by AIU or Punjab State Inter University Youth Festival organized by Punjab Government.
3. The candidate having administrative experience to organize Cultural Program or Youth Welfare Activities or Youth Training Camps in University or College will be preferred.

Duties for the Welfare Officers:

1. To assist the Director Youth Welfare during the Zonal/Inter Zonal Youth and Heritage Festivals, Seminars, Workshops, Meetings, Rehearsal-Meetings, Cultural Programmes, Production and distribution of Annual Magazine, publications and other functions to be organized by the Department time to time.
2. To plan, arrange and conduct the Youth Training Camps.
3. To look after the Youth Hostels/Students Holiday Home of the University.
4. To accompany the University Contingent during Inter University Festivals/Cultural Tours/ Youth Camps etc.
5. Any duty assigned by authority time to time.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice Chancellor be authorized to decide the nomenclature of the post in consultation with the Director, Youth Welfare, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Permission to introduce M.Com. (Business Economics) in the Colleges and change of MBE to M.Com. (Business Economics) 103. Considered if –

- (i) M.Com. (Business Economics) be allowed in any of the College which so desires subject to extension of affiliation as per rules and monitored by DCDC/D.R.(C).
- (ii) MBE be changed to M.Com. (Business Economics) from the session 2016-17 and M.A. (Business Economics) be withdrawn from the prospectus of PU-CET (P.G.) 2016.

NOTE: 1. The Senate at its meeting held on 05.12.2015 (Para XLI (R-7)) has approved the recommendation of the Committee dated 07.09.2015 that Colleges be allowed to start M.Com. (Business Economics) or M.Com in lieu of MBE, if they wish, for the session 2015-17 and those students, who wish to join M.Com (Business Economics) be allowed to do so.

2. The requests of the Principal, Guru Nanak Girls College, Model Town, Ludhiana, and Principal D.A.V. College, Chandigarh for continuation of M.Com. (Business

Economics) for the coming session 2016-17 was placed as an Agenda item No.66 for consideration in the meeting of the Syndicate meeting dated 01.05.2016 and the same was **withdrawn in the adjourned meeting dated 15.05.2016**, as the College has filed the CWP No. 7499 of 2016.

3. Punjab and Haryana High Court has dismissed the CWP No. 7499 of 2016 on 19.5.2016 filed by Guru Nanak Education Trust, Model Town Ludhiana and Guru Nanak Girls College Model Town, Ludhiana relating to Item No. 66.
4. A detailed office note containing the brief history of the case enclosed.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) M.Com. (Business Economics) be allowed in any of the College which so desires subject to extension of affiliation as per rules and monitored by DCDC/D.R.(C).
- (ii) MBE be changed to M.Com. (Business Economics) from the session 2016-17 and M.A. (Business Economics) be withdrawn from the prospectus of PU-CET (P.G.) 2016.

Appointment of Honorary Director, CIIPP 104. Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 23.05.2016 (**Appendix-CXXXIII**) to consider the proposals for the appointment of Hony. Director, CIIPP for a period of three years.

RESOLVED: That Professor Sanjeev Puri, Biotechnology Branch, UIET, be appointed Honorary Director, Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP), for a period of three years.

Membership fee of Community Centre and Staff Club

105. Considered the recommendation (7) of the Committee dated 21.3.2016 (**Appendix-CXXXIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, and

After some discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the following membership fee of Community Centre and Staff Club of the University, be made compulsory for the teaching and non-teaching employees up to the level of 'A' class officers to be deducted from the salary. For re-employed employees it be optional:

Pay band-4	:	Rs.100/- p.m.
Pay band-3 (GP ≥ 6600)	:	Rs.75/- p.m.
Rest	:	Rs.50/- p.m.

Inspection Report

106. Considered if, temporary affiliation, be granted to newly proposed College namely Nightingale College of Education, V.P.O. Narangwal, District Ludhiana, for B.Ed. (Two years) course (100 seats) for the session 2015-16.

- NOTE:**
1. The Senate in its meeting held on 05.12.2015 (Para XLII) (I-3) (Sr. No.1) has noted the recommendations of the inspection Committee constituted by the Syndicate dated 22.04.2015, for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for certain courses/ subjects as mentioned against each for the session 2015-16, subject to the fulfillment of the conditions as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/s Survey Committee and the College shall pay the salaries to all the staff members as per UGC/Panjab University, Chandigarh norms by 31.10.2015.
 2. Accordingly, the Inspection Committee has visited the College on 22.04.2016 to verify the compliance submitted by the College for the said course/s/subject/s.

The observations/recommendations of the Committee was conveyed to the Principal of the College vide letter dated 07.05.2016 for compliance.

3. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

107. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to newly proposed College namely Bajaj College, Village-Gurah Chauki Mann, Ferozepur Road, Ludhiana, for (i) B.Com Course - 1st year (Semester), (ii) B.C.A. - 1st year, (iii) B.B.A - 1st year & (iv) B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) - 1st year, for the session 2015-16.

- NOTE:**
1. The Senate in its meeting held on 05.12.2015 (Para XLII) (I-3) (Sr. No. 3) has noted the recommendations of the inspection Committee constituted by the Syndicate dated 22.04.2015, for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for certain courses/subjects as mentioned against each for the session 2015-16, subject to the fulfillment of the conditions as pointed out by the Inspection

Committee/s Survey Committee and the College shall pay the salaries to all the staff members as per UGC/Panjab University, Chandigarh norms by 31.10.2015.

2. The Inspection Committee has visited the College on 09.04.2016 to verify the compliance submitted by the College for the said course/s/subject/s.

The observations/recommendations of the Committee was conveyed to the Chairman of the College vide letter dated 07.05.2016 for compliance.

3. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

108. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to newly proposed College namely Mata Baljinder Kaur Memorial Kaler International College, V.P.O. Samadh Bhai, District Moga, for (i) B.Com. - 1st year (One Unit) & (ii) B.A.I English(Compulsory)-Two units & English (Elective)-one unit, Punjabi (Compulsory)-Two units & Punjabi (Elective)-one unit, Economics (one unit), Mathematics (one unit), Hindi (one unit), Physical Education (one unit), Political Science (one unit), Sociology (one unit) and History (one unit), for the session 2015-16.

NOTE: 1. The Senate in its meeting held on 05.12.2015 (Para XLII) (I-3) (Sr. No. 5) has noted the recommendations of the inspection Committee constituted by the Syndicate dated 22.04.2015, for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for certain courses/subjects as mentioned against each for the session 2015-16, subject to the fulfillment of the conditions as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/s Survey Committee and the College shall pay the salaries to all the staff members as per UGC/Panjab University, Chandigarh norms by 31.10.2015.

2. Accordingly, the Inspection Committee has visited the College on 16.04.2016 to verify the compliance submitted by the College for the said course/s/subject/s.

The observations/recommendations of the Committee was conveyed to the Chairman of the College vide letters dated 01.09.2015, 03.05.2016 and 07.05.2016, respectively, for compliance.

3. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

109. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Distt. Ludhiana, for (i) B.A. 3rd year (Music) (Vocal)-E (Semester), (ii) B.Com. - 3rd year (2nd Unit) (Semester), (iii) B.B.A. - 3rd year (One Unit) (Semester), (iv) B.A. 1st year (Fine Arts)-E (Semester), for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfillment of the conditions that College will observe/ follow the other Instructions/Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC).

NOTE: 1. Letter dated No. A-8/4084 dated 26.04.2016 and the report of the Inspection Committee dated 09.04.2016 enclosed.

2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

110. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32-B, Chandigarh, for M.Phil. in Psychiatric Social Work (08 students per year), for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that College will obtain the mandatory approval from RCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

NOTE: 1. Letter dated No. A-6/3412 dated 06.04.2016 and the report of the Inspection Committee dated 21.04.2016 enclosed.

2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

111. Considered if:

- (i) temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32-B, Chandigarh, for B.Sc. Nursing Course, for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that College will obtain the mandatory approval from the Indian Nursing Council and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.
- (ii) Director Principal of Govt. Medical College & Hospital be requested to recruit the staff as per requirement of the Indian Nursing Council norms.

NOTE: 1. Report of the Inspection Committee dated 31.03.2016 enclosed.

2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

112. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Khalsa College for Women, Sidhwan Khurd, Distt. Ludhiana, for M.A. – I & II (Political Science) (One Unit) (Semester), for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfillment of the conditions that College will observe/ follow the other Instructions/Guidelines of the Panjab University/Punjab Govt./UGC).

NOTE: 1. Letter dated No. A-8/4083 dated 26.04.2016 and the report of the Inspection Committee dated 12.04.2016 enclosed.

2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

113. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32-B, Chandigarh, for M.Phil. Clinical Psychology (08 students per year), subject to the condition that College will obtain the mandatory approval from RCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter, for the session 2016-17.

NOTE: 1. Letter dated No. A-6/3920 dated 20.04.2016 and the report of the Inspection Committee dated 21.04.2016 enclosed.

2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

114. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation be granted to Brahmishi Yoga Training College, Sector-19, Chandigarh, for B.Ed. (Yoga) course 1st year & 2nd Year with maximum number of 20 students for the session 2016-17.

NOTE: 1. The Inspection Committee Report dated 06.05.2016 enclosed.

2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

115. Considered if, provisional extension of affiliation, be granted to Goswami Ganesh Dutt Sanatan Dharma College, Sector-32-C, Chandigarh, for B.Voc. (Food Processing & Preservation)-III year (50 students) and B.Voc. (Retail Management)-III year (50 students), for the session 2016-17.

- NOTE:** 1. Reports of the Inspection Committee dated 21.04.2016 enclosed.
2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

Inspection Report

116. Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to J.D. College of Education, Bathinda Road, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for B.Ed. Course 1st & 2nd year-(Two units i.e. 100 seats each), for the session 2016-17.

- NOTE:** 1. Inspection Report dated 19.04.2016 enclosed.
2. An office note enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Committee constituted under Item 56.

During a general discussion initiated after consideration of Item 56, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa interjected to state that the term of the Dean, College Development Council is going to be over in a few days.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University had never been without a Dean, College Development Council.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that as per UGC Rules, the Dean, College Development Council is appointed for 3 years, which may be extended for 3 years which limits the age up to 65 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that they were not discussing it at this stage, they could talk about it later.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the viewpoint of Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa was that the P.U. Librarian had got the stay beyond 60 years.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that these were the guidelines of the UGC and also Punjabi University, Patiala also had taken up to the age of superannuation to 65 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that this was not a matter under discussion. At the moment, they have advertised the position of Dean, College Development Council. The Syndicate had approved the item for advertisement. At this time, they are discussing the affiliation of the Colleges and the members should stick to that and not digress. He added that he was not permitting the discussion relating to Dean, College Development Council at that time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor might not permit the discussion but at some point the Vice Chancellor made a point that a particular thing of an urgent nature could be discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that this was not the matter of that kind. Panjab University has already advertised the position.

Shri Ashok Goyal added that who said that they ought not to go after what had been advertised.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not want discussion on Dean, College Development Council at this moment.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that they could think over it.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that something was in front of them.

The Vice Chancellor said that let them move on with the item before them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Vice Chancellor is reacting as he (Vice Chancellor) does not want to take the Syndicate in confidence.

The Vice Chancellor said that this was not so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if something was going to happen on 31st May, 2016 and the Vice Chancellor was answering that they need not worry, as the University had never been without Dean, College Development Council, probably, this is not taking the Syndicate into confidence. What was wrong if Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa had asked this question? They were not suggesting anything. To say, the Vice Chancellor did not even permit the discussion on it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not say that. First, they could handle the agenda items before them during the day and a half, and then could come back to it after considering all the items.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they also know that the Vice Chancellor had time constraints.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would come back to the arising out of the discussion items relating to the Dean, College Development Council at a subsequent stage.

.....

The above issue was commenced during general discussion that ensued after consideration of Item 56 on May 28, 2016.

At a subsequent stage, before the urgent items of ratification could be taken near the end of day, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa intervened again to add that there is a notification of the UGC dated 23.8.1985, which states that the tenure of the Director/Dean/Co-Ordinator, CDC, may be for three years. He/she may be re-appointed for another term of three years, but not beyond the age of 65 years. As such, the retirement age of Dean, College Development Council, could be 65 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that, but right now, the retirement age of all the University employees is 60 years. The extension from 60 years to 65 years for academic staff is a matter once again with the High Court. At the moment, the Dean, College Development Council, in Panjab University, to his understanding, is an administrative post, and for an administrative post, he does not know whether he is right or wrong, the retirement age for this position (i.e., Dean, College Development Council) is 60 years. If the Court tomorrow gives the decision that the retirement age for academics is 65 years, that would be a different story and different ball game. At the moment, he does not want to get into any litigation of any kind. The retirement age for administrative positions, to his understanding, is 60 years.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that his plea is that till the post of Dean, College Development Council, is filled on regular basis, the incumbent might be allowed to continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not accepting this, but he is not the Government of the University. As per the directive and approval of the Government of the University, the Dean, College Development Council position has been advertised, applications have come, the screening process is nearly complete and Dean of University Instruction, Professor A.K. Bhandari, the Chairman of Screening Committee, is away, and as soon as he comes back, he (i.e., Vice Chancellor) is going to fix the interview for Dean, College Development Council.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that, in the meantime, a stop gap arrangement should be made.

The Vice Chancellor declined further discussion on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he (Vice Chancellor) is very right that the age of retirement of Dean, College Development Council is 60 years and the age of retirement of teachers is also 60 years, as per the existing regulations. If that has been stayed by the Court, and the persons are being allowed to go beyond 60 years, why because the argument has been taken that as per the UGC, the age of retirement is 65 years. It is only as per the same UGC, that the age of retirement of Dean, College Development Council is also 65 years, in spite of the fact that it is an administrative position in Panjab University. He requests the Vice Chancellor not to react like this, but if a proposal has been made that till the decision of the Court, the incumbent might be allowed to continue, he does not think that there should be any problem. And he was under the impression that, it is as per UGC, it is a non-teaching post and the age of retirement is 60 years and that is how it has been advertised also for three years, and it is extendable for another three years provided or subject to maximum of 60 years, and that is what they had done in the Syndicate, and, also, while extending the term of the present Dean, College Development Council. At that time also, it was decided to extend his term up to the date of his retirement, and they had specifically asked the incumbent during the meeting, as to when he would be retiring. Probably, it was told that he was retiring on 31st May 2016, and Syndicate said alright. But now, since Professor Naval Kishore is not retiring as a Professor on 31.5.2016, and is going to continue as a Professor, and he (Dr. Randhawa) has brought the provision that the age of retirement of Dean, College Development Council could also be 65 years. They had discussed in the last Syndicate meeting that the decision of the

Court is expected very soon, if it comes in favour of the teachers, then automatically this provision of 65 years for Dean, College Development Council could also be applicable. What is the practical difficulty, if they allow the incumbent to continue till the order of the (High) Court?

The Vice Chancellor said that he was given to understand that the Dean, College Development Council in the Panjab University system is an administrative post. If they want to change that and if they are permitted to change that, then it would be fine.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is nowhere written that it is an administrative post. They have, however, perceived it to be an administrative post. UGC circular had been there since 1985. University has perceived Dean, College Development Council to be a non-teaching post. If for a non-teaching post, the UGC says 65 years of age, but they have perceived it to be 60 years of age till he (Dr. Randhawa) brought this provision into light. He added that he was under the impression that it is 60, as per UGC also. Obviously, if he continues as a teacher, and as per UGC, he could not continue as Dean, College Development Council. But now if UGC says, "Yes", one could continue up to 65, it should be accepted.

The Vice Chancellor said that then they should seek a clarification from the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal countered to state that it is a (UGC) notification already.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether they have implemented it like this in Panjab University since the year 1985?

Shri Ashok Goyal replied: No. He asked Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa to clarify as to from when this notification is.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that is of August 1985.

The Vice Chancellor said that then they could look at the records of the University, and they could also get a legal opinion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that till that time, the incumbent should be allowed to continue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all those who were the Chairpersons, those whom the Vice Chancellor had changed, because of the same circumstances, should also be recalled.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Naval Kishore as Dean, College Development Council is not a Chairman of the Department.

The Vice Chancellor said that they changed Chairpersons at the age of 60, because administrative positions could not be given to anyone beyond 60 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Sir, Chairperson is not a substantive post".

The Vice Chancellor said, "Alright, get a legal opinion". If they want to pass, they could do so, he has no issue at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he (Vice Chancellor) has no issue, then probably, they should allow it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not proposing it, but they want to propose it, they could.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he knows that he (Vice Chancellor) is not proposing.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not proposing it, and if he has to do it, then he has to study these things and then only he could be a party to it. Off hand and without studying it, on the basis of what he (Dr. Randhawa) is saying, he would like to study all this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Alright", till that time, the present Dean, College Development Council could continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not suggesting this decision. The University has advertised the position, and he is committed to select the Dean, College Development Council.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that due to election of Senate this year, they need to give approval to all the appointments of teachers by the last date of filing, etc. As such, next month, much work would be there for Dean, College Development Council. This all should be seen, while determining new Dean, College Development Council.

The Vice Chancellor said that the work of the University would not be standstill if the term of present Dean, College Development Council is not extended beyond May 31. Please have the confidence that the University's work would not be at standstill.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he knows. No body is indispensable and he understands that, but there would not be difficulty at all in allowing the incumbent also to continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not proposed it. If they want to pass it, please go ahead.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the same effect would be there on all other administrative positions/previous decisions. They have also to take a decision with regard to the Dean of University Instruction and there also the effect would be the same. They have to apply the same yardstick everywhere. Last time it had come whether beyond sixty is to be allowed in the administrative positions also or not. This very Syndicate decided to authorize the Vice Chancellor, and thereafter, the Vice Chancellor took some decisions and whatever decisions have been taken by the Vice Chancellor, the same should be followed.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is just following at the moment the status quo.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let they not confuse the two issues.

The Vice Chancellor said that they followed the status quo in the hope that the Court would give some decision, but no decision has come from the Court, and that is a reason that he has also put an agenda item for the Dean of University Instruction, where also there is

a seniority list. In accordance with that very seniority list, they had asked from Professor P.S. Jaswal. So they commenced the process of asking one person, and he has said "No". Now, they have to ask the other person. The other person, in accordance with the norms which they are following, is Professor Dinesh K. Gupta. Though they have not come to that item, he would like to propose that they should accept the name of Professor Dinesh K. Gupta for the DUship, but he (Vice Chancellor) is not the Government of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that neither he (Vice Chancellor) gives the proposal nor accepts their proposal. How it would work?

The Vice Chancellor said that he is telling them that he has certain limitations and he has stated his limitations. He is not going to be a continuity of this University after July 2018. They have the past, and they are also going to have the continuity. Whatever decision they take, okay. They could adjourn for 10 minutes, have a cup of tea.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu asked that the post, which they had advertised, when would the same be filled up.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to do it as early as he could. But they have to give him at least two weeks time because all the applicants are not local candidates.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that his suggestion is that it should be done as early as possible and till then the incumbent should be allowed to continue as they have no other solution.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could not do it under the present circumstances because he has asked people to (report).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that look Sir, in that there is another problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor L.K. Bansal had continued for a little while after the age of 60. Till the new Dean, College Development Council is appointed, if he (i.e., incumbent) continues following that precedence for a little while more, that is okay with him. When Shri Ashok Goyal said that the decision of the High Court would also come, the Vice Chancellor said that he wants to take a practical solution and proceed with it, with which more questions are not raised. If the decision of the High Court comes within 15-20 days, and if by that time, they continue with the process of holding interview, the same would be cancelled.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to bring another thing to his notice that if as per their advertisement the Principals of affiliated Colleges are eligible to apply but a non-principal of a non-accredited College is not. If somebody is a Professor in a non-accredited College, he has been made eligible by them, but the Principal of the same College is not eligible. This has not come in his mind, but in whosoever mind, it has come, it might have come earlier, but he might have thought that he would disclose it at the last moment. There are other issues. As the discussion was going on for payment of salary, there are so many persons, who have got experience of 10 years or 15 years, they are eligible for Professorship, but though they have worked on Rs.10,000/- p.m. Though they have

not done the job on regular basis, they are also eligible because they see only the experience but nobody has bothered to see whether he/she was getting full salary. In fact, they have to see the salary statement also to ensure that the person concerned was working in that scale. The applications have been coming to him (Vice Chancellor) and he does not know how many applications, has been received. But nothing like this should be there. The person belonging to non-accredited college should be seen carefully. He thinks that the process could be halted for sometime.

The Vice Chancellor said that he personally would not like to delay it.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that he (Vice Chancellor) should give them 10 minutes time.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay" and he went of the room for a short (personal) break.

After a few minutes, the Vice Chancellor re-entered the House and called the meeting in order. When a few of the members, including Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky, said that now they are exhausted, the meeting should be adjourned till tomorrow, the Vice Chancellor said that they would meet again tomorrow at 10.30 a.m. Prior to it, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa had also left the meeting.

The House resumed on 29th May 2016 and considered all the items.

At the conclusion of the proceedings of May 29, 2016, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since the rainy season is going to start shortly, it is his humble request that they should get the construction of the building of P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar, started at the earliest. If unfortunately, a roof or a wall collapsed, they would be in a spot of embarrassment.

(Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa did not attend the meeting on May 29, 2016).

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua intervened to say that yesterday they were discussing the issue of Dean, College Development Council, yesterday that issue remains in between.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that is not an agenda item.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they should spend some time on the issue and arrive at some decision.

Professor Anil Monga said that, yesterday, they were discussing the issue of fees for the Department of Laws, and he thinks that the same was left.

Some of the members said that the said (fee) issue was clinched.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that yesterday, when the issue of Dean, College Development Council, was being discussed, some of the members said that they have to leave and it was said that this issue would be discussed tomorrow. As such, the item remained undecided.

The Vice Chancellor said that the present status is that after the end of three years, they (the Syndicate) accepted that the extension to the Dean, College Development Council, be given till 31st May 2016, i.e., the date of his retirement on attaining the age of 60 years, and the same has also been approved by the Senate. So this is the present situation at the moment. He has got an extension as a Professor (from the Court) and not as Dean, College Development Council. The Court has not said that the extension is also for Dean, College Development Council.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Professor Naval Kishore) has not gone to the Court regarding Dean, College Development Council.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that Professor Naval Kishore could be given the additional charge of Dean, College Development Council.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that when the issue was being discussed yesterday, he (Vice Chancellor) had said that the meeting could be adjourned for ten minutes, and in the meantime, they should decide amongst themselves. Thereafter, when the meeting resumes, on the plea of some of the members, it was decided that the meeting be called off. So the issue remained unclinched after threadbare discussion. If he (Vice Chancellor) feels that there is no need for any discussion, that would not send a right signal. Let Syndicate take a decision whether Professor Naval Kishore is to be given extension as Dean, College Development Council. In fact, it was being proposed by both the sides that the present incumbent should be allowed to continue till the order of the Court, to which the Vice Chancellor responded by saying that he has no problem if he is allowed to continue till the post is filled up, and one or two members have agreed to the proposal. He thinks that it should be discussed and it should be decided – whether by way of consensus or by way of voting.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, he has not given the additional charge to anyone and at least he is also not proposing to give an additional charge to anyone, who is beyond the age of 60 years, of any administrative post. Though he did state yesterday that he could continue. However, on the hindsight, he does not favour it as it would be setting up another wrong precedence, which could cause more difficulties than solving any problem. As they are going to proceed with the interviews for Dean, College Development Council and are going to select somebody soon, extending his term for a month could get him into a trouble. So he does not want to give an additional charge of any administrative position to someone beyond 60 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not an additional charge, but Professor Naval Kishore is already holding the administrative position by way of selection, by way of a substantive post.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Fine".

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that as far as giving additional charge is concerned – whether it is DUI or Dean, College Development Council or Director Research or Chairman of a Department, that is a different from the present situation. Now, he (Vice Chancellor) says he does not have anything against an individual, and the only concern he is showing, is an unnecessary problem or confusion or criticism, which is not the case. While they had taken the decision in the Syndicate about one and a half year back that he be allowed to continue till the date of his retirement, i.e., after asking him as to when he is going to retire. But at that time, it was almost certain that the case of extension in age of superannuation of teachers would be sorted out by the Court, as they are expecting even today. So it was decided that he be allowed to continue till he continues as a teacher, and the spirit was, that only and only, in that spirit it was decided that why the present incumbent could not be allowed to continue till the orders of the Court. It is nothing and that in view of the UGC provision that in that position also one could continue up to the age of 65 years. So he thinks that they should take a call and take a decision whether the incumbent could be allowed to continue on this position.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not proposing such an option at the moment.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that yes he knew.

The Vice Chancellor said that the UGC provision had been there since the year 1985, but such a UGC provision has never been incorporated in the University Calendar. So he, as Vice Chancellor, does not want to start another practice, just for a period of two-three weeks when the interviews would get done. For two-three weeks somebody could also be on leave, and University has been making an arrangement within their own system for two-three weeks. So he would like to complete the interview process for Dean, College Development Council within two-three weeks, and for two-three weeks, one could give an additional charge to someone, as if somebody is on leave; that is for him a more comfortable situation than disturbing anything than letting this person to continue beyond 60 years and thereby get complaints from different quarters. He does not want to get into any of those things. For him it is a more comfortable situation, and he does not want the present Dean, College Development Council to be in controversy either. After all, the present Dean, College Development Council has served this University with great distinction in so many capacities, and he is going to be here as a teacher for a period of another five years. There are so many responsibilities, which he as Vice Chancellor could assign Professor Naval Kishore and work with him as a re-employed Professor for a period of five years. Such responsibilities could be very important nature so far as the functioning of the University is concerned. Why should they drag Professor Naval Kishore into the controversy and compromise his position, just for letting him serve for three weeks more? It does not look appropriate to him.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the continuity would be there and till that time, the decision from the Court on the superannuation issue of teachers could also come.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) had given the example of Bansal, and he (Professor Naval Kishore) could also continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he wishes to change that now. He personally does not want this and he does not want to have any unnecessary issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say everybody should be asked to.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after that other decisions have also been taken.

The Vice Chancellor said that let them not get into this. His proposal is that they should make some officiating arrangement for a period of two-three weeks and fill up this position.

Some of the members said, "Right Sir".

Shri Ashok Goyal urged the Vice Chancellor to ask from all the members one by one.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Alright-Yes", then some members along with Dr. Ajay Ranga objected to it. The Vice Chancellor agreed with them and ruled not to put to vote as urged by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is not fair, and after this pandemonium prevailed.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not want to discuss this issue any more.

Once again there was a pandemonium.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue was discussed yesterday and he (Vice Chancellor) had assured that they would discuss it tomorrow. Now, he is saying that he is not allowing it to be discussed. This is not fair. He would like to tell that it is not expected from a person like him (Vice Chancellor), who claims that he is totally non-political. He changed the stand taken in the last Syndicate as far as the appointment of Dean of University Instruction is concerned, and now he is changing his stand taken last evening while discussing this issue; and now is saying that he would not allow discussion on this issue anymore.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already told them his decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has told and now let the people tell (him).

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the problem is that the item has not been brought for consideration.

At this stage, once more a din prevailed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the issue of extension in last date for enrolment of Registered Graduates was discussed, then also the item was not on the agenda.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the situation of Haryana was totally different.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is also a different situation.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Vice Chancellor should ask the members, and thereafter, if rejected, there would be no problem.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said, "Sir, your stature decreases, when you indulge in such thing".

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if they walked out, they might face problem in future. That means, if something does not suit him, he should walk out.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not putting the issue to vote.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when they said that let the Dean of University Instruction continue, he (Vice Chancellor) said that they should themselves tell.

The Vice Chancellor said that, alright, it is his decision and he does not like to put this issue to vote.

At this stage, again pandemonium prevailed.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay, they could say whatever they wish to".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has allowed the issue to be discussed and after discussion, he is saying that his ruling is that he is not putting issue to vote, and this discretion he does not have, that the Vice Chancellor may or may not put an issue to vote (is not an option). Earlier, he had been saying what does he do, there is no way, this is the provision of the Calendar, and he has to put the matter to vote.

The Vice Chancellor said he has already said very clearly that he does not want to set up another precedence, akin to whatever he did in the case of Professor L.K. Bansal. He does not want to open up such a matter again. Professor Naval Kishore had been given extension up to 31st of May 2016, and that's all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they appreciate that he had been given extension up to 31st May 2016.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, in fact, it has happened in the University for first time that the persons who have been granted stay by the Court, have not been given the charge.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this issue was discussed by them and they had authorized the Vice Chancellor to take a decision

in the matter; and the Vice Chancellor has taken decision not give the charge to the persons who are beyond the age of 60 years.

At this stage, din again prevailed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that just about half an hour before, he (Vice Chancellor) had put the proposal and also counted the heads, but now he himself is not ready. Now, he himself is adopting different standards.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no problem to them, but it appears they are taking wrong decision.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that it is a severe question mark on the dignity (of Vice Chancellor) and conduct of the members of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is alright, he is willing to face a question mark. He has faced many question marks already, and at that stage, 2-3 members collectively spoke, which is not discernible clearly. Some members argued that all the items have been considered and meeting be concluded by playing the Anthem. The Vice Chancellor thereafter concluded the meeting, and the National Anthem was played.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE CHANCELLOR