

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Saturday, 17th December 2016 at 10.00 a.m.
in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Ms. Anu Chatrath
4. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
5. Dr. Ajay Ranga
6. Shri Amanpreet Singh
7. Dr. Amit Joshi
8. Dr. Ameer Sultana
9. Professor Anita Kaushal
10. Dr. Baljinder Singh
11. Dr. B.C. Josan
12. Professor B.S. Ghuman
13. Professor Chaman Lal
14. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
15. Dr. Dalip Kumar
16. Professor Dinesh K. Gupta
17. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
18. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
19. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
20. Dr. Gurjot Singh Malhi
21. Dr. Gurmit Singh
22. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
23. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
24. Justice Harban Lal
25. Dr. Harjodh Singh
26. Dr. Harsh Batra
27. Shri H.S. Dua
28. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
29. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
30. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
31. Shri Jarnail Singh
32. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
33. Dr. Jagdish Chander
34. Dr. K.K. Sharma
35. Smt. Kirron Kher
36. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
37. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
38. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
39. Dr. N.R. Sharma
40. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
41. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
42. Dr. Neeru Malik
43. Professor Navdeep Goyal
44. Dr. Parveen Goyal
45. Shri Prabhjit Singh
46. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
47. Shri Parmod Kumar

48. Professor Promila Pathak
49. Professor Rajat Sandhir
50. Professor Pam Rajput
51. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
52. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
53. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
54. Shri Raghbir Dyal
55. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
56. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
57. Professor R.P. Bambha
58. Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha
59. Dr. S. S. Sangha
60. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
61. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
62. Ms. Surinder Kaur
63. Professor Shelly Walia
64. Shri Sanjay Tandon
65. Shri Sandeep Singh
66. Shri Sandeep Kumar
67. Dr. S.K. Sharma
68. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
69. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
70. Shri Satya Pal Jain
71. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
72. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
73. Shri Varinder Singh
74. Shri G.S. Chadha ... (Secretary)
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Dr. Amod Gupta
2. Dr. Amar Singh
3. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
4. Professor Deepak Pental
5. Shri Jitender Yadav, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
6. Shri Naresh Gaur
7. Shri Parimal Rai
8. Shri Punam Suri
9. S. Parkash Singh Badal
10. Professor Ronki Ram
11. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
12. Shri Sanjeev Kumar Bandlish
13. Dr. Suresh Chandra Sharma
14. Dr. Subhash Sharma
15. Shri Surjit Singh Rakhra
16. Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab
17. Shri V.K. Sibal

At the outset, the Vice Chancellor wishes good morning to all the members, including the new members of the Panjab University Senate. He stated that the destiny has given him a privilege to welcome the members of the second Senate, which has been constituted by the Chancellor on the basis of input from various sections of the society. He has this privilege which is rare as he looks at the history of this University. It is very

rare as the term of a Vice Chancellor is of 6 years. He is indeed happy to have this privilege to welcome the second new Senate. On the basis of experience of the first new Senate, which he presided over, let him just tell them as to how the proceedings of today's meeting would go on. After having read the Vice Chancellor's statement, they would spend a little bit time maybe up to a minute each, in introducing themselves and thereafter they would take up the agenda. He is conscious that many members wish to say so many things before they take up the agenda, which has been circulated to them in the background of several recent happenings concerning the University. He had taken an initiative of sending them several e-mails and also provided certain documents so that by the time they arrive here for the meeting, they had some background information with regard to the current difficult situation faced by the University for its sustenance.

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

- (i) Col. Thakur Singh (Retd.), father of Smt. Kirron Kher, Member of Parliament from the city and Fellow, Panjab University, on November 8, 2016.
- (ii) Professor Daya Nand Garg, Department of Laws, on November 29, 2016.

As a mark of respect to the departed souls, the Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Col. Thakur Singh (Retd.) and Professor Daya Nand Garg, and observed two minutes' silence, all standing, prayed to the Almighty to give peace to the departed souls and give strength and courage to the members of the bereaved families to bear irreparable loss of their dear ones.

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

II. The Vice-Chancellor said, –

- "1. I warmly welcome all the distinguished members to this first meeting of the present Senate. I am looking forward to guidance and support from all the hon'ble members of this august House for the sustenance and development of this prestigious University and to progress it towards becoming a global player.

The Hon'ble Minister of Human Resource & Development during his recent visit to Mohali, had shared a new scheme of Government of India under which ten Universities in the State sector shall get provided special support to attempt to attain World Class stature. Let us hope that Panjab University shall get selected for such an assistance.

- 2. I had taken initiative to provide all of you an update on the financial difficulty currently being faced by the Panjab University by sharing an e-mail sent to the Chairman, University Grants Commission (UGC). As per a directive of the Punjab & Haryana High Court, Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD), convened a meeting on December 15, 2016, in which Chairman, UGC, and several senior officials of MHRD and Secretary, UGC, were present. Registrar, Finance & Development Officer and I participated in this meeting on behalf of Panjab University. The summary of this meeting is expected to be submitted by the Counsels of MHRD and UGC to the High Court on Monday, the 19th December, 2016. The Government of India is attending to the concerns of our University and it is hoped that we shall overcome the difficulty currently being encountered. I have arranged to send you by e-mail the

collation of the minutes of all the meetings of Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate pertaining to University's finances, so that an appraisal can be made of the continuous efforts made by the Governing bodies of the University to attend to this matter. These minutes run into over 440 pages and it would take them a while before they could browse to them. They have sent them an e-mail and if the members desire, a printed copy of these minutes could also be sent to each one of them in due course of time."

The Vice Chancellor stated that this is what he had to convey to them as a part of the start of today's meeting.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in the Vice Chancellor's statement at Sr. Nos. 1 and 2, be noted; and
- (2) the action taken report on the decisions of the Senate meeting dated 03.09.2016, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

III.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor said that now they could start the task of having a brief introduction of each one of them to others. He request every member to spend up to a minute to say whatever he or she wishes to say about himself/herself.

Hereinafter the members introduced themselves one by one.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him respond by stating that he is really humbled by the background of each one of them. Had he not been appointed the Vice Chancellor of this University, probably he would have never made it to the Senate of this University. The Senate of this University, as they all know, is very-very unique. Long before the University had a Senate, the people of Punjab via Anjuman-e-Punjab had lobbied to have a College in Punjab. After a College in Punjab, the Calcutta University had conceded a Constituent College at Lahore as an Appendix to the Government College, Lahore, and for that they had put down certain conditions. The people of Punjab were supposed to contribute finances and other means so that the College could be sustained and as a gesture towards that, that College had a Senate. Long before the University had a Senate, the College had a Senate and that Senate had representation from the civil society, NGOs as well as former Maharajas and erstwhile Generals of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, who contributed money to get the College going. Since the Senate had represented that character, when the University was established on 14th of October, 1882, the University had also a Senate, but to establish the University, they had asked for a bigger contribution and for bigger contribution, more people had to get in to the Senate. As such, the Senate expanded. Earlier, it was a 70-member of the Senate, which in its very first meeting had decided to elect 15 members Executive Body and they designated it as "Syndicate". So the College had a Senate and the Syndicate and the University had a larger Senate. Syndicate size remained the same. It is in the background of that experience of Panjab University that in 1904 when the Indian Universities Act, 1904 was promulgated by Lord Curzon, and now all the Universities of India were supposed to have a Senate, in which this thing was formally introduced that the Graduates would elect certain members for the Senate. Somebody was to nominate a large number of the people of the Senate. But in the Universities Act, 1904 there is no mention of teachers as Faculty member. However, the Universities had to administer academic things. To administer academic things, they needed Board of Studies, Faculties, and so on. So the Senators were given the responsibilities of doing certain duties on behalf of three Faculties each. This is the background why the Senators have to serve on Faculties. Once the Faculties got constituted, the Faculties must have representatives on the Senate. In the case of Calcutta University, since it was a little older University, it had got going academic things on in a well established manner.

Panjab University was only 22 years old, Allahabad was only 17 years old, whereas the remaining were +25 years each. The Calcutta University elected 10 members to the Senate on behalf of 10 Faculties. Panjab University was a newer entity in this exercise, so they were asked to elect 5 members on behalf of five major Faculties. The minor Faculties were combined into one, and only after 1947, i.e., after independence, when the Act was re-issued in the form of an Ordinance, it became six Faculties and this notion of Combined Faculties came in, and the Combined Faculties elected one. The Senators were asked to serve on four Faculties after independence the old University was left in Lahore and the new University was nothing but a handful of affiliated Colleges to start with, and that is why, the duties of the Senators were enhanced from 3 to 4 faculties, and everything else remained the same. Right at the time of 1904, teachers were needed, and those who were teaching to contribute to the Board of Studies, this that and so on. That is why, this notion of Added Members of Faculties was introduced right in 1904. So, they had continued with this tradition. All other Universities of India had abandoned the original 1904 Act, but represent Panjab University in India that continuity. They have to continuously reform but in terms of People's University where all stakeholders get together and attend to the concerns of the University, Panjab University is a very unique Institution. It is not very well known nationally, but he thinks that the nation should take pride in itself that ever since the regulation of education was started with the participation of people, 1% of land tax, which the British introduced, was to go towards education. They have forgotten those things somewhere down the lanes, but the education is for the masses, i.e., for everyone. It is an inclusive thing and it must be governed in an inclusive manner. They all must take pride in this fact and they must disseminate that they are responsible body, when it comes to governance of this University. They could see themselves that they have nomination from every section of the society and elections from different sections of the Society. So it is Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha put together to one. He thinks that they all must feel honoured that the destiny has given them this opportunity. They have some difficulties, but he thinks that with the participation and guidance for all of them these difficulties would get overcome. He knows that there are several Hon'ble members in this House, who in view of impending Municipal Corporation elections tomorrow, have larger responsibility to the Civil Society. So if they permit they could allow those Hon'ble members, who are engaged to the larger Civil Society, to express their views immediately after concluding his statement, and before they take up the agenda items.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that there is a tradition of having discussion on the Vice Chancellor Statement, before the agenda items are taken up. If permitted, he could speak.

The Vice Chancellor said that he needs permission before he gets up. When Dr. Gurmeet Singh argued, the Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Gurmeet) has to allow him to first complete his statement. After whatever he has stated, in view of some members in the House, who have pressing other needs to attend to the Civil Society, if they allow them to contribute something before taking up the agenda. If they allow this, it would be nicer, but if they insist that he has to say something now for half a minute, he could permit him.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that he was just trying to seek permission that in this agenda, which the Vice Chancellor himself is saying that there is an impending issue and he has also sent certain e-mails to them. Since he was not aware that the printout of the relevant documents would be provided to them so he himself had got the printouts. He is only saying that he would like to speak on point 3 and give few suggestions. If the Vice Chancellor wishes that the Hon'ble members, who have political background, should be given preference to express their viewpoints, he has no objection.

Professor Chaman Lal said that his only request is that since in this Senate the Students' Council has not got representation by nomination, while teachers and non-teaching employees have got it. He requests the Chair to allow representative(s) of the students to sit inside and make brief observation/s about their concerns.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the students' representatives are present as audience. They have discussed this issue in the past in this House. It was desired at that stage that only the members of the House should be making participation and statements. Whatever the students wish to convey earlier, they were supposed to do the same, via the office of the Dean of Student Welfare, who was an ex-officio member of the Senate. Right now, the Dean of Student Welfare is not an ex-officio member of this House, but Professor Emanuel Nahar, who has been assigned the responsibility of Dean of Student Welfare, is a nominated member of the Senate. So until the Chancellor decides to nominate a student member into this House, this duty could be performed by the present Dean of Student Welfare. Chancellor's view of having a student member, as an ex-officio member of the House, is that this should be done, even though he has not said it in writing, the University is seized up of the matter of the governance reforms, and as a part of the governance reforms, a proposal could be made by the Senate of the University in which it could be specified that students' President be a member of the House. The Dean of University Instruction administers the University academically on the Campus, which is a very large campus. The Dean of University Instruction should also be made an ex-officio member of this House like the DPI (Punjab) and DPI (U.T. Chandigarh). They have actually discussed that the Dean of University Instruction should also be an ex-officio member of the Syndicate and Senate as the other DPIs are there. The Chancellor's view is that let these things happen via proposals of governance reforms, which would be a more appropriate way of going about it. The minutes are being recorded, and whatever is being stated, would be passed on to the Chancellor.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that he totally endorses the viewpoint expressed by Professor Chaman Lal, and he had also raised this issue in his previous terms, but when the issue relates to students, they remember all the procedures. The President, PUTA and President, PUSA, who are the representatives teachers and non-teaching staff, are also the members of this House, and earlier they were not. Why they are not involving the students, who are the major component of this institution? If the Dean of Student Welfare is to represent them (students), then where is the need of President, PUTA to represent the faculty members as the Vice Chancellor is there to represent them. He does not wish to cut down anything, but wishes to only say that the representation of students in this House is absolutely necessary because they discuss about their future and also make them to learn about the governance of this University. There are three major components in this University – Teachers, Non-teachers and students, and he thinks that the most important component is the student because this Institution has been built for them. Not to make them a part of this body, is their major weakness, and to remove this weakness, any measure/suggestion should be implemented so that they are made a part of this House.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that what he is going to say might not be liked by some of the members. In the University statutes, there are specific seats in the Registered Graduates' Constituency. Why the students spend lacs and lacs of rupees on the Students' Council Elections. Why could they not come here from the Registered Graduates' Constituency? This is what his apprehension is and what stops them?

The Vice Chancellor stated that the point is when the Senate of other Universities in the country have students representative(s), it is students who are studying in those Universities, and from the Registered Graduates' Constituency one has to be a graduate of five years standing or a postgraduate. Therefore, they should not mix up the things. The Chancellor is not against them for having students' representative in the Senate. The Chancellor's viewpoint is that let it happen in a statutory manner and let certain reforms be introduced, and proposal(s) be sent to him. These proposals would have to be taken with the Ministry of Home Affairs, which would have to give notification. It is possible as they are seized up of the matter. They have not sent the final report of Governance Reforms. It is his impression that this could happen in the next six months or year provided they complete their job and sent unanimous recommendations to the Chancellor. Until then as a stop gap arrangement, he has spoken to the Students'

Council representatives and asked them to give whatever they wish to be articulated in writing and the Dean of Student Welfare, Professor Emanuel Nahar would be given a special opportunity to articulate whatever the students wish to convey. Nobody is against this thing at all. He thinks let him now proceed further.

Shri Satya Pal Jain thanked the Vice Chancellor on his behalf and also on behalf of the entire House for using good words while welcoming the members, especially the newly elected and nominated to the meeting and also to the Chancellor. He assured that even though this House comprised people from different shades, they would work together in the interest/betterment of the University under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor, ignoring their political or other differences. The House might discuss several issues. One of the issues raised by his friends is about the representation of the students in the Senate. In fact, this issue is being raised for the past several years that there must be students' representation in the Senate. They might be remembering that earlier there was no representation to the teachers in the Senate and also to the non-teaching staff. Resolutions had come to this House from time to time and so far as representation of students is concerned, it was his resolution and after passing the resolution they requested the Chancellor that until the Act is amended to make the specific provision for representation of students, President of Panjab University Campus Students' Council should be given a place in the list of nominated persons as is in the case of President, PUTA, Dean of University Instruction, Dean of Student Welfare, etc. He thinks that there are no two opinions about the representation of the students in the Senate and everybody agrees with it, but they have to either get the Act amended from the Parliament, which might take a long time or request the Chancellor that to nominate the President of Panjab University Campus Students' Council on the Senate while making the nominations. This is not the only issue, there are several other issues, where the amendments are required. They might have gone through the Senate agenda. There are several items which could be done by the Syndicate under the delegation of legislation, but since the Act is old, the items are continuously coming. Tomorrow, there are elections to the Syndicate, which have been scheduled at different times. Mrs. Kirron Kher was asking him as to how many times she has to come tomorrow for casting her vote. He had suggested earlier also why not the change this system. They should keep one day for nominations/proposals, one day for withdrawal, and a full day for voting, so that whenever a member finds time, he/she come and cast his/her vote and leave. And after 5.00 p.m., they should count the votes and declare the results. These are the issues on which they would debate. He has come to the Senate for the first time in the year 1976 and he has seen that the members even though they come from different shades, they work together in the interest or for the betterment of the University.

When Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that Mrs. Kirron Kher should express her viewpoints first, Mrs. Kirron Kher stated that actually she does not have much to say. She needs times to absorb everything to put her mind to it. She does not want to speak just for the sake of speaking, but when she would speak, she would speak something important and authentic. Her job is mainly to solve problem(s), which the University is facing, and she would like to concentrate on the point. She would also fulfil any other responsibility given to her. How and whom she should vote even that is a problem for her because she does not really know the capabilities of the people, who are contesting the Syndicate election. So she feels that they should have been given some kind of background notes of these people and they should also have a chance to meet them, especially for the members who have become members for the first time. A lot of them do not know each other. As such, it is something, which is bothering her because she does not want to vote on political lines; rather, on capabilities, which according to her is very important.

This gesture of Mrs. Kirron Kher was appreciated by the members by thumping of desks.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that the Vice Chancellor has welcomed all the members. He also wishes to welcome all the members, who have become members of the

Senate for the first time and also those who have the experience of this House. Because all are concerned with the University as all of them had been the students of this University, and all of them are alumni of this University, they are directly linked to education. It is a heritage University and they have to take it to a much higher level by putting their heads together. He is sure that under the leadership of the chair, they would work together in this direction in the interest of the University and wherever there are differences, they would ignore them as the same is the essence of democracy. Anyhow, they should express their viewpoints openly. It would be better, if they spend maximum time on academic issues, and less on other issues. As told by the Vice Chancellor, they are also contemplating on governance reforms, and some proposals have to be sent, the same should automatically be placed before the Senate for consideration, so that they could discuss the same. Several issues are placed before the Senate, which perhaps are not required. The Senate should discuss only certain basic issues. He is not against it, especially when the elect certain persons to the Syndicate, final decision on those matters could be taken by the Syndicate itself, so that many-many matters need not come to the Senate. The Senate should debate only on larger issues/policy matters and the same would better of the University. In the end, he extended good wishes to the Vice Chancellor and all the other members.

Dr. Tarlochan Singh stated that he welcomes all the members and endorses the viewpoints expressed by Shri Satya Pal Jain, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Mrs. Kirron Kher. He stated that they should feel proud of the fact that at this time the Panjab University is keeping its standing is not only in India, but also in Asia, and the credit for this goes to all of them, especially to the Vice Chancellor and also to the former Vice Chancellors, who built this University to this level in spite of the fact the Punjab is very unfortunate as it has been divided many a times, and despite that it has progress to this level as there is a popular saying that Punjabi rise out of the ashes because the Guru has blessed them to rise whenever they fall (Chardi Kalan). In spite of all that and also the painful period of 1980s it passed through, which they all had witnessed, they are proud that this University is shining. They should debate as much as they could but should not waste time in casting aspersions on each other, whereas they debate so much, which results into nothing. Even in the Parliament one could speak only twice or thrice on an issue. Here also there should be restriction for speaking of a member on an issue and only those should speak who know the issue. They should respect the Chair and should keep in mind that their first and for most concern is the betterment of the University.

Shri Sanjay Tandon stated that first of all he welcomes to all the members present to the first meeting of the Senate. He had raised an issue during the introduction. Since he has been nominated for the first time to the Senate, he was not aware that one has to go through so many of papers, which had been supplied to them during the last 10-15 days, especially when they were busy in the ensuing election to the Chandigarh Municipal Corporation. Frankly he has not been able to go through the papers and Mrs. Kirron Kher has also said the same thing as they were largely involved in the MC election. Panjab University is situated in Chandigarh, which has so many employees who are supposed to cast their votes in the election and some of them have been deputed for election duty as well. So he thinks that this meeting should not have been held today. In fact, the meeting should have been held a few days later because voting is not only a right but also a duty. If tomorrow, they continued with the Syndicate election, it is possible that many of the members and employees might be deprived of their voting right. Therefore, he thinks that they must consider this issue and if they postpone the Syndicate election, he would be very happy. The second issue has been raised about the representation of the Students in the Senate and he does not think any institution could take a decision on its future, if all its components do not sit/meet together. When they have kept all types of people in it, he thinks that they must give a chance to the students also. Shri Satya pal Jain has rightly said that amendment in Act might take a little bit longer time, therefore, it would be good if they request the Chancellor to nominate President of Panjab University Campus Students' Council on the Senate and he thinks that nobody would object to it. The University is a part of their day-to-day process. In

his own family, three generations have graduated from this very University. As such, Panjab University is a part of their day-to-day life. They want to see this University progress. They in their home and along with their colleagues are they trying to help the University for enabling it to come out to the present crisis. They are fully with them and his only request to them is that the debate should be in open atmosphere, and as said by Dr. Tarlochan Singh, instead of being subjective, they should be objective.

The Vice Chancellor stated that let him clarify few things. For tomorrow Syndicate election, they required only about 30 people to conduct the election and to supervise everything and that job/responsibility is going to be executed by the teachers of the University and few officers who have not been deputed for MC election. The Government Machinery has sought about 600-700 persons for the MC election and they have been provided to them. They did not want women members to be assign this duty as the duty is from early morning to late in the evening. As such, they have fulfilled their requirements and now they did not have an issue. Moreover, tomorrow only the Senate members have to cast their votes. Nobody is going to be deprived of their voting right. It is okay with him if the tomorrow's election is postponed to the next Saturday, i.e., the 24th of December 2016, that is not an issue at all. However, the number of persons involved is very small and no citizen is going to be deprived of his/her right. Only the Senate members have to cast their votes in the Faculties to which they have been assigned to. Mrs. Kirron Kher has a point that she does not know the capabilities of the contesting candidates, but next year she would know everyone. Only this year, difficulty is there because they have assembled here and knowing each other for the first time. As such she had a very valid point that she needs time and also all the new members need time to know each other. However, it is for them to decide as it is not in his hands. If they all wish to come again within a week's time, he would not have any objection. He has done his duty. Normally, the meetings of the Faculties to elect Syndics are held immediately after the meeting of the Senate because the people come from far off places and the expensive are also involved.

Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu said that there is a demand by some of his colleagues, but he does not think that there would be problem in the election because election of each Faculty would take about only about an hour and every member has only four Faculties and they could spend the remaining period for the MC election. Since a lot of the members have come from different parts of Punjab, i.e., Abohar, Muktsar, Ferozepur, Moga, Ludhiana, etc., and if the election is postponed, they would have to come again which would be a problem for them. Therefore, the election should not be postponed.

Mrs. Kirron Kher said that perhaps Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu has misunderstood her. In fact, she has not said this and has only said that she is in a dilemma as to whom she should vote because she does not know the capabilities of the contestants.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that if the Government falls by a vote, who would be responsible for that.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that to which Government he is talking about as there is no Government here.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that what he means to say is that if a candidate losses the MC election by one vote, who would be responsible for that because certain persons would be deprived of their voting right.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since they have scheduled the election of the Syndicate for tomorrow, they have decided not to cast their votes in the MC election which are also to be held on tomorrow.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Keshav Malhotra could decide only about himself and not for others.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he, his family and Professor Rajesh Gill have decided not to cast their votes in the MC election.

The Vice Chancellor reiterated that he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) could talk only about himself because he had pointed out in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (well in advance) that the day they are proposing to hold the meetings of the Faculties for Syndicate election, the election of MC is also scheduled for that day. That is why, they have decided that they would not cast their votes in the MC election.

Professor Chaman Lal stated that they should talk in a reasonable manner. They should see as to what are the issues involved? He would like to point out that everybody in the Society – whether Member of Parliament or an ordinary person, has equal right. There is no privileged person in the Senate. He urged the Vice Chancellor not to give privilege permission to anyone even if one is a Member of Parliament. In the meetings of the Faculties both financial constraints and people engagements are involved. He has a lecture on next Saturday in Bangalore, and he could not come again for the Faculties meeting, if these are postponed. Since it had been decided much earlier, the Election Commission or these Hon'ble Members told the Vice Chancellor to much before the dates for the meetings of the Faculties were fixed. However, once the dates are fixed, they should stick to them because the election of the Syndicate is as much constitutional as of Municipal Corporation. According to him, the Senate of the University is not less than Municipal Corporation of Chandigarh. At best, if they want to adjust, as he has learnt, the Senate had been meeting till 12 midnight, they could adjust the timings, but the dates should not be changed. They must hold the Syndicate election either on 17th or 18th or 19th December at any time (even from 5.00 p.m. to 12 midnight), and there would be no objection from his side. However, there should be no change in date; otherwise, there would be a lot of financial burden on the University.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she appreciates that the Vice Chancellor is asking for the views of the House. So far as the clash of date is concerned, it is not only a question of her vote, her family and her parents are also dependent on her as she has to carry them to the Polling Booth. She is required to be here as the election would begin from 9.00 a.m. on 18th December 2016 and the election would go on till late in the evening. She might also be contesting the Syndicate election, and who knows. She might also be supporting somebody and she has to be actively involved in the election and it would not be possible for her to leave this venue. Hence, it is not the question of her vote, it is the question of votes of her family and her parents. Since her parents could go alone to cast their votes, she has to carry them along. Like her, there are several members. Hence, it is not only the question of votes of these members alone, but their families also. Everyday there is/are advertisement(s) in the newspapers enlightening the citizens about their voting right. She saw an advertisement where two children are going to school, who are being told to please ensure that their parents must go to vote. Mr. Milkha Singh is shown to be asking everybody to please ensure that everybody goes and cast his/her vote. Why does the Government make these advertisements. To vote is the most pious right, which she had, and even right could not be violated. Therefore, something has to done. To say that certain political people want to make. No, the political people never speak up. A person, who speaks up fearlessly, is never political. Hats off to Mrs. Kirron Kher, who says that she wishes to vote on merit. How many of them have voted on merit? Here when 10 people tell somebody, he/she cast his/her vote to the person concerned. She valued whatever Mrs. Kirron Kher said. They are sitting in a House, which comprised so called intellectuals. Therefore, it is a crime to call somebody political, if somebody raises his/her voice. Secondly, she would come to the issue of financial crunch. She appreciates the fact that a lot of information was made available to them through e-mails by the University authorities regarding the financial status of the University and also about the PIL filed in the Hon'ble Court and about that she wishes to make certain points. She has read somewhere that the University has been asked to put back the funds taken out of the Provident Fund and Research Projects to pay salaries to the University employees in the past. She would like to know as to what has been done in this regard. Have the funds been put back into

these Budget Heads or what action has been taken? She has earlier also raised the issue that two years have lapsed since crores of rupees have fraudulently been looted in infamous Pension Scam in the University. They are standing at a juncture where they are facing such a huge financial crunch. What steps have been taken to fix the responsibility? What happened to the Police case? Have they completed the investigation? What happened to the Pension Corpus? Has the money been put back into the Pension Corpus? What happened to the interest which accrued on that? She would like that the House should be informed on this also. Thirdly, it is painful to see this great University in crisis, whereas no such crisis is being witnessed in any of the University in the region, which are not as old as this University is. During the last one year cases of wrong purchases made by senior officials of this University were exposed. These cases were exposed in the Senate as well as in the media with evidence(s). She would like to know as to what action the University authorities has taken to investigate into these cases because this is misappropriation of funds. On the one hand, they are protesting against the UGC & MHRD for release of funds and on the other hand, they are misappropriating the funds. If certain complaints are coming, are they investigating those complaints? What right do they have to ask for funds? Why are they mum in these cases of corruption?

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he would like to know whether it is a zero hour?

Professor R.P. Bambah said that his suggestion is that they should keep the meetings of the Faculties for the whole day and the result could be declared together, so that people have time to cast their votes in the Municipal Corporation Election as well as here in the Syndicate Election. In this way, the problem could be solved very easily.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Professor Bambah) knows more than he (Vice Chancellor) knows as to how election to the Syndicate proceeds. So, do not ask him to respond. He (Professor Bambah) knows that the candidates of the Syndicate are decided on the floor. If one losses in one constituency, he/she could again stand in another constituency. As such, this is a very dynamic thing, and what he has suggested is not possible. The only thing, which is possible, is that the election process which is commencing 9.00 a.m. tomorrow, could commence at 2.00 p.m. and the process could continue till late in the evening. Everything could be slided by five hours. When Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the bio-data of the contestants should be provided to them, the Vice Chancellor said he could not give as it is not his responsibility. They had accepted the responsibility to be the Senators of this University and they had enough time to do this. If they want to do public service, they have to do the homework. As such, they should not raise unnecessary objections.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that he is firm of the opinion that the dates, which have been announced by the Vice Chancellor much earlier and have also been communicated to the members, should not be changed. All the members of this House are Hon'ble and responsible and have adjusted their time and responsibilities in one way or the other. There are many problems, e.g., examinations are going on in the University Campus, Panjab University Regional Centres and the Colleges affiliated to the Universities. The Principals, who are members of this House, are the Chief Coordinators of their respective Examination Centres. Similarly, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors have also to perform number of duties in a number of ways, and they have already adjusted their duties and responsibilities. If the elections to the Syndicate are postponed, they have to do this exercise again. Secondly, the persons, who have come from far of places, would put additional financial burden on the University exchequer. They are already in a problem, i.e., the financial crunch. They should not increase the financial burden just by changing the date of Syndicate election. Secondly, some of his colleagues are raising an issue they would face problem in casting their votes. No doubt, there could be small problem but could not be absolute problem. Reason being, Chandigarh is a city which is located within the periphery maximum of 15 k.m., and within an hour one could cross the city twice. As such, his request to the members is that they should not make it a political issue as it is not a political issue in any manner. As already said by one of the Hon'ble members, the dignity and reputation of this House is not less than any other

House in Chandigarh or outside. He, therefore, requested the members to maintain the dignity of this House, which they owe to it. So they should stick to the dates which have already been announced and communicated to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that instead of 9.00 a.m., they could start the election process at 1.00 p.m.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they should do whatever suit them, but he and couple of his colleagues have already pointed out that if the Syndicate election is held tomorrow, they would not cast their votes and would apprise the higher authorities about it. He has only requested them to protect their voting right. When Principal Gurdip Sharma remarked that they should cast their votes for MC election in the morning, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they know as to what problem they had. It takes three hours to cast vote in the colony where he lives. Secondly, he might be a contestant or might be supporting a contestant in the tomorrow's MC election. His only request to them is if they want to protect their voting right, they could do so; otherwise, they would not cast their votes in the MC election.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that he wants to talk about the financial crunch about which news are being appearing in various newspapers for quite sometime and he has been reading those news.

The Vice Chancellor said that before they discuss the financial crunch, let him first conclude discussion on the issue under consideration. Now, they have two options – they retain the date and timings of meetings of Faculties for Syndicate Election as it is or slide the timings of meetings of Faculties for Syndicate Election by four hours.

Majority of the members were of the view that the date and timings of meetings of Faculties for Syndicate Election should be kept as has already been announced. However, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is not acceptable to them.

RESOLVED: That the date and timings of meetings of Faculties for Syndicate Election be **not** changed.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that he would like to say a couple of words to Professor Rajesh Gill and he thinks that she would take them in good spirit. In fact, she should not have used the words “so called intellectuals”. Secondly, that the political people could not speak fearlessly, which she herself has contradicted. Actually, the political people could speak more fearlessly. Now, he would like to talk about the financial crunch, to which the Vice Chancellor has referred to in his statement. He was also a member of the Senate during the term of 2008-2012 and he thinks that Professor R.P. Bambah and certain other members might be remembering when they received a letter from the UGC and a meeting was held in the Golden Jubilee Hall in which Professor R.P. Bambah and other two Vice Chancellors were present and everybody had celebrated in such a manner as if all the problems of Panjab University have been overcome. At that time also, he had said that this letter would not enable the University to overcome from all the problems, because the Government could take another decision at any time. It was also suggested by him that ultimately they should fight for a bigger aim. He was continuously pleading that this University should be given the status of Central University because Panjab University is a heritage University of Punjab and Punjab has gone through the pain of partition, which has been described very well in the letter circulated by Professor Chaman Lal. Today, he would again like to discuss this issue with them. He has also sent a Resolution to the Registrar, the fate of which has hitherto not been told to him. Because at the time also several people were of the view that it is not possible as it relates to structural changes as also Colleges affiliated to Panjab University. However, when Shri Anupam Kher came to the campus last time, he had said that anything could happen. He remarked that if demonetization could be done in this country, the Panjab University could also be made a Central University. As such, they should not keep their aim less than that. In this letter of 2011, it has been that the

Ministry is in the process of consulting other Ministries, and thereafter the matter would be placed before the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA). According to him, though the MHRD was saying that the matter would be placed before the CCEA, the same has not been done so far. Secondly, it has also been written in the second part of the above-said letter “pending approval of the competent authority”, and the competent authority according to him is the CCEA. The Finance & Development Officer might be aware that they did not face much problem during the year 2012-13 as they had carried forward grant, but thereafter they had faced and still facing a lot of financial problem. He feels that they did not make efforts in this direction, which they should do without any further delay. When former Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh had come to the University and he had said in the Convocation that Panjab University would not see a day when a faculty member would leave this University only because of financial crunch. He further stated that he did not know where his Proposal/Resolution is because he has not received any response from the Registrar office. If there is any shortcoming, he would try to remove that just now. Secondly, he suggested that they all should try at their level best. Referring to the comment made by Professor Rajesh Gill about the politicians, he said that even though the politicians fight with each other, but they respect each other from the core of their hearts. If they constitute a Committee of senior people, who have say in the Government, it would help their cause. He said that if Dr. Manmohan Singh ji, former Prime Minister, write a D.O. letter that at that time there was a proposal to place the matter before the CCEA, but it has not gone there so far, it would be of a great help. He suggested that the draft of the letter could be prepared by the University itself. There are several people in this House, who could help in this matter. The Vice Chancellors came to the University for six years. In a humour, he said that in Cricket certain batsmen do not score a run in five balls, but hit a six on the last ball. Similarly, it is a good opportunity for the Vice Chancellor, who is in his sixth year, to get it approved from the CCEA and take this issue to its logical ends. There is no other University in the country, which has gone through the pain of partition. Similarly, there is no other University which is surrounded by three States. Even if they go to Shimla, the students first preference is Panjab University. Similarly, for the students of Punjab and Haryana, the first preference is the Panjab University and thereafter, they go to Punjabi or Guru Nanak Dev University or Kurukshetra University. The University has not been given the justice, which it deserved. They all should take this responsibility and see that the University is given justice. If permitted, he would like to pass this Resolution unanimously that keeping in view historic stature and its contribution to education not only in North India but to the entire country, and the financial crisis faced by it at the moment, it should be declared a Central University without any further delay. Earlier, there was an apprehension as to where would the affiliated Colleges go, after the University being declared a Central University, but there is no such thing as everything would remain as such and they would not part with any of the existing structure. They would not be have any objection even if Panjab University is declared a Centrally Funded University, but they must aim high. In the end, he requested that his proposal should be accepted.

The Vice Chancellor said that he thinks Shri Satya Pal Jain should be permitted to express his viewpoints because he has a large responsibility as he is a Counsel for the MHRD and to give the opinion of the MHRD in the Court day after tomorrow. The issue in its entirety was discussed on 15th of December in a very high level meeting, in which everybody was involved, which took the decision that now the route of CCEA would not be followed. It was stated in October of 2013 that the Panjab University's requirement would be met. Panjab University's funding is not a new item as Panjab University's funding was earlier met through the U.T. Administration, and now it would be met through a new route. As such, as far as Centre is concerned, it is not a new expense and only the route has been changed. The Centre also felt that there is no need to have a new budget head, but the UGC has non-plan funds for the institutions, which are of national importance, but are not Central Universities by the Central Act, and those institutions are supported through a budget head, which had enough flexibility. The then Secretary, MHRD, who was also a Panjab University alumnus namely Shri Ashok Thakur, felt the quicker thing should be to put it through the UGC, and include the Panjab University in

its non-plan budget head and the requirements of the Panjab University should get met. He (Shri Ashok Thakur) retired on 30th September 2014, and by that time certain changes had occurred, and in view of those changes, the new Secretary came in. The new Secretary could not impress upon the UGC that they should meet the requirements of Panjab University in its entirety. So the deficit happened, and once the deficit happened, his term also ended. Then another Secretary came in, and by that time there were problems created by some of them, as they themselves filed complaint with the Centre that this University has been wrongly asking the Budget for the last 25 years. From them, complaints went that the governing bodies of this University have not been doing the things honestly, as if there was misappropriation of the funding in the University. A Fact-Finding Committee was formed and that Fact-Finding Committee asked the University to bring in certain changes in its auditing procedures. They were not doing audit procedures the way the Central Government desires all those institutions, which receive Central Funding, should do. Now, they have plugged that lacuna by introducing Double Entry Accounting System. The Centre released last year's grant, but somehow they could not give whatever they wanted. This year, they need Revised Estimates, but unfortunately, the matter went to the Court and the Court is taking cognizance of it. Now, the Central Government is responding the Court in all its seriousness. Had it not been in seriousness, such a High Powered Committee would not have met (in New Delhi) on 15th December? The summary of that High Powered Committee has to be presented to the Court first. He could not share with them, because that is the responsibility assigned to the Secretary, MHRD and the Chairman, UGC, and their Counsels have report to the Court on 19th of December. So, this is the situation as of now. In the background of this, they could state whatever they wish.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that the Vice Chancellor has shared a lot of information. He would also like to share information with his colleagues, especially Dr. Gurmeet Singh. As far as the matter of grant to Panjab University is concerned, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Mahesh Grover of Punjab and Haryana High Court has *suo moto* issued a notice to the Central Government, UGC, Panjab University, Punjab Government and Haryana Government after having read the statement of the Vice Chancellor in the newspapers. In that case, the hearing in the Court is going on. He is representing the Central Government in this case, being the Additional Solicitor General of India, and the next date of hearing is on Monday, the 19th of December 2016. It would not be appropriate to have much discussion on it because the matter is in the Court. He would like to clarify 2-3 things only. First of all, he would like to make it clear that it is being wrongly publicized that the Government of India has stopped the grant for Panjab University. He has personally talked to Shri Parkash Javdekar, Union Minister for Human Resource & Development, 2-3 times and he has told him that there is no order of the Government of India to stop the grant of even of single rupee of Panjab University. Why did the problem of Panjab University grant arise? Till 2008, Panjab University used to get grant from the Central Government through the MHA via the U.T. Administration. Similarly, the grant of Punjab Government was received from the Finance Secretary, Punjab. When Dr. Manmohan Singh was Prime Minister of India in the year 2008, it was decided that the grant to the University should be given by the Central Government through the MHRD via the UGC, and the UGC is an autonomous institution, and it is not under the control of Government of India. As such, in the year 2008, the pattern has been changed. After the change of pattern, a mistake has been committed. The mistake is that the MHRD asked the UGC to give grant to Panjab University, but did not create a separate Budget Head for the purpose, and deposited certain additional funds in the UGC Account. This position continued for two-three years and the University did not face any problem. Later on, the UGC said that they are not being provided separate/additional funds for Panjab University, and they are funding the Central Universities from the funds allocated to them, and now the issue would be discussed in the High Court on 19th of December. Secondly, the grant of the University has been frozen at Rs.176 crore out of which 3 instalments the University has already received, and the fourth instalment, about which the Government decided on 15th December, would be released to the University shortly. It is also a pleasant news to them that from 1st March 2017, Shri K.K. Sharma, who was an Advisor to U.T. Administrator and a member of this House, would

be taking over as Secretary, MHRD. He has also talked to him on phone in detail, and he has assured that he would go ahead in such a manner that the University does not face any problem from the UGC side. The meeting, which was held on 15th of December, was held on the direction of the High Court and this issue has been sorted there. Thirdly, he would like to make it clear that it is being publicized that ABVP had lodged a complaint and the grant has been stopped on that enquiry, which is entirely false. In fact, there is no order from Government of India or the UGC. He is making the statement as Additional Solicitor General of India that the Government of India does not have any intention to stop the grant of even a single rupee of the University. There are certain technical problems, which everybody as Head of the Institution faces. Even the Judges of the High Court have passed strict instructions to the concerned Officers and safeguarded the interest of the University. He, therefore, requested the Hon'ble Members to put forth their viewpoints keeping in the view the facts on the issue. So far as the issue of Central University raised by Dr. Gurmeet Singh is concerned, almost all are agreeable that Panjab University should become a Central University. At one point of time, it was decided that Panjab University would be made a Central University. Dr. Manmohan Singh had taken the initiative and S. Parkash Singh Badal had also given in writing, the politics played its own role and the opponents of S. Parkash Singh Badal gave statement in the newspaper that he (S. Badal) has given away Chandigarh as also Panjab University. And on 3rd S. Parkash Singh Badal said that he had given in writing, but they (Central Government) did not do it, now he takes back his said letter. Whether the Government in Punjab is of Congress or Akalis and BJP, both oppose making Panjab University as a Central University. He, therefore, suggested that they should not move any Resolution and divide the House because maybe the persons, who represent Punjab, might not agree to the Resolution. As such, if Panjab University could be made a Central University, he could vote even by defying the party whip, but it would not serve the purpose. In fact, they should lobby for it. In the end, he said that he would like to state two things – (i) the grant of the University has neither been stopped nor it would be stopped and whatever is as per provisions/guidelines, the Government of India would meet it; and (ii) if they pass a resolution unanimously, Panjab University would become a Central University; however, if they indulged into the debate, it would never become a Central University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to give a brief information. What are the difficulties in making this University as a Central University? First and fundamental, the central institutions of long standing or the new ones, all of them have to conform to certain central norms which are very stringent. It is the ratio of the teachers to the non-teachers which in the strictest sense is 1:1.2, most liberal it is 1:1.6 or 1:1.7. Panjab University is having 1:3 or more. The whole University has to be completely restructured. If it becomes a central institution without the affiliating Colleges, entire income from the affiliated Colleges is brought down to zero. There are only 20 affiliated Colleges in the city. This University plus 20 affiliated Colleges in the city means central deficit towards Panjab University if it is of the order of Rs.232 crores today, it would become of the order of Rs.390 crores immediately. Central grant to Central University Hyderabad, Jawaharlal Nehru University as on today is of the order of Rs.400 crores. It is not half of it. Today half of PU money comes from its own colleges. 2,50,000 students of the colleges contribute so that this University at Chandigarh can run with its branding, the students/Colleges are the beneficiary of it, as these students come and join postgraduate courses, etc. For any Punjab Government, it is a trivial thing to disaffiliate all the Colleges of Punjab and attach them to Punjabi University, Patiala or Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. Immediately, the tuition fee, examination fee would rise and the salary of all the teachers would nose dive by factor of 50% straightaway. The University is being asked as to why it is not following what Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University are doing. He wanted to ask all the representatives of College teachers and the Principals whether they are aware of the consequences of their Colleges being disaffiliated from Panjab University and attached to GNDU or Punjabi University, Patiala. These are very-very hard questions and they need to ponder over it very-very deeply. Just merely passing a resolution that they should be a Central University, it is not going to happen. The Centre would do a very-very serious evaluation of what Panjab University is doing

and those serious evaluations would lead to complete restructuring of this University, complete restructuring to the extent that whatever the Centre did to IITs few years ago, forced the ratio of teacher-non teaching ratio to 1:1.1 or 1:1.2. Every IIT Department Administration is today managed by only one person. It is the duty of that person to somehow outsource all the jobs, how he/she does it, it is his/her responsibility. All the IITs have converted all their non-teaching jobs for technical persons and have removed all the ministerial staff from their rolls because the IITs could not be run without technical support. So, 80% of the non-teaching staff in the IITs is technical and only 20% ministerial. There is a complete restructuring, outsourcing and so on. For the beautiful and green campus that the members walk in, a revenue model has to be there as to how to sustain it. They would find it very difficult to maintain the kind of health scheme that they have. Look at the history of the Panjab University. Long before the University came to Chandigarh, the Senate and the Syndicate of this University had ordered that the teachers and employees of the University would be given good health coverage. Why, because this University was run from the profits of Matriculation examination. It was the students' examination fee which was running this University and it was with those profits that this entire campus progressed from 20 teachers to 1000 teachers that they are having today. The kind of service conditions that this University has offered to its employees, teaching as well as non-teaching, is a second to none. In fact, the rest of India is following it. There was no regulation for teachers' salary in pre-independent India. But after the Second World War, it is this University which increased the examination fee by 15% across the board and enhanced the salary of the teachers and non-teaching staff by 50-100%. The rest of the country got the salary structure only when Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar became the first Chairman of the UGC. After 8 months of his death, whatever proposal he had made, that brought the salary of the teachers of the country at par with the salary of teachers at Lahore in pre-independent India. They should understand the history of this University. Just passing a resolution that they should become a Central University is not going to solve the problem. If they have to protect the heritage of the University, they would have to find a different innovative route. Tata Institute of Social Sciences is not a Central University but it is an institute of national importance and its entire budget is paid, at least of all the teachers and a large fraction of non-teaching staff, from the same budget head in which the name of Panjab University has been inserted. But the UGC respects it and carries the TISS with it, because TISS is a premier research University of UGC in social sciences. He urged the members to browse the website of TISS and see that as a research University in social sciences of India which has a pride of international repute. It is better that they sustain their heritage, sustain everything that they have and not get into the argument of having teacher-non-teaching ratio having brought down drastically. Whatever was ordained by a Committee which was headed by Principal Secretary to Prime Minister in March 2009, that Committee constituted a Consultative Committee, which gave its report in March 2010. Thereafter, a Sub-Committee was formed which submitted its report in May 2012 which finally formed a part of the resolution from which he was quoting that there should be a separate budget head, which should be done via CCEA and so on and so forth. It is a whole series of connecting things and they have to connect all those thoughts and see what is the best, which is needed for this University, so that they could preserve the heritage of the University and improve continuously. The only way to protect the national status of the University is that the social sciences part of Panjab University should progress to emerge as a competitor to Tata Institute of Social Sciences and the science part of Panjab University to emerge as competitor to Indian Institute of Sciences, Bangalore or Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, which today is a smaller institute with only 100 faculty members but they have to wait for another 10 years, it would have 200 faculty members. They should not be second to IISER, Mohali but should be at par with IISER, Mohali, and on par with JNU, when it comes to social sciences, policy research and so on, Just as JNU and TISS are premier Universities for social sciences. These are things for which they must work out a plan and then keep their case forward. Mere resolution would serve a very limited purpose.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he has listened both to the Vice-Chancellor and Shri Satya Pal Jain. Whatever he could understand is that as Shri Jain has said that if the

University could become a Central University just by passing a resolution, they could pass a resolution today itself, but it could be made a Central University only with a on-the-spot decision at the level of the Government and issuing the notification. Earlier, he was a member of this House when the letter having no objection for Panjab University becoming a Central University was withdrawn by the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Punjab (S. Parkash Singh Badal). From the statement of the Vice-Chancellor, he has come to the conclusion that it is in the interest of Panjab University to become a Central University. A couple of years ago, he had read a statement of the Vice-Chancellor wherein it was mentioned that they do not want to stand in that queue. Secondly, the Vice-Chancellor has given so many demerits of Central Universities/institutions, but he has not mentioned that the research students in the Central Universities are getting fellowships. There is a hell bent upon situation in the University for the retirement age of 65 years for the last so many years. He questioned as to whether it has been made known that the retirement age in the Central Universities of 65 years. He had earlier also suggested that the University could be made a centrally funded. He would like to draw the attention of Shri Satya Pal Jain, as he understood it from his talk that when a decision to route the funds through UGC/MHRD in place of U.T. Administration/Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA), there was some error in that decision. He was a member of the Senate. There was some problem at that time that the MHA was not increasing the grants on the plea that until the Punjab Government enhanced the grant in the ratio of 60:40, it would not enhance the grant. But now there is no mention of the ratio of 60:40. Now it is being said that whatever grant the Central Government, Punjab Government would give and whatever would be the income of the University, the balance would be reimbursed by the Central Government through UGC. Professor R.P. Bambah is sitting in the House. When the statement of Vice-Chancellor that the University would close, appeared in the newspapers, it was not less than a horrible thing for persons like him (Dr. Gurmeet Singh). He said that they should not think he is dramatizing it. He said that they have an attachment with the University and have a passion in the same way as Mrs. Kirron Kher and Shri Anupam Kher have thinking the belonging to the University. He also has belongingness with the University as he would be in the University for next 20 years. The next day he read a statement in the newspapers, he would like to ask Professor R.P. Bambah whether that statement was wrong. The three former Vice-Chancellors including Professor R.P. Bambah had said in the statement, which appeared on first page of an English newspaper, that the problem of the University would be over only when it becomes a Central University. If he is saying something wrong or have read something wrong, let Professor R.P. Bambah point it out. He is saying that they need not pass a resolution but requesting the Vice-Chancellor to do a major work in the last year of his tenure. He also requested Shri Satya Pal Jain and Mrs. Kirron Kher to get this work done. There is a lot of difference between the earlier and the present Government. The Punjab Government had withdrawn the letter. As he had earlier said, the decision of demonetization was not a small decision. He requested Mrs. Kirron Kher, Shri Anupam Kher, Dr. Man Mohan Singh to get the decision in favor of the University of making it as a centrally funded University or the status at par with TIFR, from where the Vice-Chancellor had come, could be granted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had talked about the Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) and not of TIFR.

Continuing, Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the TIFR and TISS are of the same standing. He stands corrected that it should be of the same level as that of Tata Institute of Social Sciences. He is trying to say that they read the news daily in the newspapers. The Vice-Chancellor must remember that when Shri Gulzar had visited the University and the Vice-Chancellor, at that time, had said that the University has received the grant when Shri Gulzar came. The next day in the auditorium, Shri Gulzar had said that if the University receives the grant whenever he visits, he could visit the University daily. Later talking to Shri Gulzar, he had said that he had heard the bits and pieces life (*katra-katra zindagi*) in his song, but he had heard about grant in bits and pieces for the University for the first time and that too to a University which is established since 1882 and which has served the entire region even after having gone through the pain of partition. The

University, whose product has remained as the Prime Minister of the country for a period of ten years, is facing this problem. He feels sorry in saying that a product of the University remained the Prime Minister for 10 years and established so many Central Universities, did nothing for the grant of status of Central University or centrally funded University or something like that or the Vice-Chancellor could get the status of national importance to the University. He is saying it to the Vice-Chancellor who is left with 1½ years of his tenure. They should try to think and understand the pain. He did not want to bring any resolution that he did not know as to how the system works. He has an experience of 10 years in the area of journalism. As the Vice-Chancellor is talking about high-powered Committee with which he had a meeting the day before, that is not a high-powered Committee. This kind of work could not be done without convincing the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister had been in Chandigarh had got conducted the first elections to the Municipal Corporation of Chandigarh. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to talk to the Prime Minister and make him known about the problems of the University and try to get a D.O. letter written from Dr. Man Mohan Singh to the Prime Minister, get a D.O. letter written from Hon'ble Shri M. Hamid Ansari as also from other sources like Shri Anupam Kher, Mrs. Kirron Kher and the problems of the University going on for the last two years be made known to the Prime Minister where every time it is being said that the University would not be able to pay the salary for the next month even if the same is released the next month itself. They would have to think over it and get even themselves convinced. If the Vice-Chancellor thinks that with the grant of status of Central University, the non-teaching staff would get reduced or the ratio would come down, he is saying with full confidence that nothing such would happen. Where there is a will, there is way and the same could be done even with having maintained the present structure, the Senate and the Colleges and even with the present ratio, the status of Central University could be attained. What is a Central University? Basically they need the money. The Punjab Government is not giving the grants. Panjab University is a public sector University and not a Chandigarh University. He feels pained that a private University has been named as Chandigarh University and not even a letter objecting to it was written on behalf of the Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Dr. Gurmeet Singh) was also a party to it.

Continuing, Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he was not a member of the governing body at that time. Otherwise also, the Assistant Professors like him are not listened to. If personally, he writes anything, he could be served with a notice as per service and conduct rules. He wanted to say that the Vice-Chancellor should understand the pain of the loss that they are undergoing because of the use of brand name of Panjab University. Neither there was any protest nor any letter was written by the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University raising an objection to the naming, because it was creating confusion which he has seen while he happens to be at outstation. He said that if there is any objection on his resolution, the same could be amended or if the House wanted to reject it, it could be done so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would take the proposal to the new Syndicate.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that he just wanted to supplement what Shri Satya Pal Jain had said. He just wanted to share the information that when the decision to make the University as a Central University was taken (it), was personally taken by Professor Man Mohan Singh regardless of all these things which he (Shri Jain) has said. The date on which he (Dr. Man Mohan Singh) also learnt of it, he started applying his mind. Secondly, his distinguished friend who spoke just now, must know that the Minister of Human Resource Development has outrightly rejected the demand from Manipur University of Manipur Government, backed by certain Members of Parliament, to set up an Institute affiliated with the Indian Council of Social Science Research. He had also turned down the proposal of setting up any other University. The Government of India, if they go by the recent decision, is not sanctioning any new institution particularly in social sciences, he had no idea of sciences. As a result of that thinking now that by passing a resolution, it would be meaningless. It has no meaning. It is

something just like advantage to a political party. They have to look at the budget of the UGC, by how much percentage it is increased that only the Vice-Chancellor could tell, that out of the budget of the institutions of social sciences which he has been running with great difficulty, this has to be kept in mind. He did not think that any resolution or any lobbying, lobbying should not be done and an educational institutions should not do lobbying. They should get it on merits as Mrs. Kirron Kher had rightly talked about capability. He thought that it is the wrong time even to talking of resolution for making the Panjab University a Central University. They are not going to get anywhere.

Professor Shelley Walia said that during the last 8 years, since he has been a member of the Senate, he has been hearing this debate going on and on and now it has become very serious. He was just thinking that the Senate should, in fact, in the first meeting of its four-year term, sit back and take comfort with the fact that they have been ranked as one of the premier Universities in the country. They won this position because of the caliber they have of teaching faculty and also of the governing bodies as such. He would like to say something in the Senate before he comes to the idea of funding because he thought that it is related and deeply related to what they are doing in the University at the moment. They are impressive in their achievement only because of the fact that they actually have not reached a stage where a lot of Universities have reached the world renowned ranking system where they have actually been mentioned. The role of the Senate, the highest governing body, is to maintain an environment of conducive educational atmosphere and if this is to be done, then actually they have to drive home the message to the Central Government, to the State as such that they, in this University, actually have been pursuing their growth and unassailable commitment to excellence, excellent commitment to research and Panjab University set-up and its long history and he thought of a wonderful future ahead. But when he looked at the future and when he looked at the judiciary coming into the whole debate at the moment trying to persuade the Centre that they must, in fact, immediately do something before the University closes down. What are they doing about it especially in the sense that they have collected here and participated whole-heartedly for the well-being of the University and they have to raise their voice, go with a begging bowl and ask for money because they do not have the money for the salaries. When he looked at this, he could only think of Panjab University as being a kind of an angel of social mobility. It is essentially an institution which is the guardian of the culture. It is the driver of economic growth. At the same time, it generates ideals and the ideals really in a free society where they could actually speak the truth and they have the stamina to do it. But in that context, he would actually come to the top-most question that they have in front of them and that top-most question before them is really the whole idea of funding, something that is retrogressively eating into their academic energy. Could they afford really to spend so much of time on it? He did not think so because they have to see all opportunities of science and innovations of great data, the big data that they talk of the digitalized world that they have. His proposal at the moment is that they need to actually convey and why he is talking of this University is that they need to convey this to the Prime Minister's office that there is a University that exists at the moment in Punjab which has a long history and it is being ignored and its energies which should be spent on another sphere of education, on knowledge, on pushing the frontiers of education and knowledge, that University is spending its time more on begging for money. This is a worldwide problem. There are the Universities in the West also closing, for instance, the University of Wisconsin or the University of Nevada because not being funded. They did not want to close down because they have a long history. So his idea is that let them convey this in very forceful terms and convince the Central Government that they are people who are suffering and they could ill-afford, at this juncture, to spend all their time, spend many hours of the Senate, spend many hours of the intellectual think tank that they have here in the University talking about how to get the funds and how to manage the funds. Let them send a resolution, a strong letter and that is the only way, and stop this debate here, they could not afford it.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the issue of grant of Central University status to Panjab University is a very touchy and sensitive issue. In the e-mails which he had sent

to the members, he had not used the word of Central University. At the moment, he would like to support Shri Satya Pal Jain that they should not discuss on this issue. But they should discuss about the importance of this University. He talked about the five Universities which were established in the 19th century, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras in 1857, Panjab University in 1882 and Allahabad University in 1887. After that, till a period of about 25 years, no University was established. All these five Universities were brought under the Indian Universities Act, 1904. All these five Universities should try to convince the Central Government that these are heritage Universities and the Centre should take care of this University. Sardar Tarlochan Singh is very much present in the House. He thought that the Punjab Government remains financially tight. He was of the view that the Punjab Government should request the Central Government to take care of the whole budget of the University because 8% budget is also felt as a burden by the Punjab Government. Both the Jammu & Kashmir and Bihar have fought for getting two Central University each in their States. Since Punjab is having a Central University at Bathinda and if Panjab University is also granted the status of Central University, the State would have two Central University like those States. There are some benefits of Central University. He has worked in two Central Universities, i.e., at Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi and Central University of Punjab at Bathinda. It is right what Dr. Gurmeet Singh had said that every M.Phil. and Ph.D. student in these Universities get Rs.5,000 and Rs.8,000 per month respectively as scholarship. Secondly, the subsidized fee which is prevailing in JNU does not exist in any University in the world. In JNU, even today a student could stay in the hostel by spending an amount of Rs.2000/- per month without being putting a burden on their parents. Even the students of B.A. and M.A. get scholarship of Rs.2500. This scholarship is also available to the students in Central University at Hyderabad. They need to tell the Punjab Government that if Panjab University is granted the status of Central University, it did not mean that the claim of the Punjab Government over Panjab University would come down. It would remain a University of Punjab. If the Punjab Government emotionally thinks that their claim over Panjab University would become less if it is granted the status of Central University, they should not make it an issue and he would support Shri Satya Pal Jain that they should mobilize opinion and clear the doubts. In the meantime, they could impress upon the Punjab Government, if granting 8% of deficit of PU budget to the University is a burden, to request the Central Government that keeping in view the heritage status of Panjab University, 100% funding should be provided by the Centre. It is in their as well as best interest of the University. All the five universities should be declared as heritage universities of esteemed national importance. When they talk about the heritage universities, Nalanda University is also a heritage University, which is being revived after 800 years. These five universities are the starter of the education and have played a crucial role. The Panjab University was the only University which was a teaching and examining University whereas the Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras were only the examining universities. Panjab University is the only University whose Oriental College started teaching, research and classes. If the Panjab University is declared as a Central University under the new Act, then the Syndicate and Senate would not be there. That is why, in the e-mail he had sent to the members, he had clearly stated that they have to protect the Statutes/Act. If the Panjab University is declared as Central University or centrally funded, there should be no change in its Act. If the Act is to be amended, that could be done only with the recommendation of the Senate. If they have some financial issues as there is a lot of expenditure involved in the conduct of election to the Registered Graduate Constituency, that is for the Senate to think over it. Anyway, they should impress upon the Central Government. As Professor Shelley Walia said Panjab University has ranked amongst the 3-4 top institutions of India in the list of world ranking institutions and in the Indian ranking, Panjab University has got the 3rd/4th positions so many times. Since the University is already having so much of excellence, the Central Government should recognize this excellence and they should try to resolve this issue in a very reasonable and patient manner and there is no need to use high tempers. To look after the concerns of the University, they should form an opinion as to how they could protect and promote this University.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that there are two issues involved. He would not go into the detailed discussion and technicalities which have been pointed out by the Hon'ble members. One of the issues is whether they should go in for Central University and the second issue is to meet the present financial crisis. Making the Panjab University a Central University is a long procedure in which the Government is also involved and they have to bring many changes. They could also go in for that also but it would take a long time. They should proceed further and go for that. But secondly to meet the financial deficit, in the present crisis they all should work in unison, teachers, non-teaching, students and the Senate members, and should form opinion as to how to meet the deficit and how to get the grants from the Government. The Vice-Chancellor often had been meeting the MHRD and UGC also. It should be enforced and they all should work in unison from various channels also operating through Punjab Government and the Central Government also. Many of the members of the Senate must also have the access in the Central Government. They should approach all the channels and make them understand that the expenditure of the University has increased manifold, the University has expanded rank-wise and strength-wise and in every field in which the University is working. They should build up this sort of opinion, as earlier they used to have a Think-Tank, the Think-Tank should make a proposal, involved all the members and should work in unison and go to MHRD. The first task should be to make the Government understand to meet the deficit of the University and release the grants also. This should be the foremost priority of the present Senate as to how to meet the deficit and how to get the grants released and how to convince the authorities in the Government. If they think for the grant of the status of Central University, it is not that it could be granted overnight. It is a long process and it has been a long process for many years but they have not been successful in it. A time would also come and they would be able to build up an opinion also about the Central University. But presently, they should focus on how to meet the deficit and how to convince the authorities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is the requirement that they did not face the crisis in the 6th Pay Commission. They are asking only for a 12% increase in the central funding every year since 2013-14. The budget head in which the Panjab University stands included along with 8 other deemed Universities which are not Central Universities, they have been given an increase of 15% of the salary budget. The deficit that they are having, 80% of that goes towards payment of salaries. Their simple plea to the MHRD was that the Government is committed to give 15% increase in the salary budget head every year, the same 15% should be given to Panjab University also. If the Government gives 15% on this 80%, that would come to 12%. They have been telling the Government that the University's expenditure is increasing at a rate of 12.5% and the University is enhancing its income by 12.75% and asking only for 12%. The University is asking for a lower figure than it is already generating. If the Government just agrees to it, then there is no financial crisis at present. The financial crisis could come only when the 7th Pay Commission recommendations are implemented. But as on date, there is no financial crisis. This is what they have told the Central Government day before yesterday and they have to wait for the response of the Government as to what the MHRD submits in the Court on 19th December. Whatever submission the UGC made in the Court on 12th December, the University has filed a rejoinder to that. He would have that rejoinder converted to a PDF file and shall arrange to send the same to each one of the members through e-mail. All these things are stated in the rejoinder and the plea of the University is that at the moment whatever is being given to other University, the same also be given to Panjab University in the same budget head. The Panjab University should not be singled out by freezing the grant whereas all other deemed Universities, 22 EMMRCs, affiliated Colleges of Delhi University and Banaras Hindu University, the Inter-University Centres are being given grants with an enhancement of 15%. Every institution which is in the same budget head and is given 15% increase to meet the enhanced salary and inflation, the same 15% increase on the salary component of Panjab University be also given and that comes only to 12%. The Panjab University has not made a demand anything more than 12%. This plea is being submitted on behalf of the Panjab University by the Registrar. He would get it e-mailed to each one of the members. His plea to all the

members is that they wait for what happens on 19th December. Let them continue with the agenda.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that her queries remained unanswered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not answering.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they were discussing the financial aspects of the University and it has been repeated by most of the members time and again. Shri Satya Pal Jain, Principal R.S. Jhanji and Professor Chaman Lal have raised good points. Firstly, there is a case in the Punjab and Haryana High Court and the matter is sub-judice and hope that something positive would come out. Secondly, since the Vice-Chancellor has already been meeting the Ministries and the UGC and hoped that they would be convinced. Thirdly, as many of the members have suggested that they should lobby all available sources with the UGC, MHRD and Prime Minister's office that a permanent solution be sought to this problem. Some of the Hon'ble members have suggested for leading a resolution for granting the status of Central University. He thought that it could create problem. Any such step or resolution that leads to disaffiliation of Colleges of Panjab University, that would not get support from this House.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that there is a feeling amongst the members that making the Panjab University a Central University would be beneficial for the University. Actually, a number of Universities were converted into Central Universities. Allahabad University was converted into a Central University but it has as many problems that as it had as a State University. Visva Bharti is a Central University, still it is having the problems. They are talking about the Central Universities, like, Hyderabad and Jawaharlal Nehru University, but, they are very small universities, residential universities and not having affiliated colleges. Their budgets are very high and that is why they are good institutions. If they want to make this University a heritage University, then it would be a correct approach that they make it an institution of national importance. As Professor Chaman Lal mentioned that Panjab University is one of the five universities which came up in the 19th century. They all should put their efforts for making it a national institute so that the progress of the University is not stopped and the present structure is not disturbed so that they could continue to progress like that.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would concentrate himself on the issue of financial crunch only. He would not involve himself in the discussion about the status of Central University because it is a long pending chronic issue. Before coming to the financial crunch issue, he would like say a few things. First, as far as the election to the Registered Graduate Constituency is concerned, the hon'ble new members of the Senate have talked about the expenditure on this Constituency. 8% grant is not from the Punjab Government but basically in the beginning it was in the ratio of 60:40. But this 8% is the annual hike from the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that that amount of Rs.20 crore amounts to 8% of the deficit of the University that it has today. But actually it is less than 8%.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the UGC, MHRD and the Central Government should support the institutions of higher learning. But it seems that during the last four years, they could not do much in the field of academic and administrative reforms. He has got the details of the summary which has been e-mailed to the members by the University. He would just like to go through a part of data and not the whole data. Since he was elected as a member of the Senate in September 2012, he is taking up data of 2013 and 2014. In that year, the income of the University from the examination fee was Rs.66 crore.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was not the stage to go through the microscopic details and the House is not discussing the financial agenda. But they should discuss only broad things.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that during the last four years, they could not do anything to bring the academic and administrative reforms. As far as manpower audit is concerned, till date they do not know what is the position of teaching faculty in the University? As far as the examination reforms are concerned, he was amongst those people who made a voice that time has come that they adopt partial outsourcing where it is feasible to reduce the cost. Even the NAAC Peer Team had suggested that there was a need of clubbing of some of the emerging departments. They have not moved in that direction. He was the first one to suggest that the time has come that they should introduce entrance examination in the social sciences but they have not moved ahead. There is no comprehensive policy regarding filling up the NRI seats. They have not explored the feasibility of increasing the seats in the departments where it is possible. They have also not allowed lateral entry in some of the courses particularly in Computer Science. There are about 200 Colleges affiliated to Panjab University. Every year most of the Colleges are not applying for extension of temporary affiliation and robbing the University of vital resources. The distance education courses of the University at one time were supposed to be major earner of revenue. If they look at the data for the year 2012 and 2016, there is a stagnation in the number of students in the Distance Education Department. He understood that it is the responsibility of higher education authorities including UGC, MHRD to subsidize and to give financial help. Some of the things which they could have done easily in the last four years, unfortunately, they have not been able to do. Some of the controversies have not helped the University. They have enhanced the retirement age to 65 years and it is an additional financial burden on the University. He was never a supporter of it. They should ponder upon all these things and a small beginning has to be made. For the last four years, the Senate as a body has failed to take these steps. It is for Government alone, it is not for the Senate. But whether any circular has been issued from the office of the Vice-Chancellor to the departments for increasing the number of seats, for clubbing of the departments or for bringing examination reforms? So it is an onus on all of them that they should make optimal use of the resources and at the same time make endeavour to enhance the revenue of the University. They could not run from their responsibility as member of the Senate or the governing body of the University. There are some courses where the income of the University is stagnated for the last four years, e.g., partially self-financed courses. They could take the case of courses in the University School of Open Learning as to how many teaching and non-teaching staff is working there. So, the role of manpower auditing is necessary. What he wanted to say is that they should not expect something from UGC or MHRD by increasing the expenditure year after year. They have to look at themselves also.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that for a very long time, they have been discussing about the finances of the University. He would specifically like to draw the attention of the House towards the letter dated 14.11.2014 to which Dr. Gurmeet Singh had also referred. There are 3-4 issues and they have a lot of discussion over those issues. They need to devote attention to two issues. One of the recommendations of the Committee is that the Director, Finance be requested to initiate action to open a new sub-head.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has already been clarified that the Government of India has decided that there is no need of a separate budget head. There are so many institutions under the budget head of the UGC where Panjab University has been put under that budget head, like Tata Institute of Social Sciences and 8 other deemed universities. This budget head had enough elasticity and after putting the requirement of the University in that budget head, it is the responsibility of the UGC to put those things to the MHRD and it is the responsibility of the MHRD to get those from the Centre. What Shri Satya Pal Jain was trying to say is that the Centre has not said that Panjab University be not given the grants. It has nowhere been said and there is no explicit directive that the Panjab University should not be given the grants. This is also what the

Hon'ble Judges are also telling the Government. This is the answer that the MHRD has to give in the Court on 19th December. The question posed by the Judge to the Government is that where it has been said that the Government should make a distinction between meeting the needs of Panjab University and Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Gurukul Kangri, Coimbatore Institute of Home Science, 3 other Sanskrit Universities. This is the question that the Judge has posed to the Government and the reply to the same has to be given by the MHRD in the Court on 19th December.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that he wanted to draw the attention of the House is that the Senate should emphasize on it and if the Government is saying that there is no need to create a sub-head but as per this letter, a sub-head is to be created and after creation of a sub-head, it would become a part of the Union Budget on the demand of MHRD. Until it is made a part of the Union Budget, they have to face these problems. His submission is that the budget of the University should be made part of the Union Budget. Only then, they could come out of the crisis otherwise they would have to face the crisis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is the reply which the University is going to file in the Court. The last paragraph of the submission made by the Registrar is that: "it is further submitted that the UGC in its meeting had stated that due to non-creation of a separate budget head for funding of so and so, the UGC could not release the required funds to Panjab University". So this was what the UGC was saying. What the Government of India has to say, it would be known on 19th December only. The UGC says that the MHRD is not creating a sub-head. The University has told the UGC that until a new sub-head is created, there should be no discrimination against the University. If all other institutions are given an increase of 15%, then the same 15% on the salary portion should also be given to the University. Since all the details of salary portion are provided, they could see that the salary portion of the total budget is about 83% and if an increase of 15% is given on it, it would come to 12%. The University has not demanded even a single penny beyond this 12%.

Professor B.S. Ghuman suggested that whatever has been submitted by the Registrar, should be got endorsed from the House.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that so many members have shown their concern on the financial crunch. The case is already in the Court. Even the UGC and MHRD are also concerned that the University should get the grants but there is a need to change the route of grant. Since the Vice-Chancellor has explained all the things in detail and there is no need to discuss the matter further. They should have hope of getting a positive response of the meeting which the Vice-Chancellor had with the officials in Delhi. He suggested that the agenda should be taken up.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let them conclude this discussion at the moment by conveying his thanks to each one of the members of not only showing their concern but also implicitly endorsing what the University officers are doing on behalf of the University to protect the current situation for the University. The recommendations of the 7th Pay Commission have not yet come. Whatever the University is pleading for the 6th Pay Commission and if the Government accepts that, then the 6th Pay Commission would go forward. What the University has said and what the UGC on its own has said that when the 7th Pay Commission would be implemented, then there would be more problems. The UGC has given a red flag to MHRD that while implementing the 7th Pay Commission if these budgets are not taken care of, then there would be problems. The UGC has voiced its concern. Right now, the UGC is saying that the budget head be created. The University is not opposing it and wants that a budget head of the University be created. But the Centre has some concerns when it comes to certain diktats that they impose on centrally funded institutions. What could those diktats be for Panjab University, would be known only on 19th December. If necessary, they would convene a meeting of the Senate as early as they could. If some deadline is given to the University, they would not

hesitate to convene an emergent meeting of the Senate to proceed further. The way the concern, the kind of attendance that they have had, almost appreciation of each other's view and have a near consensus that they have to protect the heritage of the University and the governance structure of this University. If they fail to protect the governance structure of this University, they take it from him, then the University would be run by faceless bureaucrats sitting 200 miles away and they would be able to do nothing. It is necessary that they protect the governance structure. They could have some governance reforms but the broad governance structure that it is a peoples' University where there is a participation of all of them, this must be protected because the bureaucrats sitting in Delhi would not be able to devote so much time to the University. The governance structure of the Tata Institute of Social Sciences has not been changed but it has managed to get support for itself by performing at a high level of excellence. He thought that they should do the same strategy and should not be seen very much behind the Tata Institute of Social Sciences when it comes to social sciences. Panjab University should not be seen behind good Central Universities in sciences namely Central University of Hyderabad. They should be at par and protect the governance structure, debate things properly here and it is a very good thing that the Senate elects a 15-member body Syndicate. It is not a body which would continue for 4 years. University of Poona has also an equivalent of PU Syndicate which continues for 5 years, with no change in it. There are some very good things in the governance structure of this University which could be somewhat modified. It might be that they elect a Syndicate for a period of two years or half the members go in the next year. There could be some reforms so that more and more people who aspire to be part of daily governance could be involved and move forward and some governance reforms could be made so that everybody feels a sense of participation or may be run the University governance in the form of a Sub-Committee as the Parliament also has some Sub-Committees. Let there be Senate Sub-Committees which handle the situation regarding the governance. They have enough experience. Let them bring in some reforms, some changes that they did not lose this representative character of governing this University.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor must not have idea what are the stringent rules for the deemed universities. He said that they (CRRID) were offered to become deemed University. As a research institution, he refused it after going through the entire process. He found that it is totally surrendering the autonomy, getting into the hands of the middle-class bureaucrats worth nothing. So it is not that simple. He said that the outer part of deemed universities seems to be very glorious but if they see inside as he has seen his counterparts and interacted with them and found that they are finding it very difficult. They are in a better situation like IIMs as IIMs are getting so much funds from the private sector, and Professor R.P. Bambah could better tell it as he is the Chairman (of CRRID). Similarly, Tata Institute of Social Sciences has survived because it is getting lot of money from Tata Trusts and if it is not getting funds from Tata Trust, it would not have maintained its autonomy. Nor they (CRRID) could have as an institute maintained that kind of autonomy and become an institute of national importance. It is not that simple. It is like flower without thorns. It is very difficult.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are already a heritage University with national standing.

IV.

Item **C-1** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-1.

To elect (by simple majority vote) two Fellows (Non-Syndics) as members of Board of Finance for a term of one year i.e. from 1.2.2017 to 31.1.2018 under Regulation 1.1(iv) at page 37 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. The following valid nominations duly proposed and seconded, have been received:

1. Dr. Balbir Chand Josan
Principal Lodge
D.A.V. College
Sector-10
Chandigarh
2. Professor Rajat Sandhir
Department of Biochemistry
Panjab University
Chandigarh
3. Shri Sanjay Tandon
1636, Sector 18-D
Chandigarh
4. Dr. Sarabjit Kaur
Guru Ram Dass B.Ed. College
Jalalabad (West)
Distt. Fazilka
5. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
Kenway College of Education
Hanumangarh Road
Abohar-152116

2. The candidature of the above persons is provisional subject to their being **not** elected as members of the Syndicate in the ensuing election on 18.12.2016.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have been five valid nominations namely from Principal B.C. Josan, Professor Rajat Sandhir, Shri Sanjay Tandon, Dr. Sarabjit Kaur, Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang. As per Regulation, only two Fellows (Non-Syndics) are to be elected as members of the Board of Finance. If any of the candidates wish to withdraw, they could do so.

Principal B.C. Josan, Dr. Sarabjit Kaur and Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang withdrew their candidature on the floor of the House.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be declared unanimously elected as members of the Board of Finance for a term of one year, i.e., from February 1, 2017 to January 31, 2018, under Regulation 1.1(iv) at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Professor Rajat Sandhir
Department of Biochemistry
Panjab University
Chandigarh
2. Shri Sanjay Tandon
1636, Sector 18-D
Chandigarh.

- V.** Considered the recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 15.11.2016 (Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 20) **(Item C-2 on the agenda)**, as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 21).

ITEM 3

That the existing provisions for English Proficiency Course (EPC) in the Department of English and Cultural Studies be revised as per (Appendix-II) (Page – 2).

Existing in Budget Estimate 2016-17		Revised Estimates	
English Proficiency Course	Amount	English Proficiency Course for Department of English and Dean International Students	Amount
		Department of English	
(i) Honorarium to Teachers	60000	(i) Honorarium to Teachers @ Rs.1000/- per session & Co-ordinator @ Rs.5000/- per course	500000
(ii) Office & General Expenses	13500	(ii) Office & General Expenses	100000
(iii) Secretarial Assistance	5000	(iii) Overtime to Supporting Staff	100000
(iv) Material Production/upgrading	25000	(iv) Material Production/upgrading	200000
		(v) Licences Fee for Online Platform by 'Skills Anytime'	690000
		Dean International Students	
		(i) Overtime to Supporting Staff	20000
		(ii) Office & General Expenses	20000
		(iii) Transportation for International Students	200000
TOTAL	103500	TOTAL	1830000
		Revenue Receipts	5000000
		Note: The estimate has been made for 20 courses (each course contain 25 students per course).	

NOTE: (i) Skills Anytime provide online, hosted Interactive English language assessments and learning courses, designed to provide individualised learning pathways for English language development. The Skills Anytime product range consists of English Anytime and Speaking, Listening, Reading, Writing ('SLRW') as student programmes/resources, and which are supported by a tutor interface to manage the learning process. Skills Anytime' was launched by bksb India Private Limited, founded January 2015, as a subsidiary company of bksb Limited.

(ii) Since, it is now compulsory for all international students of the University to complete the EPC; hence the office of Dean, International Students has joined hands with the department for running this course. In order to include these structural changes and add the online platform, there is a need to rationalize the budget for the course.

- (iii) 'Skills Anytime' was selected by the committee comprising of the then EPC Coordinator, Director Central Placement Cell and Dean International Students for providing this on-line platform.
- (iv) The Department of English & Culture Studies has been running the English Proficiency Course (EPC) and gained popularity over the years. Keeping with up gradation, certain structural changes have been made in the course. It was also proposed to provide an online platform for one year to every student for continued input from the course.

ITEM 4

That the Vice-Chancellor be **authorized** to sanction honorarium to Mr. Subhash Chander, Senior Technician G-II, Department of Physics, for recognition of his outstanding performance to his work.

NOTE: The Chairperson, Department of Physics on the recommendation of the Administrative Committee of the Department of Physics forwarded the case to the Vice-Chancellor vide letter No. PHS/729 dated 20.5.2016 (Appendix-IV) (Page-4) for grant of two Special increments to Sh. Subhash Chander, Senior Technician (G-II) for recognition of his dedication and devotion to his work.

- a) Sh. Subhash Chander, Senior Technician (G-II) was awarded commendation certificate on 26th January, 2015 in recognition of his outstanding performance towards his work.
- b) Before joining in the Department of Physics in 1993, Shri Subhash Chander served as electrician in the Construction Office for about ten years and is apt in handling all kinds of electrical renovation, repair and maintenance work relating to electrical installation.
- c) Mr. Subhash Chander actively involved in National level events organized in the University and Department from time to time and also provided support in DAE Nuclear Physics Symposium (1999), All India Vice-Chancellors' Conference (2001, Meeting of the Indian Academy of Sciences (2003) etc.
- d) Regular monitoring of audio visual system in the Senate and Syndicate meetings and other events of the Campus.
- e) The Vice-Chancellor constituted a Committee to consider the case of Shri Subhash Chander.
- f) The Committee at its meeting held on 16.06.2016 recommended that the case for two accelerated increments to Shri Subhash Chander be referred to P.U. Syndicate for approval as he is a 'B' class employee.

- g) The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.07.2016 vide paragraph 35 (Appendix- V) (Page – 5) resolved that the item be referred to the Board of Finance.

Item 5

That the Technical Officer of the University Institute of Engineering & Technology and Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology working in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + GP 5000/5400 be given the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP 5400 w.e.f. 01.11.2012 as has been granted to the Technical Officer (G-I) of Laboratory and Technical Cadre.

Additional Financial Liabilities: Rs.7.97 lacs p.a. (approx.)

- NOTE:** 1. The sanctioned and filled position of Technical Officer is as under:

Sr. No	Name of Department	Sanctioned Position	Filled Position
1.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology	6	4
2.	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology	2	1

2. The pay-band/Grade pay of the Laboratory and Technical Group I posts has been revised w.e.f. 01.11.2012 from (Rs.10300-34800+ GP 5000) to Rs.15600-39100 + GP 5400.
3. The pay band and Grade pay of equivalent posts of Technical Officers of UIET and UICET remains at Rs.10300-34800 + GP 5000/5400 as these posts were not part of the Group-I Technical posts.
4. The Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in its meeting dated 02.08.2016 considered the issue and observed that the nature of work and required qualification for these posts are similar, hence recommended that the posts of Technical Officer of University Institute of Engineering & Technology and Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology be given the pay scale of Technical Officer (G-I) i.e. Rs.15600-39100 + GP 5400 w.e.f. 01.11.2012 as has been granted to the Technical Officer (Group – I) of the Laboratory & Technical cadre.

ITEM 6

That –

- (i) Review Petition or the LPA as may be advised by the University counsel be filed against the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana dated 26.09.2016 in case of Professor Vinod C. Nanda and others

verses Panjab University vide CWP No. 21795 of 2014 (Appendix- VII) (Page-8 to 12).

- (ii) the case for amendment in the Regulation 3.9, Panjab University, Calendar Vol.-I 2007 be sent to Government of India that the operation of Regulation 3.9 be given effect from 18.06.2012.

NOTE: (i) The regulation 3.9 is reproduced here below:

“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 recruitment 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 post-graduate research or specialist qualification or experience in scientific, technological or professional field is essential, and

(b) to which candidates of more than twenty five years of age are normally recruited.

Provided that this concession shall not be admissible to an employee unless this actual qualifying service at the time he quits University service is not less than ten years”.

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of a Committee dated 28.05.2012 had passed the orders that the benefit of addition in qualifying service under Regulation 3.9 shall be implemented prospectively i.e. from 18.06.2012. Whereas the petitioners filed the writ before the Hon'ble High Court that the above benefit be implemented from the year 2006 when they had deposited amount of CPF and became eligible for grant of Pension.

(iii) Tentative amount of arrears of revised pension as under:

Sr. No.	Name	Revised Pension	Interest @ 9% p.a.
1.	Dr. V.C. Nanda	3,22,788	2,85,668 (approx.)
2.	Dr. Sunder Lal	3,23,019	2,85,875 (approx.)

ITEM 7

That no contractual appointments be converted into temporary appointments.

NOTE: (a) The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.01.2013 (Appendix- VIII) (Page-13 to 16-E) while considering the term of appointment of Dental Institute resolved that:

“.....that all the teachers appointed on contract basis in the University be treated appointed on temporary basis and the benefit of all allowances like HRA etc. be given to them with retrospective effect.”

(b) The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 reviewed the above decision in view of observation of Audit regarding conversion of appointments from retrospective date. After such review the Syndicate resolved that:

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

(c) The above decision of the Syndicate was also approved by the Senate dated 27.09.2015 as per Appendix- IX (Page-17).

(d) In pursuance of the decision of the Syndicate & Senate the case was submitted to the Audit to admit the consequential benefits as per above decision and the audit observed that (i) the case be illegally examined whether Contractual appointment be converted into temporary appointment from the retrospective date. (ii) approval of Board of Finance be also obtained since the proposal involve financial implications.

ITEM 8

Noted and Ratified the decision of the Vice-Chancellor for sanction of Honorarium to the Faculty Members who have been given the additional charge in the Central Placement Cell out of Central Placement Fund to strengthen the placement activities for the students of University with the modification that Honorarium be paid prospectively i.e. from the date of decision of the Board of Finance.

Sr. No.	Name	Additional Charge given as	Honorarium p.m. (fixed)	With effect from date of their joining
1.	Professor Suresh K. Chadha	Honorary Director	Rs.5000/-	17.01.2011
2.	Professor Deepti Gupta	Associate Director	Rs.2000/-	16.01.2014
3.	Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha	Associate Director	Rs.2000/-	16.01.2014
4.	Dr. Manu Sharma	Associate Director	Rs.2000/-	23.01.2014

ITEM 9

That a sum of Rs.1,87,110/-be sanctioned out of budget head 'Estate Fund' for fixing of BRC fabric grills on the existing glazing of 10 rooms of Hindi Department in Arts Block No.2, P.U. Campus, Chandigarh.

- NOTE:**
1. The Chairperson, Department of Hindi informed that the glasses of faculty member's room and class rooms of Arts Block No.II have been broken and Monkeys often come inside the rooms. The BRC fabric grilling is required to prevent the entry of monkeys.
 2. Estimates of Rs.1,87,110/-submitted by the Executive Engineer for fixing of BRC fabric grills is available as per Appendix- X (Page-18-19).

ITEM 10

That a sum of Rs.8.41 lac be sanctioned out of 'Teachers Holiday Home Fund' for the drainage system of Dingle Estate building and Three bridges building of P.U. Guest House at Shimla.

- NOTE:**
- (i) The Incharge, Panjab University Teachers Holiday Home Shimla intimated that there is an urgent requirement to connect the waste water of kitchen and Sewerage of wash rooms of Dingle Estate building and Three bridges building at Shimla, to the sewerage system of the city.
 - (ii) A detailed estimate submitted by Executive Engineer-I is available as per Appendix-XI (Page-20 to 23).

ITEM 11

That a sum of Rs.17.00 lacs be sanctioned out of Development Fund for purchase of Books & Journals to comply with the requirement of Dental Council of India (DCI) for running the MDS courses as per Appendix- XII (Page-24).

ITEM 12

That:

- (i) an additional provision of Rs.12,92,325/-(NR) be sanctioned in the budget head 'General Administration sub-head-Service Charges to Bank' for payment of service charges to State Bank of India, Sector 14, Chandigarh @ Rs.20,000/- p.m. for the period from 01.01.2012 to March,2017 plus Service Tax as applicable.
- (ii) that the feelings of the members of the BOF should also be conveyed to the SBI that being a captive banker of the Panjab University, they should continue to provide the services of operation of University Fee Counter free of charge from April 2017 onwards as a goodwill gesture for having such a long term relationship with the bank.

NOTE: (i) The Brief facts are as under:

- (a) On the request of the Panjab University, the State Bank of India has deputed its officials to collect the fee from students at the Panjab University Fee Counter. In consideration of that, the University had agreed to pay monthly service charges of Rs.20,000/- to SBI. For this, an agreement was also signed which was valid upto 30.09.2007.
- (b) Thereafter, a Committee was constituted for renewal of agreement. Such Committee in its meeting dated 05.09.2012 recommended for the renewal of the agreement with enhanced monthly service charges of Rs.25,000/- However, the formal agreement could not be signed as the bank was requesting for a higher service charges. Nevertheless, irrespective of the renewal of the agreement, the bank has been providing its services for collection of the fee from the students till date.
- (c) The SBI vide letter No. BM/2016-17/29 dated 20.05.2016 has requested to release the payment of service charges from the period 01.01.2012 onwards and, also requested to execute fresh agreement at the enhanced rate from October, 2015.
- (d) The service charges to State Bank of India is payable @ Rs.20,000/- p.m. for the period January, 2012 to

August, 2012 alongwith service tax as applicable and @Rs.25,000/- p.m. (as recommended by the Committee dated 05.09.2012 and approved by the Vice-Chancellor) for the period from September, 2012 to September,2015 alongwith service tax as applicable.

- (e) A Committee has been constituted and its meeting is fixed for 18.11.2016 to finalise the fresh agreement with SBI for operation of the fee counter. Till the time such agreement is executed, charges already recommended and approved by the Vice-Chancellor i.e. Rs.25000/- per month plus service tax may be paid to the SBI out of Budget Head "Service Charges to Bank".

ITEM 13

That a provision of Rs.10,52,146/- under the head 'Checking of Account by IPAI' be approved.

- NOTE:**
1. The proposal for extension of term of assignment of Institute of Public Auditors of India (IPAI) upto February, 2017 for checking of Non- Plan and Provident Fund Account for the last 3 years i.e. 2012-2013, 2013-2014 & 2014-2015 was submitted to Board of Finance in its meeting dated 01.08.2016.
 2. The Board of Finance after due deliberation did not recommend the extension (Appendix-XIII) (Page-25).
 3. In pursuance of decision of the Board of Finance as above, the term of IPAI was restricted upto 31st August, 2016.
 4. The above provision has been requested to make the payment to IPAI for their services which they had rendered from April, 2016 to August, 2016.

Item 14

Noted and Ratified the rates of the Honorarium for the conduct of Senate Election 2016 as follows:

- (a) For Pre conduct of Senate Election - as approved by the Syndicate vide Para 45 dated 01.05.2016 as per Appendix- XIV (Page-26).
- (b) For conduct of Senate Election - as approved by the Vice Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate as per Appendix-XV (Page-27-28).
- (c) For Counting of Votes - as approved by the Vice-Chancellor as per Appendix- XVI (Page-29-30).

NOTE: The payment of above honorarium shall be made from the budget head 'General Administration sub-head Election of Fellows' where the adequate provision exist which has already been approved by the Board of Finance.

ITEM 15

Noted and Ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor in sanctioning a sum of Rs.1,71,230/- out of 'Development Fund Account' for purchase of Photocopier Machine on DGS&D rate contract on buyback terms for General Administration (Secrecy Branch) (Appendix- XVII) (Page-31).

- NOTE:**
- (i) The old Photocopier Machine (Model MP2000 Le) was purchased on 22.12.2009. This photocopier machine had outlived its life and had become unserviceable, hence the same was written off with the approval of the Vice-Chancellor.
 - (ii) Due to work of secrecy and urgency it was not feasible to get the Photostat from market.
 - (iii) The new Photocopier (Ricoh Model MP3554 SP) has been purchased on DGS&D rate contract on buyback terms on 03.05.2016 and installed in the Secrecy Branch on 11.05.2016.

ITEM 16

To note that the matter of appointment of Chief of University Security as per Appendix- XVIII (Page-32) be sent to UGC for their comments.

- NOTE:**
- (a) After the interview for the post of Chief of University Security, the minutes of the Selection Committee were place before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 8th October, 2016. After discussion, it was resolved that:

“in view of the recommendation of the Board of Finance that fresh appointments in future shall be made only on need basis with due justification and after getting the same approved from the Board of Finance, which have duly been approved by the Syndicate and Senate, the recommendation of Selection Committee dated 31.08.2016 & 01.09.2016 for appointment of Chief of University Security – 1 (Advt. No. 2/2016), Panjab University, Chandigarh be rejected by majority opinion (eight for rejection, one for approval and five for referring back to the Board of Finance).”

- (b) The above matter got raised a during the Zero Hour of Senate meeting dated 9th October, 2016. After due discussion, it was agreed to that the matter is to be placed before the next Board of Finance. If permitted by Board of Finance, the same will be

place before the next meeting of the Syndicate/Senate.

- (c) During the discussion on Revised Estimate of 2016-2017, in the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 01.08.2016, the Vice-Chancellor stated that:

“.....no advertisement with regard to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor was pending except that of constituent colleges where the teachers appointed vide walk in interviews have already been working against the vacant posts. A blanket ban on all inductions could adversely affect the functioning of the University. There could arise a need for critical inductions, like, Chief of University Security, Medical Officer(s), Deputy Registrar who have been selected but there was a court case and judgment in that case stands reserved. No Deputy Registrar has joined against advertisement for long and at the moment only one directly inducted Deputy Registrar is working in the University.”

- (d) The Board of Finance while approving the Revised Estimate of 2016-2017 has also resolved that:

“fresh appointments in future shall be made only on need basis with due justification after getting the same approved from the Board of Finance”.

ITEM 17

Withdrawn

Item 20

That the consolidated Balance Sheet and Income & Expenditure of Panjab University for the financial year 2015-16, prepared in accordance with the uniform format of accounting prescribed by the Government, be circulated to the members of BOF for information and to the Syndicate/Senate for approval, after making modification/corrections (if any) by getting the same examined properly by the audit.

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor has been authorized to approve the Audited Statement prepared in accordance with the Double Entry System, on behalf of the Syndicate and place the same before the Senate in its next meeting to be held on 17th December 2016.

Referring to Sub-Item 3, Shri Prabhjit Singh pointed out that the existing provision in the Budget Estimates for the year 2016-17 relating to honorarium to teachers was Rs.60,000/- and in the Revised Estimates, it has been enhanced to Rs.5 lac, which is a five times increase. Similarly, there is a provision Rs.1 lac for over-time to supporting staff. He enquired whether this course would be run after the office hours because overtime is only to be given if the course is to be run after the duty hours; otherwise, question of over-time does not arise. At the same time, a provision of Rs.20,000/- has also been made for the office of Dean International Students.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that all these classes are to be held in the evening in convenience with the foreign students. Moreover, the foreign students want these classes to be held on Saturdays, Sundays and other holidays.

Continuing, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that a revenue of Rs.50 lac has been shown to be earned from about 500 students. His concern is as to how much fee is supposed to be charged from these foreign students. He enquired as to how Rs.50 lac would be collected from 500 foreign students.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Finance & Development Officer has informed him that the fee is Rs.10,000/- per student.

Continuing, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it has been written here that "Since it is now compulsory for all international students of the University to complete the EPC; hence, the office of Dean, International Students has joined hands with the Depart for running this course".

The Vice Chancellor said that those foreign students, who do not know English, they have to undergo this course, but those who know English, they could walk out of this course.

Continuing further, Shri Prabhjit Singh pointed out that they themselves are admitting that the expenditure is Rs.18.30 lac, whereas the revenue to be earned is Rs.50 lac. As such, the high fee to be charged from the students is a big burden on them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that, in fact, that money is to be paid by the ICCR to the students. As such, in a way the money is to come to the University from the ICCR.

Referring to Sub-Item 4, Professor S.K. Sharma said that he wishes to point out that such duties are being done in each Department. Maybe not in one or two, but in most of the Departments such duty of audio visual is being performed. If they give two increments to this person.

The Vice Chancellor interjected to say that increments are not being granted, and only a small honorarium is being given.

Professor S.K. Sharma said, "No, No". This is basically two increments.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that two increments have not been granted by the Board of Finance. In fact, the Vice Chancellor has been authorized to sanction honorarium to this person.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that even if the honorarium is being granted, either the same should be for all or for none because the same work is being done in almost every Department. If they granted this honorarium to only one person, there would be problem to others. Either they might stop performing that work or they would also demand this honorarium. As such, the total financial liability should be taken care of; otherwise, the University has to spend a lot. They could not do pick and choose.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not doing any pick and choose because it has been recommended by the Administrative Committee of Department of Physics. If such a recommendation comes from other Department(s), they would see the same.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that there would be going to be ripple affect.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Alright, they would see".

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that what he (Professor S.K. Sharma) means to say is that everybody is outstanding, which could not be.

Referring to Sub-Item 5, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that in this item the pay-scale/grade pay of five employees has been sought to be changed, and in accordance with the agenda, they are going to pay a sum of Rs.8 lac per year to these five employees. (Vice Chancellor) has granted to change the pay-scale of five employees, and that too, from the retrospective effect. There is a liability of Rs.32 lacs of only four previous years, i.e., 2012 to 2016. Though they are so much concerned with the finances, they are giving this to these employees. Why they are going to give this. According to him, even this calculation is also wrong because here the date of appointment of any of these employees has not been mentioned. Even if they are presuming that all these employees have been appointed in the year 2012, there is an increase of about Rs.12,000/- to Rs.13,000/- per employee per month. It is not written as to when their posts were advertised and when these employees were appointed, and also whether these pay-scale/s and grade pays was/were mentioned in the advertisement. Whichever Committee was constituted, it has said that since their qualifications and work is equal, they are recommending these pay-scales and grade pays. Personally, he has nothing against any of these employees, but tomorrow several persons would come, including from Dental Institute, UIET, etc. pleading that they are also doing the same job. He urged the Vice Chancellor to re-look into the whole issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has already been approved.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there is misnomer over here. In fact, these people have the same expertise and same qualifications as that of Technical Officers (G-I). The scale of Grade-I people was increased, but of these people was not. Basically, they said that they are doing the same job, have the same qualifications and have the same experience, why they should be debarred. So this is basically to give them the benefit.

Referring to Sub-Item 6, Professor R.P. Bambah enquired why are they going for this review petition?

The Vice Chancellor said that personally, he is not in favour of this review petition, but this is the decision of the Board of Finance and he could not do anything. He was not in favour of filing this review petition as this review petition is uncalled for, for variety of reasons. First of all, it is adding of five years to those who had joined the University with Ph.D. degree and so on and so forth. It is a norm all over the Country. They (University) have themselves recommended to the MHRD that regulation(s) that number of years for getting full pension should be brought down from 33 years to 25 years. If they decrease the number of years from 33 to 25, it would be okay to them. However, the said Regulation is languishing in Delhi. So they are unnecessarily putting the review petition. This review petition is being again put on the premise that the Court order is that there money should be given to them from the date they were due. From the date they were due means that previous payment has to be made and the interest has also to be paid. As such, it has a financial difficulty/liability. Since they are going through a financial crisis, they (Government) should deny them. He just does not agree with this logic at all, but it is not his personal decision. He had written it in the file that they should not do it. The Senate could take a call, but he could not. The Senate could take a call to decide to refer it back to the Board of Finance because it is a financial matter.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that it is unnecessary because the Courts are already over burdened.

The Vice Chancellor stated that given the fact that they have recommended that 33 years should brought down to 25 years and this five years addition becomes a redundant thing. They know that the people who joined the University in the 1960s with their Ph.D. when they how difficult time in getting these people to come and join, and at

that time there was no Pension Scheme in the University. When some of the members suggested that it should be referred back to the Board of Finance, the Vice Chancellor said, "Okay".

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it would have been better, had it been recorded in the minutes of the Board of Finance that the Vice Chancellor personally is not in favour of filing the review petition, because in the present form it looks as if it is a unanimous decision of the Board of Finance, which has duly been endorsed by the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that he had written on in the file. On hindsight, he understands what he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying. However, he does not want to confront with Board of Finance, where the representatives of Governments were sitting like hawks to cut every extra expenditure.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he understands that indirectly, he (Vice Chancellor) wishes that the Board of Finance to be confronted by the Senate and not the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate is the Governing Body and he is not the Governing Body.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that but the Vice Chancellor as the Chairman of the Senate, Syndicate and the Board of Finance is the best person to guide on the basis of his judgement as to what is his opinion in the matter. So it would have been better, if the Vice Chancellor had got his opinion recorded in the minutes of the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor again clarified that he had recorded his opinion in the file. They themselves have approved that the minimum years of service for becoming eligible for the full pension should be brought down 33 years to 25 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, what they expect is that he should put it before the Board of Finance irrespective of the fact what decision is taken there, because it should not give an impression that the Vice Chancellor is also a unanimous on this decision which has been taken in the meeting of the Board of Finance.

Professor D.V.S. Jain remarked that when the Vice Chancellor had written it in the file, how it is a unanimous decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not got his dissent recorded because how could a person, who is presiding over the meeting, record his dissent.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that it is very difficult for the Vice Chancellor, who chairs the meetings, to record his dissent.

Professor Chaman Lal stated that so far as this review petition is concerned, he does not know the facts, he wants to say is that if the UGC and the Government(s) had reduced the qualifying service for the pension to 20 years not only five years less than to 33 years. Probably, it applies to the Central Government employees and Central Universities employees and they are getting full pension after 20/25 years of their complete service. He does not know about this case at all, but he thinks that the Central Government directive(s) and UGC's recommendation(s) allow people to avail full pension after 20/25 years of service. He suggested that the same should be adopted by the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have adopted it and have sent the amended regulations to Delhi, but they have not approved any regulation approved by this House over last 10 years. Any of the regulation which has been sent to Delhi, no decision on that has been given, and all of them are pending. When Professor R.P. Bambah enquired whether there is any stipulation, within which the Government has to convey its approval

(over some time period), the Vice Chancellor said that there is no such stipulation. Because they (UGC/MHRD) are their (University) pay master, this is the problem. If they wish to get the status of a Central University, the governance right(s), which they have until now, would also be reduced.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that he thinks that the Punjab Government has also adopted the above-said regulation/rule.

Professor Chaman Lal said that they could plead that they have just adopted the Central Government regulations/rules, which Central Government was supposed to approve.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would not serve any purpose. And as and when they say so, they would say reduce the number of employees.

Professor Chaman Lal said that, that they could not do because he knows that in other Central Universities, it has been done in a slow manner. They did not allow (other Central Universities) to make recruitments against the posts fallen vacant due to retirement, etc. They could not say that people should be dismissed from the service, as nobody, including the Government, could do that. Even when they were asking for ratio of 1:1.7 or 1:65, they had asked to do that within a stipulated period, i.e., 5 years' or 10 years' time.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not get into this because he could show them what has been filed in the Court by UGC/MHRD. Anybody could say something and could get away, because they are the receivers and they (Government) are the giver.

Professor Chaman Lal said that what he means to say is that as such they should not become a party to the kind of any loss to their employees, who have served their objective. Their position should be made clear to the Ministry of Human Resource & Development or the UGC.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could only make the things clear, but they do nothing. What could they do?

Professor Chaman Lal said that then the employees have the right to go to the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is what, the employees did. Though he does not want to file an LPA, the Audit and the Government people sitting in the Board of Finance said that this has a financial implication and the University does not have money, they should contest it.

Principal N.S. Sidhu said that if they have already approved it and sent the amended regulations to the Government for approval, then they have no right to file an LPA.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired is there other implications that it would affect many others.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could affect others.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that if that is the case, then they have to think about it very carefully and see as to how many others would be affected.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is even if 50 or 100 are affected, how does it matter? Money matter is nothing. One rank, one pension is to be given to all.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as far as he understood, the problem so far as pension is concerned is being faced by the University and also its different employees from time to time. If they read Regulation 2(i), they would find that amendment in Regulation 3.9 be sent to the Government of India that the operation of Regulation 3.9 be given effect from 18th June 2012, i.e., the date of the decision, pending for approval with the Government of India. This problem they have been facing in Panjab University specifically in view of the fact that they have a unique Pension Scheme as per Government of India. Though they were able to get it in 2006 and effective only to those employees, who have entered into service before 1.1.2004, and after getting it approved from the Government of India. Now the Government of India does not want to move even an inch this side or that side. They should not try to find fault with the Government or the audit people because what they say that they could go only as per the regulations. The Government says alright if they feel legally feasible and they have to give it legally, then instead of under the orders of Court, they should get their regulation(s) amended. And till the regulations are amended, he thinks that the Board of Finance must have said that till the regulations are amended, they must present their case by filing LPA that regulations do not permit and just because UGC or Government of India and other Central Universities have reduced the minimum service for becoming eligible for pension from 33 years to 20 years, it automatically applies to them (Panjab University) also. Probably, that argument was not accepted. Though it is a very-very difficult job as they had been discussing in the morning about the financial crunch of the University, of course, he came late and did not get an opportunity, he remembers that 10 years earlier, there was a proposal in this House only that let they write off the pending arrears, which the University has to receive from the Punjab Government. At that time, he had said that writing off means that they have accepted that there is no liability of Punjab Government on the Panjab University. They say practically, "Yes", but he (Shri Goyal) had said that at least on papers this amount should be shown as an outstanding towards Punjab Government. In the morning, they have been discussing the issue with respect to Central Government that let them assert that they give the grant to meet the deficit. Probably, they have completely forgotten as to what is the liability of Punjab Government, which in fact is the biggest hindrance in making this University as a Central University or a Heritage University or Centrally Funded University or University of National Importance because of whatever political reasons. Since that problem has taken the backseat, equally important, is the amendment of regulations relating to Pension Scheme. He (Vice Chancellor) also knows since he is here from the last four years that how many problems they have faced that the person is not entitled something and that some other person is not entitled something. He had written a letter also in 2012 or maybe in 2011 that these regulations are to be read to result into the maximum benefits to maximum employees of the University. The regulations, which in fact help an employee to get pension, those at least should be implemented. The regulations which are not beneficial to the employees, as has been done in this case, the Government says that their regulations do not permit, they could file an LPA, but the regulations which permit are not being implemented by the University itself because they say that when the Pension Scheme was introduced, though it is not written in the regulation(s) and also not in Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, but since they were the witness to it, there was also an understanding that this would not be and that would not be, and morally they could not implemented those regulations. He simple says that either they should go in accordance with the statutes or by what is practically feasible or not. But what they are doing unfortunately that both the things they are applying simultaneously both to the disadvantage of employees of the University. Firstly, whatever regulations are applicable to the advantage of the employees, they should start implementing them. Another request which he would like to make is that a small team of the members of the Senate should go and approach the persons who matter in Delhi to get the regulations amended so that at least the Pension, at par with other Central Universities is made available to those who are covered under the Pension Scheme which is applicable to Panjab University, i.e., to those who were here in service as on 31st December 2003. Secondly, so far as application of regulations is concerned, their regulations are very clear that if a person joins the Panjab University after having attained the age of 35 years, he/she would be given an option to accept the pension or not to accept the pension. In the

absence of any such option, he/she would be entitled only and only for the pension, and that regulation has not been amended while giving approval to the Pension Scheme. That regulation, of course, relates to the old Pension Scheme, but when they put the date that only up to 01.01.2004, they forgot to amend this regulation. In fact, the corresponding change should have been done in this also because if they are issuing the notification in 2006 and saying that this is applicable only to those who were there on 31st December 2003, and there is in the regulations that within three months one could opt. Obviously, the three months would start from February 2006 when the Pension Scheme was notified. So it is only for those who joined the University service after attaining the age of 35 years. After February 2006, if within three months they do not opt, they are entitled for pension. As per that regulation, if the persons, who have joined the University service after attaining the age of 35 years after 2006, at least they should be given the benefit of Pension Scheme, but they are saying “No, No”, personal understanding was that it would be applicable only to those who were here on 31.12.2003. So again he wants to submit that let they try to do something to give this benefit of pension to maximum employees of the University because otherwise now the pension is going to be a history so far as the attitude of Government of India is concerned, and it is very-very alarming situation that the biggest tool of social security, i.e., pension and if this is denied, he wonders what is to be to happen to the employees.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they do not file the LPA, they would again be accused that they have not tried to save the funds of the University. At that time, there was a feeling that LPA should be allowed to be filed and the Court would dismiss the same.

Professor R.P. Bambah enquired would they not be expenditure on LPA?

The Vice Chancellor said that so far as expenditure on LPA is concerned, it is a small expense. However, if they did not file the LPA, the Centre would say that even though the Board of Finance had suggested filing of LPA, they deliberately did not do so. As such, they are irresponsible so far as financial management of University is concerned. One could also get an application filed from a RTI Activist and get the same drop in the drop-box of Prime Minister, who would ask them as to why they did not file the LPA. Then he would have to give a detailed reply. It is because of this that he agreed to file the LPA.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that then he thinks that they have to attend to it very carefully because this is the ordered dated 26th September 2016 and the LPA is to be filed within a stipulated period. Are they sure that they would be able to get the nod of Board of Finance within the stipulated period. If they are sure, then it is okay, but if they say that it should again be taken to the Senate, and by the time it would come to the Senate again, the limitation period of filing the LPA would already be over.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is why, he suggested that the LPA should be allowed to be filed.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the LPA has not been filed so far because they might be waiting for the meeting/decision of the Senate. Since the Board of Finance has met only recently, i.e., on 15th November 2016, what would they do if the Board of Finance does not meet in near future? Then the limitation period for filing the LPA would be over and the Senate would also say that it has to be guided by the Vice Chancellor, and while taking the decision they did not know its implication. As such, all these things need to be discussed keeping everything in mind because tomorrow they could be blamed that they did this with a special design in their mind, they wanted to expire the 90 days period so that even if the decision is reiterated by the Board of Finance that the LPA be filed, even then the LPA could not be filed.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is why, he suggested that the LPA should be allowed to be filed.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he would go by the LPA as it is the safer route as there are also far more implications than they are realizing at the moment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they are hopeful rather it goes to the advantage of the employees if the LPA is dismissed. However, if the LPA is not filed, then probably, on the basis of this order they could not extend this benefit to all. Therefore, it should be considered after lunch, after taking into consideration all the implications.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay".

Referring to Sub-Item 9, Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that he would like to bring to their notice, especially the Chair, that for the last few months there is a terror of monkeys in Arts Block-II.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not discussing monkeys.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that first he (Vice Chancellor) should see as to what the item is. The item is that a provision of Rs.1,87,110/- has been made in the Budget for fixing of BRC fabric grills on the glazing of 10 rooms of Department of Hindi in Arts Block-II at Panjab University Campus, for which he is thankful to the Vice Chancellor. He is going to discuss an issue directly related to that. If he (Vice Chancellor) allows him to continue, only then there would be advantage.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he (Dr. Gurmeet) has objection to this sum or the sum is being wrongly granted, only then he could speak; otherwise, he could raise the point/issue during the zero hour.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that one day a monkey entered into the room of a senior faculty member and spoiled the entire furniture, including the heritage furniture. When he pointed out the same to the higher authorities, it was said that it would be placed before the Board of Finance. Even though a month has gone to the meeting of the Board of Finance, nothing has been done so far. He urged the Vice Chancellor to make a provision from where certain emergency expenses could be met. In the South Block, where the Prime Minister's office is, even the monkeys are there also. When he enquired from the staff of the Dean of Student Welfare Office, they told him that earlier there was a system under which the 'Langoors' were hired to get the monkeys dispersed. Had that system not been discontinued, perhaps they might not have to spend this sum of Rs.1.87 lac. It is not a small issue. In fact, one day a student slipped from the stairs and got injured. Fortunately, the injury was not severe. He pleaded that there should be system in the University to address such problems under which even if *post facto* permission is to be sought from the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dean of Student Welfare, said that since a RTI had been filed, the practice of hiring of 'Langoors' was discontinued. Thereafter, they have appointed four persons, who later on left the job. Yesterday, they have again appointed five employees to do this job. They are sure that they would not face such a problem in future.

On a point of information, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired should they accept this explanation that since an application under RTI Act was filed, they discontinued with those services.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that there is a restriction on exploiting 'Langoors' for this purpose from the Ministry of Environment.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that so they should say that to avoid allegation of cruelty against animals, they have dispensed with the services of 'Langoors', and not because of application under RTI Act. Otherwise, it would lead to a conclusion as if they have now replaced five 'Langoors' with five employees.

Referring to Sub-Item 10, Shri Jagdish Chander said that he has a query as well as a suggestion. A provision of Rs. 8.41 lac has been made for the drainage system at Teachers' Holiday Home at Shimla. In fact, they have two buildings there, i.e., Dingle Estate Building and Three Bridges Building. Three Bridges Building is not functional at all. In this building, there are no rooms, no infrastructure and no beddings, so firstly they should make a provision for such things and make the building functional, and then think for the drainage system. He suggested that a Committee should be formed to make the building functional.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the bags, Calendars and certain other items have been provided to them, for which they are thankful to the University Authorities. However, he wants to bring it to the notice of the Vice Chancellor that though it looks that the P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 has been printed afresh, the list of Senate members is of the year 2004. He urged the Vice Chancellor to get the said list replaced with the list of new members.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that the list of old members has been there because the list of new members, which was given for printing, has not yet come. Anyway, they are going to send all of them a booklet, which would have names of all the new Senators with their photographs and other additional information. Even one volume of the Calendar and the diary is also missing because the addresses in the diaries were wrong. The diaries needed to be updated and they are correcting the mistakes. They are working on these and they would be ready and provided to them soon.

Shri Jarnail Singh pointed out that, in fact, the Calendar is of the year 2007. Now, it is 2016 and in the intervening period so many things have changed. He suggested that the office should be instructed to incorporate requisite changes in the relevant Calendars and the revised Calendars be supplied to them within next six months.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is very good that a sum of Rs.8.41 lac has been sanctioned for teacher Holiday Home, but he thinks that he had tried to bring to the notice of the Vice Chancellor earlier also that there are certain small things which need to be done on an urgent basis. Probably, during his visit to the site, the Vice Chancellor had also passed some orders that this should be done immediately, and he thinks that it was about a year back but it is yet to be done. His simple request is that whatever is possible by spending meagre amount, it should be done. He undertakes if it is not possible for the University officials to meet those small expenses for the facility of the teachers, who visit Holiday Home, whatever the expenses are, he is ready to bear those expenses.

Principal R.S. Jhanji pointed out that when last time this issue was raised, it was assured that the Registrar would improve the things there in the next six months. At that time, he had also said that since his Fellow colleagues as well as teachers from the University as well as affiliated Colleges visit the Holiday Home, its condition should be improved. In fact, the condition is very bad, especially the washrooms of both odd and even numbers. He added that the even numbers are slightly better but nobody wishes to take odd number. Though it was ensured that they would improve the things within the six months, but no change has occurred. He suggested that a Committee comprising of those persons, who could visit there, should be formed to make the recommendations to get the pathetic condition improved.

The Vice Chancellor said that Shri Varinder Singh and Dr. Parveen Goyal are assigned this task.

Referring to Sub-Item 20, Shri Raghbir Dyal drew the attention of the House towards page 22 of the Audit Statement and enquired whether the sum of Rs.73 lac comprised of admission fee only or it comprised of various funds because the column of admission fee has been left blank. Is the tuition fee comprised of tuition fee only it

includes all the courses being offered in University Teaching Departments, including Self-Financing Courses?

The reply to this was given in affirmative.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that but they have not given the details of the schedule from where this Rs.73 lac has come.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to come and look at the file.

Continuing Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his second query is whether they have held the meeting of the Think-Tank after enhancing the examination fee or not.

The Vice Chancellor replied in negative and said that they are just waiting for the outcome of the Court. They have to enhance the income of the University. They have made a commitment that they would enhance the income of the University at the rate the expenditure get increased; otherwise, they would not give the grant.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether the so called enhancement of 12% would come out through any other sources, or the students are the only alternative.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has to come through all the sources and it could not come from arbitrary means.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired what they had been contemplating during the last four years? Are they making a beginning?

The Vice Chancellor said, "Yes", they would make a beginning; rather, they have already made a beginning.

Continuing further, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he congratulates the University that at last they have adopted the Double Entry System. However, there are certain glaring mistakes for which the audit notes have been provided. Although it is a new system and very complex system, he has an opportunity to go through the audit notes, which have been attached in the form of Annexure-A and the same he would like to bring to the notice of the House. Firstly, Schedule-III is sponsored projects. There are many instances where the opening balances of various projects have been left out. Wrong opening balances have been taken and also wrong income and expenditures have been taken. Now, the necessary corrections have been made with which the liability has increased by Rs.8 crore in the Plan Account. Secondly, what they had been doing till now – the deficit of Non-Plan, i.e., Academic Note No. 4 which clearly shows that now they have adjusted the deficit of two previous years, i.e., the financial years 2014-15 and 2015-16. The interest earned on the investment made out of the surplus fund lying in the Plan Account might not be treated as income of Plan Account without the consent of grant giving agency/agencies. So the practice being followed by the University during the previous years is that they had been transferring the interest amount from plan income to the non-plan income without taking the consent from the grant giving agencies, and the same might be in various research projects and institutions of higher learning. Most importantly, there is a note that even the loans have been taken from the Plan Account without taking permission from the grant giving agencies. Referring to number 15, he said that the figures of income and expenditure and investment, the closing balance, etc. of hostels, Dean of Student Welfare and Sports Department have been incorporated in the Financial Statement, but these accounts have not been got audited from the Local Audit Department. Why these have not been got audited? As far as Hostel and sports funds are concerned, he would like to have a statement that the Hostel and sports funds for the year 2015-16 has not been audited from the Local Audit Department.

It was clarified that so far as the Audit notes and other notes as the hon'ble member has referred to, these are the normal part of checking of any Balance Sheet or

income and expenditure of any organization. So these notes have been duly considered and wherever any modifications or corrections are to be made, the same have accordingly been incorporated, and accordingly the audit has certified the consolidated income expenditure account of the University. So far as non-auditing of Hostel and Sports Department funds by the Local Audit Department are concerned, this has been the practice in vogue for the last many decades. This position has already been put up before the Governing body of the University as to what practice was been followed in the case of Hostels Account. Now, on the basis of a Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor it has been decided that from next financial year onward these accounts shall also be audited by the Local Audit Department, but till the financial year 2015-16 the same practice, which was being followed for the so many decades, has been followed, i.e., professional Chartered Accountants (CAs) were being engaged by the Hostels and they certified the financial statement, and on the basis of the certified financial statement by the CAs, the figures have been incorporated and have duly been verified by the Local Audit Department. So far as Sports Department is concerned, the Local Audit Department does not conduct 100% checking of the account, but carry out random checking only. As such, it is not that they are not doing the checking, but they are doing the checking on random basis. However, from the next financial, as the Committee has already recommended, the accounts of Hostels as well as Sports Department shall also be subject to audit by the office of the RAO.

Continuing further, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that before the financial year 2016-17, if his knowledge is correct, the income received from the Hostel has never been the part of their Balance Sheet. It is only in the year 2016-17 onwards the Hostels funds were made a part of the University Balance Sheet. But in the year 2015-16 these funds were part of the Balance Sheet, why these have not been audited by Local Auditors. Previously, he was made to understand that these are audited by the professional CAs, but since 2015-16 onwards these have been made part of the Balance Sheet, and he thinks that these should have been got audited from the Local Audit Department.

It was clarified that, in fact, it is not the income. Neither income nor expenditure out of the Hostels was included in the consolidated Balance Sheet of the University. This fact has already been brought to the notice of the Fact-Finding Committee constituted by the Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD) and they never raised any objection regarding the audit by the Professional CAs because for them it is a standard practice in many Government organizations. Even the UGC accepts the audited utilization certificate(s) duly attested by the Professional CAs, who are empanelled with the CAG Office. As such, they never objected as to why they (University) are getting it audited from the Professional CAs. Their only concern was that they should include both the income as well as expenditure of the hostels in the consolidated Balance Sheet of the University, so that they could have consolidated view. As per the *pro forma* approved by the Government of India, for all Central Education Institution, this balance sheet has been prepared. Now, accordingly for 2014-15 as well 2015-16 it is not only from 2015-16 actually they have incorporated from 2014-15 onwards the whole, i.e., the expenditure from the Hostels as well as income from the Hostels and also of the Sports Department in the consolidated Balance Sheet of the University and that has now been certified by the Local Audit Department. This is the decision of the University that in order to have parity of Hostels and Sports funds, they should start audit by the Local Audit Department because for that they have to change the structure of whole accounting of Hostels as each hostel has a separate accounting entity. There are about 18 accounting entities, which means, they have 18 accounts entities. So auditing of 18 accounting entities by a single audit office, is a very complex task. As such, to bring audit of all the Hostels in the ambit of RAO, they have to change the structural procedure of all the Hostels, for which a Committee was constituted under the chairmanship of Hon'ble Dean of University Instruction and the Committee has given the verdict they have to change the structure. Now they are in the process implementing it from 1st April 2017.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his only query is that since the purchases made by the office of Dean of Student Welfare during the financial year 2016 were in question. He

is not pointing fingers at the Audited Report of the Professional CAs, his only view is that since the purchases made by the office of Dean of Student Welfare were in question, ideally they should have gone for the Local Audit Department. If they had not done it, they should have gone for it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to make 4-5 points for her own knowledge and hopes that this time she is responded to. Referring to page 14, she said that it shows that the investment was earmarked for endowment fund, and Sr. is amalgamated funds under which the sum of about Rs.15 crore has been invested. She would like to know what is the item which has been included in it and who are the person(s) who are normally authorized to make purchases out of it?

It is clarified that amalgamated fund is a separate earmarked fund and has been approved by the Governing body of the University. So there is a separate Amalgamated Fund Committee, which approves various items of expenditure. The Committee is headed by the Dean of University Instruction and it comprised of representatives of students as well as faculty members and administrative officers of the University. This Committee meets on annual basis to consider demands of various Departments and depending upon the recommendations of that Committee, the Budget provisions are approved for the financial year and accordingly the expenditure is made. Whenever there is an expenditure, there are different Authorities which could approve the same out of those sanctioned provisions, i.e., Dean of University Instruction, Dean of Student Welfare and the Vice Chancellor. When Professor Rajesh Gill enquired that whether the Hostel wardens are authorized to make purchases out of this, the reply was given in negative. It was further clarified that that they could make purchases only against the sanctioned Budget provisions already approved by the Committee and by the Governing Body. They could only place order with the approval of the competent authority.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it means the Hostel Wardens could do it with the approval of the Dean of Student Welfare. She pointed out that at the same page the Budget provision for Teachers Holiday Home for the year 2015-16 is for Rs.1.45 crore. What were the different things for which this amount is to be spent?

It was clarified that it is also a fund which has been created many years before. In fact, this fund was created to make the Teachers Holiday Home self-sufficient. They deduct 5% of the remuneration paid to the evaluators and examiners towards this fund and matching amount is contributed by the University, i.e., 7%.

Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that the Budget provision for Holiday Home for the year 2014-15 is Rs.70 lac, whereas for the year 2015-16 it is Rs.1.45 crore.

It is clarified that out of this fund they used to meet the recurring expenditure of Teachers' Holiday Home as well as staff provided at those Holiday Homes. When Rajesh Gill asked where the same is the position in the case of Students' Holiday Home, the reply was given in affirmative.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to why there is a huge jump (from Rs.70 lac to Rs.1.45 crore) from 2014-15 to 2015-16 in the case of Teachers' Holiday Home?

It was clarified that actually this is only for investment. Sometimes, there could also be bank balance as on 31st March and the same gets converted into security on 1st April and that might have jumped to the next financial year.

Professor Rajesh Gill, referring to Sr. Nos. 8 and 9 (Hostel Security and Dean of Student Welfare Fund) at next page, said that nothing has been shown in the year 2014-15, which means they were not taking anything.

It was clarified that when they shifted to scientific based Double Entry Accounting System and whenever there is shift, there is always a chance that they might not have

full/complete information to make it full-fledged document. In that case, on the basis of available information, they prepare basic state of affairs and then it gets updated on year-to-year basis. So as far as 2014-15 is concerned, these details were not readily available. As such, when the prepared 2014-15 statement of affairs, they took note that this needed to be updated in the next financial year.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that then they should say that up to 2014-15, these details were not available. She further said that at page 27, the income from Consultancy has been shown and it is very shocking that this is very less amount (Rs.48,000/-), which they are getting from consultancy in such a esteemed and big University. She was worried that they have to do something about it as this could be a good source of income for the University. They also call it a heritage University, but they are just earning Rs.48,000/- through consultancy.

It was clarified that there is a separate earmarked fund also, i.e., CIIPP, which is being reflected separately in Schedule-II. However, the same is kept as earmarked fund.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that but she thinks that they have to work on this.

Dr. Parveen Goyal stated that their University has a good ranking and he has got elected from the Assistant Professor's Constituency. Their main problem is that even though they have high quality research facilities, the same are not being utilized optimally. In order to use these facilities optimally, they should make them online so that there is no repetition. If there is repetition, there would be problem because the University is already facing a financial crunch. Sometimes, they go to CDAS, CSIO and other organizations to do research and pay there, which later on they get reimbursed. Therefore, the research facilities which are available in the University, should be made online so that it is known to each and every faculty member. Secondly, they get pre-screening and screening done, and every file contains more than 120 pages. He suggested that an online portal should be created and the same should be developed by the Panjab University (Department of Computer Science & Applications and UIET as well), so that they could avoid wastage of time and paper and promote Digital India.

Professor D.V.S. Jain stated that he thinks that the issues raised by Dr. Parveen Goyal are very much valid because they had very costly equipments, but they are not used optimally. In fact, there should be a log book for every instrument, so that if any research scholar wants to work, he/she could sign that book and use the instrument. Secondly, he would like to say something for the research projects. They are lucky that their faculty has been able to get crores of rupees under different projects from DST, DBT and other grant giving agencies, but the Principal Investigators (PIs) are facing a lot of difficulties. He thinks that somehow the office does not understand the urgency of the action to be taken. About 30 years back, the problem was even worse. When Professor R.P. Bambah was the Vice Chancellor, he had constituted a Committee comprising Professor Harkrishan Singh, him (Professor Jain), Finance & Development Officer and Auditor(s) to look into the problem. At that time, all the papers had to be routed through the Head of the Department and the same was given directly to the Principal Investigators. He thinks it is high time now that they form a Committee which could again make suggestions because the projects are to be completed within a stipulated time and they must understand the urgency of action to be taken and the office should not delay the paper work by more than a week. Therefore, he (Vice Chancellor) must take some action on this issue and form a Committee to make recommendations.

RESOLVED: That recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 15.11.2016 (Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 20) **(Item C-2 on the agenda)**, as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 (Para 21), be approved.

VI. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-3**, on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-3. That Dr. Shweta, Assistant Professor at Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, Punjab University, Chandigarh, be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) w.e.f. 03.12.2013 as the API score obtained by her meets the UGC requirement with capping as per 2nd amendment.

- 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 candidates 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.

(Syndicate dated 8.10.2016 Para 3)

VII. Considered amendments in Regulations 1.2, 1.6 and 4.3 (**Item C-4 on the agenda – Syndicate dated 08.10.2016 Para 5**) appearing at pages 180-191 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, and

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) Regulations 1.2, 1.6 and 4.3 appearing at pages 180-191 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, be amended 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 REGULATIONS</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATIONS</u>
<p>1.2 The provisions of these Regulations shall apply to-</p> <p>** (a) all employees who joined service under the University before 1.1.2004;</p>	<p>1.2 No Change</p> <p>(a) all employees who joined service under the University before 01.01.2004 <u>and those employees who have joined the University on or after 1.1.2004 and borne on Pensionable post in the previous organization and have applied through proper channel without any break shall also be covered under old pension scheme under the provisions of these Regulations subject to the condition that the previous employer have transferred the pro-rata pensionary benefit to University as defined in Regulation 3.14(i).</u></p>

<p>(b) the employees who retired prior to the date of notification of these Regulations if they specifically elect to be governed by these Regulations by exercising an option as provided in Regulation 1.8 infra.</p>	<p>(b) <u>No Change</u></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">NOTE: The proposed amendment is an enabling provision to give effect to the notification No. 28/30/2004-P&PW (B) dated 26.7.2005 issued by Government of India, Ministry of Personal & Public Grievance and Pension, Department of Pension and Pension Welfare. This notification has been adopted by the Government of Punjab vide Notification No. 6/10/08-6/Finance Pension rules & Coordination/723 dated 24.10.2008. The same has been adopted by the Senate at its meeting dated 10.10.2010 vide Paragraph LVI. Through this notification the Govt. of India has clarified that all employees who entered in the Government service before 31.12.2013 and were governed by old Pension Scheme will continue to be governed by the same Pension Scheme as amended from time to time, if such employees submit technical resignation on or after 01.01. 2004 to take a new appointment in another government department or an autonomous body set up by the government.</p>	
<p>1.6 In the matter of application of these Regulations, regard may be given to the corresponding provisions of Pension Rules contained in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume II, as amended from time to time, insofar as, these can be adopted to the service in the University, but subject to such exceptions and modifications, as the University may from time to time, determine through Regulations.</p>	<p>1.6 In the matter of application of these Regulations, regard may be given to the corresponding provisions of Pension Rules contained in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume II, as amended from time to time, <u>as the University may, from time to time, determine through its governing bodies i.e. Board of Finance/ Syndicate/Senate.</u></p>
<p>4.3 In the case of an employee who has rendered 10 years (20 half years), or more of the qualifying service, the pension payable shall be calculated at the rate of 50% of average emoluments, if the qualifying service rendered is not less than 33 years (sixty six half years). In cases where the qualifying service is less than sixty six half years, the pension admissible shall first be calculated at 50% of average emoluments and then reduced proportionately, to completed half years service actually rendered, provided that pension shall, in no case, be less than Rs.375 per month.</p>	<p>4.3 In case an employee who has rendered 10 years (20 half years) or more of the qualifying service, the pension payable shall be calculated <u>as per the pension Rules of Punjab Govt. as contained in Punjab Civil Service Rules Volume II as amended from time to time.</u></p>

Explanation to the proposed amendment as above

The present Pension Regulations of the University as approved by the MHRD, are based on the Pension Rules as contained in the Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume-II. In the recent past, there had been some amendments in the Pension Rules of Government of Punjab consequent to the implementation of pay commission report w.e.f. 1.1.2006. E.g.

- (i) The benefit of full pension had been allowed on the basis of qualifying service of 25 years instead of 33 years;
- (ii) the minimum amount of pension now has been enhanced to Rs.3,500 p.m. from the earlier limit of Rs.375 p.m. from 1.1.1986 and Rs.1,310 p.m. from 1.1.1996.

The amendment of regulation as above has been proposed so that University may adopt and implement the changes in the Pension Rules as approved by the Government from time to time.

- (2) additions/amendments in Regulations 1.2(c), 1.8 (a) and 5.2 appearing at pages 180-187 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, (Para 21), 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 REGULATIONS	PROPOSED REGULATIONS
<p>1.2 The provisions of these Regulations shall apply to –</p> <p>**(a)all employees who joined service under the University before 1.1.2004;</p> <p>(b) the employee who retired prior to the date of notification of these Regulations if they specially elect to be governed by these Regulations by exercising an option as provided in Regulation 1.8 <i>infra</i>.</p>	<p>1.2 The provisions of these Regulations shall apply to –</p> <p>(a) all employees who joined service under the University before 01.01.2004 and those employees who have joined the University on or after 1.1.2004 and borne on Pensionable post in the previous organization and have applied through proper channel without any break shall also be covered under old pension scheme under the provisions of these Regulations subject to the condition that the previous employer have transferred the pro-rata pensionary benefit to University as defined in Regulation 3.14 (i).</p> <p>(b) No Change</p>

	<p>(c) the widow/widowers/ legal heirs of the employees who expired prior to the date of notification of these Regulations if they specifically opt to be governed by these Regulations from the date of amendment by exercising an option as provided in Regulation 1.8 <i>infra</i>.</p>
<p>1.8.(a) The employees who joined the service of the University before the date of notification of these Regulations shall have the option -</p> <p>(i) to continue to be governed by the Contributory Provident Fund-cum- Gratuity Scheme contained in Chapter VI Conditions of Service of University Employees” of the Panjab University Calendar, Vol. I, 1994.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) to elect to be governed by the Pensionary Scheme contained in these Regulations.</p> <p>(b) **<i>(i)</i> In the case of an employee who elects the alternative under sub clause (a)(ii) above, the total contribution of the University to his C.P. Fund Account as on 24.10.2005 or the date of retirement whichever is earlier, alongwith interest thereon, shall be transferred from his C.P. Fund Account for being credited to the University Pension Fund (Corpus).</p> <p>**<i>(ii)</i> The employee’s share of C.P. Fund, as on 24-10-2005, alongwith interest thereon, shall be transferred to his General Provident Fund Account to which he shall subscribe compulsorily under the rules of that fund as prescribed by the University from time to time.</p>	<p>1.8 (a) The employees or the widow/widowers/Legal Heirs of the employees on whom these regulations are applicable under Regulation 1.2 shall have the option -</p> <p>(i) to continue to be governed by the Contributory Provident Fund-cum- Gratuity Scheme contained in Chapter VI Conditions of Service of University Employees” of the Panjab University Calendar, Vol. I, 2007, as amended from time to time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) No change</p> <p>(b) (i) to (ii) No Change</p>

<p>(c) The option shall have to be exercised within such period as may be decided by the Syndicate and once exercised shall be final and irrevocable.</p> <p>(d) Those who fail to exercise the option within the period prescribed under Clause (c) above shall be deemed to have elected for continuing under the C.P. Fund and Gratuity schemes mentioned in sub-clause a (i) above.</p> <p>** (e) The employees who retired prior to 24.10.2005 may, if they so desire, elect to be governed by these Pension Regulations, subject to the condition that they refund the University's C.P. Fund contribution, including interest thereon, as received by them from the University for being credited to the University Pension Fund (Corpus). The University would neither charge any interest on this amount of the University share of C.P. Fund received by the retiree for the period from the date of his/her retirement upto the date of his/her joining the Pension Scheme nor would pay any arrear of pension. The pension may be made available to the employees from the date they deposit their University share of C.P. Fund, including interest thereon.</p>	<p>(c) to (d) No Change</p> <p>** (e) The employees who retired or the legal heir of an employee who deceased prior to 24.10.2005 may, if they so desire, elect to be governed by these Pension Regulations, subject to the condition that they refund the University's C.P. Fund contribution, including interest thereon, as received by them from the University for being credited to the University Pension Fund (Corpus). The University would neither charge any interest on this amount of the University share of C.P. Fund received by the retiree/legal heir for the period from the date of his/her retirement/death upto the date of his/her joining the Pension Scheme nor would pay any arrear of pension. The pension may be made available to the employees/legal heir from the date they deposit their University share of C.P. Fund, including interest thereon.</p>
<p>5.2 In the event of death after retirement, family pension is admissible only if the retiree was in receipt of pension at the time of death.</p>	<p>5.2 Family pension is admissible only if,</p> <p>(i) <u>the retiree was in receipt of pension at the time of death.</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) <u>the legal heirs of the deceased employee had opted for the pension under Regulation 1.8 (a)</u></p>

VIII. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-5**, on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

C-5. That recommendations of the Committee dated 23.06.2016, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to letter F.No. 5-1/2016 Pt. A (CPP-II) dated May 13, 2016 received from University Grants Commission, regarding amendment in nomenclature of degrees, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 08.10.2016 Para 6)

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that as per letter of the UGC dated 13th May 2016, Para 2nd is very clear which says that “The University is requested to give detailed justification on the degrees awarded by the University so as to place before the Standing Committee on specification of degrees in its next meeting”. This University is having a unique history imparting Honours School degree, and they are known for the uniqueness of the University. He did not know why they are changing the nomenclature as they having the provision in the UGC Regulations. In fact, they could place the matter before the UGC.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had run into this difficulty when the NAAC had come to the Campus and there were all kinds of such things. So it is better to call it B.A. (Honours) and when they would issue the Certificate, they would mention the Honours School System. They could have a confrontation on every small issue, and only the major things are to be got corrected.

Professor Shelley Walia said that since these changes are very legitimate, they should move to the next item.

Professor Chaman Lal stated that he would not be speaking on the nomenclature of degrees as the same is fine, but his concern is, which the Vice Chancellor has expressed just now, that the UGC is dictating the University, and they are not performing their duties. In fact, all the academic matters are to be taken care of by the University. They must take strong view as the autonomy of the University is must and nobody is supposed to interfere in it, especially in the academic matters. Who are they (UGC) to interfere in the affairs of the University, whereas the UGC is interfering in everything? What kind of autonomy the University is enjoying? Many Universities would not accept this kind of interference. He has no objection to the nomenclature and whatever is done, is done and he understands their problem that they should not confront with them on all issues, but they must be aware of these things that the tendency of the UGC to impinge upon the autonomy of the University, must be resisted very strongly. He wants to put on record that the UGC has no business to impinge upon the autonomy of the University as the academic autonomy of the University could not be compromised and only the financial kind of blackmailing could be allowed.

The Vice Chancellor stated that they do it and they had suffered a lot last year. They asked the University to adopt in CAS promotions certain documents, which they said is effect from July 2013. The directive came three months late and the same has to be process through regulatory bodies, i.e., Syndicate and Senate. Ultimately, the Senate adopted the same in May of 2014, and since they adopted in May of 2014, they could only do the same from future as they could not do the same from the past, but they penalized them (University) via the auditors. They made them interact with everything, and this body became toothless because it was one auditor’s dictate. They stopped the release of their NAAC score by more than three months. Since their NAAC score was not released and they were not NAAC accredited, in a competition where the University could have got Rs.50 crore, they got zero because they were thrown out of the competition.

Professor Chaman Lal intervened to say that the Vice Chancellor could have raised this at the President or any other level.

The Vice Chancellor stated that they are not a Central University and are not invited by the President. Even the State Government does not invite them. The State Government did not give them a rupee under RUSA even though they have 172 Colleges in Punjab. The State does not give them any money even though they have 172 Colleges in Punjab and the Centre does not invite them because they are not a Central University. This is a letter which had arrived on 25th of November 2016 and the letter says about the list of degree awarding institutions in India and this is circulated to all in India. What does it say "Institutions deemed to be the Universities and they are not an Institution deemed to be the University? State Public Universities, State Private Universities and then somewhere there are Central Universities also. Where are they put? They are in Union Territory. In a Union Territory, they are put in the State Universities. Pondicherry is a Union Territory and every institution in Pondicherry is a part of Central Institution. The Pondicherry University was established in 1987, but they did not have. Colleges in Pondicherry are treated like Central Colleges – in the sense that they get 65 of age and they also get all the benefits which are available to all the Colleges of Delhi, all the College of Pondicherry, all the Colleges of Dadar and Nagar Haveli, but when it comes to Panjab University, what are they? They are part of the Union Territory. In a Union Territory, all the Colleges get full salary from the Central Government and all the aided Colleges, whatever posts are under the aided scheme, they would get 94% salaries from the Central Government and the same is inflation protected and have all the D.As. release, but when it comes to Panjab University, they would not give them any money, so that they give salaries which they give to the Government Colleges. Punjab Engineering College gets full salary, PGI gets full salary, CCET gets full salary, and Government Medical College and Hospital gets full salary, but teachers of Panjab University would not get full salaries because they are not a Central University, and their grants would be frozen. As such, they are living in a very difficult time.

Professor Chaman Lal said that what he suggests is that the anguish of the Senate must be conveyed to the UGC.

Professor B.S. Ghuman suggested that instead of protesting, they should accept the suggestion of Professor R.P. Bambah and at the same time, a Resolution should be sent from the Senate that their old system should be restored.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has no purpose.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that at least it would be on record that they have done something for the University. It might result in a positive way.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would just satisfy their ego and nothing else.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that the UGC has informed that to determine and maintain standard, and the grant is meaningless.

Professor Shelley Walia said that why this kind of bias. The problem might spread to the Colleges as well.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that the UGC Act says that the Parliament has said that the UGC has been formed to determine and maintain standard of higher education. Grant is the only the means and not the end. So under the maintenance of standard, their interpretation is that they would interfere in everything. Now, it is matter as to how do they counteract. As far as they are concerned, it is their responsibility to do all these things.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not want to contest all these things because the NAAC team also sided with them. Now, anything which they write in the NAAC report, the same would get checked up five years later – whether they complied with it or not. Fifteen people, who came, were toeing that line, and he could not do anything at

that time. They have written that the nomenclatures of the degrees are not correct, what could they do? Where would they fight? How many fronts, they could open?

Professor Shelley Walia said that this kind of prejudice against Panjab University and in case they are not taking them on, then he would go by this argument that let them be more autonomous, and let them make their own rules and regulations at least pertaining to academics, research and teaching. There is too much of this kind of influence.

The Vice Chancellor stated that do not seek grant, they could do whatever they want. Mr. Javedkar declared in ISB, Mohali, less than one month ago that the degrees which ISB Mohali gives, do not need approval of any one. They do what they want, but the market accepts them. So either they become a market oriented institution and attain so much of eminence that nobody questions them. They should collect their own money and should not ask their graduates to seek government jobs and recognition of their degrees, nothing that kind of sort, and he endorsed it. If they want to do whatever they want as the ISB does, then they have to generate all their resources at their own. The ISB does not say that they are doing any social responsibility. Of course, they have taken land at a very cheaper rate from the Punjab Government, but after having taken the land at inexpensive rates, they are doing what they want. So if they argue with these people, they will say that land has been given to them, do whatever they wish to, but do not come to them for funds, but they are not in a position to do so.

Professor R.P. Bambah suggested that they should become a part of 10 Universities.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is what they are trying to do, but to go to that stage, they have first to survive for four months. Their major problem is to survive till the next semester as they have admitted students this year. When Professor Shelley Walia said something, the Vice Chancellor said that right now they have a commitment to the society as they have taken their children even if the teachers have to accept frozen salary for next three months. The teachers are the drivers of the University and their sacrifices are to be made by them first before they ask anybody else. They have to meet the commitment of the society, so that the society supports them. So mentally they have to be prepared with so much of harsh step. Somehow they have to manage with the money whatever they have and get this semester completed of these students.

Dr. Baljinder Singh remarked that in this kind of emergency, only the court could come to the rescue of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are depending on that, and that is why, the Judge moved to write this and why did the Chief Justice also accept his argument. In this judiciary there has been some talk and some consensus to save this Institution because High Court is the defining part of the capital city of Punjab and Haryana and at some stage Panjab University is also the defining part of the city.

Dr. Baljinder Singh remarked that the glorified leaders could play a proactive role.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are all here and listened to the debate and the sentiments of the people of the University. All of them are sitting here – whether in the form of College teachers, Principals, members of the civil society. As such, this is a representative body.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-5** on the agenda, be approved.

IX. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-6**, on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-6. That, the recommendations (at Sr. Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 25, 26, 37, 38 and 49) of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 01.08.2016, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 8)

X. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-7** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-7. That the awards for the year 2016-17, be conferred on the following persons as mentioned against their names:

1	Prof (Ms.) Dalip Kaur Tiwana B-13, Punjabi University Campus, Patiala-147002	(2016-17)	Sahitya Rattan
2	Shri Anupam Kher 402 Marina Juhu Tara Road Juhu Beach, Mumbai	(2016-17)	Kala Rattan
3	Dr. P.D. Gupta Director Raja Ramanna Centre for Advanced Technology Indore-452013	(2016-17)	Vigyan Rattan

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 15)

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-7 on the agenda**, be approved.

XI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-8** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-8. That Mrs. Manninder Kaur, Senior Technical Assistant (G-II), be appointed as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), at Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering and Excellence in Biomedical Sciences, w.e.f. the date she reports for duty, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400 with initial start of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University Rules.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 16)

Professor Prabhjit Singh stated that the item before the Senate is that Mrs. Manninder Kaur, Senior Technical Assistant (G-II), be appointed as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), at Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering and Excellence in Biomedical Sciences, whereas the papers attached and the Syndicate has also recommended that she should be appointed, but the page 91 of the agenda says, "The Syndicate at its meeting held on 30.6.1994 (Para 68) has approved the following qualifications/experience for filling up the posts of G-I to be filled in by 100% promotion from among the incumbents working in G-II, satisfying the following qualifications and experience and the qualifications and experience is meant for promotion". However, the item before the Senate is appointment. There is a lot of difference between appointment and promotion. The Selection Committee is also recommending eligibility for promotion. He drew the attention of the House towards page 92 where it has been written that

“Mrs. Manninder Kaur, Sr. Tech. (G-II) meets the requirement of eligibility for promotion to the post of Senior Technical Assistant (G-I). Is this a promotion or an appointment? If it is a promotion, it must be on the basis of seniority. He urged the Vice Chancellor to get the same checked. Earlier, which they have done in the Board of Finance, they have also been given the same pay-scale. He reiterated that if it is promotion, it must be on the basis of seniority, and there was no need to interview three-four candidates.

The Vice Chancellor said that they carry out promotions/internal selections.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that, that is what he is saying that it is appointment and not a promotion, but the papers provided to them are of promotion.

The Vice Chancellor said that the promotion is because it is related to the internal candidate. In fact, three candidates were found eligible and they appeared before the Committee and one of them has been appointed.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that then it is appointment, but the qualifications are of promotion, and then the seniority would prevail.

The Vice Chancellor said that there could not be 100% internal. They have also decided that in future, the posts of Deputy Registrars would be filled up, 25% from internal promotion and 25% internal candidates who are eligible would apply and the selection would be there.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that, that is appointment but in the case under consideration, the qualifications mentioned are meant for promotion. He reiterated that there is a lot of difference between promotion and appointment.

The Vice Chancellor said that the qualifications for promotion and appointment could be the same. Citing an example, he said that if persons are to be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the academic excellence has to be the same.

Shri Parbhjit Singh said that then don't say it appointment. Secondly, the Selection is also recommending the appointment.

The Vice Chancellor said that what the technical point he is trying to make, he does not understand.

Shri Parbhjit Singh said that he just wants to know that whether it is an appointment or promotion.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is an appointment.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-8 on the agenda**, be approved.

XII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-9** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-9. That the Fellows be assigned to the Faculties as opted by them for the term 1.11.2016 to 31.10.2020 (**Appendix-II**), under Regulation 2.1 at page 46 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, except that the following Fellows be assigned to the Faculties as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Fellow	Faculties
1.	Shri Raghbir Dyal M.Sc., M.Phil. Near Dr. Madan Mohan Hospital Bathinda Road, Bye Pass Chowk Sri Muktsar Sahib-152026 Punjab	1. Medical Sciences 2. Science 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Education
2.	Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill M.A., Ph.D. Professor Department of Sociology Panjab University, Chandigarh	1. Medical Sciences 2. Arts 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Engineering & Technology
3.	Professor (Dr.) Anita Kaushal Principal PG Government College for Girls Sector – 11, Chandigarh-160010	1. Science 2. Languages 3. Business Management & Commerce 4. Design & Fine Arts
4.	Shri Prabhjit Singh B.A. O/o DPI(C), Punjab, Chandigarh S.C.O., 66-67, Sector 17-D, Chandigarh	1. Science 2. Arts 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 22)

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the definition of special qualification has not been told to them. He had asked in the meeting of the Syndicate as to what is the definition of special qualification – whether it is academic or any other special qualification.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he has told them and he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) could also read the Indian Universities Act. He is not the only one who knows the Indian Universities Act. Professor Chaman Lal also told them something about the Indian Universities Act. When the Indian Universities Act came, and when this notion was introduced that the Fellows would be assigned to three Faculties, what was the purpose of assigning and having Added Members, that their assignment should be such that whatever professional qualifications and experience they have, that should get reflected in that assignment somewhere. The Senate has this authority to do this assignment. On behalf of the Senate, the Syndicate was elected. So it comes through the processing of the Syndicate. What was happening is that if there is a University Professor belonging to Science Faculty, he was there in the Science Faculty and people were choosing four more Faculties adding to it, i.e., 4+1. So these are not good things. After all, they have to serve the society. Everything has evolved in making choices for the given Faculty. They should choose a Faculty to which they belonged to, but if the Faculties are being chosen in an arbitrary preferred way then one leaves out even the Faculty to which he/she belonged to.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has been member of the Senate for the last 16 years, and this has been done for the first time. One should not be forced to choose Faculties. Secondly, ones interest also changes with the passage of time.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not participating in this assignment of Faculties.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that why one should fix his/her interest. One's interest could change from Psychology to Engineering and vice versa.

The Vice Chancellor said that, first of all, they should understand the spirit of assignment of Faculties. This is not being done anywhere in any of the University of the country now a days. It was done when the University did not have teachers. There were no teachers and no Faculties on behalf of the University. The Professors of the University being made a part of the Faculties of Panjab University is only a post independent phenomenon. Until independence, the Professors were not even members of the Faculties. He went up and checked up the Calendar of the University and the book of the University which is of 1946-1947 published from Lahore. Whichever Professors were appointed after 1904, they were not the members of the Faculties. The only way that somebody could be a member of the Faculty was either the Fellows/Senators assigned to the Faculties or the Added Members by the Senators to the Faculties. This was the spirit, in which it was being done. Slowly-slowly, today the University has evolved that at least on the Campus there are Departments on the basis of and with the Career Advancement Scheme, this that and so on and so forth, there are large numbers of Professors. At present, there are about 220-230 Professors in the University distributed in 11 Faculties. There are 220-230 Professors and by this choice, i.e., 90×4 , there are 360 members of the Faculties on behalf of the Senators. And these 360 members amongst fellows, in principle could add 180 other members as Added Members. Some Faculties have some other ways of adding members.

Professor Keshav Malhotra intervened to say that these things were there earlier also. From the Senate formed, the Fellows were being assigned to the Faculties in this very manner.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he is okay with it, but the things are evolving. Now, the matter is before the Senate. His job is only to put all the things before them. So everything is put before them. The Syndicate, in its own wisdom, chose to change the allotment of few Faculties in the sense that certain people, who had chosen a given Faculty, and they felt that he/she should belong by virtue of their professional background to a given Faculty and that choice had not been made. Okay, they have done it. So this is the matter before them. He is okay with it – whatever they wanted to decide. It is their decision and the job of the Registrar tomorrow is to carry out the election on the basis of decision taken by them.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she is agreeing to a large extent that the specialization is important while opting for the Faculties, but since it has been done for the first time, there might be apprehension in the minds of certain colleagues as to how certain options were changed. And there is no criterion laid down as to on what basis these specialization. So she would suggest that why could they not make the system transparent. Let everybody know, what everybody opted for and what specialization everybody has given and how the Faculties have been granted.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was made available. He asked the Registrar has it been given. It was confirmed that the same had been provided.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that nearly everybody has got his/her choice, except these four people.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, “No”, because particularly her Faculty has been changed in the Syndicate. She had given her specializations and she would like to know the specialization of each and every member also.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it has been given.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, “No, No”, on what basis? What specialization area people have given and they have been assigned the specific Faculties. In fact, she is asking how Faculties were assigned to the people and what specialized area they have given.

The Vice Chancellor said that see, these lists are before them. When Professor Keshav Malhotra said something, the Vice Chancellor said that she (Professor Rajesh Gill) had not opted for Arts Faculty. Why she has not chosen the Arts Faculty, which is her own Faculty?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she could always change her Faculty.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate could assign her different Faculties as it is not her prerogative that whatever she demands, the same should be given to her. In fact, the right is with the Senate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the right is with the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that the Syndicate assigns the Fellows to the Faculties on behalf of the Senate. The Syndicate has recommended assignment of Fellows to the Faculties, and the Senate could accept or reject those recommendations.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired that why the Faculties of certain people have been changed, why not of others? They have to make it transparent.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the other Fellows have opted for the Faculties as per the norms.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill said she does not understand what he (Principal Sharma) means by norms.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he was there in the meeting of the Syndicate and he had requested to make the logic given by Professor Rajesh Gill open on what basis she has opted for these Faculties, but that was not opened.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Professor could not be assigned to five-five Faculties.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his Faculties were changed and it was assured that he (Shri Dyal) could speak in the meeting of the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Yes, yes”, please speak. The point is he (Shri Dyal) must understand that things are evolving. They have moved from 1904 to 2016. The Senate elects Syndicate members Faculty-wise.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that whatever the Fellows have opted for, same should be given to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is their decision, and they should give their decision.

Professor Chaman Lal stated that let him give his example. He is here for the first time. When he was given a letter, a copy of the relevant portion of the Calendar was attached with that, which told him very clearly even though he is from Languages as he is a Professor of Hindi, that one major Faculty they have to chose on their own, and the

second major should logically be of an allied area. Citing an example, he said that since he belongs to languages, he has put languages at No. 1 and closest to him is Arts, that is why, he has chosen Faculty of Arts. Even while opting for minor Faculties, he was very careful, so that he should not look like, particularly because he is a nominated member, he should be careful about the University Calendar. He has chosen only those subjects (for minor faculties) which he knows a little bit. That is why he chose Faculties of Design & Fine Art and Education. That is kind of thing which everybody/every member of the Senate should honestly follow that first Faculty has to be chosen of one's own subject and it is the direction of the Calendar also. Even if the same is turned down by the Senate by majority, it would be turning down of the Calendar. Whether they would like to turn down the Calendar? He does not know anything about Science, Pharmaceutical Sciences and Medical Sciences. If he opts for these Faculties, it would be making a mockery of the whole academic system. They are condemning the UGC, and if they do not follow their own moral principles, then what kind of membership they are having in the Senate. So it is following of Calendar and only thing which the University should have done is that all these four members should have been issued with a notice by the Registrar stating that they have chosen in correct Faculties, please correct the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Registrar does not open these things as these come in sealed envelopes and they go to the Syndicate in a sealed cover. As such, the Registrar does not know what is there in the sealed cover.

Professor Chaman Lal said that the only thing which he is saying is that the proposal should have been followed. He is making a very humble kind of request that they should have been careful while choosing for the Faculties. Please choose the Faculties as per the Calendar and they could have attached the relevant portion of the Calendar which says that one major Faculty must be of one's own subject. That should have been called a little bit courtesy. So he requests all the members, whose Faculties have been changed, to accept it in good spirit. If they still want to protest, they should protest only about the procedure followed that why they have been informed about it. Had they been informed, probably they would have the courtesy to follow the Calendar? His only concern is only part of courtesy. So far as Calendar is concerned, it is perfectly alright. Whatever has been done by the Syndicate, it is perfectly alright.

The Vice Chancellor said that he knows that after the things got opened, the Dean of University Instruction chose only two Faculties and did not give two more preferences. So he does not know whether everybody has necessarily to choose four Faculties. One could opt for even one or two Faculties.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that he thinks that they should accept the recommendation of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he (Vice Chancellor) should tell them the meaning of special qualification.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not going to tell them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that neither it was told in the Syndicate meeting nor here in the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not his job.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is not academic qualification. In fact, special qualification has been written because there could be certain specialty.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that they should move forward.

Principal Gurdip Sharma and certain other members said that they should proceed further.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since his Faculty has been changed, he should be allowed to speak.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could speak.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his Faculty has been changed from Languages to Science by majority in the Syndicate on the plea that he has M.Sc. (Mathematics) degree.

The Vice Chancellor said that yes, he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) is a Professor of Mathematics.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that forget about that because he is only an ordinary student of Mathematics.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether he is not a teacher of Mathematics.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is a teacher, but not a Professor.

The Vice Chancellor asked does he not check and correct the papers of Mathematics. He also goes in Selection Committees to select Faculty in Mathematics.

To this, Shri Raghbir Dyal said, "No Sir". For the last about 2-3 years has not been a member of the Selection Committees. It has been manipulated by a few members, and at the moment he does not want to debate on that. Let him confine to the agenda topic. Is he permitted?

The Vice Chancellor said, "Yes".

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that only special people are sent and he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) is not a special one.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that Science comprised at least 20 subjects, e.g., Physics, Chemistry, Botany, Zoology, Anthropology, etc. how he would contribute in these subjects. So far as special qualifications are concerned, neither he has done Ph.D., even though his degree is in Mathematics with distinction, but the same is not a specialization, and nor it is in Pure Mathematics or Applied Mathematics.

Professor D.V.S Jain remarked whether Medical Sciences is (his specialization).

To this, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that let him first complete his point, and he has not disrupted any member since he is here. Since he (Professor D.V.S. Jain) is an icon and distinguished Professor of the University, it does not look nice on his part to disrupt him. He has been teaching undergraduate courses for the last 20 years, from where does his specialization comes. Yesterday, he has searched the entire google to find as to what the meaning of special academic qualifications, but it identified only the special skills, i.e., a person with leadership skills, communication skill, but he has nowhere the academic specialization. There is second issue, on which there could be disorder in the House. A statement was given by him (the Vice Chancellor) about four months back that a Lecturer of Government College, who is coming unopposed, and this is a mafia. He had said in the Syndicate that he belongs to a family, which has given to the society either the teachers or doctors. There are eight medical practitioners in his family, who are serving different sections of the society. Had he not come from the Medical Faculty unopposed, somebody else would have come, who also might not have medical background? Is there any guarantee that only the person having medical background would come from the Medical Faculty? The whole purpose would be defeated. What is the guarantee that only a doctor or qualified doctor (M.B.B.S. or M.D. (Medicine) or Master of Surgery) would come to the Faculty of Medical Sciences. This process has been going for years. In the name of special qualifications, by using brute majority in the Syndicate, they have been denied their privilege to opt the Faculties of their choice.

Professor Navdeep Goyal remarked that the privilege is not given in the Calendar.

The Vice Chancellor stated that these are matters of governance reforms. At the moment, the matter before them is very simple that they could make their choices, on behalf of the Senate. In between Professor Keshav Malhotra also continued speaking, to which the Vice Chancellor said that he will not answer to his questions.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that don't answer, but let him speak. Two years ago when the members of the Syndicate and the Senate in wholesale number opted for this very Faculty of Medical Sciences, had they the qualifications at that time? Had they now become wiser? He enquired what parameters they are setting for the persons to choose the Faculties.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that he is sorry that one of the Faculty opted by him has also been changed by the Syndicate, but he respects the decision of the Syndicate. He also requested the members to accept the decision of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he thinks that Professor Chaman Lal has touched a very pertinent point. Now, the Vice Chancellor says that he is not answerable to anybody and he is also not a responsible for assigning the Faculties; rather, it is the Senate on the recommendation of the Syndicate. He says that on what basis the letter has been issued in 2016, which is different from the letter which was being issued on the same occasion after every four years or after two years in the past. Under which authority and under what circumstances, the language of the letter has been changed. He thinks the Registrar could not issue such a letter with a different language than those letters issued during earlier period without the direction from the Vice Chancellor. Now, the Vice Chancellor after four years has come up with a logic that he would go only by what is written in the Regulations. Notwithstanding with the fact that this matter is not being discussed in the Syndicate and the Senate for the first time today, it has been discussed in the past also, and every time after discussion it was decided consciously by the Syndicate and the Senate that the practice of giving freedom to all the Fellows of choosing the Faculties of their choice be continued. In one such meeting of the Syndicate, he thinks about 5-6 years ago or might be 8 years ago, this issue was raised specifically and at that time it was assured that this aspect could be looked into. Now, as Professor Chaman Lal has said that necessarily if there are some lacunae in assigning the Fellows to the Faculties, and they feel that those, who are not well versed with the relevant subject, are not supposed to be the member of the Faculty, was it not obligatory on the part of the University to bring it as an agenda item before the Syndicate and Senate, so that if there is any ambiguity in assigning of Faculties, a conscious decision could have been taken, on the basis of which there could not have any question by the members of the Senate to raise any such thing. After unilaterally decision has been taken by the Vice Chancellor himself directing the Registrar to issue such a letter forgetting what the same Vice Chancellor as Chairman of the Syndicate has done two years earlier while allowing the changes of Faculties by all the Non-Medical people to Faculty of Medical Sciences knowing fully well that this very Regulation is prevailing in the Calendar at that time also. At that time also they had protested that they have to follow the Regulations of the University, and they could not allow the change of Faculties at this juncture, and at that time also the Vice Chancellor had said that the item is before them for consideration, and they have only to say, "Yes or No". They should not go into that legalities and technicalities. If anybody has any objection, let him go to the Court. This is how the University has been functioning for the last four years. Unfortunately, they had to challenge that decision in the Punjab and Haryana High Court and he is happy to announce that in the meeting of the Senate itself the information had come that the High Court had quashed the decision of the Syndicate as the Court termed it unconstitutional and in violation of the provisions of Panjab University Act. He wonders how the same Vice Chancellor after two years, that too unilaterally without putting it before the competent body, has taken the decision that this time they would be assigning the Fellows to the Faculties on this basis without even defining specifically what special

qualification means and without specifying in the Syndicate why the Faculties of four members have been changed. In directly amounting to the conclusion that all the Vice Chancellors, who were the predecessor of this Vice Chancellor, had been committing illegalities, as if all the members of the Senate, who were members of the earlier Senate, were committing illegalities. As if, it is for the first time, they have realized that they have to convert the illegalities into legalities. Alright, even if it has been done with the best of intention, he thinks everybody has the right to at least get a reply, as to how, that who, without giving an opportunity of hearing that her Faculty has been changed by the Syndicate. Just because they had got brutal majority in the Syndicate and Senate, they could not make Chandigarh the capital of Haryana alone or Punjab alone. If it is the Union Territory today, it would remain Union Territory irrespective of the fact what kind of brutal majority they have. So dear sir, they should not forget that if they are academic body, they are democratic body also. The basic and unique structure of Panjab University is that they believe in democracy and that is why they have a democratic set up and they are proud of their democratic set up. In the name of majority, they should not destabilize the strength of democracy. Dear Sir, the allegations have been, and he does not know why the people are not coming up to say that instead of working for the academic purposes, the selection of Faculties was made only for political purposes, as if to be elected members of the Syndicate is a political game. Notwithstanding the fact that as member of the Syndicate, he is only contributing towards the upliftment of the University and he is not serving any of his political game. But this has been the message that instead of academics, they are more interested in politics while selecting the Faculties. Now, the question is – if academics are to be taken into consideration, and if a Professor of Arts by being virtue of Professor of Arts, is already entitled to serve the Faculty of Arts, why he/she could not be given an opportunity of serving another Faculty, where he/she could contribute. He would just like to correct Professor Chaman Lal that there is no such provision that only one major Faculty has to be form ones field. There is nothing like that; rather, they only have said – two major Faculties and two minor Faculties to be assigned based on the special qualifications of a member. He says that if that logic is to be got, then if they are giving one Faculty based on qualifications, if at all they have decided that special qualifications mean academic qualifications, what about others. That means, the others could serving without the special qualifications. He says that if he could serve other Faculty also without academic qualifications, he could serve the first also. And if he could serve two major, he could serve two minor also. To say that the Vice Chancellor has taken the decision and the question is being asked that he (Vice Chancellor) should tell the criteria, the Vice Chancellor says that he is nobody to answer and he is nobody to make the criteria. The Vice Chancellor is the Chairman, and if at all, he has done with good intention, he should rather be proud to explain as to under what circumstances such a decision was taken in spite of the fact that the Senate and the Syndicate after having taken the decision to look into it in detail, and have not been able to look into in detail, which forces him and compelled the Vice Chancellor to take the decision on his own, that too, unilaterally. As far as accepting the recommendation of the Syndicate is concerned, he does not think anybody has got any kind of disrespect for the recommendations of the Syndicate, but what he wants to say that if the people had been opting for the Faculties only with a political angle in mind, he has no hesitation in saying with full responsibility that this decision of the Vice Chancellor is also purely political and nothing else.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not want to respond to any of the insinuation.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that they should proceed further.

When Professor Keshav Malhotra tried to say something, the Vice Chancellor requested him to sit down.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired is it democracy? She does not understand what kind of democracy is it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that firstly reply should be given to them on the issue, papers relating to which he had provided to him (Vice Chancellor) where Principal Gosal had raised a point wherein it had been decided that the case would be looked into. Till date the Senate is not decided as to what is the definition of special qualification, and even though the meeting of the Syndicate had held many days before and the meeting of the Senate is going on, but no response has been given by him or his office. Firstly, comments should be given to them on those papers, only then they would allow to proceed further.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not going to give any comment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the decision of the Syndicate is as per Regulations.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that whatever suits them, they applied Regulations and whatever does not, they violate the Regulations. Only those talk about the Regulations, who throw them into dustbin.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they have to proceed like this, his dissent should be recorded.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Alright", his dissent would be recorded.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he needs reply on as to what is the special qualification, and also on the papers which he had provided to him (Vice Chancellor) in the meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not giving any reply.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if the proceedings of Syndicate and Senate are to be carried in such an arbitrary manner, then his dissent should also be recorded.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that his dissent should also be recorded.

The Vice Chancellor directed the officials to record their dissents.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that he is just pondering that if they compel the person to take one Faculty of his/her specialization, then the other three Faculties seem to be incongruous to that Faculty. If they look in detail for instance, how is Faculty of Arts congruous to other three Faculties, and they are not, which means they allow one Faculty to go according to the specialization and three others Faculties actually are not concern of the Senate or Calendar. Therefore, he thinks that there is a need to change the Calendar.

The Vice Chancellor said that this could be made a part of the Governance Reforms, and the matter could be referred to the Governance Reforms along with the discussion of today's meeting.

Professor Shelley Walia said that anyway he thinks that the four Faculties should be allied ones. And if they are not allied, they allow them to take three faculties arbitrarily, and then the fourth Faculty should also be allowed.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they are living in the world in which they are swearing by interdisciplinary research and there are no boundaries, and the boundaries are being broken. As Professor of Sociology she is already a member of Faculty of Arts, and she might not like to exercise her right to vote for Syndicate election from that Faculty. She might have opted for other Faculties, but she continues to be a member of Faculty of Arts, and by virtue of her research, specialization, her areas of interest and she

has also given rationale as to why she is opting for these Faculty, why the same has not been distributed to all the members.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested the Vice Chancellor to read out the rationale to all the members as to why she has opted for those Faculties, so that the members could know the same.

Principal Gurdeep Kumar Sharma said that let they proceed further.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that what do they mean by proceeding further. She said that whenever she speaks, either the Chair says that he would not respond or the members say proceed further. She said that there is a hierarchy in the Senate, some members are not important.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate is a democratic body and they have to respect the majority and minority.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that “no”, this majority is political.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he wanted to know the reasons why she (Professor Rajesh Gill) opted for Languages and Medical Sciences.

Due to shouting by some members, nothing could be made out.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor adjourned the meeting for 5 minutes.

When the meeting resumed, Shri Raghbir Dyal requested the Vice Chancellor that as the Faculties have been changed but in the letter sent by the office, the members were requested to write their resume/bio-data. If a Professor has written her bio-data, how the claim could be rejected without reading the same. He (Vice Chancellor) could reject as he has got the right.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not answering and announced item C-10.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that what it meant, first he should be given the answer to three questions. He had pointed out it in the Syndicate that what Professor Rajesh Gill had given in writing that should be read out, but it was not read out.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a legitimate question that if the documents had been requisitioned, then how, without considering the same, a decision was taken. If this is the way they are approving it, then probably he may state it with full responsibility at his command that they would be compelled to write to the higher authorities, then the Vice-Chancellor should not say that he has to answer to everybody. He thought that it is a democratic platform where they have every right to express their opinion and he (Vice-Chancellor) unilaterally and arbitrarily is trying to say that neither he is answerable nor to explain the position.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that first he should be given the answer to three questions. The Vice-Chancellor needed to respond on three issues.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not responding.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said in a loud voice that he wanted to know as to why Professor Rajesh Gill who had opted for Languages and Medical Sciences. A different choice has been imposed on her.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is again adjourning the meeting for 5 more minutes to which most of the members requested not to adjourn the meeting and move ahead. He said that he is conducting the meeting and they have to listen to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal objected to it saying that the Vice-Chancellor had adjourned the meeting for 5 minutes and how he has resumed the seat now. After adjourning the meeting, he (Vice-Chancellor) is again saying that he is conducting the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that majority of the members are saying that the meeting should continue.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, 'no', that does not mean majority.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he should be given the answer of three things. What is the logic behind changing the Faculties?

At this stage, once again a din prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to allow the meeting to proceed and they have a long agenda at hand.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the decision has to be taken by way of majority and if anybody does not agree, he/she could get his/her dissent recorded.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it is a very irresponsible statement. If the Vice-Chancellor had asked for the resume/bio-data, why it was not placed before the Syndicate? Since the Vice-Chancellor had asked for the bio-data, he could reject it but at least it should be read. He (Vice-Chancellor) could reject it by using majority vote.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that if the members want it, why the Vice-Chancellor is not reading it.

When the Vice-Chancellor announced the item C-13 for consideration and some members wanted the Vice-Chancellor to proceed, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they wanted to talk about the item C-9.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is conducting the meeting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is conducting the meeting in an arbitrary manner.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that till now he has not given the answers to the questions raised by him in the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not answering this question.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since the Vice-Chancellor had asked for the rationalization, she had given the same. When the Senate demands and every member is a Senator, why the Vice-Chancellor could not produce that here.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor could reject it by majority voice vote but the bio-data attached by Professor Rajesh Gill should be read out in the Senate. If the bio-data has not to be seen, then why the same was asked?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that without looking into the bio-data, the Faculties have been assigned.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that the resume provided by Professor Rajesh Gill should be placed before the House. It was not placed before the Syndicate and now it is not being placed before the Senate. They could reject it voice vote or majority vote, but at least as a member of the House, he wanted to know it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he would not mind it if it is rejected but is going to be part of the history as to how the Vice-Chancellor manipulated it. It be recorded.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is manipulation and nothing else.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is conducting the meeting in most irrational manner, he could reject it but at least it should be placed before the Senate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Vice-Chancellor should listen to the members.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it should be placed before the Senate that why Professor Rajesh Gill is choosing for such Faculty. They could reject it.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that it is her (Professor Rajesh Gill) choice.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the choices should be made known.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if the bio-data had not to be seen, why the same had been asked for.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it had been decided in the Syndicate by brute majority.

Dr. Baljinder Singh said that he is a neutral person and is a first-timer Senator.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everyone here is an individual. There are no parties, no groups and could not say the group of one or the other or majority.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is a fact.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he had said it in the Syndicate that the Vice-Chancellor is leading a group.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is a fact and he (Vice-Chancellor) could not negate it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not answering.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that whenever it did not suit the Vice-Chancellor, he chose not to answer.

Shri Jarnail Singh requested the Vice-Chancellor to conduct the business.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they could approve all the agenda, he had no problem.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the disruptions should not be allowed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor is not giving the answer.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if the bio-data had not to be seen, why the same had been asked for, it meant that one could do as one wishes.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to on what basis the Faculties have been assigned to the person at Sr.No.4. He could understand the assignment of other three persons.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not answering as he has not filled it. Then the Vice-Chancellor announced the item C-13.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that first the reply to his questions be given.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that let him first complete the discussion on C-9.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that Professor Rajesh Gill was not assigned the Faculties of her choice.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua again said that let him first complete the discussion on C-9.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the dissent had been recorded and now they proceed further.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he needed the replies to three questions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not answering.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is murder of democracy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not answering.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is a wrong interpretation of the rule and the Vice-Chancellor is saying that he is not answering.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said that it is murder of democracy.

When a few of the members were standing and discussing on item C-9, Shri Prabhjit Singh started the discussion on item C-13 and said that he appreciated the efforts of the Registrar.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that first he should be allowed to complete the discussion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not permitting.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua requested Shri Prabhjit Singh to take his seat and allow him to discuss.

When the Vice-Chancellor announced item C-13, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Raghbir Dyal and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they be allowed to discuss on item C-9.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if the bio-data had not to be seen, why the same had been asked for.

When the Vice-Chancellor announced item C-13 again, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he be allowed to discuss on item C-9.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that why did he (Vice-Chancellor) ask for her bio-data?

Shri Prabhjit Singh referring to C-13 said that an amount of more than Rs.1 crore would be spent on the map that has been prepared.

Shri Raghbir Dyal and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua disrupted in between.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua not to disturb the meeting and said that they were disturbing the meeting continuously.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is not answering the basic question.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to sit down and not to disturb the meeting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal walked away from his seat and sat on the floor of the House.

When Shri Raghbir Dyal sat down on the floor of the House, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua asked the Vice-Chancellor as to what he (Vice-Chancellor) is doing.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said that what is this happening?

The Vice-Chancellor repeatedly asked Shri Harpreet Singh Dua to sit down.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he was present in the November meeting of the Syndicate whether the dissent had been recorded.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to how much time it would have taken to read a paper. It would not have taken more than two minutes.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua requested that it be made known as to how many members dissent is there. Even where a member of the Senate is sitting on the floor and the Vice-Chancellor is not allowing the discussion.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to sit down and Shri Prabhjit Singh started discussion on item C-13.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua disrupted and enquired as to who have given their dissent.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not permitting him (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) and his dissent has been written.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he has not yet got recorded his dissent and it could be got checked.

Shri Prabhjit Singh referring to item C-13 said that he appreciated the efforts of the Registrar.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that what happened to the document that he had given in the meeting of the Syndicate. The legal opinion on that should have been taken.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the proceedings are yet to be circulated and if there is any objection regarding dissent that could be got corrected.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, "No", as they are approving the item.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is asking for the reply to his questions which is not being given.

Shri Prabhjit Singh started discussion on item C-13 and said that he is being disturbed.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to take his seat.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that since the Chairman of the House is announcing the item C-13 for discussion, they should allow the discussion on it.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to sit down and allow the meeting to proceed. Is this the honour for which he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) is elected as a member of the House that he is not allowing to proceed?

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-9** on the agenda, be approved

XIII. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-10, C-11 and C-12** on the agenda were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-10. That the following faculty members, be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

(i) University Institute of Hotel Management and Tourism

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Prashant Kumar	Associate Professor	30.5.1976	24.7.2015	24.7.2016

(ii) University Institute of Hotel Management and Tourism

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
#1.	Dr. Neeraj Aggarwal	Assistant Professor	19.06.1972	20.8.2015	24.7.2016
#2.	Mr. Jaswinder Singh	Assistant Professor	28.10.1983	24.7.2015 (A.N.)	25.7.2016

In order of merit

(iii) Department of Community Education & Disability Studies

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
\$1.	Dr. Saifur Rehman	Assistant Professor	9.4.1978	17.9.2015	17.9.2016
\$2.	Mr. Nitin Raj	Assistant Professor	7.7.1985	18.9.2015	18.9.2016

\$ In order of merit

(iv) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
@1.	Ms. Ravreet Kaur	Assistant Professor	30.9.1987	22.6.2015	17.6.2016
@2.	Dr. Preeti Aggarwal	Assistant Professor	30.6.1979	18.6.2015	18.6.2016
@3.	Ms. Deepti Gupta	Assistant Professor	4.9.1982	3.7.2015 (A.N.)	4.7.2016

@ In order of merit

(v) Department of Microbial Biotechnology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Rohit Sharma	Associate Professor	28.10.1971	24.7.2015	24.7.2016

NOTE: 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.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 23)

C-11. That the following faculty members be promoted w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty members/ Department/Institute/Centre	Date of Promotion
I. Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5)		
1.	Dr. S.P. Padhi Department of Economics, P.U.	15.10.2015
II. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4)		
2.	Dr. Keerti Vardhan Evening Studies-MDRC (Mathematics), P.U.	21.12.2013

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 24)

C-12. That University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences 2nd Block, be christened as 'Professor K.N. Gaiind Block.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 6)

XIV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-13** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-13. That detailed drawing and an estimate cost i.e. Rs.113.56 lacs prepared by Executive Engineer-I, P.U., for construction of P.U. Holiday Home and shops at Hall Bazar, Amritsar, be approved:

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 10)

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they are going to spend more than Rs.1 crore on it construction of shops and the guest rooms. He suggested that if it could be done in public-private partnership, then it would be good. But since the University is already facing financial crunch and it would not be useful to spend an amount of more than Rs.1 crore. The donor of this land had clearly mentioned that the income generated would go towards payment of scholarship. Since the whole of the income generated from this land

would go for the scholarship, the decision of the University to spend more than Rs.1 crore on the construction is not acceptable. It should be reconsidered and the possibility of public-private partnership be explored. If the University constructs rooms for which the staff like Caretaker, Cleaner, Security Guard etc. would be required which would increase the expenses for the University which is not desirable.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the scholarship would not be provided to the students of Pakistan instead the scholarship would go to their own students. It is for them to see the expenditure to be incurred. The logic being given that the income would not accrue to the University but would go towards the scholarship is not a good logic as the scholarship would go to the students of the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that as said by Shri Prabhjit Singh regarding scholarship is right. But for creating the posts they would have to seek the permission of the Board of Finance. Whether it would be approved by the Board of Finance or not and from where the money for expenditure on these posts would come?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the income generated would be spent for the building itself.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this income would go towards the scholarships.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua requested the Vice-Chancellor to persuade Shri Raghbir Dyal get up and take the seat to which the Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to take the seat.

Principal I.S. Sandhu endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Prabhjit Singh. Supposing they construct the rooms for the guest house in Amritsar, at least three persons would be required to look after the guest house which would increase the expenditure. He suggested that it should be relooked and the item could be again placed. If they take a decision in hurry, it could be burdening the University. If the University wanted to rent out the shops, someone might take hold and might not vacate. Therefore, the matter be reconsidered.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that on the one hand they are facing the financial crisis but on the other hand they are spending more than Rs.1 crore. They are having holiday homes in Shimla and Dalhousie. He has been observing for the last 10 years that the holiday home at Dalhousie is not functional. They are going to spend more than Rs.1 crore for construction whereas the holiday home at Dalhousie requires only renovation. The other holiday home at Shimla is also not functional.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has already been done.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this item should be deferred till a revenue model is prepared. First of all, they should prepare a revenue and if the same is in earning way, then they should go for it otherwise it should be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are three floors. One floor goes to the people from whom the shops have been taken. These shops would go to those persons but with an enhanced price. The other floor would be given to the bank from where they would revenue. The second floor which would have two/three rooms could also be given to the bank and they would get revenue.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it should be approved.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a revenue model be prepared as also the budget as to how many posts would be required to manage it. A provision for lift for the second floor is also required.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the holiday home would not be constructed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would not construct the holiday home.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they should have not have a holiday home otherwise they have to appoint staff there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are not incurring the expenditure from the holiday home funds and not constructing a holiday home.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could also rent out the holiday home also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to generate the money for the scholarships. If the members say that that they should have the details of the revenue model, this could be worked out and would be brought.

Principal Gurdeep Kumar Sharma said that it is not a right head of expenditure as they are spending the money from holiday home fund as they are constructing the shops and bank.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the details of the revenue model could be worked out. A Committee would be formed and have a look on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the financial propriety has to be taken into consideration before going in for any such proposal. It is a very legitimate objection that they are spending the money from a particular budget head and it was for the welfare of the teachers. It is for the first time being shared that one floor would be given to the shopkeepers from whom they have got the shops vacated, another floor would be given to the bank and three rooms would be available for holiday home for use by the teachers. The impression which has been gathered from the item is as if they are going to make it a holiday home building. Why, it is because they are spending the money from the holiday home budget head. Shri Prabhjit Singh is right in saying, as the Vice-Chancellor also said that they could not sell the property and they could not put the same to use without renovation and they did not have any funds unless and until they take it from one or the other head which is meant for other purpose. He (Shri Prabhjit Singh) has given the suggestion that there could be a model of public-private partnership wherein no money from the University is to be spent, wherefrom the income could also be generated, whereby the property could be put to appropriate use also and whereby they could afford to give some scholarship to the students also. But that could be done only by making the project if it is complete in all respects that this is how much that they have to spend, this is how much the revenue would be generated and till that time, this item should not only be deferred, but it should be withdrawn and be brought as a fresh item so that there is no objection of misusing a particular head or misusing the property.

The Vice-Chancellor said okay, fine, it is withdrawn.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when this had come up for consideration in the Syndicate, then it was said that an amount of Rs.10 crore had been sanctioned for all the three holiday homes. At that time, he and Dr. Ajay Ranga had particularly raised a point about the Construction Department that it is not doing good construction work. The Vice-Chancellor had formed a Committee regarding the newly constructed College Bhawan about which they had said that the air conditioning and wiring are external. He requested that all the details of the construction of the building and the minutes of that Committee meeting be provided to the Syndicate/Senate as to what all that project was. He had been reminding about the same since March, 2015 every month and every time it was replied that the meeting is going to be held in the next month. The proceedings of the meetings are available, he and Dr. Ajay Ranga are also sitting here, the Vice-Chancellor must remember it, in spite of that no meeting had been held, no documents have been supplied to anyone. The face work of the College Bhawan is falling apart

which had been fixed with the help of screws. He said that it might be the first such a building.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are also some other such buildings.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in spite of reminding it in every meeting of the Syndicate, if something is not done, it seems that there is some problem in it. Whenever he talked about it, it seems as to why only bad things are being brought out but the money has not utilized properly. He has brought the ground realities to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor in every meeting of the Syndicate. A Committee was formed but no meeting was held. If they form a new Committee, the meeting of the same would also not be held and why the meeting would not be held, the reasons might be well known to the Vice-Chancellor. They had sanctioned an amount of Rs.10 crore to a branch the work done by which was not of good quality. Why it is being done, the reason is best known to the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that about the construction, he had never seen as to what kind of construction is being done by the Panjab University. He had seen it now. If the construction work they are proposing to do is done as has been done in the Panjab University Regional Centre, Muktsar, he requested that this work should not be done. They had floated a tender for Rs.30 lacs for the construction of the boundary wall. The people use good quality of water even for the construction of hay storage for cattle in the villages than what is being used for this boundary wall. The SVC has visited there and must have seen that the contractor has dug a pit in which the water is being collected from a nullah and the muddy water is being used with the help of buckets. He proposed that the officials of the Construction office whether SDO or XEN should be summoned and suspended. He did not want to use the words but the boundary wall which has been constructed is already under several feet of water and is dampened. The new walls are being constructed with the help of beams on the earlier dampened walls on the plea that the permission for the same has been obtained from the Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor. Since the University is already facing financial crunch, all the norms are being blatantly violated. The Vice-Chancellor had sent a message to him that he was just made a member of the Committee, he does not want to become the member of such a Committee which does not come to any conclusion. All these things are going on even in the presence of the J.E. who has been deputed by the University there. This is the situation of the tenders being floated. If they wanted to approve even such things by way of majority, he did not have any objection, but seeing the condition of construction he could talk in a tough way.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not responsible for construction.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired then who is responsible.

Continuing the Vice-Chancellor said that he has come as a Vice-Chancellor only four years ago. He had not inducted anybody in the Construction wing. The construction wing of the University is in existence for a very-very long time. He requested Shri Raghbir Dyal not to level any personal accusations against the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is not leveling the accusations against the Vice-Chancellor. But who is accountable for it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the governing bodies of the University are accountable. Members of the Committees are members of this governing body of the University and are teachers of the University. He requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to understand it. It is easy to level all kinds of accusations, insinuation and so on. The public is witnessing whatever is happening.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that has any allegation been levelled against the Vice-Chancellor by Shri Raghbir Dyal and why the Vice-Chancellor is

unnecessarily saying that allegations are being levelled against him and saying that he is not responsible for it. Shri Raghbir Dyal has not held the Vice-Chancellor responsible for it but bringing it to the notice of the Chairman of the Senate.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if he had brought the corruption of the Construction Wing of the Panjab University to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor, it did not mean that he is accusing the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever written complaints with documents had been received, he had referred the same to appropriate authorities in the University.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the SVC had visited the site and seen the things. The Vice-Chancellor could also visit and see the things himself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for the last 18 months he is occupied with the issue of getting the salaries for the employees, preparing the documents, going to Delhi so that he could ensure the payment of the salaries.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he just wanted to know that since the SVC had visited the site, what action has been initiated against the contractor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the SVC has given a report to him.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to place that report before the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the report could be placed before the Senate and they could have a special meeting of the Senate where they could have a review of all the construction projects.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that before that the Vice-Chancellor should constitute a high-powered Committee including technical people so that they could visit the site and submit the report and thereafter that report would be discussed in the House.

The Vice-Chancellor requested to suggest the names for the Committee. He would put the names to the next Syndicate and let the Syndicate form the high-power Committee and take up the responsibility of reviewing all the construction that has happened in the University over the last ten years. He himself has expressed his anguish ever since he saw those buildings being constructed. He had seen such building in Mumbai and it is not correct.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he was the first person who had requested to publish a white paper on the construction activities but nobody listened to him at that time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this responsibility has to be executed on behalf of the University.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he had submitted a complaint last year regarding the construction work going on in Sector-25 of the campus and the Registrar had formed a Committee. He had prepared a video recording of the material being used in the construction work in which the persons from the XEN office were also involved and they had also signed the report. He had been pointing out the issue for the last one year time and again, but till date he does not know what action has been taken on that report.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this would be looked into. The new Syndicate would form the Committee, assume the responsibility. All the documents on behalf of the University shall be provided to the members and there would be no cover up.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that why such works are being done which gives any person to level the allegations. Whoever is found guilty should be punished.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if somebody has to be punished, they have to follow certain procedures of the Government and it could not be done arbitrarily. The new Senate, which has been got elected for four years and has the responsibility to see that whatever has happened as a part of the construction in the University ever since the University started to expand in Sector-25, let everything be investigated from the year 2000 onwards. Let the Senate assume the responsibility to do it as it has a term of four years.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that his humble submission is that Chandigarh falls in zone-4 which is an earthquake prone area. The buildings are so sub-standard that even a person could make a hole in the walls with fingers in the residential area. If the building falls, who would be responsible as they have constructed multi-storey buildings of the girls' hostels.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they all of them are responsible.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that everyone is responsible and let an enquiry be conducted.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that about 5-6 years ago he had broken the bricks of the shooting range which was being constructed at that time. They could see the quality of the material. A Committee was formed at that time. He had brought it to the notice of the then Vice-Chancellor, Professor R.C. Sobti that the rates of the bricks which at Abohar/Fazilka was Rs.3000/- whereas it was Rs.5500/- in Chandigarh, the bricks were purchased at the rate of Rs.3000/- and were shown to have been purchased at Rs.5500/- and were used in the construction of the shooting range but till date no action has been taken. He requested that a Committee be constituted which would conduct an enquiry of all the buildings which are 10 years old and everyone would be able to come know as what is the truth.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that there is no need to form a new Committee. She suggested that the details of the buildings constructed by the XEN office since 2000 should be provided to the Senate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they would not be able to know the quality from such details.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that they could take a decision regarding the technical officer and get the things examined by the technical officer.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the technicalities could not be known in this way which could be known only by visiting the site.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolved part in C-13 is that a revenue model of the building to be constructed at Amritsar would be prepared, and if the budget head from where the money is to be spent would not serve that purpose, then new thing has to be done. At the moment, this item is withdrawn. On a query by Shri Raghbir Dyal about the construction, he said that all papers would be requisitioned, a data would be prepared of all the buildings which have been constructed over last 16 years ever since the University started expanding in Sector-25.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the item should not be withdrawn but it should be brought again to which the members said that it is withdrawn.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the English Auditorium is a very important auditorium in the campus as it has a very good lecture hall. It is under renovation for the last 1½ years. If they visit, they would see that the work is going on at snail's pace.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is the responsibility of the user department. The Chairpersons of the Departments have to accept the responsibility and follow it up. He had gone there a couple of times and could do only that much. The Vice-Chancellor's office is an office occupied by one person at a time. It is not occupied by ten people at a time.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the letters have been sent to the XEN office but it does not do anything.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is their XEN and they have spent the whole time with him.

RESOLVED: That the item **(C-13, on the agenda)** be withdrawn. In the meanwhile, the revenue model for the building to be constructed at Amritsar be prepared.

RESOLVED FURTHER: A data of all the buildings constructed over the last 16 years ever since the University started expanding in Sector-25 be prepared and placed before the Syndicate for formation of a Committee to enquire into the quality of construction and the report of the Committee be placed before the Syndicate/Senate.

XV.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-14** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. -

C-14. That it is, in principle, decided that Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Assistant Professor, Training-cum-Placement Officer, University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, be taken on deputation, subject to administrative clarification(s) as is/are required, are taken from Punjabi University, Patiala and satisfied.

NOTE: The case of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, was placed before the Senate in its meeting held on 9.10.2016. Copy of the relevant extract of minutes is enclosed.

Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 20)

XVI.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15** on the agenda was read out, viz. -

C-15 That -

- (i) the recommendations of the Committee dated 12.07.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding re-allocation of the nomenclature of funds and the review the fee structure of the Constituent Colleges.
- (ii) the imprest money of the Principals of P.U. Constituent Colleges, be enhanced from Rs.25,000/- to Rs.50,000/-.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 20)

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she always used to listen to Shri Raghbir Dyal Bansal when he used to speak about the Regional Centre. She just wanted mention that when she visited during the elections, it is pathetic to see the condition of Regional Centre, Muktsar. They are students but no infrastructure. When they go to Kauni, there

is huge infrastructure but no students. The building, which was inaugurated by the Vice-Chancellor sometime back, is gathering dust. Therefore, she thought that they need to do something about these Regional Centres as they are spending so much which is going waste. It is only the utilization of the services and the infrastructure that they have built up.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested as to why the imprest is being enhanced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the imprest of Rs.25,000/- is very less as these are the new Colleges and need more money.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that with an amount of Rs.25,000/- even two rooms could not be got white washed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the amount of Rs.25,000/- is a very small amount as the inflation has increased. A period of 6 years has passed when this amount was sanctioned.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this amount still needs to be increased.

RESOLVED: That, the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15** on the agenda, be approved.

Professor Emanuel Nahar abstained when the following item was taken up for consideration.

XVII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-16** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-16. That

1. with immediate effect, Professor Emanuel Nahar, University School of Open Learning, be appointed Dean Student Welfare up to 31st May 2017, under Regulation 1 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007;
2. with immediate effect, Professor Neena Capalash, Department of Biotechnology, be appointed Dean Student Welfare (Women) up to 31st May 2017, under Regulation 2.2 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007; and
3. with immediate effect, Dr. Rattan Singh, University Institute of Legal Studies, be appointed as Associate Dean Student Welfare up to 31st May 2017.

NOTE: Orders to the above effect have been issued.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(i))

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is very happy that the Syndicate has recommended the names of Professor Emanuel Nahar and Professor Neena Capalash as Dean Student Welfare and Dean Student Welfare (Women), and understood that they have taken over as such also for which he congratulated them. But what was the necessity for these people to join unless and until the appointing authority appointed them. There is nothing as such which has been mentioned. Similarly, the earlier DSW whose term had expired on 31st July 2016 was given an extension up to 31st October, he did not know for what reasons. Why the new DSW could not be appointed from 1st August itself. If at all

it was in the mind of the Vice-Chancellor to change him, why the extension for two months especially in view of the fact that, when he had touched this subject in the last meeting of the Senate also, then he had detailed discussion on 30th July for more than two hours with the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar containing the allegations against the DSW for having favoured his real brother and his real first cousin. On 30th July, the Vice-Chancellor had assured him that he would get an enquiry conducted and the report would be placed before the Syndicate within 10 days. To his surprise, even that the meeting of the Syndicate was scheduled to be held on 31st July and the term of the DSW was expiring on 31st July, it is the prerogative of the Syndicate to recommend to the Senate or not as far as extension is concerned, the item was not brought before the Syndicate and notwithstanding the fact that the Vice-Chancellor had assured that the enquiry would be ordered and it would be handed over to the CVO, on 1st August when the meeting of the Syndicate had already taken place, the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation and approval of the Syndicate and Senate, extended the term up to 31st October, again not understandable why for two months and why not for full one year and similarly it was in the case of DSW (Women) also. Then in the meeting of the Senate, he raised the issue with full responsibility and the Vice-Chancellor assured him in the Syndicate and Senate also that all the concerns expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal would be forwarded to the CVO. When nothing happened after 10 days also, he met the Registrar to have a follow up. It was kind of him (Registrar) to call the CVO there only and he was assured that in another 10 days the report would be submitted. Meaning thereby that latest by 20th August, the report would be submitted. He, there and then in the presence of the Registrar and the CVO, said that he had also got experience of more than two decades in the University, come what may, this report is not going to see the light of the day before 31st August. If at all any report comes, it would come after 31st August so that the elections from the Faculties to the Senate take place on 31st August wherein the DSW was also one of the contesting candidates. But he thought that may be, by the first week of September the report would come. When that also did not come, he raised it in the Senate in its meeting in September. He raised it again in the meeting of the Senate in October but nothing has been done so far. Rather, on the record, he has come to know that since there were two cases, one related to his (DSW) real brother and another related to the first cousin (his mother's real brother's son), whose name is Mr. Vinay Jindal. He had said it in the Senate at that time also. He has been given to understand that before a Committee which is assisting the CVO, that also he did not know under what provisions this kind of assignment could have been given to a low rung official in any of the branches none other than the Registrar if they only had to call and ask the DSW whether he had any relationship with that man and calling that man whether he had any relationship with this man and both saying 'no' and they say what else they could do as they have called them who have said 'no' and they did not have any other mechanism to find out the facts. He sent the messages through the Registrar, the Vice-Chancellor also that if at all any assistance on his part is required by the CVO or by any enquiring authority of the University, he was there to depose and prove that 'yes', he (that person) happens to be the real Mama's son. But now he has been given to understand that one case he (DSW) has accepted that the contract in one case which has been allotted happens to be his (DSW) real brother. But in the other case, he (DSW) has denied having any relationship with Mr. Vinay Jindal. He has been given to understand further that Mr. Vinay Jindal has also been called by the Committee and he also says that he did not know anybody by such and such name who is DSW in Panjab University. He is sharing in this open House that he believed and presumed that both of them are right. He also believed and presumed that the Committee is also of the view that they could not do anything. But he thought that this House has the capacity and capability to hang him (Shri Ashok Goyal) at least who has falsely alleged that he (that person) is his (DSW's) first cousin. If in a University where the Vice-Chancellor has an innovative idea could come up with a proposal to appoint Chief Vigilance Officer with a view to see the things with a vigilance angle and the CVO of the University says that they did not have any mechanism to ask anything except to call the person, take the statement and that is all. If they did not know as to what is the job of the CVO, if they did not know that as per the vigilance manual, how they have to do the investigation, he wondered as to what is the purpose of appointing the CVO. Why he is saying it that after 30th July now it is going to be five

months on 31st December and the report has not yet come. He was hoping only of 10th August or 20th August or September, the report has not come as yet it. It is off the record that he has come to know that these statements have been given. He wondered that the report has not come, he wondered that when the things were brought to the knowledge of the Vice-Chancellor on 30th July, the extension was granted and again wondered that why on 31st October, he (DSW) was asked to relinquish the charge and another DSW was appointed w.e.f. 1st November of which there is no mention in this agenda, i.e., Professor Goswamy. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation and of course, he presumed that subject to approval of the competent authority appointed the DSW and also the DSW (Women). In its next meeting of the Syndicate, when the item was taken, it was not for consideration of appointment, it was probably for ratification of the action of the Vice-Chancellor wherein it did not find favor with the Syndicate and they proposed some other name. In that meeting he has been given to understand that the Vice-Chancellor, on his own, who himself appointed in anticipation of approval of the Senate and Syndicate a person, the Vice-Chancellor instead of defending his own action, instead of his action getting ratified, introduces the item which says that in the year 2013 this Syndicate had given two names, one for DSW and one for DSW(Women), he (Vice-Chancellor) did not mind if the members again him the two names, he had no problem instead of defending whom the Vice-Chancellor had appointed. Not realizing the fact that in 2013 when the item was brought before the Syndicate, it was for consideration for giving extension to the then DSW and in 2016, it was for ratification of the one who is already appointed. There is a lot of difference. Is it not humiliating a person without the competence of the Vice-Chancellor to appoint him on 1st November, if there was no emergency on 31st July to appoint somebody, nobody could ever come and prove that there was an emergency on 1st November. As if they could assume that, that was only to ensure that a person who happened to be a member of the Senate by virtue of being DSW since he was nominated to the Senate in the capacity of the DSW and the term of the Senate was expiring on 31st October to enable him to continue as member of the Senate till 31st October, the extension was given up to 31st October and since he already got elected for the ensuing election it was to ensure that the membership of the Senate would continue after 1st November also. A person who has been nominated as the DSW and not in any other capacity, not in individual capacity, he thought that the Vice-Chancellor must appreciate and must agree with him that the moment he (DSW) ceases to hold that position, he ceases to be the member of the Senate also. He thought that it is the clear position and the notification of the Chancellor also specifically mentioned that they would be holding the position till they are holding the offices. But to his surprise, he (DSW) was allowed to continue as member of the Syndicate even after 31st October also and was allowed to attend the meeting of the Syndicate in November and December keeping him at par with those who were elected members of the Senate till 31st October or nominated members of the Senate or till 31st October in their individual capacity who were members of the Syndicate for full term equating him who was holding the membership of the Senate by virtue of having the position of DSW, he was also treated at par with them and to his understanding, he (DSW) was allowed to attend both the meetings of the Syndicate. Not only that he has been allowed to attend both the meetings of the Syndicate, the video cassettes would show that he not only attended the meeting, in fact instead of the Vice-Chancellor and he has no hesitation in clearly saying that he (DSW) was the one who conducted at least the meeting of the December meeting of the Syndicate and that video cassette he (DSW) could find himself. His query still remains that, he is again saying it, that inspite of his telling every time in the Syndicate and Senate privately and publicly that a corruption has taken place by favouring the near relatives of DSW by DSW himself flouting all norms of financial propriety and technical propriety and also the vigilance manual and also the norms for awarding the contract, why no action has been initiated against such a person just because the impression is, as he told the Vice-Chancellor also that he (DSW) has been openly talking that the Vice-Chancellor has assured him not to worry and nothing is going to happen, whatever he (DSW) did, he (Vice-Chancellor) would take care of it. He told that to the Vice-Chancellor, who told that nothing doing, he (Vice-Chancellor) would see to it that a spade is called a spade. But now he is compelled to believe that what he (DSW) says, is right and what he (Vice-Chancellor) gave him to understand seems to be incorrect. If his allegation, in one case

he could understand that he (DSW) did not know, if in two cases and in both the cases, one is the real brother and in other first cousin and the items which are supplied are not even of branded nature, the same are not of ISI or any standardization and that too by ignoring the leading brands of the country, if it is not corruption what else it is. Though he did not need to, but to be on the safer side, he just wanted to particularly say that he is not accusing the Vice-Chancellor of anything because before the Vice-Chancellor loses his temper by saying that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is accusing him, he is not doing so. But 'yes', if the Vice-Chancellor had not acted till now or the CVO, inspite of the Vice-Chancellor's clear-cut directions and the clear-cut directions by the Registrar, has not acted till now, he would like to see the guidance of the Vice-Chancellor what he should conclude. He wondered, all the people who are sitting here, if for the sake of defending him and say that so what is if somebody is somebody's brother, so what if somebody is somebody's cousin, everybody has the right to compete. Yes, he could understand that defence could be given but he knew, within themselves they know that it is not allowed. The close relatives are not allowed to compete specifically where the person who is sitting at the helm of the affairs is handling the charge. Why because, they have given the reasons also that if one had some close relative dealing in such things, while floating the tender, while designing the specifications, while requisitioning the things, one would always keep in mind that if one does it this way, it would go to his brother. That is why the close relatives are not allowed to participate. But yes, there are exceptions. There are exceptions that where somebody has a monopoly and happens to be the relative of somebody working in the University, they have no choice. But did anybody stop him (DSW) by writing that before taking the decision this fact may be kept in mind that such and such vendor who has given the quotation happens to be his brother, that such and such happens to be his cousin. He just warned that if this House under the chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor tries to absolve such actions of such members of the Senate also, he did not think that this University has any right to call itself a University of pride because the way the things are happening in the country, the way they are undergoing so many kinds of allegations and counter-allegations, he thought that it is imperative on the part of the educational institution, especially the institutions of higher learning like Panjab University to take pride in saying that they are a zero tolerance University as far as corruption is concerned. Let them become a guide to others that how they would not tolerate anybody howsoever big or important one may be, involves himself in corruption, would they tolerate? But now a more serious thing has come. He just wanted to ask those who want to defend him (DSW) by saying this thing that the brothers and relatives are not barred from participating in and bidding for such tenders, if that proves to be correct then why at all the DSW or that man who has supplied the things to the University need to depose before the Committee that they have no relation and on top of that the Committee says that they have no mechanism to prove that they are relatives. If at all, the Vice-Chancellor finds that 'yes' they are right, neither they have any mechanism nor the Vice-Chancellor has any mechanism nor this House has any mechanism to know what he is saying is correct or not, he had suggested this also let the case be handed over to CBI. Rather a person against whom the allegations are being levelled, he expected that he (DSW) would stand and say that let the case be investigated from anywhere and if that also does not find favor with the House, he could bring in each and every evidence to prove what he is saying provide his presumption that there are some people interested in getting the man scot free even after having done all these things is proved to be incorrect. He just wanted to make another mention that he had spoken in the meeting of the Senate in September making it conscious effort to ensure that the allegations he is putting against somebody, he would be speaking only in his (DSW) presence and he was successful in speaking in his presence. In the next meeting also, he made the same efforts to speak in his (DSW) presence because to speak at somebody's back, he feels is cowardice. When he saw the member sitting, he thought that it was the right time to speak. But after he had spoken, somebody brought to his notice that when he was speaking, that man (DSW) was not sitting. For that he wanted to apologize that if he had spoken anything against anybody in his absence, then probably that was not his intention. Today also, only after ensuring that the person against whom he is putting the allegations is very much sitting in this House, only then he is speaking. Again at the cost of repetition, he is saying that if his allegations are

proved to be wrong, he is ready to undergo any kind of penalty. But he expects from the Vice-Chancellor, from the House that before any other agency including PMO which is reported in the newspapers also, including Chandigarh Police, or other vigilance agencies before those people come and tell them that these illegalities have been committed, he thought that they stand up and try to find out the fact and be not hesitant in taking the desired action against anyone and if it is found that the allegations by Shri Ashok Goyal are not correct, then whatever action could be taken against him (Shri Ashok Goyal), that should also be taken and if the members feel that action could not taken against him whatever penalty they wanted to impose on him which he could voluntarily undertake, he undertook to take that also. But he wondered that the Registrar said and told him that whatever case is referred to the CVO, the CVO has to send the report to the CVC. He did not know as to how many cases have been referred till date to the CVO by the Vice-Chancellor or the University office and in how many cases, the report of the CVO has been submitted and in how many cases any such report has been sent to CVC also. If at all there is any such procedure that the CVO has to send the report to CVC, is there any time bound programme within which he/she has to conduct the enquiry or it is only after it has been concluded and even the CVC does not know that the CVO is enquiring into and it is to be sent to CVC. To his knowledge, CVO is to submit the report only if it has been routed through the CVC or it has been routed through the CVO of the concerned State or the organization. Nor that they did not know that when something has been referred and where the report has to be sent. But anyway since the Registrar told, he knew that the Vice-Chancellor might like to opt for the same answer again that he is not answering. He would like to know that if any such report till date has been submitted by the CVO and if yes, has it been sent to CVC. If no, why and if yes, what is the outcome and if the report has been submitted to the Vice-Chancellor also, why the same has not been placed before the Syndicate and if at all it was not placed before the Syndicate, he would like to know the reasons and if at all there is an intention to place before the Syndicate in future, when it is likely to see in the case of Senate. He would like to all these things and request that if at all nothing has been done so far, please expedite the matter and again he is ready to voluntarily undertake to assist any Committee appointed by the Vice-Chancellor including the CVO.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item before them is the appointments (C-16). As regards the reports to the CVO, in the next Syndicate meeting, the complete reports will be given as to how many cases have been referred to the CVO, what the response of the CVO has been and so on.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the case he is referring also would be placed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the recording of today's proceedings would be made available.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is for the fourth time that the Vice-Chancellor is saying that the recordings would be made available. Had the recordings gone, she had no intention to proceed further. What is the idea of sending the recordings if it is not to be followed up at all.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would give a complete report of this thing in the next meeting.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when a case related with any official is sent to the CVO, he has seen that when the DSW was a member of the Senate, he had been going as a Vice-Chancellor nominee in major Colleges of the City or as an expert. He requested that it should be checked that if allegations has been levelled against a person, till the time the allegations are not proved false, that person should not be sent as an expert/Vice-Chancellor nominee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not proper. He did not appoint Professor Navdeep Goyal as DSW but was appointed by the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when the case against DSW has been sent and he has admitted that the person who has been awarded the contractor is his brother, even then, the Vice-Chancellor is sending him as expert.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he was a member of the Syndicate when Professor Navdeep Goyal was appointed as DSW, it did not mean that he did not have the right to speak.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not saying so. They posed confidence in that person for over a period of three years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have every right to become wiser any day.

When Professor Rajesh Gill tried to say something, the Vice-Chancellor said no to which Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could not stop a member from speaking.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor is giving a message in the public to the CVO.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that how the Vice-Chancellor could stop her from speaking.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that charges have been levelled against a person and the Vice-Chancellor is not allowing to speak?

Shri Raghbir Dyal asked as to whether they would be allowed to speak on C-16 or not.

The Vice-Chancellor asked whether do they not approve these appointments to which a couple of members said, "No".

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is related to DSW.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had even congratulated the appointees and thanked the Syndicate also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item before them is approval of the appointments.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that unless and until the discussion has taken place, they could not say 'yes' or 'no'.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could say whatever they wanted.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are the elected representatives and the Vice-Chancellor did not want to listen to them

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor could say that the members would not be allowed to speak on this agenda item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could speak after they approve the item C-16.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Vice-Chancellor is right that when Professor Navdeep Goyal was appointed as DSW, there were certain Syndicate members. Does that belittle or negate the fact that at certain point of time, certain facts were exposed and the question is whether the University is investigating into those facts or not, whether these facts/allegations have been found to be true, correct or incorrect. They have to answer this question and whenever a certain question is asked, the Vice-Chancellor could not

say that he would answer. It is no excuse saying that a particular member was sitting in the Syndicate. They are a part of the Senate. Whenever a case comes to the exposure, it has to be taken up especially when they call this House, this University a heritage University, they call it a democracy and zero tolerance for corruption. Secondly, the other DSW who was appointed, with due regards to Dr. Nahar, it is nothing against him, but it is humiliating, so derogatory to the other person who is also a Professor, who was appointed and the Vice-Chancellor assured him to occupy that position and after one month, he was removed without any reason. How could the Vice-Chancellor explain this?

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

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked it a very convenient answer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is why the Vice-Chancellor is interpreting the Regulations unilaterally that he is not the Government of the University and presiding over the meeting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he was surprised over it that the Vice-Chancellor is saying that he is not the Government of the University. The Vice-Chancellor must know who is the Government of the University, it is the Syndicate and also knows that who are the members in the Syndicate. What was the fault of Professor J.K. Goswamy and why was he humiliated? The Vice-Chancellor should have firstly asked the Government as to who should be appointed as the DSW. They could expect at least this from the hon'ble Vice-Chancellor that if there is a Government then election has also to be there. He had congratulated Professor Emanuel Nahar in the Syndicate also. Since they have appointed a Professor as DSW and the Vice-Chancellor being at the helm of the affairs in the office situated at Chandigarh, he should have taken the members of the Syndicate present in Chandigarh into confidence about the appointment. He thought that it is a humiliation and injustice to the then incumbent Professor Goswamy. As Shri Ashok Goyal said in detail about the purchases made by the DSW, if the House shuts its eyes on that, then they should not make high promises that they are a very old University, a heritage University. If in the purchases made in crores of rupees, he remembers it being a member of the Syndicate at that time when the case of Professor Rajesh Gill came, the Syndicate members constituted a Committee with a deadline to submit the report in 20 days, when the case of purchases made by DSW came, then the Syndicate members did not say that the CVO must give the report within a month. They could not adopt different parameters for different persons. Whatever is going under the disguise of majority, it is not good for the academic growth and administration of the University. He did not mind if the Vice-Chancellor did not allow him to speak. But the things which are going on under the patronage of the Vice-Chancellor, who is an eminent scientist of Tata Institute of Fundamental and has contributed a lot in that area, he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) felt that it is not good.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is the prerogative of the Syndicate and the members are challenging the prerogative of the Syndicate. It is not that the Syndicate has taken a decision by majority for the first time. Professor Goswamy is a respected person for all. He said that since it was the prerogative of the Syndicate and the approval has come to the Senate and if the Senate approves it by majority that should be done otherwise it is a wastage of time in discussion. He also would like to point out that earlier also the decisions were taken by way of majority. He was a member of the Committee, Professor Ghuman another member is here, which took decision related with API score and he had dissent on it. After that a Committee was constituted. The teachers who were teaching for 5-7 years were not selected as those were not having Ph.D./NET. If the Ph.D./NET is an essential qualification, then the notification should have been issued but it should not have been written that they were not eligible but were earlier selected and teaching M.A. classes. He had his dissent at that time and the decision was taken by way of majority. Secondly, a Principal of the College of Education, who was corresponding with the University, the College was disaffiliated. The members

wanted to approve the same, it was a also decision taken by way of majority. But today the decision taken by way of majority is being challenged. Since the time the Syndicate and Senate have been formed, the decisions are always taken by way of majority. If now a decision is taken by majority, it should not be challenged. Professor Goswamy is a respected person for them. If the Syndicate members thought that a Senate member should be appointed as the DSW who could look after the welfare of the students and in place of that person Professor Emanuel Nahar has been appointed as DSW and now the matter is before the Senate and if the Senate wanted to reject the decision of the Syndicate, it could do so by way of majority. If most of the Senate members are in favor of approval, then it should be done and time should not be wasted and move ahead.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the members had discussed the matter in detail and completely thrashed out in the Syndicate. If some member says that if he had given the dissent there, had he no right to speak here. If there was no dissent and was a party to the decision, here again, they wanted to thrash out the same here and spending hours on discussion, he thought that in the Syndicate those members congratulated and in the Senate they are not allowing the House to function and trying to stall, it is not fair. It is totally undemocratic. He wanted to ask that if any member of the Syndicate had given his/her dissent in the Syndicate, now he had the right to speak and if he/she was a party at that time then why now it is being stalled and there should be the responsible way and should own the same in the Senate also. As Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the democracy, the decisions are taken by way of majority. If something was approved in the Syndicate and someone did not give dissent, then that person is a party. So if the dissent was not given in the Syndicate and here again hours are being spent on discussion, the time of the House be looked and it is better that time should not be wasted.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that since morning when the meeting of the Senate had started, she had talked to the nominated senior members that the students union is an important organ. The appointment of Professor Goswamy is also good as he is a respected person. But till then the list of the nominated Senators had come to the University and DSW was not ex-officio member. If the Syndicate took a decision so that the interest of the students could be looked after and Syndic/Senator should be given the charge and it is a decision taken by way of majority, it should be approved.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-16** on the agenda, be approved.

XVIII. Considered the report of the Johl Committee, which was constituted by the Senate in its meeting dated 9.10.2016 (**Item C-17 on the agenda**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item is to consider the report of Johl Committee which was constituted by the Senate in its meeting date 9.10.2016. The report had been received by the Registrar in a sealed cover. If the members permitted, the report could be opened.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the absence of any such provision, keeping in view the sentiments of the House, it was suggested that a Committee be constituted to look into the case informally and if at all any settlement could be arrived at, it would be in the best interest of the University and all concerned. Now, he is not against it if the Vice-Chancellor wanted to make it official. Anything which was informal, he thought, should not be formalized otherwise there is no such provision because it is PUCASH or for that matter in this PUCASH is not applicable according to the complainant as they have seen so many correspondence. A Committee to be appointed for the purpose by the employer could look into all these things if at all settlement could be reached but in the Senate a Committee was constituted requesting senior members to find out the possibility of sorting out the matter privately and informally. Still he did not know when he saw the item that in a sealed cover the report

has been received, he thought that if at all it is to be shared with the House, it should not be made a part of the record. His request is that it could be shared informally only.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that if they go by the last proceedings while the Committee was constituted, all the members had suggested that it is out of the Senate or the Committee was fully authorized or empowered to sort out/resolve the matter at their own level and the report be sent as it was desired by the Chancellor's office. Since the complaint was made to the Chancellor and much correspondence is going on, the report should be sent directly to the concerned office instead of opening and making it public.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay. There is a suggestion that this envelope goes to the Chancellor.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he is the only member of the Committee present here. The general sentiment of the Senate was that the matter should be resolved amicably and the responsibility was assigned to them. He thought that since it is informal, off the record or on the record, he could inform that they did not succeed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor R.P. Bambah has given them a brief. This envelope is there. They could keep here it as sealed or they could send it to the Chancellor as this sealed cover is not with anybody in the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no idea of sending it to the Chancellor's office.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then where would it remain – in the office of the Registrar or do they return this envelope back to Professor S.S. Johl. That is another option. Or could they give it to Professor R.P. Bambah.

The members agreed that the sealed envelope be handed over to Professor R.P. Bambah. The sealed envelope was accepted by Professor R.P. Bambah.

XIX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-18** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-18. That Dr. Roshan Lal, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, P.U., be confirmed as such on his post.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016, Para 33)

Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that this person had served in the College for 17 years with excellent work and joins the University, what are the reasons that an unsatisfactory report is given about him. The person was being victimized and harassed for 3 years and is not being informed that there are negative reports against him.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if the probation period of one year is not extended, then the person automatically gets confirmed.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the person was being harassed for 3 years and then an unsatisfactory report is submitted. What did it mean? What was the basis on which the unsatisfactory report is submitted? How any Chairperson could harass anybody? They should take some precautions so that such cases are not repeated and he requested that a Committee be constituted to frame the guidelines in this regard.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that there seems to be an intention to spoil the career of a teacher.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University norms are very clear. They could not extend the probation period beyond two years at all and if the probation is to be extended

beyond one year, noting has to be there. In this case some noting is made and by the time it comes to him, it is so late. He could not keep track of everything. He said that system have to be in place.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the system should be accountable.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have some problems as they did not have adequate number of senior people in the administration. They promote people to the senior most level in the administration who are in the last leg of their career. The Deputy Registrars, from the start of career, remain in this position for a small period of time. They did not have a very tight and efficient system in place because they are really short of senior officers. They need professional people to head and this is the reason the administration also is not pressing.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they understand that there are some administrative problems but under those problems there should not be any victimization.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said that there should not any victimization. It is a lapse on the part of the administration that if the work of a person is not satisfactory, no action is taken. It should be enquired into and the confirmation of the person should be done.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that according to the court decision, during probation period if somebody is not to be kept in service, no reason is to be given. If a reason is given, that is to be proved. Therefore, all employers within the probation period either extend the probation period or not extend the probation period and could ask to leave without any reason. If no action is taken against a person within two years of service, he/she automatically stands confirmed. Therefore, as far as the confirmation is concerned, that is done. As far as he is concerned, he thought that the practice is that no reason is to be given. However, when unsatisfactory report is given, then they could ask the Chairperson or the Administrative Committee as to what are the reasons for it. Once is put on record, then the reasons could be challenged in the Court and the Court might not give the relief. If the services are terminated without any reasons, then no relief is given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he fully agrees with Professor R.P. Bambah. As the Vice-Chancellor said that they need some professionals to handle this. There is no professionalism in this. The only thing that they need to do is that to streamline this, since the appointment letter is issued by the Establishment branch, the Establishment branch should have a diary where it should be written that somebody is going to complete 10/11 months and instructions should go along with the appointment letter to the concerned Department to make it sure that the Department sends the report by such and such date and it should be added that if the report did not come, then the efforts have to be put in to ensure that the report comes and the report is placed before the competent body because the prerogative of extending the probation again lies with the employer and it has to come. But the Vice-Chancellor is right that when the things have already gone beyond one year and they had not extended the probation, the person automatically stands confirmed after completing one year. As far as two years period is concerned, that stage would come only if they had extended the probation beyond one year. Now, two years have also lapsed. There are various judgements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court which have come that, yes, after a person has completed the probation without the same having been extended, he/she automatically stands confirmed. But thereafter, the judgments have come that unless and until there is a positive order conveying the confirmation, the person could not claim to have been confirmed. But the only difference is that even if he/she is not confirmed in the absence of a positive order, he/she could not be treated on probation also. So, the only thing is that they could only delay the communication of the confirmation which ultimately leads to victimization of the person who is awaiting the confirmation and if there is no way of extending the probation and then *fait accompli* they have to confirm the employee, then why not to confirm the employee well in time instead of making him/her feel that he/she is being

harassed. So, this system could be done at the lowest level that the report is to come from the Department by such and such date and if the same is not received, a fixed time be given to send the same, place the same before the Vice-Chancellor, let the same be placed before the Syndicate. In the past, even sometimes it got late by 9 months keeping in view that the meeting of the Senate was going to take place. So all such cases be placed before the Senate and let the Senate say that such and such person stands confirmed from such and such date, subject to the condition that in the meantime no adverse report is received against him/her. Then they would be completing all the formalities and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized that in case any adverse reports are received, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to extend the probation on behalf of the Senate. This is not such a big thing. Another thing that he wanted to suggest is that some of the Departments did not know that this is also a compulsory legal formality which has to be completed before the completion of probation period. That is only to streamline, which needs to be streamlined. Why he was saying so is that it is a very good suggestion that let them be careful in future. But he did not mind in sharing that they have been saying this for the last 30 years or so to be careful in future and this practice has not stopped and one or the other case has come. The second biggest problem is that there is a real person on probation who, Professor R.P. Bambah suggested, without giving the reason, should have been thrown out but because of non-receipt of any such adverse report well in time, they would have to bear with that fellow for the next 30-40 years. That is also creating problems for the University and to tackle this, the Registrar could direct the Establishment branch.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he has a suggestion for the Registrar on this. He did not know as to how modern the Establishment branch is. The Indians all over the world are controlling the IT sector. A simple IT tool could be put into the computer of the Establishment branch which could signal two months in advance for the actions to be taken. The reports could come one month in advance and if the report did not come, the person automatically stands confirmed. As such, a simple IT tool could be of help and it would not cost much.

Professor Chaman Lal said that there is criticism also. In case, the Head of the Department sends the adverse report against a teacher or an employee, there should be a system to scrutinize the adverse reports. The Dean of University Instruction or the Dean of the Faculty should scrutinize whether the report is genuine one or not. It is very easy to say that the report is unsatisfactory. Moreover, every unsatisfactory report should be given in detail with what could be said to be unsatisfactory and what are the facts. All these things should be clearly put down in the instructions part and that is also very clear that if adverse report does not come in time, then the person should be deemed to be confirmed. For future, he is saying that in case of adverse remarks, the employee should be given a chance of hearing and every employee has a right to it.

Professor B.S. Ghuman said that since the Chairpersonship of the Departments is on rotation basis, the reports should come through the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Departments.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that if there is an unsatisfactory report from the Department, that is enough but in practice, it happens that sometimes people are appointed by the Selection Committee, Syndicate and Senate against the desires of the senior people of the Department. If they are not vigilant, they could use their power to force someone to leave the job. Therefore, although the courts say that they could get rid of the person without giving the reasons but within the University there is no mechanism that the selection made by the Selection Committee is against the desires of the Department people should not be there. So, if there is an unsatisfactory report, the Dean of University Instruction should meet the Administrative Committee or senior people of the Department and form his own opinion and bring it to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor that as far as he is concerned, he is satisfied and there is no victimization.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Roshan Lal, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, P.U., be confirmed as such on his post.

XX. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-19. That the following recommendations of the special meeting of the Faculty of Medical Sciences dated 10.08.2016 with regard to the request of the Director-Principal, Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh, for inclusion of Professors of GMCH, Sector-32 in the Faculty of Medical Sciences, Panjab University, be approved:

“There would be 5 (Five) members from amongst the Faculty of Government Medical College, Sector-32 in the meetings of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, Panjab University, as special invitees to contribute on academic matters. The names would be proposed by the Director Principal of GMCH, Sector-32. The names of the Special Invitees shall remain the same or may differ, as decided by the Director Principal based on the agenda to the taken in that meeting.”

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 34)

The Vice-Chancellor said that they did not have a Medical College of their own.

Professor R.P. Bambah felt that once they open this gate, the people who are not employees of the University would automatically become the member of the Faculty of Medical Sciences.

The Vice-Chancellor said that having people from Medical Sciences would do a lot of good for the University.

Professor R.P. Bambah enquired whether such members would be entitled for voting rights.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no voting rights would be available. Voting right is only a thing to elect a Senate member or something like that. The first thing is how to improve the academic discussions in the Medical Faculty. Right now, the Faculty of Medical Sciences is chosen by people who are not from the medical profession at all.

Shri Raghbir Dyal objected to it.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they could have members of the Board of Studies from the Medical College.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that if the faculty of Medical College is invited to advice on academic medical matters, then there should be no problem. They could invite them as special invitees for any meeting.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that medical professionals like Dr. Amod and Dr. Jagat have opted for Faculty of Medical Sciences and Professors of the Dental College would also be ex-officio members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, but that number is a very small. The members have to take a decision.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that as far as academic participation in the Faculty meetings is concerned, they welcome the faculty members but they should not have the voting right to elect the members of the Syndicate or the Dean but could only become the special invitees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that anyway the faculty members are not electing the Syndicate. They need not be elected as Dean of the Faculty also if they participate in the election of the Dean, what is wrong.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in future the Professors of the Government Colleges could also ask for the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is the difference between 20 Government Colleges and a Government College which is a part of Panjab University? How many Government Medical Colleges are there which are a part of Panjab University?

Some of the members said that the faculty of the Medical College could be invited as special invitees for advising on academic matters.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University is taking the help of the Government Medical College for training the students of the Dental College of Panjab University. Whenever help from the Government Medical College is needed, then it is said that the Vice-Chancellor should go and ask for the help. The Medical College of the city is a very special institution. At one time, the PGIMER used to serve the purpose as the degrees were issued by the University. At the moment, there is only one Medical College which is part of the University. So, they take the help the Medical College so that the students of the Dental College get the practical training as the University is not having its own hospital. The members could make arguments if the Professors of the Medical College are a part of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, then the Homoeopathic doctors should also be part of the Faculty of Medical Sciences. If the members give that argument, he felt some weight in it. But approving this, he thought that they are not serving the interests of the University when it comes to the Faculty of Medical Sciences on behalf of the University. They had two Faculties in Lahore, a Medical Faculty separate than Dental Faculty. They should forget the history now. Since only 5 Professors are to be a part of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, let them become. He requested the members to lift themselves above from the electoral politics.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he agrees with it that they could have the faculty members as special invitees for the meetings of Board of Studies. If the voting rights are given, it could create problems.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is the problem other than the fact that the Faculty of Medical Sciences elects a Senate member for the next Faculty? There is no other problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to clarify that the item before the Senate is the recommendation of the Faculty of Medical Sciences and whatever the recommendation of the Faculty is and all the members are speaking about what the recommendation of the Faculty and that is purely for academic purposes. The names of the special invitees shall remain the same or may differ as decided by the Director-Principal. A decision was taken in the presence of many faculty members of the Medical College even those who are not members of the Faculty of Medical Sciences. The concern was that sometimes they were in strange position that if the decision is taken in their absence, the agenda item could be relating to a particular subject if the person remains the same though not of the specialization, it was left to the Director to send a special invitee. Secondly, he wanted to inform the House that these recommendations of a Sub-Committee, which was formed by the Vice-Chancellor, those recommendations were with voting rights. The Faculty of Medical Sciences, as Professor R.P. Bambah has rightly suggested, that the faculty is only interested in taking care of academic matters and it was recommended that 5 senior Professors of choice of the Director. There is no such thing as recommended or proposed by the Faculty that they would have the voting right either to elect the Dean or the Syndic.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that at the time when the MD/MS courses of PGI were affiliated with Panjab University, all the Professors of the PGI used to be the members of the Faculty of Medical Sciences whereas the Professors of Ayurvedic Colleges used not to be the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that the Professors from PGIMER, DMC or CMC or Government College, Amritsar or Patiala were never members of the Faculty of Medical Sciences.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as they were talking about the Faculty of Medical Sciences that the senior most Professors of the Medical College would be on the Faculty. But there are some Colleges like Physical Education, Music and Home Science and he had also raised the issue several times as to why those faculty members are not elected as members of the Board of Studies. He pointed out that two years ago he along with Dr. Dalip Kumar had moved a resolution that the College Professors should be made members of the Faculties. Only 1-2 meetings have taken place. Thereafter neither the Resolution has been rejected nor accepted. What is the emergency in this case that a need has arisen to bring this at once? He had been raising the voice related to his Resolution time and again but no action had been taken.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that a Resolution was moved in April 2014 for inclusion of Professors of Medical College. At that time there were 34 Professors in the Medical College. There is letter from Dr. Raj Bahadur of the year 2013 mentioning therein that they are having 24 medical specialties in the Medical College. As the members were talking about inviting 5 Professors, he wanted to say they could invite all the 24 specialists for academic matters. What about those who have been promoted as Professors in the Colleges by the University system? There are about 27 Professors and they should be invited to participate in the academic matters in the first instance. Only 2 meetings have been held on the Resolution moved by him and waiting for the decision. Professor B.S. Bhoop was the Chairman of the Committee and for the last two years, no meeting has been held and now there is a need to have a new Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the meetings have to be held by the members. He said that all these things be put to the Governance Reforms Committee since they have to reform the governance. The added members were added to get expertise preferably from the Colleges. But the problem is that there are Professors in the Government Colleges whereas in other Colleges, it is only up to Associate Professors. If they restrict to Associate Professor only, the Professors of some Colleges would be able to participate. So he gave a thought to and the suggestion from talking the people is that the Associate Professors of certain years of standing, who become eligible to put up case for Professorship, and the Professors of the affiliated Colleges, preferentially they should try to get them as added members of the Faculty. Do this way and do not do a pick and choose, the way it happens now and let this go to the Governance Reforms Committee. Let the Governance Reforms Committee come up with appropriate guidelines. Such things would settle on their own. If they keep an open mind that they need governance reforms, then come up with a recommendation on the governance reforms, bring it to the Senate, take a collective decision. They do not need to recommend change in the Act and the Parliament does not have to act on the recommendations. Most of the recommendations could be handled by the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) by just issuing a notification. He has got it checked, that normally whenever there are some recommendations, the MHA sets up a group having persons from Law Ministry, Ministry of Human Resource Development, UGC, they would evaluate those things and the MHA could issue a notification and governance reforms could be introduced without having a bill go to the Parliament for changing the Act. Large number of reforms could be done. The people in Delhi have given a thought to it. It is their opinion that governance reforms in Panjab University did not need a change in the Act. It only needs a consensus on behalf of the governing body of Panjab University and appropriate viable recommendation should come on which they could opine and do things. Let they approve it and then come back.

RESOLVED: That there be 5 (Five) members from amongst the faculty of Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh in the meetings of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, Panjab University, as special invitees to contribute on academic matters. The names be proposed by the Director-Principal of GMCH, Sector-32. The names of the Special Invitees shall remain the same or may differ, as decided by the Director-Principal based on the agenda to be taken in that meeting.

XXI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-20** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-20. That Shri Abhinav Bindra, Gold Medallist at Beijing Olympic, 2008, be offered the first Olympian Balbir Singh Sr. Chair Professorship in the Department of Physical Education on the same term and condition as in the case of Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh offered the Maharaja Ranjit Singh Chair Professorship at the Department of Defence & National Security Studies.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 42)

XXII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-21** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-21. That the recommendations of the Committee dated 26.10.2016, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of the decision of the Syndicate in its meeting held on 31.07.2016, to put in place a procedure for strengthening the system and implementation of financial model at Panjab University, keeping in view the Accounts Manual, Regulations, Rules, various decisions of the Syndicate and Senate etc., be approved.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 44)

XXIII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-22** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-22. That the recommendations of the Standing Committee dated 20.09.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to relaxation and concession of experience in appointments as per UGC norms 2006, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 45)

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the item before them is that the Syndicate resolved that the recommendations of the Standing Committee dated 20.09.2016 be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that it is only item No. 9 relating to relaxation and concession of experience in appointments as per UGC norms 2006.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as they were talking about the UGC norms of 2006, but nobody knew as what are those norms. He suggested that the item should be withdrawn and it could be reconsidered because after the year 2006, the UGC Regulations 2010 have come and the University had adopted the same and the Regulations of 2006 have now become meaningless. If they want to approve the recommendations, first they must know as to what percentage of relaxation and concession in experience is to be given. For example, for the appointment of a Principal, an API score of 400 is required for a general category candidate and what is the requirement of a reserved category candidate whether it is 300/200/100 or not at all required. They must know as to what they are approving.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is well taken and they could defer it at the moment and it could come again.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he would like to bring it to the attention of the members that the UGC Guidelines, 2006 were accepted by the members sitting in this very House in 2009. If somebody did not have the knowledge about it, he would request the University to provide the photocopies of the same and otherwise also these are available on the internet with the title Guidelines for Strict Implementation of Reservation Policy in Deemed Universities/Universities 2006 issued by the UGC. He had also pointed out in the Syndicate also that the language of the item is not proper. In the minutes, there is no talk about the concession but it was discussed in the meeting but the agenda item has been made that of concession. He had said that a Committee be formed to define the quantum of concession as to what would be the nature of concession.

Shri Prabhjit Singh enquired as to what concession the UGC had given. They could not go beyond that.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that all the Guidelines of DoPT under Section 20 sub-clause 2 say that if there is a contradiction between the UGC and Central Government policy/Law, then the law of the Central Government would prevail over the UGC. If the UGC had not notified something and the Central Government notifies something, they have no other option and are bound to accept those. They need to form a Committee to specify the quantum of concession and relaxation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they had no paper on the quantum of concession, this matter be deferred. He would appoint a Committee and have put up it back to the Syndicate.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that this item should not be deferred. This item is a very large and there are about 25 items in the minutes. He had said in the Syndicate also that all other items of the minutes were accepted except this one. All other benefits like hostel, allotment, etc. be given as per rules.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he was also talking about it and it is written that Punjab DPI has not reimbursed fee component of the past scholarship amount for the financial years 2014-15 and 2015-16. He said that a vigilance enquiry is pending in this case. First, they should look into as to what they are approving. There would be problems in giving blanket approval. He pointed out that some of the Colleges had made fake SC admissions and got the scholarship amount against it from the Government. The issue was raised in the Punjab Vidhan Sabha and the enquiry is going on. It should be relooked into. He further said that one of the recommendations is regarding separate hostel for SC/ST. He enquired as to from where the grants would come for this purpose. As such, they did not know as to what they are approving.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that from where the grants would come or not, it is not the headache of anyone. The grants would come only if the recommendations are approved. He said that the Social Welfare Department of U.T. Chandigarh had been time and again requesting the University to construct the rooms on the building of IAS Coaching Centre for which the whole amount would be given by it. But no action was taken on the pretext that they had no such rules. Now when the rules are being framed, it is being said that from where the grants would come. The grants would come.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they could see Item 16 Current Item wherein it is written that Professor Ranga raised the issue of non-maintenance of any record by the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University, Chandigarh with regard to implementation of Reservation Policy. It has been resolved that a report in this regard would be prepared involving the office of Dean College Development Council and further necessary action would be taken up accordingly. If they approve it, then they would have to seek the report from the Colleges. The University is not giving the grants to the Colleges. Only

Punjab Government is giving 95% grant to some Colleges which are aided. They are implementing the reservation policy without giving the money to the Colleges. How would they react? There would be serious repercussions of it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they could not deny the implementation of reservation. It is not the personal right of any one.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they are not denying it but first they must know as to what they are approving. They could seek the information from the Principals and the Managements as to how it could be implemented.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the policies are not being implemented since the last 50 years and the House is not taking any decision. He wanted to know why this House had not taken such decisions during the last 50 years.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is not responsible for it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he (Shri Prabhjit Singh) is responsible as he had been a member of the House and when the matter is placed before the House, he is speaking against it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is not speaking against it but said that it needed clarifications.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is giving the clarifications.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) is nobody to give the clarifications.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the members are saying that it should be blindly rejected.

To this, some of the members said that it is not so and they are not blindly rejecting it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the reasons be given as to why it is to be deferred. He is giving the points for its acceptance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to address the concerns of the grant-in-aid Colleges and non-aided Colleges.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the DoPT has issued specific guidelines for the appointment of teachers on temporary or contractual temporary appointment. More than 50% of the Panjab University faculty is temporary. He requested the Chair, House, Principals and the Chairpersons to provide him the data that how many people of the reserved category have been appointed on temporary basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on behalf of Panjab University when they appoint temporary teachers whom they continue year after year, they ought to have a reservation (roster) ratio being maintained for all those positions. There could not have different opinion on it. Dr. Ajay Ranga is right on this thing. He thought they need to quantify it and get back so that it is written clearly as to what they have to do and some algorithm also how to do as the time progresses.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that regarding point No.9, he had said in the Syndicate that the language of this item is not proper. There is no concession given and the quantification of concession was not done. He had said in the Syndicate that a Committee could be formed which could quantify this, but neither the Committee was formed nor the concession quantified. Even after his pointing out it in the Syndicate, the

item has been placed in improper language and that is why the problem arose. It might be that the members must have understood it as the item that talks about concession.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that before starting the discussion, the Vice-Chancellor had said that they have to discuss only point No.9 and not other points.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that all the points have to be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting of the Committee happened recently on 26th November 2016. So they have not even got the feedback from the members and a draft had been circulated. Probably, it is premature to have a detailed discussion on it and they would come back. They were not in principle disputing the recommendations of the Committee. The detailed things had not been done which ought to have been done before they bring it to the governing body of the University.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the question is related to quantum only. He suggested that those points which did not need quantum, those could be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would have to go back as the quantum has to be specified.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that such an item has come for consideration for the first time during the last 50 years.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if they talk about the aided Colleges, a question was raised in the Vidhan Sabha and Master Mohan Lal, Minister of Higher Education replied in the house that it is not possible to hold reservation policy in private Colleges because there is only one unit and could not be clubbed. If there is only a Professor of English or Mathematics, how that post could be reserved. They have to see it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he did not want to comment on anyone but the lack of knowledge and excessive knowledge is dangerous. The roster system is given on the internet and is available in the library. There is a ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India regarding roster on single cadre post. Mrs. Anu Chatrath, a senior Advocate is sitting in the House and she must be knowing it. If someone says that he did not know it and say that it could not be granted, what is this. Even in the Government Colleges also there are single posts of some subjects and the roster system is also implemented there. Why it could not be implemented in the private Colleges? He cited the example of the Panjab University Constituent Colleges where some subjects are having single posts, they had to revise the roster.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to bring a complete algorithm. They are not rejecting but deferring it. It would go to the Committee of this Senate only to suggest the algorithm and bring it back.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that his request to the House is that those points which are complete in nature, those should be approved and the points which are not complete, those could be reconsidered.

Professor Chaman Lal said that in principle it should be approved to give relief to the SC/ST category. They should not try to put off. However, if there is certain problem or certain clarifications of some kind are to be sought, a Committee could be formed for that but in principle it should be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to implement it, they needed the details.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they have to see the all DoPT guidelines whether these of 2006 or 2009.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the guidelines have already been accepted by the University and this august House but are not being implemented.

Professor Chaman Lal said that they should give a chance to the SC/ST section and the Senate fully supports their interests.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whether they accept what Professor Chaman Lal is saying.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he had listened to Dr. Ajay Ranga who has talked about the reservation policy. Before approving the whole agenda in toto, there is a need for deliberations as to what should be the modalities. As the Vice-Chancellor had said and everybody also agrees to it that the quantum has to be specified. If they approve it as it is then what would be the scope of quantum. If the item stands approved, then what is to be quantified. Dr. Ajay Ranga is saying that there are certain points and could provide all the information. They did not know whether these are the right source for providing the information or not. In his opinion, a Committee should be formed to look into the modalities in a very holistic practical manner and the item could be again placed. No one is against it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he had doubt on the intention. He wanted to know from the members who are members of the House since long ranging from 10 to 40 years as to why the guidelines since 1947 till 2016 have not been implemented. Instead of approving it, the member who had come to the House for the first time, had also raised objection. He wanted to say that the points which are clear and no quantification is required, at least those should be approved and there is no problem. He himself is saying that in the points where there is some problem, a Committee could be formed for that. He had also made such a similar request in the Syndicate also. But it seems that it is being blindly objected.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they would have to go one by one. They could make it time bound and place before the next meeting of the Senate to be held in February.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested that this item be placed before the next meeting with complete details.

This was agreed to.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that related with the item, he had pointed out in the Syndicate meeting that the appointments of the Principals in the Colleges of Education have been made, he wanted to know whether the same have been made as per UGC norms. He has come to know that a teacher without having been approved as a teacher has been appointed as Principal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not the matter under consideration right now.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that at that time it was said that it would be got checked by the Dean College Development Council. His query is whether the minutes of that meeting have been provided to the Dean College Development Council or not and if any action has been taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the minutes had been finalized some time ago.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had doubt that the Principals that they had appointed during the last two years especially in the Colleges of Education, whether they have been appointed as per UGC or NCTE norms and if so, that is good. His second query is that in some Colleges, there are not regular Principals and the letters coming from the teachers who have been given the charge, are those teachers approved or not

and without those teachers being approved teachers, they are entertaining their correspondence. He had read the minutes of the Syndicate wherein the Dean College Development Council was asked to get it checked. He requested that if the minutes had not been sent, the same be sent to the Dean College Development Council and action be taken on this.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "okay".

RESOLVED: That, the consideration of the item be deferred and a Committee be constituted to recommend quantum of relaxation and concession of experience in appointments in accordance with latest UGC norms, modalities, etc.

XXIV. The information contained in **Items R-1 to R-8** on the agenda was read out and ratified, i.e. –

R-1. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Rules and Regulations, Scheme of the B.Voc. courses running in the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University, as recommended by the Skill Development Board (B.Voc. Course) dated 03.08.2016.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxxv))

R-2. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed:

- (i) to release/transfer the Retirement gratuity in respect of Dr. S.P. Gautam, Professor, Department of Philosophy, up to the date of service rendered by him with this University i.e. up to 01.12.2004.
- (ii) the above benefits in respect of Dr. S.P. Gautam, be transferred to Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxxviii))

R-3. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Professor Sukhjinder Singh Gill, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University on contract basis upto 12.11.2021 (i.e. the date of his attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date he joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: Academically active report should be submitted by him after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xl))

- R-4.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Mr. Shamshad Alam as Assistant Professor in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, P.U., purely on temporary basis, against the post lying vacant in the Department for the academic session 2016-2017 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP Rs.6000/- + allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to him/her in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University, P.U. Regional Centres and Institute 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.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xliiii))

- R-5.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) appointed the following persons as temporary Assistant Professors at University Institute of Legal Studies w.e.f. dates mentioned against each, for the Academic session 2016-17, against the vacant posts of the Institute, or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+ AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances, as per University rules:

Sr. No.	Name	w.e.f
1.	Dr. Abha Sethi	07.07.2016
2.	Ms. Shafali	07.07.2016
3.	Mr. Harvinder Singh	07.07.2016

- (ii) approved the appointment of following persons (including waiting list) as Part-time Assistant Professors in Law at University Institute of Legal Studies on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week) for the Academic session 2016-17 w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name	w.e.f
1.	Ms. Nancy Sharma	21.7.2016
2.	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar	21.7.2016
3.	Ms. Amrit Pal Kaur	21.7.2016
4.	Ms. Supreet Gill	21.7.2016
5.	Ms. Harman Shergill	21.7.2016
6.	Dr. Jaswinder Kaur	21.7.2016
7.	Ms. Alamdeep Kaur	21.7.2016 to 30.08.2016
8.	Ms. Shivani Gupta	25.07.2016
9.	Kajori Bhatnagar	(waiting)
10.	Tanmeet Kaur	(waiting)

NOTE: The waiting list be operative only if anyone from Sr. No.1 to 8 does not join.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xlvi))

- R-6.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Committees, Syndicate/Senate, has approved the enhancement in price of Application form from Rs.65/- to Rs.75/- for admission in P.U. Teaching Departments/Regional Centres/Institute for the session 2017-18.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(lii))

- R-7.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of the following Deans up to 31.10.2016, under Regulation 1 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty members
1.	Professor Navdeep Goyal, DSW Department of Physics
2.	Professor Nandita Singh, DSW (W) Department of Education

NOTE: 1. Regulation 1 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 is reproduced below:

“The Senate may, on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare for such period and on such terms and conditions as may be determined by them.”

2. The present term of appointment Professor Navdeep Goyal as DSW and Professor Nandita Singh as DSW (Women) has been expired on 31.07.2016 and 11.08.2016, respectively.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(i))

- R-8.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has appointed the following as Dean of Student Welfare and Dean of Student Welfare (Women) w.e.f. 1.11.2016 until further orders:

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty members	Appointed as
1.	Professor Jatinder Kumar Goswami UIET	Dean of Student Welfare
2.	Professor Neena Capalash Department of Biotechnology	Dean of Student Welfare (Women)

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xli))

XXV. The information contained in **Items I-1 to I-49** on the agenda was read out and noted, i.e. –

I-1. That Dr. Bhupinder Singh, Assistant Professor, USOL, be allowed to continue as Associate Professor (Temporary) in the Department of Indian Theatre, for one more year.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 41)

I-2. That, Post Graduate Government College, Sector-11, Chandigarh, be granted Co-Educational status, w.e.f. the session 2016-17.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 7)

I-3. That an endowment of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Professor Roshan Lal Raina, Vice-Chancellor, JK Lakshmi Pat University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, be accepted for institution of Endowment named as “Prof. Roshan Lal Raina Award”, and the investment of Rs.1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment and the interest of the amount be utilized to annually present ‘Prof. Roshan Lal Raina Award’ to M. Lib. & Information Science topper (first in order of merit) in the department of Library & Information Science of Panjab University, with the following terms and conditions:

1. Endowment will be named as ‘Prof. Roshan Lal Raina Award’.
2. Cash Prize will be awarded to M.Lib. & Information Science Topper (first in order of merit) of the University.
3. A certificate of the Award.
4. Contribution of Rs.1000/- towards Life membership Fees of any Indian National Level Professional Body (such as IATLIS, IASLIC, ILASIS etc.) as mutually decided by the Department of Library and Information Science and the Awardees.
5. A token Cash Award of Rs.5100/-.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 11)

I-4. That the proposal dated 29.4.2016 of Indian Institute of Chemical Engineers, Chandigarh Regional Centre of IChE (Indian Institute of Chemical Engineers) that the four scholarships be opened for all the three UG Courses namely: 4 year B.E. (Chemical), 4 year B.E.(F.T.) and 5 and ½ year Integrated B.E. (Chemical) with MBA courses being run by Dr. SSBUI CET, along with the following proposed terms and conditions (to be awarded w.e.f. current session i.e. 2016-17), be approved:

Existing Terms and Conditions	Proposed Terms and Conditions
1. The four scholarships to be awarded to one students each of under graduate class of the B.E. (Chemical)	1. The four scholarships may be opened for all the three UG Courses namely: 4 year B.E. (Chemical), 4 year B.E.(F.T.) and 5 and ½ year Integrated B.E. (Chemical) with MBA courses being run by Dr. SSBUI CET and one student may be selected from each year (all the three UG courses considered on a collective basis) as per norms already approved. 2. In case of tie, the Socio-Economic criteria will be considered.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 12)

- I-5.** That, to promote mutual understanding and international scientific research, Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), be executed between Julius-Maximilians-University of Würzburg, Germany and Panjab University, Chandigarh.
(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 31)
- I-6.** That an additional sum of Rs.1,00,000/- donated by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram, H.No. 362, Sector-9, Panchkula, be accepted for purchase of books and payment of Scholarship etc. to the poor & needy students out of Students Aid Fund Account and Income Tax Exemption Certificate duly signed by the Registrar, P.U. Chandigarh be provided to the donor to avail income tax benefits for the session 2016-17.
(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 32)
- I-7.** That the money be collected as Alumni is a very good base available to the Dean, Alumni Relations. The Dean, Alumni Relations, would invite proposals and also form a Committee comprising eminent persons from the Alumni, excluding University Professors, to evaluate the proposals. 60% of the money be given to the innovative proposals from the Colleges and 40% from the University Teaching Departments.
(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 5)
- I-8.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Zarreen Fatima as Assistant Professor in Department of Urdu, P.U., on contract basis at fixed emoluments of Rs.30400/- p.m. w.e.f. the date she starts work, for the academic session 2016-17 i.e. up to 31.05.2017 against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions according to which she had worked previously during the last session.
(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(ii))
- I-9.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Richa Rastogi Thakur as Assistant Professor at Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology, University Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U. w.e.f. the date she starts work purely on temporary basis for the next academic session 2016-17, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(iii))
- I-10.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Vishal Agrawal as Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, purely on temporary basis, w.e.f. 07.07.2016 to 30.04.2017, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, for the academic session 2016-17 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(iv))
- I-11.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor at Centre for Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering Institute of Emerging Area in

Science & Technology, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date he start work for academic session 2016-17, against the vacant post or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(v))

- I-12.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) the following persons as Assistant Professor, in the Department of Biotechnology, P.U. purely on temporary basis, for more one year w.e.f. the date they start work against the vacant posts of the department or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

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

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(vi))

- I-13.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed following persons at P.U.R.C. Extension Library, Ludhiana as Part-Time Assistant Professors for the current session 2016-17, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) w.e.f. 27.07.2016 i.e. the date from which they have actually started work for the session 2016-17, against the vacant positions in the Centre:

1. Ms. Vandana Bhanot
2. Mr. Sharwan Sehgal
3. Ms. Sarita Paul

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(vii))

- I-14.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed Dr. Jasmeet Gulati, Assistant Professor in Law, University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS), to proceed on deputation initially for a period of one year w.e.f. the date she is relieved from the Department/ Institute to enable her to join as Assistant Professor on an ex-cadre post of Assistant Registrar (Research) in Registry of Supreme Court of India.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(viii))

- I-15.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) re-appointed (afresh) the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 08.07.2016 for the academic session 2016-17 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, with one day break as usual, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and

conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2015-16:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person	Designation & Subject
1.	Ms. Inderjot Kaur	Assistant Professor in Law
2.	Shri Hardip Singh	Assistant Professor in Law

- (ii) appointed Dr. Rajnish Mutneja as Assistant Professor at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib on part-time basis w.e.f. 08.07.2016 for the academic session 2016-17 or till the post is filled in through selection, whichever is earlier, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week).

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(ix))

- I-16.** In term of Syndicate decision dated 31.05.2015, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed following persons as Assistant Professor at UIH&TM purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date they start work, for the academic session 2016-17 against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the pay-scale on Rs.15600-39100+AGP plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation, 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007:

1. Mr. Gaurav Kashyap (Hotel Management)
2. Mr. Abhishek Ghai (Hotel Management)
3. Mr. Manoj Senwal (Hotel Management)
4. Ms. Lipika (Tourism Management)
5. Mr. Amit Katoch (Tourism Management).

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(x))

- I-17.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of Ms. Rajni Chauhan as Assistant Professor in Commerce (purely on temporary basis), University School of Open Learning, for one more semester i.e. July to December, 2016 (for the session 2016-17), w.e.f. the date she start work, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000 + allowance as admissible as per University rules under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xi))

- I-18.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed following persons as Part-Time Assistant Professor in the Department of Laws, P.U., for the current session 2016-17, on the same term and conditions according to which they have worked previously during last session 2015-16:

1. Dr. Gurpreet Singh
2. Ms. Naveender P.K. Singh
3. Dr. Neetu Gupta
4. Ms. Priyanka Bedi

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xii))

I-19. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of following persons as Assistant Professor, at UIET purely on temporary basis, up to 30.06.2016 with one day break on 02.05.2016, 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 person	Branch
1.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Maths
2.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Management
3.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Management
4.	Ms. Geetu	Physics
5.	Mr. Saravjit Singh	ECE
6.	Ms. Garima Joshi	ECE
7.	Ms. Daljit Kaur	ECE
8.	Ms. Rajni Sobti	IT
9.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh	IT
10.	Ms. Renuka Rai	Chemistry
11.	Ms. Pardeep Kaur	ECE
12.	Dr. Ranjana Bhatia	Biotech.
13.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Maths
14.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Biotech.
15.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
16.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
17.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
18.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
19.	Mr. Gurmukh Singh	IT
20.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
21.	Ms. Shweta Mehta	IT
22.	Ms. Manisha Kaushal	CSE
23.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
24.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Biotech
25.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	Micro Electronics
26.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
27.	Mr. Chander Prakash	Mech.
28.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	EEE
29.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
30.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Physics
31.	Mr. Munish Kansal	Maths

- (ii) also re-appointed (afresh) the above (Sr. No. 1 to 31) as Assistant Professor at UIET purely on temporary basis, w.e.f. the date he/she/they start/started work, for the academic session 2016-17, 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.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xiii))

I-20. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Munish Kumar, Assistant Professor in Computer Science (Temporary) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni,

Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. 11.08.2016 instead of 08.08.2016 as per request of the Director, P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni (as he has given one month notice), under Rule 16.2 given at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xiv))

- I-21.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Rishi Raj Sharma, Associate Professor, University Business School (UBS) w.e.f. 10.08.2016 (A.N.) by waiving off the condition of giving one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xv))

- I-22.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has ordered that the tenure of Professor S.K. Soni as Honorary Director, CIIP, P.U., be treated as extended w.e.f. 24.03.2016 to 18.07.2016 (A.N.) (the date on which he handed over the charge to his successor) instead of upto the start of Summer Vacations, on the previous terms & conditions.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xvi))

- I-23.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Committee dated 04.07.2016 of Research Promotion Cell and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Centre of Innovative and Applied Bioprocessing (CIAB), C-127, Phase 8, Industrial Area, SAS Nagar, Mohali (Punjab), as a recognized Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work in the subjects of Microbial Biotechnology, Pharmaceutical Sciences and System Biology and Bioinformatics, for the purpose of Ph.D.

NOTE: Faculty of CIAB can be appointed as Research Supervisors subject to the terms and conditions as laid down by the Panjab University.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xviii))

- I-24.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Committee dated 02.08.2016 of the Research Promotion Cell and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Defence Institute of Physiology and Allied Sciences (DIPAS), Govt. of India, Ministry of Defence, Defence Research & Development Organization, Lucknow Road, Timarpur, Delhi-110054 as a recognized Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work in the subject of Anthropology for the purpose of Ph.D.

NOTE: Faculty of DIPAS can be appointed as Research Supervisors subject to the terms and conditions as laid down by the Panjab University.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xix))

- I-25.** Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 19.07.2016 (Para 40), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to transfer Rs.50.00 lacs out of U.I.A.M.S. Exam Fund to Building & Infrastructure Fund Account for Development expenditure of Teaching departments.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xx))

- I-26.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) along with Agreement of Academic Exchange between Saitama University, Japan and Panjab University, Chandigarh.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxiv))

- I-27.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted provisional affiliation to Waheguru College, Burj Muhar Road, Abohar, District Fazilka for (i) B.A.-I (Mathematics) (One Unit) and (ii) B.Sc. 1st year (Agriculture) (Four Years Course)- (One Unit), for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfillment of the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its reports dated 31.07.2016, dated 08.07.2016 and 12.07.2016 and also subject to remittance of Endowment Fund as per PU/UGC rules/regulations.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxv))

- I-28.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted provisional affiliation to Waheguru College, Burj Muhar Road, Abohar, Distt. Fazilka, for (i) B.A.-I (One Unit) (English (C&E), Punjabi (C&E), Hindi, Public Administration, Political Science, Economics, Sociology, Physical Education, History, Fine Arts and Computer Science, (ii) B.Com.-1st year (One Unit), for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfillment of the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its reports dated 8.07.2016 and 12.07.2016 respectively and also subject to remittance of Endowment Fund as per PU/UGC rules/regulations.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxvi))

- I-29.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the National College for Girls, Chowarian Wali, Fazilka, be converted into a Co-educational College as 'National Degree College', Chowarian Wali, Fazilka.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxvii))

- I-30.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) re-appointed afresh the following faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis from 14.09.2016 for 11 months i.e. up to 13.08.2017 with one day break on 13.09.2016 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the grade of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000 + NPA + Allowances as admissible respectively as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1	Dr. Amandeep Kaur	Assistant Professor
2	Dr. Prabhjot Kaur	Assistant Professor
3	Dr. Amrita Rawla	Assistant Professor
4	Dr. Vandana Gupta	Assistant Professor
5	Dr. Rajni Jain	Assistant Professor

6	Dr. Monika Nagpal	Assistant Professor
7	Dr. Manjot Kaur	Assistant Professor
8	Dr. Rajiv Rattan	Assistant Professor

- (ii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty member at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis from 14.09.2016 for 11 months i.e. up to 13.08.2017 with one day break on 13.09.2016 or till the post is filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the grade of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600+NPA as admissible respectively as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he was working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
9	Dr. M.K. Chhabra	Associate Professor

- (iii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis from 14.10.2016 for 11 months i.e. up to 13.09.2017 with one day break on 13.10.2016 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the grade of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs. 7000 + NPA + Allowance as admissible respectively as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
10	Dr. Ruchi Singla	Sr. Assistant Professor
11	Dr. Rosy Arora	Sr. Assistant Professor
12	Dr. Prabhleen Brar	Sr. Assistant Professor
13	Dr. Vivek Kapoor	Sr. Assistant Professor

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxx))

- I-31.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed following persons as Assistant professor (who worked during the last session and their work and conduct have been found satisfactory) at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, for the academic session 2016-17 as such purely on temporary basis, w.e.f. 07.07.2016 against the vacant posts of the Centre, or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances under University Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of Person	Branch
1	Shri Kanwal Preet Singh	CSE
2	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE

3	Mrs. Shama Pathania	CSE
4	Mrs. Monika	ECE
5	Shri Anish Sharma	ECE
6	Mrs. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
7	Shri Gurbinder Singh	I.T.
8	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T.
9.	Mrs. Ritika Arora	I.T.
10	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	I.T.
11	Shri Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
12	Shri Gurwinder Singh	Mech.
13	Shri Ramandeep Singh	Mech.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxx))

- I-32.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the appointment of Professor Ashok Sahni, FNA as ONGC Chair Professor in the Department of Geology, P.U., Chandigarh, as per the decision/recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committee of Geology department. All the expenses including honorarium of Rs.3.00 lacs p.a. TA/DA, Hospitality, infrastructure/research facilities, residential and office accommodation at par with other professors as per the MoU be provided from the ONGC Endowment Fund.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxxiv))

- I-33.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has enhanced the existing income slab i.e. Rs.1.5 lacs to Rs.2.5 lacs, for tuition fee concession where both parents of the students are not surviving and those whose father has expired and mother is not able to bear his/her expenditure towards studies at par with the existing different schemes to maintain the uniformity in the income slab w.e.f. the session 2016-2017.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxxvi))

- I-34.** That the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Republic of India and Allameh Tabataba'I University, Islamic Public of Iran.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xxxix))

- I-35.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

- (i) re-appointed Dr. Minakshi Garg and Dr. Gursharan Singh who fulfil the requisite qualifications as per UGC Amendment (3rd as well as 4th amendment), Regulation, 2016 as Assistant Professor purely on temporary basis at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, w.e.f. the effective date of UGC's (3rd amendment) i.e. 04.05.2016 for the period 04.05.2016 to 30.06.2016.
- (ii) also re-appointed afresh the above faculty members for next academic session 2016-17 w.e.f. 07.07.2016 to 30.04.2017 in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible as per University rules under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xlii))

I-36. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed following persons as Part-time Assistant Professors at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week), w.e.f. the date they start work for the session 2016-17:-

1. Dr. Chander Shekhar Marwaha
2. Mrs. Kamy Rani.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xliv))

I-37. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has reappointed afresh the following Assistant Professors at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date of start/started of classes for the academic session 2016-17 upto December, 2016 (odd semester) or till the posts are filled in on regular basis through proper selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2015-16:

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

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xlvi))

I-38. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies, as Dean International Students for one more year w.e.f. 13.11.2016 on the same term and conditions.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xlvii))

I-39. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has appointed Dr. Ranjan Kumar, Professor, Department of Physics as Associate Dean of Student Welfare, in addition to his own duties with immediate effect till further orders. No honorarium will be paid for the purpose, till the matter gets approval from BOF/ Syndicate/ Senate.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(xlviii))

I-40. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved:

- (i) the recommendation (Item no.7) of the meeting of the Science Research Board dated 30.08.2016 that the Centre of Innovative and Applied Bioprocessing (CIAB), C-127, Phase 8, Industrial Area, SAS Nagar, Mohali (Punjab), be treated as a Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. in the subjects of Biotechnology, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering.

- (ii) that in future such matters of other Institution/Centre in future for recognition of Research Centre be placed before the Research Promotion Cell for approval.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(l))

I-41. That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, has granted temporary affiliation to new proposed College namely Hoshiarpur Professional and Vocational College, Adamwal, Distt. Hoshiarpur, for the following courses for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfillment of the conditions mentioned in the inspection report including appointment of all the Teaching and Non-teaching staff and conditions laid down in the Para 3(6), 5 of Survey Report dated 13.07.2016 and till then the UGC regulation 3.3 shall prevail only if, the society submits undertaking for fulfillment of all the conditions within one year. The undertaking shall be submitted by the College within a week from the date of issue of this letter.

1. B.A.-I (English (G&E), Punjabi (G&E), Political Science, Sociology, Physical Education, History, Economics, Mathematics and Computer Science)
2. B.Com-I (One Unit)
3. B.Sc.-I (Agriculture) – One Unit

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 47(li))

I-42. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.5.2016 (Para 56), the Committee in its various meetings, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses/subjects for the session 2016-17, as under:

Sr. No.	Date of the meeting of the Committee	Name of the College	Name of the courses/ subjects
1.	23.08.2016	Guru Gobind Singh Girls College Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	(i) B.A.-I, II & III- English, Punjabi, Hindi, History, Political Science, Physical Education, Economics & Mathematics (ii) B.A. I, II & III (Computer Science)-40 Seats each and (iii) B.Com. I, II & III- one unit each, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016, failing which grant of temporary extension of affiliation will stand withdrawn.
2.	23.08.2016	M.M.D. DAV College Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	(i) M.A.-I & II (History)- one unit each and (ii) M.A.-I & II (Punjabi)-one unit each, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.9.2016, failing which, grant of temporary extension of affiliation will stand withdrawn.

3.	23.08.2016	Guru Nanak College for Girls, Tibbi Sahib Road Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	(i) B.B.A. I, II & III- one unit each (ii) B.Com. I, II & III- one unit each, (iii) M.Com. I & II-one unit each, (iv) B.Sc.-III (Fashion Designing)-40 seats, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016, failing which grant of temporary extension of affiliation will stand withdrawn.
4.	23.08.2016	Guru Nanak College, Killianwali, Distt. Sri Muktsar	(i) M.A.-I & II (Hindi)-one unit each (ii) M.A.-I & II (History)-one unit each (iii) M.A.-I & II (Punjabi)-one unit each (iv) PGDCA-40 seats, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016, failing which grant of temporary extension of affiliation will stand withdrawn.
5.	23.08.2016	Shri Ram College, Dalla, Tehsil-Jagraon, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	(i)B.Com. 2 nd year (1 unit), (ii) M.A.-II (Punjabi)-one unit and PGDCA (one unit), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016, failing which grant of temporary extension of affiliation will stand withdrawn.
6.	23.08.2016	DAV College, Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	(i)B.C.A. I, II & III-one unit each (ii) B.Com.-I, II & III (one unit each), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee will be complied with 30.09.2016, failing which grant of temporary extension of affiliation will stand withdrawn.
7.	23.08.2016	Mata Gurdev Kaur Memorial Shahi Sports College of Physical Education, Jhakroudi, Samrala Distt. Ludhiana, Punjab	(i) B.P.Ed.- 1 st & 2 nd year (two year course)-100 seats each class & (ii) D.P.Ed.-2 nd Year (two year course)-50 seats
8.	23.08.2016	DAV College, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	Advance Diploma courses (Add-on course) i.e. E-Banking and E-Commerce
9.	23.08.2016	P.G. Govt. College for Girls, Sector-42, Chandigarh	Certificate courses (i) Cosmetology (ii) Animation and Graphics
10.		Khalsa College for Women, Sidhwan Khurd Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	M.A. 2 nd year (Political Science) (one unit), subject to the condition that the college shall pay salary to the teachers as per P.U./U.G.C. norms.
11.		National College for Women, Machhiwara, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Sc. 1 st & 2 nd year (Fashion Designing) (one unit) 40 seats, subject to the condition that the college shall pay salary to the teachers as per P.U./U.G.C. norms.

12.		Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College for Women, Village-Kamalpura, Tehsil: Jagraon Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Com. 2 nd year (1 unit), subject to the condition that the college shall pay salary to the teachers as per P.U./U.G.C. norms.
13.		Government College for Girls, Rakh Bagh Ludhiana (Punjab)	(i) B.B.A. I, II & III (One unit), (ii) M.Com. I & II (One unit), (iii) M.Sc. IT-I & II (iv) B.A./B.Sc. I, II & III (Computer Science) (E)-40 seats & (v) P.G.D.C.A., subject to the condition that the college shall pay salary to the teachers as per P.U./U.G.C. norms.
14.	23.08.2016	Kamla Lohtia Sanatan Dharma College, Ludhiana	(i) Advance Diploma in E-Commerce (ii) Advance Diploma in Entrepreneurship Development Career Oriented courses
15.	23.08.2016	Arjan Dass College, Dharamkot, Moga	Foundation course under the UGC scheme of Human Rights Education
16.	23.08.2016	G.H.G. Khalsa College, Ludhiana	(i) B.Voc. Degree in Food Processing and Quality Management (ii) B.Voc. Degree in Medical Lab Technology under B.Voc. Degree Programme
17.	23.08.2016	D.A.V. College, Chandigarh	B.Voc. II & B.Voc. III in Medical Lab Technology and Advance Diploma in Medical Lab Technology under Community College Scheme
18.	23.08.2016	R.S.D. College, Ferozpur City	Diploma course in Guidance and Counselling
19.	23.08.2016	S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana	Add-on-course Diploma in Cosmetology under UGC Scheme of Career Oriented Course
20.	23.08.2016	Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozpur City (Punjab)	(i) M.Sc. I (Zoology), (ii) M.Sc. I (Botany), (iii) M.Sc. I (Cosmetology & Health Care) 2 nd Unit course, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.9.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn. Further, as regards affiliation of B.A. I (Indian Classical Dance), the college vide its letter No. 280/16-17 dated 13.06,2016 has itself declined to start the course.
21.	23.08.2016	S.D.P. College for Women, Daresi Road Ludhiana (Punjab)	(i) B.Com. I (3 rd unit) & (ii) M.Com. 1 st year (2 nd unit), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.9.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.

22.	23.08.2016	Mata Sahib Kaur Girls College Talwandi Bhai, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	<p>(i) B.A. Part-I, II & III (English (C&E), Punjabi (C&E), History, Sociology, Political Science, Mathematics, Economics, Computer Science, Physical Education, Elective Hindi (ii) M.A.-III (Political Science) courses for the session 2016-17, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/ Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.</p> <p>Further, the Committee has not granted temporary affiliation for (i) B.Sc. Part-I (Non-Medical) (ii) B.Sc. Part-I (Medical) and (iii) B.Sc.-I (Fashion Designing) w.e.f. the session 2016-17.</p>
23.	23.08.2016	Shaheed Ganj College for Women, Mudki, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	<p>(i) B.A. Part-I, II & III (English (C&E), Punjabi (C&E), Mathematics, Political Science, History, Economics, Sociology), (ii) B.A. I&II Computer Science, Physical Education, (iii) B.C.A. Part-I, II & III courses for the session 2016-17, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/ Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.</p> <p>Further, the Committee has not granted temporary affiliation for B.Sc. Part-I (Non-Medical) w.e.f. the session 2016-17.</p>
24.	23.08.2016	Bhag Singh Khalsa College For Women, Village Kala Tibba, Abohar (Punjab)	<p>(i) B.Com. I, II & III (one unit), (ii) B.Sc. I, II & III (Non-medical), (iii) M.A.II (Sociology) and (iv) B.Lib. course for the session 2016-17, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/ Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.</p>
25.	23.08.2016	MBG Government College, Pojewal, S.B.S. Nagar (Punjab)	<p>(i) B.A.-I, II & III (Computer Science) course for the session 2016-17, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/</p>

			Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
26.		Satyam Girls College, Village Sayadwala, Fazilka	(i) B.A. I, II and III (English) (C & E), Philosophy, Political Science, Economics, History, Mathematics, Sociology, Computer Science, Hindi, Physical Education, (ii) B.Com. Part I, II and III, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
27.	23.08.2016	Baba Kundan Singh College VPO Muhar, Ferozepur	M.A. II (History) and B.Com. 2 nd year course, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
28.	23.08.2016	Syon College, Abohar-152116 (Punjab)	(i) B.A. I & II (English)(C&E), Elective Hindi, Physical Education, History, Economics, Sociology and Political Science, (ii) B.Com. Part I & II (one unit), subject to the conditions that the conditions/requirements imposed by the Inspection committee be complied with by the College by 30.09.2016 and also send the salary statement alongwith relevant Proof of the whole teaching and non-teaching staff to the office from April, 2015 to August 2016 latest by 15.9.2016.
29.	23.08.2016	Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur Cantt	M.A. I (Sociology), M.Com. I, M.Sc. (IT), M.A. I & II (Punjabi), M.A. I & II (History), M.Sc. I & II (Mathematics), B.C.A. I, II & III, B.A. I, II & III (Sociology), B.Com. I, II & III and PGDCA. The Committee recommended that in the absence of any concrete evidence regarding fulfillment of conditions laid down by the Inspection Committee relating to any of the course applied for afresh or grant of extension of temporary affiliation of existing course, the Committee is not inclined to accede to the request of the College to

			grant affiliation/extension of temporary affiliation for the courses applied for session 20-16-17.
30.	23.08.2016	Rayat College of Law, Railmajra, Distt. SBS Nagar	(i) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Years Integrated Course (two units)-120 seats) (ii) B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Years Integrated course (one unit)-60 seats), subject to conditions/requirements imposed by the Inspection Committee be complied with by the College by 30.09.2016.
31.	23.08.2016	Bajaj College, V-Chauki Mann, Ferozepur Road Ludhiana-142024	(i) B.Com. 1 st & 2 nd year (one unit) (ii) B.C.A. 1 st & 2 nd year 30 seats (iii) B.B.A. 1 st & 2 nd year-40 seats (iv) B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) - 1 st & 2 nd year (one unit), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
32.	23.08.2016	Swami Ganga Giri Janta Girls College, Raekot Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	(i) B.A. 1 st year Computer Science (Elective) (one unit), (ii) B.A. 1 st year Principle & Practice of Insurance-E (40 seats) (iii) B.A. 1 st year (IT) (One unit), subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.9.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
33.	23.08.2016	Kamla Lohtia Sanatam Dharam College, Subhash Nagar, Daresi Road Ludhiana (Punjab)	Master of Entrepreneurship and Family Business (1 st & 2 nd year) (ii) B.A. III Computer Science-E, subject to the conditions that all the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee/Affiliation Committee will be complied with by 30.09.2016 failing which the grant of extension of temporary affiliation will stand withdrawn.
34.	08.11.2016	Govt. College of Yoga Education and Health, Sector 23, Chandigarh	(i) B.Ed. Yoga (ii) Post Graduate Diploma in Yoga Therapy (iii) Basic certificate course in Yoga Education and (iv) Advance certificate course in Yoga Education, subject to fulfillment of all remaining conditions/requirement imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary/ extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.

35.	08.11.2016	Shree Atam Vallabh Jain College, Hussainpura, Distt. Ludhiana	B.Com.-II (4 th unit), subject to fulfillment of all remaining conditions/ requirement imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary/ extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
36.	08.11.2016	Guru Gobind Singh College for Women, Sector-26, Chandigarh	(i) M.A. English I & II (ii) M.Com. I & II (iii) M.Sc. IT-I & II (iv) M.A. Sociology I & II (v) M.A. Economics I & II (vi) B.C.A. I, II & III (vii) B.Com. I, II & III (3 rd unit) (viii) Functional English I, II & III (ix) B.Sc. I, II & III (Non-Medical) (x) B.Sc. I & II (Computer Science), subject to fulfillment of all remaining conditions/ requirement imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary/extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
37.	08.11.2016	Dashmesh Girls College, Chak Alla Baksh, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) M.Com. I (One unit) (ii) B.A.-II (Fine Arts) (iii) B.A. I (Fashion Designing) and (iv) B.A. B.Ed. 1 st year (4 years integrated course)-50, subject to fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/NCTE/UGC/Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
38.	08.11.2016	Sant Hari Singh College for Women, Chella-Makhsuspur Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A.-I, II and III (English (General & Elective), Hindi, Economics, Pol. Science, History, Punjabi (General & Elective), Home Science, Computer Science, Physical Education) (ii) BCA I, II and III (one-unit) and B.Com. I, II and III (One unit), subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/UGC/Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
39.	08.11.2016	J.C. D.A.V. College, Dasuya Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.A.-I, II & III (Gandhian Studies)-E (ii) M.A. I & II (History)-60 seats and (iii) M.A. I & II (Punjabi)-60 seats, subject to fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/ UGC/Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
40.	08.11.2016	DAV College, Hoshiarpur	(i) BA-III (Sociology) and (ii) B.Com. I (2 nd unit), subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/

			NCTE/UGC/Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
41.	08.11.2016	Sant Majha Singh Karamjot College for Women, Miani	(i) B.C.A. I, II & III (one unit) (ii) M.A. I & II (Punjabi)-60 seats (iii) B.Com I, II & III (one unit), subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/ UGC/ Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
42.	08.11.2016	S.D. College, Hoshiarpur	B.C.A. I, II & III (one unit for each year) and B.B.A. I, II & III (one unit for each year), subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/ UGC/ Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
43.	08.11.2016	B.A.M. Khalsa College, Garhshankar Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) M.Sc. I (Physics)-40 and (ii) M.Sc.-I (Mathematics)-60 seats, subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/NCTE/ UGC/Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
44.	08.11.2016	G.T.B. Khalsa College for Women, Dasuya Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.A. II (Fashion Designing),), subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/NCTE/ UGC/ Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
45.	08.11.2016	S.G.G.S. Khalsa College Mahilpur, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) BCA- I, II, III (One unit for each year) and M.Sc. I & II (I.T.) 40 seats for each year, (iii) B.P.Ed.-I & II (50 seats) each and D.P.Ed.-II 50 seats (iii) M.Sc.-I (Mathematics 20 additional seats i.e. 40 to 60),), subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/ UGC/ Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
46.	08.11.2016	MBBGRGC Girls College, Mansowal Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.A.-III (Sociology),), subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/ UGC/ Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.

47.	08.11.2016	DAV Post Graduate College Sector-10, Chandigarh	<p>B.A.B.Ed. & B.Sc., B.Ed Integrated course,), subject to the fulfillment of all remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/ UGC/ Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.</p> <p>“Accordingly, keeping in the view of the above the court is of the opinion that the petitioner is entitled to admit 50 students for said course of B.A., B.Ed. & B.Sc. B.Ed. integrated course for academic session 2016-17 in consultation with the respondents admission process by the 9th September 2016 & the students to be admitted will be informed of the pending litigation. This order purely on interim measure and no right of equity will be there n favour of the petitioner.”</p>
48.	08.11.2016	Sri Guru Gobind Singh College, Sector 26, Chandigarh	<p>(i) B.Com I, II & III (4th unit) (ii) BCA I, II III (3rd unit) (iii) M.A. Economics-I & II (iv) M.Sc. Microbial Biotechnology- I & II (v) M.Sc. Biotechnology-I & II (vi) M.Com-I & II (2nd unit) (vii) M.Sc. I & II (Zoology) (viii) M.Sc. I (Chemistry), subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/ UGC/ Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.</p>
49.	08.11.2016	Guru Hargobind Institution of Law for Women, Sidhwan Khud, Distt. Ludhiana	<p>(i) LL.B. 3 years course and (ii) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 year integrated courses, subject to the fulfillment of all remaining conditions/ requirements imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary affiliation/extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.</p>
50.	08.11.2016	Siri Guru Har Rai Sahib College for Women, Chabbewal, Distt. Hoshiarpur	<p>(i) B.A. I, II & III (English G & E), (ii) B.C.A. I, II & III (one unit) (iii) PGDCA (one unit) and (iv) M.Com. I (one unit), subject to the condition that the college shall appoint three Assistant Professor in the subject of English and Six Asstt. Professors in the subject of Computer Application and one Assistant Professor in the subject of Commerce on regular basis by 31.12.2016 and also fulfillment of</p>

			condition imposed by the Inspection Committee/NCTE/UGC/ Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
51.	08.11.2016	Khalsa College, Garhdiwala Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) B.Sc. (Agriculture)-4 years integrated course and (ii) M.Com. I (One Unit), subject to the condition that the College shall appoint two faculty members on regular basis in the subject of Agriculture by 31.12.2016 and also fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/ UGC/ Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
52.	08.11.2016	Dev Samaj College for Women, Sector 45, Chandigarh	(i) M.Com. I (ii) B.Sc. I (Non-Medical), subject to fulfillment of all remaining conditions/ requirements imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary affiliation/extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
53.	08.11.2016	Government Rehabilitation Institute for Intellectual Disabilities (GRIID), Sector-31, Chandigarh	B.Ed. Special Education (Mental Retardation)-1 st & 2 nd year (30 seats) and M.Ed. Special Education (Mental Retardation)-1 st year (15 seats), subject to fulfillment of all remaining conditions/requirements imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary affiliation/extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
54.	08.11.2016	Baba Kundan Singh College VPO Muhar, Ferozpur (Punjab)	M.A. II (History) and B.Com. 2 nd Year, subject to fulfillment of all remaining conditions/requirements imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary affiliation/extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
55.	08.11.2016	Guru Nanak College for Girls, Tibbi Sahib Road Sri Muktsar Sahib (Pb.)	(i) B.B.A.-I, II & III- one unit each (ii) B.Com. I, II & III-one unit each (iii) M.Com. I & II-one unit each (iv) B.Sc. III (Fashion Designing)-40 seats, subject to fulfillment of all remaining conditions/requirements imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary affiliation/extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
56.	08.11.2016	G.T.B. National College, Dakha, Distt. Ludhiana	(i) B.Com. 3 rd (2 nd unit) & (ii) M.A. I Sociology (one unit), subject to the

		(Punjab)	fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee, failing which the temporary affiliation/ extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
57.	08.11.2016	Mata Sahib Kaur Girls College Talwandi Bhai, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab)	<p>(i) B.A. Part I, II & III (English (C&E), Punjabi (C&E), History, Sociology, Political Science, Mathematics, Economics, Computer Science, Physical Education, Elective Hindi, (ii) M.A. II (Political Science), (iii) B.Sc. Part I (Non-medical), (iv) B.Sc. Part I (Medical) (v) B.Sc. I (Fashion Designing) (vi) PGDCA courses.</p> <p>In response, the college has sent letters dated 19.9.2016 and temporary Assistant Professor but the College has advertised on 13.5.2016 to appoint Assistant Professor on regular basis for which the panel has also been sought from the University. Further, the College has also fulfilled the conditions for PGDCA.</p> <p>Keeping in view the explanation given by the College and in the interest of the students, the Committee decided to grant temporary affiliation for (i) B.Sc. Part I (Non-Medical), (ii) B.Sc. Part I (Medical) (iii) B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) and (iv) PGDCA for the session 2016-17, as a special case, with the conditions that the College will appoint teachers as per advertisement latest by 31.12.2016 and compliance be sent to the University accordingly.</p>
58.	08.11.2016	Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Women, Village Kala Tibba, Abohar-152116 (Punjab)	<p>(i) B.Com. I, II, III (one unit), (ii) B.Sc. I, II & III (Non-Medical), (iii) M.A. II (Sociology), (iv) *B.Lib. course, subject to the fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary affiliation/ extension of temporary affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn. *(The College will pay requisite late fee to the University as per rules).</p>
59.	08.11.2016	GHG Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Distt.	B.A./B.Sc. B.Ed. 1 st year (4 year integrated course)-50 seats (one

		Ludhiana (Punjab)	unit) & B.P.Ed. 1 st year (2 year course)-100 seats (2 units), subject to the fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee, failing which the temporary affiliation/extension of temporary affiliation granted to the college shall be withdrawn.
60.	08.11.2016	Shaheed Ganj College For Women, Mudki, Distt. Ferozpur (Punjab)	B.Sc. I (Non-Medical), subject to the condition that the College will appoint regular teachers in the subjects of Physics and Chemistry latest by 31.12.2016. The College be advised to re-advertise the posts and Chemistry for the said posts be given in the national newspapers.
61.	08.11.2016	Rayat College of Law, Railmajra, Nawashahar, SBS Nagar, (Punjab)	(i) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Years Integrated Course (two units)-120 seats), (ii) B.Com. LL.B (Hons.) 5 Years Integrated Course (one unit)-60 seats) for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfillment of all remaining conditions/requirements imposed by the Inspection Committee and subject to the approval of BCI for the session 2016-17 failing which the temporary affiliation/extension of temporary affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
62.	08.11.2016	M.R. Govt. College, Fazilka (Punjab)	B.A. I, II, & III (Computer Science)-40 seats and B.C.A. I, II, III (One Unit)-40 seats courses for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary affiliation/extension of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
63.	08.11.2016	Guru Gobind Singh Girls College, Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	(i) B.A.-I, II, III- English, Punjabi, Hindi, History, Pol. Science, Phy. Education, Economics & Mathematics, (ii) B.A.-I, II & III (Computer Science)-40 seats each and (iii) B.Com. -I, II, III- One Unit each for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfillment of the all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
64.	08.11.2016	Govind National College, Govind Nagar, Narangwal, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Com.-2 nd Year for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfillment of all the remaining conditions

			imposed by the Inspection Committee, failing which the temporary affiliation/extension of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
65.	08.11.2016	National College For Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka (Punjab)	<p>The committee has not granted temporary affiliation for the courses i.e. M.A. II (Hindi) and B.Com. II (one unit). However, the students admitted M.A. II (Hindi) and B.Com. II (one unit) be transferred to the nearest College i.e. D.A.V. College, Abohar in the interest of the students.</p> <p>Further, the College be asked to explain as to why the College has admitted the students inspite of the University letter dated 7.9.2016 vide which it was clearly informed that it is not possible for the University to accede to the request of the College to grant extension of temporary affiliation for the courses i.e. M.A. II (Hindi) and B.Com. II (one unit) for the session 2016-17.</p>
66.	08.11.2016	Govt. College (Girls), Jalalabad (W), Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	(i) B.A. I, II, III (One Unit) (History, Political Science, Physical Education, Mathematics, Economics, English (Elective), Punjabi (Elective) and (ii) B.Com. I, II, III (One Unit) courses for the session 2016-17, subject to the fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee failing which the temporary affiliation/ extension of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
67.	08.11.2016	DAV College, Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjabi)	(i) B.C.A.-I, II, III- One Unit each, (ii) B.Com.-I, II, III (One Unit each) for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
68.	08.11.2016	M.M.D. DAV College, Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	(i) M.A. -I, II (History)- One Unit each and (ii) M.A.-I & II (Punjabi)- One Unit each for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
69.	08.11.2016	Guru Nanak College,	(i) M.A.-I, II-(Hindi)- One Unit

		Killianwali, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	each (ii) M.A. –I & II (History)-One Unit each (iii) M.A. –I & II-(Punjabi)-One each, (iv) PGDCA-40 seats for the session 2016-17, subject to fulfillment of all the remaining conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report, failing which the temporary extension of affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
70.	08.11.2016	Govt. College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh	MD (Pulmonary Course)-04 seats per year for the session 2016-17, subject to condition that the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the MCI before making admissions in the above said courses.
71.	08.11.2016	Govt. College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh	B.Sc. Nursing Course-35 seats for the session 2016-17, subject to condition the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the MCI before making admissions in the above said courses.
72.	08.11.2016	S.P.M., Mukerian, Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) M.Sc.-II (Mathematics)-40 and (ii) M.Com. –II (One Unit) for the session 2016-17, subject to the conditions that the College shall appoint two more teachers in the subject of Mathematics by 31.12.2016 as the College has appointed only four teachers instead of six teacher, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn for the next session i.e. 2017-18.
73.	08.11.2016	Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32-B, Chandigarh	M.Phil. Pyschiatric Social Work-08 seat per year, subject to condition that the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the RCI before making admissions in the said courses.
74.	08.11.2016	Tarawati Memorial Degree College, Bringali Distt. Hoshiarpur	(i) M.A. II (Punjabi)-One unit and (ii) M.A. II (Hindi)-one unit, subject to the fulfillment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/ NCTE/ UGC/Panjab University, Chandigarh, failing which, the affiliation granted to the College shall be withdrawn.
75.	08.11.2016	Government College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh	M.Phil. Clinical Psychology-08 seats, subject to condition that the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the RCI before making admissions in the above said courses.
76.	08.11.2016	Maharaja Ranjit Singh College, Burjan Bye-Pass, Malout-Abohar Road, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar	The students have been allowed to appear provisionally in the examination for the courses i.e. (i) B.A.-I, II & III-English (C) & (E),

		Sahib (Pb)	Public-Administration, Pol. Sc., Physical Education, Mathematics and Computer Applications (ii) B.Com. I, II and III (one unit each), (iii) B.C.A. I, II & III (two units each) (iv) PGDCA-40 seats (v) M.A. I & II- History-one unit each and (vi) B.Sc. I & II –Agriculture-One unit each, in best interest of the students, keeping in view the very special/extraordinary circumstances.
77.	08.11.2016	Government College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh	Diploma in Psychiatric Nursing-10 seats per year, subject to condition that the College will obtain the mandatory approval from the INC before making admissions in the said course.
78.		Guru Nanak College of Education, Ludhiana-Malerkotla Road, Gopalpur Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	M.Ed. (1 st year)-50 seats (one unit), subject to the fulfillment of all the conditions including appointment of staff by 25.11.2016, otherwise the provisional temporary affiliation to the new M.Ed. course shall be treated as withdrawn.
79.	08.11.2016	HKL College of Education, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur	B.Ed. Course (one units-50 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
80.	08.11.2016	Kenway College of Education, Abohar	(i) B.Ed. Course (Four units-200 seats) and (ii) M.Ed. Course (One Unit-50 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
81.	08.11.2016	B.K.M. College of Education, Railmajra, SBS Nagar	B.Ed. Course (Two Units-100 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment staff as per NCTE norms.
82.	08.11.2016	Guru Ram Dass B.Ed. College, Chak Room Wala, Jalalabad (W), Distt. Fazilka	(i) B.Ed. Course (Four Units-200 seats), (ii) M.Ed. Course (One unit-50 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.

83.	08.11.2016	Lala Jagat Narayan Education College, Jalalbad (W), Distt. Fazilka (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course (Two units-100 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
84.	08.11.2016	D.A.V. College of Education Fazilka-152123 (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course (Two Units-100 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
85.	08.11.2016	Surjeet Memorial College of Education Malwal, Ferozepur-142052 (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course (Two units-100 seats), subject to the condition that the college shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
86.	08.11.2016	Jyoti B.Ed. College, Fazilka-152123 (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course (Two Units-100 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
87.		Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur Cantt	Keeping in view the explanation given by the College and in the interest of the students, the Committee decided to grant temporary affiliation to following new courses be allocated in other centers of Ferozepur as soon as possible: (i) M.A.I (Sociology), (ii) M.Com. I and (iii) M.Sc. I (IT)
88.	08.11.2016	Guru Nanak College of Education, Ludhiana-Malerkotla Road, Gopalpur, Distt. Ludhiana (Punjab)	B.Ed. course-1 st year (150 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
89.	08.11.2016	GHG College of Education, Gondwal, Raikot, Distt. Ludhiana, Punjab	B.Ed. course-1 st year & 2 nd year (Two year course) (100 seats), subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.

90.	08.11.2016	A.S. College of Education, Kalal Majra, Khanna-Samrala Road Distt. Ludhiana Pb.	B.Ed. Course (1 st year)-100 seats, subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by the 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
91.	08.11.2016	Partap College of Education Hambran Road, Ludhiana Punjab.	B.Ed. course-1 st year & 2 nd year (Four Units) (200 seats), and M.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd Year (I Unit- 50 Seats) subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.
92.	08.11.2016	Sant Darbara Singh College of Education for Women Lopon, Distt. Moga, Punjab	M.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd Year (50 Seats) subject to the condition that the College shall fulfill all the conditions by 31.12.2016 as imposed by the Inspection Committee and NCTE including appointment of teaching staff as per NCTE norms.

NOTE: 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) constituted by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.5.2016 (Para 56) to check the inspection report/s thoroughly and verify their compliance/s and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, has granted/not granted affiliation/extension of affiliation to the above colleges.

I-43. Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.5.2016 (Para 56), the Committee in its various meetings, has **not** granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses/subjects for the session 2016-17, as under:

Sr. No.	Date of the meeting of the Committee	Name of the College	Name of the courses/ subjects
1.	23.08.2016	Muktisar Institute of Higher Education, Jalalabad Road Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab)	B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (two units i.e. 100 seats each), as the college has remained fail to get the Inspection done.
2.	23.08.2016	Baba Mangal Singh Institute of Education, Barnala Road Bhugipuru, Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each), as the college has remained fail to get the Inspection done.
3.	23.08.2016	Shukdeva Krishna College of Education for Girls,	B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (Three units i.e. 150 seats each), as the

		Ferozepur Road V.P.O. Ghall Kalan, Distt. Moga (Punjab)	college has remained fail to get the Inspection done.
4.	23.08.2016	Babe-Ke College of Education, V.P.O. Daudhar Tehsil & Distt. Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each) and M.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (50 seats each), as the college has remained fail to get the Inspection done.
5.	23.08.2016	Moga College of Education, Near P.S. Sadar, GT Road Moga (Punjab)	B.Ed. Course 1 st & 2 nd year (two units i.e. 100 seats each) and M.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (50 seats each), as the college has remained fail to get the Inspection done.
6.	23.08.2016	Kalgidhar Institute of Higher Education, Kingra Road, Near Danewala Chowk, Malout Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib	B.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (Two units i.e. 100 seats each), as the college has remained fail to get the Inspection done.
7.	23.08.2016	Lala Lajpat Rai Memorial College of Education, V.P.O.- Dhudike, Tehsil & Distt. Moga (Punjab)	M.Ed. course 1 st & 2 nd year (one units i.e. 50 seats each), as the college has remained fail to get the Inspection done.
8.	08.11.2016	Guru Nanak Khalsa College for Women, Shamchaurasi Distt. Hoshiarpur	The Committee after considering the Inspection Report and the fact that the College has not sent any communication with regard to appoint six faculty members on regular basis and one Lab. Technician for (i) B.A. I II and III (Computer Application) (ii) B.C.A. I, II and III (one unit) and (iii) PGDCA mentioned letter and has decided not to grant temporary extension of affiliation for (i) B.A. I II and III (Computer Application) (ii) B.C.A. I, II and III (one unit) and (iii) PGDCA-40 seats

I-44.

That the Syndicate has felicitated to the followings:

- (i) Prof. S. Khanduja, formerly Professor at Department of Mathematics, PU, on having been elected as Fellow of The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS) for her outstanding contribution to science and its promotion in the developing world;
- (ii) Prof. Ronki Ram, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Science, on having been nominated as a member of the Senate of National Institute of Pharmaceutical Science and Research (NIPER), S.A.S. Nagar for a period three years w.e.f. November 2016;
- (iii) Professor Virendera Kumar, formerly Fellow, PU and UGC Emeritus Fellow in Law, on having been nominated as a member of the Governing Council of

Himachal Pradesh National Law University, Ghandal, Shimla, for a term of 5 years;

- (iv) Professor B.S. Bhoop, Chairman, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, on having been conferred with 'Best Innovation and Research in Healthcare of the Year' Award by the Worldwide Achievers Private Limited, for his outstanding contribution in the fields of healthcare, medicine, pharmaceutical sciences;
- (v) Professor Karamjeet Singh, Hon. Director, Human Resource Development Centre, PU, on having been co-opted as Director on the Board of Directors of the Punjab State Cooperative Bank Limited;
- (vi) Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, PU, on receiving 'Education Leadership Award' by the 24th Business School Affaire and Dewang Mehta National Education Awards, for its outstanding contribution in the field of special education and society at large;
- (vii) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Assistant Professor of Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, on having been selected for Young Scientist Award-2016 by the Aufau International Awards for his contribution in scientific research;
- (viii) Dr. Madhu Prashar, Principal, Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City, on having been invited for a special interview by the Lok Sabha Channel in the Parliament House;
- (ix) Mr. Sandeep Kumar, NSS Cadet of Panjab University, who is a BA final year student of the Department of Evening Studies, on having been conferred upon with the coveted Indira Gandhi National Service Scheme Award (IGNSS) by the Hon'ble President of India, Shri Pranab Mukherjee.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 1(1))

I-45. That the donation of Rs.4,15,650/- (Four lakh fifteen thousand six hundred fifty) equivalent to 5,000 UK Pound made by Mrs. Ann Zammit wife of eminent economist and former Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair Professor at PU, Professor Ajit Singh, for establishing an endowment fund in memory of Late Professor Ajit Singh to support an annual Professor Ajit Singh Memorial Lecturer in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, be accepted.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 1(2))

I-46. That –

- (1) The 5th instalment of donation of Rs.4,10,000/- made by the family of Justice Teja Singh, in respect of Award of Justice Teja Singh Memorial Scholarship, be accepted and the same be allowed to

invest in the shape of TDR @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year in the State Bank of India, P.U. The interest so accrued be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust (SET) fund account No. 10444978140.

- (2) the Scholarship amount, be enhanced from 30,000/- to Rs.50,000/- p.a. from next financial year, i.e. 2017-18.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 40)

- I-47.** That Ms. Pamela Kumar be appointed Visiting Professor against Bharti Chair in Information Technology and Telecommunications, on an honorarium of @ Rs.5000/- per day whenever she visits UIET in addition to TA/DA and all the expenditure be met from the interest earned on endowment fund established by Bharti Enterprise.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 37)

- I-48.** That, as requested by Professor Ashok K. Ganguli, Director, Institute of Nano Science and Technology (INST) (DST, Government of India), Institute of Nano Science and Technology (INST), be approved as Research Centre of Panjab University, Chandigarh, for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree in the subject of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 39)

- I-49.** That the Syndicate has noted and approved the following:

- (i) Panjab University, Chandigarh, has been declared as the best University and best Institution of India 2017 by the US News and World Report in October, 2016. This survey has been supported by Thomson Reuters. Earlier too, Thomson Reuters-powered US News Global Rankings had judged the PU as the best University of India and placed it at the second position behind IISc., Bangalore.
- (ii) Panjab University, Chandigarh, has won the CII-Clarivate Analytics 'India-UK Award for Excellence in Research Collaboration'. PU Vice-Chancellor received the prestigious award at the India-UK TECH Summit organized on the occasion of UK PM visit to India at New Delhi on November 9, 2016.
- (iii) Panjab University is continuing to perform well during the various sports events during the current academic year. An update on comparative performance between 2015-16 and 2016-17 has been made available by the Directorate of Sports for perusal of the Syndicate.

(Syndicate dated 27.11.2016 Para 1(5)(i, ii and xiii))

XXVI.**ZERO HOUR**

(1) Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that there is a list of colleges in the items for ratification who have requested for extension and to start new courses. There is a condition that such Colleges will give full salary to the teachers. It is a good resolution and he added that in the advertisement of posts, it is written that the qualifications and salary shall be as per the UGC/P.U. norms. However, in 90% of the colleges, full salary is not paid to the teachers. The University has now issued a letter asking for salary statement of teachers. There is a great deceit in this also. They are paid full salary through cheque, but some amount is taken back from them in cash. Two/three College teachers have refused to pay back the cash amount. A meeting of teachers was held to discuss this issue. Their mobile phones were got switched off so that they may not do recording for proof. They are being threatened that they will not be given the next month's salary and were told that they can leave the job, if they want so. It is being done in S.D.P. College. Teachers are being paid salary to the tune of Rs. 44000/-, only on paper, but the amount is being taken back from them. It is also being done in a College at Machhiwara. It is not only done in 2-3 colleges, but there are number of such Colleges.

(2) Shri Jagdeep Kumar also spoke about the maternity leave rules of lady teachers who are appointed on contract in grant-in-aid colleges. He said that such lady teachers are not given maternity leave for six months as is being given in the government departments. When asked, the D.P.I. (Colleges) office has also not given any thing in writing about this. He, therefore, urged that the lady teachers should be given full maternity leave of six month. In case it has already been passed by the University bodies, a copy of the same may be provided to him. The University should also send a directive to the Colleges to adhere to this provision so that the interest of the teachers may not suffer. Rules should be very clear so that there is no ambiguity in the colleges. The P.U calendar should be followed and all leaves including the maternity leave, granted to the regular teachers should also be given to the contract teachers.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu informed that it has already been passed and the letter is to be issued.

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Jagdeep Kumar that first they should make sure that the D.P.I (Colleges) and D.P.I. (Punjab) should come to attend these meetings. The problem is that these officers control everything from outside and they never come to these meetings. With great difficulty he could get D.P.I. Colleges (U.T) once to attend the Senate meeting and D.P.I. Colleges (Punjab) for two times to the Syndicate. Until they have these officers come over here, the issues cannot be addressed. Let the Senate appoint a 5-Member Committee which will go to the U.T. Administration and to the Punjab Govt. and plead with the ex-officio members of the Punjab Govt. who are members of the Senate; namely, the Minister of Education and the Chief Minister to impress upon the D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab to attend the Senate/Syndicate meetings. Similarly, to the UT Administrator so that he must direct these officers to attend at least the Senate meeting, if not Syndicate. Since they are ex-officio members and the University needs their assistance. One could offer, on behalf of the Senate, that whenever they (DPis) are present in Senate/Syndicate meetings for an hour, they could discuss the College related matters and convey the same through them to the Govt. It could be done if all of them along with senior members go and request the Chief Minister and Education Minister, Punjab and Administrator, U.T.

Chandigarh to impress upon the DPIs of Punjab & Chandigarh to attend the meetings.

- (3) Shri Jagdeep Kumar further said that the colleges who have applied for extension in a course, a letter is being sent by the University to the Colleges regarding fee structure. Such a letter was also sent in 2016-17. There is a column for retirement benefits. In that letter it is written that the Colleges would charge a fee of Rs. 1940/-. However the colleges do not show it under a separate head and the teacher is deprived of the retirement benefit. He, therefore, suggested that there should be a separate Head for that. Most of the colleges charge this fee, though they are aided college or un-aided colleges especially this is a problem in un-aided colleges. After rendering 20-30 years of service, a teacher is not given the benefit. He suggested that the colleges which do not make a separate head for this, may not be allowed to introduce any new course. A separate-head be started from the day, such letters are being sent to the colleges by the University.

- (4) Shri Jagdeep Kumar informed that a system of online approvals was started by the Dean College Development Council. In this case too, strict action should be taken. It would be very beneficial for the teachers.

Prof. Keshav Malhotra said that for properly taking care of the system and for creating/maintaining separate head for the retirement benefits of college teachers, as pointed out by Sh. Jagdeep Kumar, a nominee of the teachers should appointed on the Management of the College.

- (5) Dr. K.K. Sharma appreciated the work of the Inspection Committees which go to the Colleges for grant of new courses. The first step is to ensure that adequate infrastructure and regular faculty must be there in the college which is very well taken care of by these Committees. But if a regular teacher leaves the job for one reason or the other, the teacher appointed in his place is appointed on temporary or contract basis and it continues for all times to come. He suggested that they should also ensure that regular faculty is appointed if a regular teacher joins somewhere as they all are against adhocism.

- (6) Dr. K.K. Sharma, continuing the views expressed by Shri Jagdeep Kumar, said that he also talked to the D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab regarding leave rules. They informed that the leave rules prevalent in Panjab University are applicable to the College teachers. He further said that he is also a grant-in-aid college teacher in A.S. College, Khanna and all leave rules of Panjab University are applicable to him. He suggested that these rules should be applicable to the contract teacher also at par.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that he should take up this matter with the Dean College Development Council.

- (7) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu while taking part in the discussion said that the problems of teachers have been put-forth by his colleagues. In most of the unaided colleges the teachers are not being given proper pay scale. There are no Associate Professors in the unaided colleges. If there are no Associate Professors even after a service of 20 years, they should think, why it is so. He should come under the CAS promotion Scheme, he should have been given increment/s under CAS scheme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why the DPIs should attend the meetings.

However, Dr. Shaminder Singh said there is no role of DPI in this. It is clearly defined in the Panjab University Calendar-I, Chapter-VIII that the leave rules of the Panjab University will be applicable to the college teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Panjab Government says that they should appoint temporary teachers in the campus as is being done at the Panjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar.

At this, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the Panjab Govt. gives 100% grant to these Universities, however, in the same breath, he said that theirs is a democratic system and it cannot be done on the campus.

(8) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu urged that the facilities which could be provided without spending any money, such as leaves etc., should be provided to the teachers.

(9) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that another issue is that of Provident fund which is a basic right of every teacher. They may hold an enquiry to know how many colleges are there, where P.F. is deducted. He said, to his mind, there cannot be more than 3-4 such colleges where teachers get such type of security.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should give this in writing to the Registrar.

(10) Dr. Neeru Malik while thanking the Vice Chancellor for giving her an opportunity to express her views said that the women teachers working in the affiliated colleges of Panjab University are deprived of the maternity leave. Some of the colleges give one month of maternity leave with pay and three months' maternity leave without pay in spite of the fact that the duration of maternity leave has been clearly mentioned in the P.U. Calendar. She requested that an undertaking from the colleges be taken so that the teachers may not be deprived of the maternity leave and mother's right should be protected.

(11) Dr. Jagdish Chander while endorsing the view point expressed by Shri Jagdeep Kumar and Dr. Shaminder Singh said that the salary is taken back from the teachers in almost all colleges of Punjab. He further informed that the employer's share of C.P.F. is taken from the salary of the teachers. He disclosed that the system of paying salary of Rs. 21600/- per month to a teacher has also been introduced in Chandigarh colleges. Chandigarh colleges are much better colleges. He added that they cannot get good faculty until they give the scale of Rs.15600-39100 with added DA. He suggested that the Senate can request the DPIs to attend the meetings so that the issues relating to them could be sorted out. In case, they are not able to come, they could be informed about the decisions taken by the Senate with a request for resolving the issues on priority. He urged that all issues relating to regular teachers, contractual teachers and also the issues relating to promotion cases under Career Advancement Scheme need to be taken care of.

(12) Dr. Jagdish Chander also raised an issue relating to non-teaching staff. He informed that one Clerk was provided to the Centre Superintendent at the examination centre on a strength of 150 students. Now, one Clerk is provided upto a strength of 350 students. In this way, the work of the Centre Clerk has increased. It has been given to understand that in the last Syndicate meeting the remuneration to the Centre Clerk was increased from Rs. 225/- to Rs.250/-. He informed that

he has got a letter where the remuneration of Centre Clerk is still mentioned as Rs. 225/-, which should be looked into.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that they should give in writing about all the issues which are being discussed in the zero hour so that action could be taken on them as it takes a long time for finalizing the minutes.

- (13) Dr. Gurmit Singh wanted to draw the attention of the House that the issue of exempting NET for the regular employment in Self financed Educational Colleges. He stated that when they have already NET qualified teachers in sufficient numbers in the State of Punjab then why they are permitting Non-NET qualified teachers. If permitted this will lead to the exploitation of NET qualified teachers and this practice would not help in the improvement of the quality of teacher education.

- (14) Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu talked about problems of aided and un-aided posts. They may set aside the aided posts, but for the problems, as mentioned by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and Shri Jagdeep Kumar, regarding leave etc. being faced by the staff/ employees, there is a need for a Special Committee to resolve these problems. The inspection committees or affiliation committees, before granting permission, may check all these things and see whether these are being implemented or not, especially in the case of un-aided posts. In this way a check could be exercised on it.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean College Development Council to note all these things and further asked to generate model reports with the help of these teachers.

- (15) Dr. Sarabjit Kaur said that she is representing Technical and Professional Colleges, their problems are quite special and wanted special attention from the Vice Chancellor to solve all the problems. Their concerns are quite different whether they are aided colleges or unaided colleges. Whether that is an issue of affiliation, when it is an issue of affiliation then it should be taken care of and that college should not be harassed at any level, because there is a lot of communication gap. Sometimes they are told at the eleventh hour that an Inspecting team is coming to your college and asked to get the records ready for that Inspecting Committee. She has been the victim of that type also. Therefore, she desired to seek the special attention of the Vice Chancellor, whether that is of examination or affiliation or rules of these unaided colleges, especially the professional college, they should be given a special privilege and issues should be considered on priority basis.

- (16) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, at the very outset, congratulated the Registrar (Returning Officer), the way in which the elections for Registered Graduate Constituency were conducted, the utmost transparency and specially the way the videography was done, was commendable. He informed that he had been contesting the Senate Elections since 1992 and there has been so discontentment among the people that they start saying that this constituency should be abolished. But this time's election was one of the best elections ever held so far. At this time, many Senate members congratulated the Registrar, for this achievement by thumping their tables.

Dr. Neeru Malik intervened to say there was a problem at Gidderbaha. She informed that she called Col. (Retd.) G.S.Chadha, Registrar and the problem was solved immediately.

- (17) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma mentioned about Mr. Parveen Gupta who died due to heart attack at the age of 45 years and requested to expedite the action to be taken in his case.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that has already been taken care of.

- (18) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further requested to take care of the health of the health centre because there is no recruitment of new doctors. The old doctors there are on re-employment.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have reached a state that for every appointment approval from Delhi is required.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is wrong and they oppose it as it is a step to end their autonomy.

The Vice Chancellor said what can they do, they could only oppose it and they cannot recruit anybody. Appointment of Chief of University Security is stopped, appointment of Medical Officers is stopped, everything has been stopped. He said that if a student suffers because of non-availability of medical aid, the University will be on fire. There is no regular doctor left in the Health Centre.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further suggested that a resolution should be passed to the effect that the D.P.I. Colleges should be a teacher as the non-teacher does not take any interest on the issue of teachers.

- (19) Shri Jagdeep Kumar stated that a teacher who is working in a College on regular basis if he has to apply in some other college, the Panjab University proforma says that an NOC is required from him, however, in most of the Colleges, NOC is not given to them. Whereas the rule is that if a person is on probation and wants to leave the job to join somewhere else, he is required to deposit one month's salary. If he is confirmed or on permanent basis, he is required to deposit three months' salary. Due to this maximum of the teachers do not apply in a good College as they do not get the NOC. If a teacher goes on his/her own risk, the management of the new College ask for the NOC and create problems for him/her. He requested that if there is a provision for depositing the one month's salary or three months salary, then the condition of submission of NOC should be removed. The teachers are being exploited due to this condition. One such case has happened in a college at Sidhwan Khurd who has joined the other college without NOC. When the teacher was going to be confirmed, the Principal of his previous College complained to stop his approval. All this is wrong.

- (20) Shri Jagdeep Kumar further talked about the booking in College Bhawan and Faculty House and requested that it should be made online. A teacher who has rendered 20 years service comes to the University for a day or two, he is not given a room.

- (21) Shri Jagdeep Kumar further requested that pre-Ph.D. course work on common topics should be organized on the University campus in the month of December.

- (22) Principal Gurdeep Kumar Sharma stated that for the last five years, colleges are not being paid grants for NCC and NSS for holding camps from the NSS department of the University. They have been conducting camps from our own resources, but now the NSS department is stressing the Colleges to pay per student that much money and lacs of

rupees are being demanded for the last 4-5 year. They are paying honorarium to the NSS officers from the College funds. He requested that no money should be demanded from the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor asked him to give in writing.

- (23) Principal R.S. Jhanji while endorsing the view point of Dr. Gurdeep Kumar Sharma stated that he has already mailed to the Registrar and the Coordinator also on this issue. From the last so many years they are not getting the grant, earlier they used to get grant.

The Vice Chancellor asked him to give in writing to which he said that he has already done this. The Vice Chancellor asked him to submit it again.

Principal R.S. Jhanji explained that they charge Rs. 10/- from each student and if there are two thousand students, the total amount would be Rs. 20000/- and the expenditure on holding a camp comes to around Rs. 30-35 thousands. The honorarium is also paid to the Programme Officers. Wherefrom they will pay the money? Now they have sent a letter conveying that no camps will be granted if the Colleges do not pay half of the money. They do not get any grant for organizing campus. If they have to organize the camps by paying half of the money, no College would like to organize the NSS camp and the students will be deprived of it. He requested that this should be swiftly prevented.

The Vice Chancellor said that it will be taken care of.

- (24) Shri Sandeep Kumar said that some members have stated that some salary is taken back from the teachers, it has also been given to understand that some of the Colleges do not make payment to Class-IV. He requested that the payment of Class-IV should be sent online to their bank account.

- (25) Principal R.S. Jhanji requested the Vice Chancellor that NSS camps should be got sanctioned before the winter vacation starting from 29th December.

- (26) Dr. Gurmeet Singh wanted to draw the attention of the Chair towards the problem of the junior faculty whose CAS promotion is held up because of change in regulations by the UGC. The promotion process is held up for the last six months. He said that the Vice Chancellor may say that the process is held up because of non-receipt of list of journals from the UGC. But he suggested that they should upload the form on the website and let the people fill the form. He suggested that if they do not have the list of journals, give a teacher zero number for that column. But, in case, if somebody is still able to get required marks even without adding the marks of journals, he/she should be allowed to be eligible. What is the problem in it, he asked. It is not written anywhere to compulsorily get marks from the journals. The required marks can be got from Ph.D. or from any other column. He said, in the new guidelines the capping is rather abolished to some extent. If the promotion process is stopped, it will be indefinite because they are not likely to get the list of journals from the UGC so soon.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is nobody to stop the process.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh further stated that till today there is no template. He requested that the frustration of the junior faculty should be

taken care of and they should be allowed to fill the form. He said that he is not blaming the Vice Chancellor for this, it is because that the UGC is frequently changing the rules. But, what the Vice Chancellor can do is that those who would be becoming eligible and are able to secure the marks even without the marks allotted for the journals column, the promotion process could be started for their promotion. And those who are not able to secure the required marks, their cases could be kept pending and dealt with only after the receipt of list of journals. If this is not done, there would be a huge backlog and the frustration of the teachers would increase.

- (27) Shri Sandeep Singh said that there is a demand from the students that they should be given golden chance.
- (28) Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out about the result of re-evaluation and about the compartment paper. The re-evaluation result is not declared till the examination of compartment paper. Sometimes, the compartment paper is held and the re-evaluation result is not declared. It was also pointed out that the result of re-evaluation of December, 2015 has not been declared so far. It should be looked into and that the declaration of re-evaluation result should be made time bound.
- (29) Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out that in Panjab University, the male students belonging to general and B.C. category are not allowed to appear in the examinations as private candidates and requested that these candidates should also be allowed to appear as private candidates. He has enquired about this from Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, where this provision exists irrespective of caste. But some members were not in agreement whether such a provision exists in these Universities. However, he said that this should be done even if this provision does not exist there as this is a genuine problem. They are talking here about teachers, but they are not talking about those for whom the Colleges are made.
- (30) Shri K.K. Sharma said that if the re-evaluation process has been made online, then only instead 21 days, only 10 days should be given to apply for re-evaluation because online result is displayed with the mark sheet. This way the delay can be controlled. Secondly, instead of sending the answer sheet for checking to the local evaluators at their residence, let it be spot evaluation. Let the teachers come from Punjab for checking the answer sheets.
- (31) Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan spoke about the issue of examination fee. He said that in a meeting where the Controller of examination was present, it was given to understand that those students whose parents' salary is less than five lacs, they will be charged old fee, but they have not yet received any notice in this regard. Therefore, they charged the old fee of Rs. 2500/- from the students. He pointed out that the rural students are not able to deposit the fee (40-45 students) and so they are leaving the college. They have income of only one lac in a year, how they would deposit the fee. This is a very serious issue. He further pointed out that the practical examination has not been held, but the practical fee has been charged. He said, if the practical examination has not been taken, the fee should be returned.
- (32) Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha said that every year the University non-teaching employees work as Checking Assistant. Now they have shifted from annual system to semester system. After 2012, the rates for marking have been increased twice. For undergraduate courses, it has

been increased from Rs. 18 to 24 and then from Rs. 24 to 28. He is not against it and he welcomed this decision. It is a very good decision as Rs. 6/- have been increased. The rate for Checking Assistant has not been increased since 2012 and it is still Rs. 2/-. He requested that this rate should be increased at least from Rs. 2/- to Rs. 3/- for which he has already given in writing to the Controller of Examination. He informed that a Committee was constituted in 2012-13, but no meeting of this Committee could be held. He further stressed that since the marking has been started and the rates for Checking Assistants may please be increased from Rs. 2/- to Rs. 3/- immediately.

- (33) Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha said that the fee of entrance test which are going to be held in the coming year, has been increased from Rs. 1800/- to Rs. 2000/-, but the rates of remuneration for Supervisory staff, Clerk, Waterman, Peon, Daftri, Electrician etc. have not been increased and he requested that Committee already constituted for this purpose may be asked to hold the meeting and enhance these rates.

While replying to it, the Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, he will not look into any matters pertaining to finance and that he does not want to do anything adhoc, Shri Trikha said that he is not asking for much more, he is just asking for an increase of Rs. 1/- for Checking Assistant. He is not against anybody and this is a very genuine demand. The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a question of genuine demand, they cannot do these things adhoc at the moment enhancing the expenses of the University, without looking at the income of the University. Till the time the issue is resolved, that as to how they will pay the salaries, he is not recommending and also not accepting it. When Shri Trikha said that the rates for marking have also been increased by Rs. 6/-, the Vice Chancellor answered that it must have been decided at some stage. On saying by Shri Trikha that increase of Rs. 6/- for marking may have been decided by the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor said that let it also go through that process. He does not want to do anything adhoc.

- (34) Mrs. Inderjit Kaur said that she would like to add something to what has been said about making the Punjab Govt. aware of the problems of the Colleges. She informed that the persons who have been Principals in the affiliated Colleges after January 2015, they are not given any allowances on their basic pay of Rs. 37400/-. Those Principals, when they were Associate Professors were getting more salary, but now it seems that this is not a promotion rather it is a demotion. They have completed the A.P.I. Score. When they make comparison with Govt. Colleges, they find that they get everything on promotion. She requested that their concern should be conveyed to the appropriate authorities.

- (35) Dr. Harjodh Singh while endorsing the view point expressed by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, said that this time the elections were held in a very fair and transparent manner and for that he congratulated the Registrar.

- (36) Dr. Harjodh Singh while talking about the online system, was of the opinion that a good number of college students belonging to rural areas are associated with the Panjab University who are not well versed with this system. He said that it would be better if they wait for some time.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that for online a directive be sent to the college so that there should be an e-help desk as the college

managements are not so poor. It would also give employment to many persons, particularly in the rural areas.

- (37) Dr. Harjodh Singh further advocated that it would be better if a special chance is granted to the student.

The Vice Chancellor said, let the Controller of Examinations consider and if he recommends, it is O.K.

- (38) Dr. Parveen Goyal said that for the motivation and encouragement of the teachers, they want that there should be clear guidelines whether they will get Ph.D. increments or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that he thought they have resolved this issue.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that there is lot of resentment on this issue.

The Vice Chancellor wanted to know if this issue is not resolved, why it has not been resolved.

Dr. Parveen Goyal further stressed to clarify the guidelines by sending a circular or an email. Sometimes a circular is sent for having Ph.D. increment, but when they go there, they are asked who has issued the circular. He further wanted to know whether the persons who have done Ph.D. from such a University where the UGC is not effective, would they get the increment.

The Vice Chancellor asked why they go to such a sub-standard University?

Dr. Goyal replied that the person is selected by the Selection Committee. He further explained that the teachers who are doing Ph.D. from some other institute, are they entitled for Ph.D. increment. On asking by the Vice Chancellor about the institute, Dr. Goyal mentioned the NIT, Hamirpur.

The Vice Chancellor said that NIT, Hamirpur is a national institute, who can declare their degree invalid.

Dr. Parveen Goyal wanted that it should be made clear whether the teachers who are doing Ph.D. from such institutes will get increment for Ph.D.

The Vice Chancellor asked him to bring the individual cases who have been denied increment. He is willing to sit with Director, UIET and DUI to sort out the matter. It is their right and there is no issue in it.

Dr. Parveen Goyal further stated that for the internal regular faculty, the University has given Ph.D. Entrance Test exemption through Syndicate and Senate, if it is approved by the UGC, they will also get Ph.D. increment, otherwise it will not be given.

- (39) Dr. Parveen Goyal further talked about the promotion of teachers. The third and fourth amendments to the UGC regulations 2010 were done on 4th May, 2016 and 11th July, 2016, respectively, but form for the same has not been prepared. If that form is prepared, there are a good number of faculty members who are eligible even without the list of journals.

The Vice Chancellor advised to take up this matter with Col. P.S. Sandhu (Retd.), Secretary to Vice Chancellor who is specially looking for it.

- (40) Dr. Parveen Goyal then pointed out towards the problems being faced by the residents of Sector-14 & 25. When these people give a complaint in the XEN office regarding their house, there is neither diary number system nor online system. The work is done by keeping in mind as to how influential a person is.

The Vice Chancellor said that the XEN office is not going to make it online and suggested Dr. Goyal to create a software for this and make a Residents Welfare Association and follow it up and do it himself. It will not be done until and unless people do not take the responsibility.

- (41) Dr. Parveen Goyal also stressed the need for proper utilization of workshops which are set up in UIET, Chemical Engg. Deptt. and other departments. He asked the Vice Chancellor to come to the UIET and give instruction.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to do it themselves as the UIET is an independent autonomous institution like Punjab Engineering College and the Director should have the confidence and do things and implement it on their own. UIET is not a school. This University comprises so many autonomous institutions which are like deemed universities themselves. They must assume certain responsibilities and deliver. If they depend on Senate to raise these issues, there are only 2-3 Senate meetings, nothing will happen unless the teaching community and these independent institutions emerge as "Kar Sevaks" and implement what they want.

- (42) Mrs. Anu Chatrath stated that if any person i.e. teaching or non-teaching applies for extra-ordinary leave for a period three years, with respect to her colleagues in the Syndicate, but without giving any reason for sanctioning seven months' leave in case of D.P.R., she thought if a person is to go on deputation for a particular assignment, sanctioning seven months' leave is practically of no use.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not sent him (DPR) on deputation, he has not even applied after taking permission. They have only one D.P.R., the given D.P.R. cannot apply to another place and stay there for three years, who will do the job which has to be done by the PU D.P.R.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath pleaded that if not for three years, he (DPR) could be given leave at least for two years.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already given a great concession by giving him seven months leave and permitted him to retain the house at PU Campus. Who will do the job of D.P.R. of this University, will she do it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said if the D.P.R. leaves the job, then what.

The Vice-Chancellor said then he will advertise the post immediately and recruit a person.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath stated that no one would come on deputation for seven months.

The Vice Chancellor said that he can cancel the leave. They have got a D.P.R. with great difficulty. They will manage somehow for seven months. He said that he cannot recommend any such thing in the zero hour. It has to go back to the Syndicate as considered item.

On asking by Mrs. Anu Chatrath to refer it back to the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor said that this is not an appropriate recommendation. They are the controlling body of the University and have to see that this University's governance should not suffer. They are recommending decisions which are against the governance of the University.

Continuing, Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that they can get a good person if two years' leave is granted, but for seven months no person will come.

However, the Vice Chancellor did not agree to it.

- (43) Professor Chaman Lal, while pointing out towards the photographs of former Vice Chancellors of this University installed in the Senate hall, said that the tenure of first Vice Chancellor Shri S.B.S. Teja Singh is wrongly written as 9.2.1945 to 31.3.1949 whereas it should be 9.2.1948 to 31.3.1949 and requested to correct it.

The Vice Chancellor said it was also written wrongly in the Vice Chancellor's Office which he has got corrected.

Professor Chaman Lal said that they have connected it to Lahore, it is good thing. But he is sorry to say that UGC thinks that the University has come up in 1947. However, he said that the University is established in the year 1882. They must carry it forward from Lahore. He suggested that the photographs of all the Vice Chancellors, i.e., from James Broadwood Lyall, who joined as first Vice Chancellor, in October, 1882 and Sir P.C. Chatterji, the first Indian Vice Chancellor who joined in May, 1907 and so on should be installed in the Senate Hall. He requested that the continuity of the University would be there if the photographs of all the Vice Chancellors since 1882 are installed. The University has many luminaries which they have not recognized. He mentioned the name of Madan Gopal Singh, Asstt. Registrar (Examinations) who had sacrificed his life in 1947 and requested that some building of Panjab University should be named after his name. He stated that there is a plaque of Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar installed at Hostel No. 3, and stated that it should be a model in the way as they honour a person so that people should know. Secondly, Professor Brij Narayan, a very well known Professor of Economics and a well known national economist, has written a book in 1936 'Sufferings of the Peasant'. He was assassinated in September, 1947 at Lahore when he was in his office. He requested that plaques of both Shri Madan Gopal Singh and Professor Brij Narayan should be installed or some building should be named after their name. Thirdly, he mentioned the name of Shri Prem Dutt Verma, who was S. Bhagat Singh's colleague. He was awarded death sentence. He had taught in the Department of History of this University. Nobody knows about it. He shifted to America in 1969. Prof. Chaman Lal said that he has been given to understand that there is a Hall named as 'Bhagat Singh Hall' in the History Department. He requested that a plaque and a photograph of Shri Prem Dutt Verma should also be installed in that Bhagat Singh Hall in the same way as that of Professor Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar. Fourthly, he talked about Sir P.C. Chaterji, the first Indian Vice Chancellor of Panjab University appointed in 1907 and requested that something should be there in his name.

The Vice Chancellor, however, stated that he (Sir P.C. Chaterji) was not a full time Vice Chancellor and informed that the first full time Vice Chancellor of Panjab University was appointed in the year 1938. Professor Chaman Lal also mentioned the name of Dr. Mohan Singh Diwana. He was first person who did his Ph.D. in Punjabi. He was associated with an Intermediate College at Lahore from 1928 to 1947, and probably till 1959, he was the founder Head of the Punjabi Department in Panjab University, Chandigarh. He was the first person to do his Ph.D. in 1933. Another person whose name he mentioned was that of Dr. Inder Nath Madaan. Dr. Inder Nath Madaan was first person to do Ph.D. in Hindi in whole of India in 1935. He informed that Dr. Madaan was his teacher. But he said that he is not talking about Dr. Madaan, because he was his teacher. It is (indeed) the history, which the Panjab University should be proud of. Dr. Madaan had done his Ph.D. on Munshi Prem Chand. These are the people whose memory has to be relived in the University.

- (44) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that before taking up the issues for discussion, he suggests that the zero hour should either be fixed in the morning or immediately after lunch, because normally the Principal and College teachers do not stay in the meeting till the end. If any decision has to be taken that should be in the presence of the College teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had done it many times in the past, but again said that he will take care of this at the next meeting.

- (45) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the 3-4 issues relating to leave rules etc. have already been discussed. While referring to the issue of C.P.F, he informed that they constituted two Committees in Syndicate for C.P.F., i.e., one for whole of Punjab and the other for Ludhiana Distt. because the colleges have changed the C.P.F. into E.P.F. on their own. There is a provision of C.P.F. in the P.U. Calendar, but college managements have changed it to E.P.F. and also started deducting for E.P.F. contribution from the salary of teachers. It was decided that an aggrieved teacher can send his application to a Fellow or to the Dean College Development Council for redressal of his grievances. These things were decided in the Syndicate of April, 2016. He further said that the Vice Chancellor may not be able to go through all these things because of his busy schedule, but these things are necessary to be sorted out. They do remind about it to the Registrar and the C.O.E.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Controller of Examinations is already over-burdened. He informed that they are not able to appoint a full time Dean College Development because there is a case pending in the Court. Why do they not have a Chief of University security, because there is a case, why do they not have Deputy Registrars, because there is a case. Everything here, if it does not happen as per the desires of somebody, in a convoluted way, it will be stopped. They have also to do a very serious thinking, if they want their dreams to realize into actionable points, there has to be soul searching as to how to run the governance of the University. Lastly, the Vice Chancellor said that he thinks there is not much more to say and that they can think over this issue later on.

However, Shri Dua continued and said that there is the issue of Principals pay. They have been discussing other issues but there is no discussion on it. There is no discussion on leave rules, whatever has been spoken here, it is just a speaking out and they all know that nothing would come out of it. He said 3-4 circulars regarding leave rules,

discussed here should be issued and the Committees constituted for C.P.F. should be circulated.

- (46) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua also talked about the Inspection Committees. He stated that the Inspection proforma is very large and the colleges fill it themselves. In columns of C.P.F., number of staff etc., they just write 'as per rules'. They have also pointed out even the names of colleges who first give full salary to the teachers and then take it back from them. For this, they have to face opposition from the managements of the colleges. If they do not raise such issues, then why they come here, he said. He pointed out that only 2-3 meetings of the Senate are held in a year. There could be one or two Syndicate meetings in a month. But they have not been able to get these circulars out, because of his (Vice-Chancellor) busy schedule.
- (47) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua also talked about the B.Ed. court case. He informed that in every Syndicate this matter is discussed and agreed that the stay in this matter should be got vacated. These teachers are not getting HRA and DA. He asked why their advocates are losing every case. The Registrar has said that he will get the stay vacated, but nothing has been done so far.
- (48) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua further stated that the process of Inspections for starting of new or extension of old courses should be started in January/February and completed before 31st March. It would then be decided in this House which college is to be accorded the permission for starting a course or not. But it happens quite opposite. The item is brought just for information and they say that if some shortcoming is there, it will be seen next year. In this way, many years have passed and barring some colleges, nothing concrete could be done.
- (49) Shri Raghbir Dyal talked about the earned leave of non-teaching employees and requested that a circular in this regard may be issued.
- (50) Shri Raghbir Dyal said that under the annual system, the golden chance has been stopped and requested that a golden chance be given to the candidates. The fee as charged earlier i.e. Rs. 5000/- and Rs. 10000/- for Undergraduate and Postgraduate classes may be taken from the candidate.
- (51) Professor Keshav Malhotra said that one college has started M.Phil. They started M.Phil under the annual system as they did not get the information about the switching over of the University to semester system from the annual system. He requested that they should be allowed to hold the examination under annual system to which the Vice Chancellor did not agree.
- (52) Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang pointed out that the Inspection committee members are appointed from Chandigarh when the experts are available locally. The University only takes care of its own finances, whereas it should also take care of the college finances. He, therefore, requested to appoint the Inspection Committee members from the local areas.
- (53) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu spoke about the UGC template based rules for appointment and promotion and the amendments made thereto. He said that, time to time, all teachers have been sufferers in this system. According to the criteria, they gathered points as per the 1st amendment but then the criteria was changed, then as per 2nd amendment and then as per 3rd amendment. Then came the 4th amendment. This amendment was

more dangerous because it was said that the list of journals would be provided by the UGC. It has, now perhaps, received and circulated to the departments. He requested that it should be expedited. Secondly, the college teachers are also stockholders in this. He, therefore, requested that college teachers should also be involved in the Committee of that department. He pointed out that there is a problem in the template also and therefore, the college teachers should also be involved in the Committee constituted for framing the template.

The Vice Chancellor asked Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu to give in writing and said that he will attend to it.

- (54) Dr. Harjodh Singh said that he got a telephone for Flying Squad duty to be performed at Ludhiana. He told them that he lives in Patiala and there are many teachers at Ludhiana who could be appointed for this duty from Ludhiana or from the local area. He requested that it would be better if local teachers are appointed for such duties.

Lastly, the Vice Chancellor thanked the members and said that they have managed to complete the agenda and the zero hour. They have also resolved many important things, some of which need immediate follow up. He again requested to give in writing about the issues raised in the zero hour so that action could be initiated on them.

Since 2-3 members could not participate in the zero hour, the Vice Chancellor asked them to speak something.

- (55) Principal Dr. Nisha Bhargava while taking part in the discussion said that this time they are Observers. However, the Vice Chancellor said that she is the senior most Principal of one of the largest education College of Panjab University, therefore, she must speak.

While endorsing the views expressed by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu, Principal Dr. Nisha Bhargava said that the Inspections should be completed within time. She informed that last year, their college had also missed one course, i.e., Cosmetology and Beauty Care P.G. Diploma because the inspection was delayed.

- (56) Principal Dr. Nisha Bhargava also spoke about the API template and requested that it should be out as soon as possible.

- (57) Principal Anita Kaushal said that it is a requirement that there should be regular teachers for teaching a course. For instance, their college has applied for Fine Arts. But she said that the appointment of regular teachers is not in their hands. They already have two permanent faculty members and they are ready to teach post graduate classes. But only because of condition of regular faculty, their college was denied permission. The regular faculty has to come from UPSC.

The Vice Chancellor suggested to have contractual teachers appointed.

Dr. Anita Kaushal said they have resource persons. Contractual teachers have gone to the court and got the stay.

The Vice Chancellor suggested her to give the names of the resource persons with a commitment letter as to how much teaching they would undertake.

Principal Mrs. Kaushal while agreeing to it said that now she will apply again for this course.

- (58) Dr. Ameer Sultana said that recently they have brought out a new accounts manual, but the staff working in her office needs some clarifications/know how on many aspects for which a workshop should be conducted.

Prof. B.S. Ghuman informed that the accounts manual training programme is already going on in their department (Public Administration), they may nominate the names of persons for such training.

- (59) Dr. Ameer Sultana further said that the extraordinary leave being granted to the teachers should not be given in between the semester because this causes a great loss to the students. If research scholars are asked to teach, they are not much experienced to teach the classes.

The Vice Chancellor said that the case comes through the Chairpersons with his/her recommendations.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that sometimes the case is sent directly.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Vice Chancellor once again thanked the members.

(G.S. Chadha)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR