

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 23rd January 2016** at **10.30 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

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

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

At the outset, the Vice-Chancellor extended warm greetings to all the honourable members.

Condolence Resolution

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

- i) Dr. Rahul Sharma, Associate Professor of Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, on 7th December, 2015.
- ii) Shri Jawahar Lal Gupta, Chief Justice (Retd), elder brother of Prof.(Retd) Balram Gupta (Presently Director, Judicial Academy, Chandigarh), on 3rd January, 2016. Justice J.L. Gupta also taught at Department of Laws, PU, as part-time faculty member.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. Rahul Sharma and Shri Jawahar Lal Gupta and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- (1) Prof. K.N. Pathak, former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University and Professor Emeritus, Department of Physics, has been conferred upon the NASI-Senior Scientist Platinum Jubilee Fellowship from the year 2016.
- (2) Two faculty members of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Dr. Devinder Preet Singh and Dr. Shipra Gupta, have been elected as Fellows of International College of Dentists (USA) in recognition of their services rendered in the Art and Science of Dentistry.
- (3) Dr. Sanjeev Puri, Professor of Biotechnology at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, has been elected as a Fellow of Indian Society of Nephrology (FISN).
- (4) Dr. R.K. Gupta, Professor at University School of Open Learning and Dr. Devinder Singh, Professor at Department of Laws, have been nominated as Dean for the Faculty of Business and Service, Management and Faculty of Law respectively at the I.K. Gujral Punjab Technical University, Jalandhar.
- (5) Prof. Indu Banga, Emeritus Professor, Panjab University has been awarded Itihas Rattan by the Asiatic Society Bihar on the occasion of the 76th Session of the Indian History Congress at Malda (WB). Earlier, this award has also been conferred upon Prof. R.S. Sharma, Prof. Irfan Habib, Prof. J.S. Grewal, Prof. Bipan Chandra and Prof. Romila Thapar. It is a great honour indeed.
- (6) Prof. V.K. Rattan has taken over as the Editor "Indian Chemical Engineer", quarterly Journal of Indian Institute of Chemical Engineers (IICChE), published by Taylor & Francis Group (a very eminent publishing house), U.K. w.e.f. 1st January, 2016.
- (7) Ms Baljinder Kaur of the Department of Indian Theatre has been awarded with best sporting actress for her role in the Haryanavi film 'Pagdi Da Honour'.
- (8) Prof. Meenakshi Goyal, Chairperson, Dr. SSB UICET has been awarded Bharat Vidya Shiromani Award by International Institute of Education & Management, New Delhi for Outstanding Achievements in the field of Education at New Delhi on 18th December, 2015.
- (9) ICSSR has sanctioned a project to Dr. Roshan Lal, Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology to conduct research on 'Psychological Correlates of Caste Stigma among Dalit Students' in Haryana, Punjab and Chandigarh for the period of two years. He has been awarded Rs.15 lakhs for conduct of research on the project.

- (10) Pilot Scale Fermentation Facility, sanctioned as part of the ongoing DBT project under Prof. S.K. Soni, Department of Microbiology, has been installed and become fully operational. This is the first facility of this kind which can be used for Skill Development programmes in the field of Fermentation Technology.
- (11) Department of Microbiology has been adjudged as the best unit in the country for promotion of research and public awareness activities by the Chandigarh Unit of Association of Microbiologists of India (AMI).
- (12) Fourteen students of Centre for IAS & Other Competitive Examinations have qualified the PCS (Judicial Branch) - 2015.
- (13) A MoU has been signed between the Panjab University and the managing trustee Shri S.P.S. Oberoi of the Trust, Sarbat da Bhala (SDB) Charitable Trust and as per agreement, hundred Panjab University selected needy students will get scholarships. The selected needy students in non-professional courses would get full fee scholarships and the professional courses students would get 75% of the fee from the Trust.
- (14) Professor S.K. Sharma, Professor Emeritus and a Senate member, has been appointed Co-Chair of the prestigious working Group on "International Standards and Trade" by the International Standards Organization (ISO). A great honour indeed.
- (15) Professor Preeti Mahajan, Department of Library & Information Science has been appointed as member of the Committee constituted by the Chairman, UGC to evaluate the material received from various Universities and Colleges for uploading on the web-portal in the prestigious Bharatvani Project launched by Government of India to accommodate and strengthen the oral traditions of India by disseminating and presenting the un-written vernacular and country's classical literature in different languages.
- (16) Dr. Ramesh Kataria, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Dr. Jasvinder Singh Bhatti, UGC-Research Awardee, Department of Biochemistry and Dr. Shivani, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, DAV College, Chandigarh, all three have been selected for Raman Fellowship in USA by University Grants Commission, New Delhi. Under this Fellowship, they will get training of latest technology in the Texas Tech University, USA for a period of 12 months.
- (17) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences organized the eventful 3rd DST INSPIRE Internship Camp from January 5-9, 2016. Nobel Laureate Professor Venkatraman Ramakrishnan, President Royal Society, Cambridge, UK delivered INST-PSCST Har Gobind

Khorana Lecture cum DST INSPIRE Internship Camp Inaugural Lecture. Dr. T. Ramasami, Ex-Secretary, Department of Science & Technology, Govt. of India and INSPIRE Program Visionary also shared his scientific experiences in his Valedictory Lecture.

- (18) Dr. V.K. Jindal, former Professor of Physics and former Coordinator, Nanoscience and Nanotechnology has been offered as Honorary Professor in the Department of Bio & Nano Technology, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar.
- (19) Mr. Sarwar Beg, Senior Research Fellow at Panjab University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences has been selected for prestigious 'Ranbaxy-sun Pharma Science Scholar Award 2015' for his research work entitled, "Systematic Development of Optimised oral Lipid-Based Nanostructured Delivery Systems of Cardiovascular Drugs employing quality by design (QbD) Paradigms" This award would include an engraved plaque, a citation and a cash prize of Rs.50,000/-.
- (20) Enactus team of Dr. SSBUCET has bagged the two more grants from (i) KPMG Business Ethics Grant 2015 of Rs.50000/- (ii) Walmart Women's Economic Empowerment project partnership 2015-2016 grant of Rs.20000/-.
- (21) The numerous activities have been undertaken by Swachh Bharat Abhiyaan Committee of P.U. till date, these stand listed as an information item in the Supplementary Agenda papers.
- (22) Panjab University (Men & Women) teams are performing well in the Inter-University Competitions held till date during the session 2015-16.
- (23) Panjab University would commemorate 2016 as Balwant Gargi Centenary year. Shri Balwant Gargi, the founder Director of Indian Theatre Department, was born on December 4, 1916. As a part of this commemoration, the contributions of the iconic alumni of Panjab University in the fields of Performing Arts, Literature & Culture, Humanities and other related areas shall be recalled and celebrated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he seeks their participation in 2016 Balwant Gargi Year. It should not only be commemorated on behalf of the University campus, but also in all the affiliated Colleges in a suitable way. He would like to request the Dean, College Development Council to make available special grant for those affiliated Colleges which would like to come forward to commemorate the performing art of their State.

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Prof. K.N. Pathak, former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University and Professor Emeritus, Department of Physics, on being conferred upon the NASI-Senior Scientist Platinum Jubilee Fellowship from the year 2016;
 - (ii) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh and Dr. Shipra Gupta, faculty members of Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, on being elected as Fellows of International College of Dentists (USA) in recognition of their services rendered in the Art and Science of Dentistry;
 - (iii) Dr. Sanjeev Puri, Professor of Biotechnology at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, on being elected as a Fellow of Indian Society of Nephrology (FISN);
 - (iv) Dr. R.K. Gupta, Professor at University School of Open Learning and Dr. Devinder Singh, Professor at Department of Laws, on being nominated as Dean for the Faculty of Business and Service, Management and Faculty of Law, respectively, at the I.K. Gujral Punjab Technical University, Jalandhar;
 - (v) Professor Indu Banga, Emeritus Professor, Panjab University, on being awarded Itihas Rattan by the Asiatic Society Bihar on the occasion of the 76th Session of the Indian History Congress at Malda (WB);
 - (vi) Professor V.K. Rattan on taking over as the Editor “Indian Chemical Engineer”, quarterly Journal of Indian Institute of Chemical Engineers (IChE), published by Taylor & Francis Group, U.K.;
 - (vii) Ms Baljinder Kaur of the Department of Indian Theatre on being awarded with best sporting actress for her role in the Haryanavi film ‘Pagdi Da Honour’;
 - (viii) Professor Meenakshi Goyal, Chairperson, Dr. SSB UICET on being awarded Bharat Vidya Shiromani Award by International Institute of Education & Management, New Delhi for Outstanding Achievements in the field of Education at New Delhi;
 - (ix) Dr. Roshan Lal, Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology, on being sanctioned a project to conduct research

on 'Psychological Correlates of Caste Stigma among Dalit Students' in Haryana, Punjab and Chandigarh;

- (x) Professor S.K. Sharma, Professor Emeritus and a Senate member, on being appointed Co-Chair of the prestigious working Group on "International Standards and Trade" by the International Standards Organization (ISO);
 - (xi) Professor Preeti Mahajan, Department of Library & Information Science on being appointed as member of the Committee constituted by the Chairman, UGC to evaluate the material received from various Universities and Colleges for uploading on the web-portal in the prestigious Bharatvani Project launched by Government of India;
 - (xii) Dr. Ramesh Kataria, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, Dr. Jasvinder Singh Bhatti, UGC-Research Awardee, Department of Biochemistry and Dr. Shivani, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, DAV College, Chandigarh, on being selected for Raman Fellowship in USA by University Grants Commission, New Delhi;
 - (xiii) Dr. V.K. Jindal, former Professor of Physics and former Coordinator, Nanoscience and Nanotechnology on being offered Honorary Professorship in the Department of Bio & Nano Technology, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar; and
 - (xiv) Mr. Sarwar Beg, Senior Research Fellow at Panjab University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences on being selected for prestigious 'Ranbaxy-sun Pharma Science Scholar Award 2015' for his research work entitled, "Systematic Development of Optimised oral Lipid-Based Nanostructured Delivery Systems of Cardiovascular Drugs employing quality by design (QbD) Paradigms".
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (10), (11), (12), (13), (17), (20), (21), (22) and (23), be noted and approved; and
 3. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 18.10.2015 and 22.11.2015, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

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

2(i). Considered the minutes dated 21.11.2015 (**Appendix-II**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that he would like to draw the attention of the House that many teachers are engaged in vanity publication. In fact, they go to the publishing houses and pay for publication of the papers. The idea is that when they do screening of the candidates, who are coming up for promotion, the Screening Committees have to understand as to what kind of publications are being presented by the candidates. He is talking about the declining standards of research in the University. He noticed, being from the language faculty, that in a particular case, a book was published by Prestige Publications of Delhi. He stated that for the last number of years, a lot of people go to Prestige on Friday and by Monday, they could get 20-25 books published if one goes with the CDs, but they would have to pay about Rs.10,000/- per book. This could be a very rampant practice. But he personally felt that in such cases the Prestige Publications should be blacklisted, if it is found to be true. Why he was saying so was because senior people also go to the same publisher and it is a kind of a trend. The trend is that some persons also say that since the senior people have got published books from that publisher, he/she could also get it done from the same publisher. Thus, it becomes very important for Academic Institutes to uphold the academic standards and take some kind of notice of this practice and action should be taken on it. It should be seen that such publications are discredited. For instance, there are some academics, he would not name, who have more than four publications in the journal published from the department. Could not the candidate go to other journals? Why is it so that 4-5 articles are in the English Department Journal. It is his plea and submission that when this kind of CAS programmes under which people with declining standards of research are becoming Professors without having done any research of consequence at the last stage getting the books published. This practice should be stopped. This item has been passed but he has a case in front of him where promotion has been granted. However, he felt that something should be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University Grants Commission (UGC) is seized of the matter and a Committee is looking into this. The UGC is also dependent on the Universities to individually come up and settle these things. If they wanted to take an initiative, let all the Deans come together and should take the responsibility of recommending the journals on behalf of the University in which the University faculty could publish. They could not bind them because somebody could say that it is not legally tenable. They could appreciate those who take the responsibility. They could recommend that the University is efficient in a particular subject and the students and teachers could contact that particular journal. They could come up with the recommendations in order to appreciate and reward these recommendations they could come up with some internal appreciative things. An alumnus of this University has offered to institute some kind of prize for best contribution in research in a given area and that matter is being processed. They could come with 11 appreciation awards on behalf of the faculty or it could be 25 given the size of the University. They could reward good research and good research means publishing good papers. This way

the people who accept the University's recommendation could publish good papers and they could give the awards. If they are having 25 such awards, they could set aside an amount of Rs.50,000/- for each award which works out to Rs.12.5 lacs per year. It is not a great deal of money that the University could not extract from the funds since they are conducting the examination and having the income. A part of that income could be utilized for promoting the research agenda of the University. It is a very good thing. He said that he would make Professor Shelley Walia as Chairman of the Committee to convene a meeting of the Chairpersons to recommend at least one journal for every department and give output on that. The University would reward the persons from the University as well as the Affiliated Colleges. Panjab University is a reputed University. They could set aside an amount of Rs.25 lacs, half of which could be meant for the campus and half for the College people. They would give the rewards only to the deserving people. If they do not find any deserving candidate, the reward would not be given in that year. Let them send a message that this University would do things proactively.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu appreciated what Professor Shelley Walia had said and agreed with him. However, he added that, in English, there could be so many journals and publishers but in the subject of Punjabi, there are only 2-3 good journals/publishers in the State of Punjab. Earlier, the teachers having interest in research used to do research work. But now a new condition has been imposed on the College and University teachers to do research for getting promotion from one pay band to the other. Since publication of papers/books is a requirement for the students/teachers, good publishers demand money to publish the books up to the extent of Rs.60,000/-. Some new publishers are charging about Rs.35,000/-. It is not that a book being published by a new publisher is of sub-standard. He would like to share that it is a condition for a Ph.D. student to publish at least two papers in a journal. A student submitted the paper for publication of paper in a journal of Punjabi University, Patiala, which did not publish the paper even after charging the fee and the student is waiting for the publication of the paper for the last more than four months. There are so many practical difficulties. Since Professor Shelley Walia is a well known academician and has a reputation in the society, he has a point. Because of the conditions for promotion, teachers have to do research work. But there are problems. As the Vice-Chancellor is talking about forming a Committee, this Committee should not comprise only Deans, but also the teachers from the Colleges should also be associated with the Committee. He cited the example that in a seminar, about 70 papers are being presented, which is not possible in a single day. There is a rat race to get the papers published because during the first five years of service, the condition for publication of a required number of papers has been imposed. If a condition has been imposed in 2011, how a teacher could meet that requirement of 2009. This race of meeting the requirement of publishing papers would be over within 4-6 months and the concern shown by Professor Shelley Walia would be satisfied. The teachers would start working honestly. Since it is compulsory for the teachers to fulfill the requirement of getting the next higher scale, they could not wait for 5-6 months.

Professor Shelley Walia said that such conditions are ruining the standards. These are conditions which are very-very retrogressive but there could be different problems of different disciplines. He thought that in English, there are so many publishers, but in the

subject of Punjabi, few publishers might be available and that is why the people have to pay for getting their work published. So far as he knew, the publishers of English do not demand any money for publishing the books, etc.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since it is a requirement for the teachers, 95% of the teachers get their work published after making payment to the publishers.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the apprehensions shown by Professor Shelley Walia are not his alone but of all. The other concern is that one of the recommendations of the UGC was that the API score has to be acquired along with capping. A person, who is on the verge of promotion, how could he meet the requirement of 10 years old? He knew that a person having purely empirical work contacted one of the standard publishers for publication, the publisher said that publishing this work is not a profitable one for him and he is working to get profit on publications. It might be possible that after spending about Rs.1-2 lacs on the publications, the sale of the books might not fetch his investment costs. When that person went to the other publisher, the response was the same. No doubt, the work done by that teacher is of good quality, but not in demand. What would such a person do? He had worked hard for years together. Ultimately, he would try to do something in order to meet the requirement of UGC. Secondly, he cited the case of the journal of the Department of Laws. If the journal wanted to publish a particular paper, that is sent for comments of the referee a nearby place like Sector-15 and which they wanted to reject, the same was sent to a far off place like Bengaluru or to a Professor who would not review the same for a long time. When the person asked about the status of the paper, he/she was told that since the response has not been received, the paper could not be published. Should that person wait for two years or try to know where the paper has been sent, what are the objections, no communication is given to him about this. This is not made public on account of secrecy. If they wanted to do something, they should challenge the publisher who is publishing sub-standard work and even could go to the court. He said that there are such persons, who have not published any paper, but have got promotion. Since the capping has been introduced, people have started writing papers, some of them might be of sub-standard. But some research has taken place in terms of quantity. Till now, the people did not know how to write footnotes, now they have started working. Those people who were doing research earlier are doing quality work. It is only those people who are saying that they have published about 250 papers that might be of sub-standard quality. The practical problems being faced by the researcher should be solved.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa supported the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Ajay Ranga that now people have started doing research.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members would recall that the UGC held a series of regional meetings all across the country. Such a meeting was conducted in the Panjab University and many people, including teachers of the University from the region and Colleges had participated in the same. The report of that Committee has still not come. Let they hope that the report would be submitted shortly. In the meanwhile, to encourage and recognize quality research, if they could work on the offshoot of what Professor Shelley

Walia said and they could at least come up on behalf of the University, a list of good recommended journals in different subjects. If possible, on behalf of at least six Departments of the University which are receiving grant in the form of CAS, SAP, DBT, DRS for promoting research, they could come up with a list of journals. Some incentive has to be given to the people who accept the recommendations of the University that they have to approach those journals. Let them set aside some money of the University for the best work. It is worth spending a small sum of money to recognize quality research on behalf of the University. If they could do it, at least 50 papers in a year, they could show to NAAC during next visit that this is what they have done. This is a thing which the peer community would also appreciate if they are the first to do it.

Professor Shelley Walia said that it is just to push quality research. He could understand the problems that have been raised but to improve the standards, they have to ensure quality publication.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that while discussing this important issue, it has been divided in two parts. One is to take steps to provide incentive to the good research work that has been published in good recommended journals. That is very good. It is going to enhance the prestige of the University and it is going to encourage good teachers to do more research. But the context in which Professor Shelley Walia has pointed out is in case of promotion and appointment to which some of the friends have talked about practical difficulties. This could be done even now and the Committee could be constituted. But as far as the practical problems are concerned, in view of what UGC has said and in view of the fact that good journals are not available or good publishers are not available and because of unavailability, they have not been able to score and everything has collapsed. UGC, in fact, has fixed minimum standards and does not stop any University to further make the standards stronger but would not allow diluting the standards. As far as encouraging research, as suggested by Professor Shelley Walia, UGC has also not been able to find a solution to the problem being faced by the genuine candidates who are applying for the post, who are pursuing Ph.D. and whose papers have been published and Ph.D. having been awarded, even they have not been able to find the solution. As Dr. I.S. Sandhu has rightly said, he remembered that UGC has made the Ph.D. mandatory condition for appointment of the Principal in the Colleges. All of them know that wherefrom and who and for what price, the degree of Ph.D. were being purchased because there was no guide for the senior teachers to guide for Ph.D., who became eligible to become Principals in spite of the fact that they are senior administrators. So, they were forced to do that. Now, it is almost 20 years that people have genuinely started pursuing Ph.D. It was only to overcome that problem, that the UGC brought stringent Regulations of 2009 like Pre-Ph.D. course work, etc. So may be when the UGC finds the solution to this problem also at one side, UGC would be able to find solution and on the other side the candidates would be available, good publishers would also be available. This is an ongoing process. This is a very good proposal that to earn a very good name in the society, the Panjab University should take initiatives to make the Committee in which the people from the Colleges be also associated, to recommend good journals and to give incentives.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in today's time, the faculty of the University and the College are supposed to have the same career.

Large number of Colleges are engaged in postgraduate teaching. It is not proper to exclude Colleges. Campus of the University has to be taken up together with the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that having endorsed the appointments, he just wanted to make one observation that unlike in the past, the application forms of the candidates are not annexed with the agenda. Probably, this has happened for the first time. Only one application has been annexed. Maybe it is due to oversight.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be due to oversight. They would correct it and the applications would be annexed when the whole matter is finalized.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he wanted to say that whatever is placed before the Selection Committee should be placed before the Syndicate and Senate which has been done till now.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he would not repeat what Professor Shelley Walia and Shri Ashok Goyal have said about the declining standards of quality research but would like to add two points. Some of the departmental journals are not following the schedule of publication and are published about two years behind schedule. Already a condition had been put that the students pursuing Ph.D. would have to publish two papers. The point made by Professor Shelley Walia is valid that the appointments are being made but the quality of research is declining. They have a mechanism of checking the plagiarism but could not implement the same. Some of the Universities have made it mandatory to check the plagiarism in the projects/thesis submitted by the students of M.B.A. and other programmes. They did not want the research to be stopped. A condition could be imposed that when the students/research scholars/teachers publish the paper that should be screened through a software to check plagiarism.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that what Shri Harpreet Singh Dua is saying is right. The anti-plagiarism software also has some problems. There are many dimensions of plagiarism. He got a series of lectures on Anti-plagiarism delivered in the University and the problems of the software were pointed out. Blind adherence to the software is not a solution. Somebody has declared that there is no plagiarism in the research and the plagiarism software has also failed. They needed to set up some machinery or could form a small Sub-Committee which could do this job.

Professor Shelley Walia said that there is no foolproof system.

Continuing the Vice-Chancellor said that he knew that Dr. Parveen Chadha, an Adjunct Professor of IISER, Mohali who has delivered lectures at IISER, Mohali and other institutes. The issue of plagiarism is not only of the University but also of other institutions. He would contact Dr. Chadha and form a small Sub-Committee which could come up with some specific recommendations that they needed to follow and minimize the plagiarism.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired if they are not using this plagiarism software. If the system is not foolproof, what should be done to follow that system?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the UGC says that the University should use the plagiarism software but blind adherence would cause problems. If someone, who is not having a good command over language, has taken 2-3 lines from the introduction part already used by some other person, the software would say that it is plagiarism. The introduction part is a generic one. That person should not suffer for that part since he has worked hard. It would be frustrating for those persons due to technical reasons. He would request Dr. Praveen Chaddah to help in this matter.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the mechanical surveillance carried over the researchers all over the world is not foolproof and not showing the results. He thought that what is important is to delink the research from academic ethics. At the end of the day, there is a fear that one would be scanned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had an occasion to listen to Dr. Praveen Chaddah at a number of colloquia and a series of lectures. They could ask him to repeat such series for the benefit of the Research Scholars in the University Departments also. An awareness has to be created. Dr. Chaddah has guided so many researchers and has been invited to academic meetings in so many universities to share the knowledge. There are so many dimensions of plagiarism, like, language, data, idea, etc. He has categorized all these things with seriousness and he has prescribed the ways how to protect one's ideas with examples. One has a nice idea and trying to put it in high profile journal, and the journal says that the research work is not published and someone has stolen that idea before publication. He gave a very clever prescription that one having a very nice idea should share the same in a national meeting, disseminate the same and then wait for a year and then put the same somewhere else. He provided a lot of ways. His concern is that young Indians have good ideas and those ideas get plagiarized by others because that person does not have the way of effectively reaching that idea to the right stage.

Professor Anil Monga said that could they think of adding more journals from the campus.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no limit set by the University to have more and quality journals. Dr. R.P.S. Josh from Government College for Girls, Sector-42, Chandigarh has come up with an idea of having a quality journal on behalf of the College teachers. They could also have the same for University teachers. Volunteers like Dr. Josh could come forward from the University faculty also.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in the subject of Punjabi, there are only 2 good journals and there was not much choice for getting the papers published. Now, with the requirement of API, some colleges including like DAV College, Chandigarh, DAV College, Abohar have also started publishing good journals. These journals are of good standard. With the introduction of new journals, the teachers from the Colleges have also started taking interest in research.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Press of Punjabi University, Patiala is producing a large number of publications of the books which are written by the students and the teachers. But the Panjab University Press is not able to publish properly the journals of the

Departments and facing difficulties. When they talk about publication of standard journals, they needed to strengthen their own Press.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the Press is in bad shape.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not so. He would ask the Panjab University Press to submit a white paper on as to what they are publishing and come out with a solution. The members should not think that the Press is not doing anything. In fact, the Press has produced a book in a record time when the World Congress of Excellence in Psychology was held. This book is a high quality publication. Recently, the Press has also produced a manuscript of Professor G.S. Gosal which was there and could not be published for a long time. He is not ready to accept that the Press is not doing anything.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Professor Shelley Walia meant to say that the Press needed to be upgraded.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that what Professor Shelley Walia is saying is that proper infrastructure is not available in the Press. He said that it is very good that the promotions have been made. But there are some issues of capping on the promotions which have already been made due to which the pay is not being released. Chandigarh Administration has already cleared the matter. He requested that it should be made time bound.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had already taken up the matter with the Finance Secretary and the U.T. Advisor, who have agreed that they would get it done in a specific way. He has approached everyone in the U.T. Administration and provided all the documents. The Administration would try to resolve the matter after 26th January, 2016 when they are free from some other pressing engagements. A solution to the problem has been found out and the Finance Secretary and the Advisor have agreed to follow that. Let they have a hope that the matter would be resolved. He along with the President, PUTA and other officers of the University had met the Finance Secretary and the Advisor who have assured that the matter would be sorted out.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that there are so many journals published by the Colleges are charging money ranging between Rs.500 to Rs.2000 for publishing the papers. He cited the example of one of his students whose work was very good, but the journal demanded a payment of Rs.2000/- for publishing the paper. They could put some check on it. He pointed out that one of the Colleges was derecognized by the National Council of Teacher Education but the College is publishing the journal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the factual data might be given to him and he would bring the same as an agenda item.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Electrical & Electronics Engineering) **(Stage-1)** to Assistant Professor (Electrical & Electronics Engineering) **(Stage-2)** at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|-------------|
| 1. Ms. Parul Gaur | : | 01.07.2015 |
| 2. Mr. Gaurav Sapra | : | 01.07.2015. |

- 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 selections have been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

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

2(ii). Considered the minutes dated 21.11.2015 **(Appendix-III)** of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Information Technology) **(Stage-1)** to Assistant Professor (Information Technology) **(Stage-2)** at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|-------------|
| 1. Ms Sukesha | : | 01.07.2015 |
| 2. Ms. Monika | : | 01.07.2015 |
| 3. Ms. Raj Kumari | : | 01.07.2015. |

- 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 selections have been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

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

2(iii). Considered the minutes dated 21.11.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Mamta be promoted from Assistant Professor (Computer Science & Engineering) (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (Computer Science & Engineering) (**Stage-2**) (Computer Science & Engineering) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **01.10.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidates meets the UGC requirement.

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

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 21.11.2015 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Information Technology) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Information Technology) (**Stage-3**), at the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------|---|-------------|
| 1. | Ms Veenu Mangat | : | 03.02.2015 |
| 2. | Ms. Roopali | : | 29.08.2014. |

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

2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

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

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

2(v). Considered minutes dated 21.11.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Mechanical Engineering) (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (Mechanical Engineering) (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------|---|-------------|
| 1. | Ms. Anjali Gupta | : | 06.10.2014 |
| 2. | Shri Parveen Goyal | : | 30.09.2014. |

- 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 selections have been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in School of Communication Studies

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 21.11.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in School of Communication Studies, P.U., Chandigarh

RESOLVED: That Dr. Bhavneet Bhatti be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the School of Communication Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **04.10.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the University Business School

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 21.11.2015 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Business School, P.U., Chandigarh

RESOLVED: That Dr. Tejinderpal Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at University Business School, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **16.11.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the UIFT

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 21.11.2015 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Fashion Technology & Vocational Development, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rita Kant be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Fashion Technology & Vocational Development, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the **12.06.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of English & Cultural Studies

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 21.11.2015 (**Appendix-X**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Meenu Aggarwal nee Gupta be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**), Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **03.11.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

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

2(x). Considered minutes dated 01.12.2015 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in Department of Economics, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Smita Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **18.11.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

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

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 01.12.2015 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Business School, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Tilak Raj be promoted from Assistant Professor (Economics) (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (Economics) (**Stage-2**) at University Business School, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **26.08.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be

personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

Promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at USOL

2(xii). Considered minutes dated 01.12.2015 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University School of Open Learning, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Swarnjit Kaur be promoted from Associate Professor (Political Science) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (Political Science) (**Stage-5**), at University School of Open Learning (transferred to Centre for Human Rights & Duties for working as Coordinator), P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **23.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of Evening Studies-MDRC

2(xiii). Considered minutes dated 01.12.2015 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gian Chand Chauhan be promoted from Associate Professor (History) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (History) (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **12.10.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

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

Promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of Law

2(xiv). Considered minutes dated 01.12.2015 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Geeta Khanna Joshi be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **23.04.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Re-advertisement of the post

2(xv). Considered minutes of the Selection Committee dated 09.12.2015 for appointment of Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

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

Appointment of Associate Professor-1 (General) in Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome

2(xvi). Considered minutes of the Selection Committee dated 09.12.2015 (**Appendix-XVI**) for appointment of Associate Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Ms.) Ramandeep Kaur be appointed Associate Professor (General) in the Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.

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

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

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

Promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of Mathematics

2(xvii). Considered minutes of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee dated 24.12.2015 (**Appendix-XVII**) for Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage 4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in Department of Mathematics, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Dinesh Kumar Khurana be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **23.03.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

Promotion from Associate Professor Stage-2 to Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of Biotechnology

2(xviii). Considered minutes of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee dated 24.12.2015 (**Appendix-XVIII**) for Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage 2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in Department of Biotechnology, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kashmir Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **01.07.2014**, in

the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

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

Assignment of Fellows to the Faculties

3. Considered and

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following Fellows be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against their names:

1. Shri Rubinderjit Singh Brar Director of Higher Education U.T. Administration U.T., Chandigarh	1. Languages 2. Medical Sciences 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Dairying Animal Husbandry & Agriculture
2 Shri T.K. Goyal Director of Higher Education Punjab Chandigarh SCO 66-67, Sector 17-D, Chandigarh	1. Languages 2. Medical Sciences 3. Dairying Animal Husbandry & Agriculture 4. Design and Fine Arts
3. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar Acting Chief Justice Punjab & Haryana High Court Chandigarh.	1. Law 2. Arts

Appointment of Chair Professors

4. Considered proposal of the Vice-Chancellor, for nominations/appointments for Chair Professorships at Panjab University. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIX**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The recommendations of the Committee dated 11.12.2015, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).
 2. The Committee has urged the Vice-Chancellor to approach Professor Yoginder K. Alagh, former Vice-Chancellor, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, to persuade him to accept Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair Professorship.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that it is nice that the University is constituting Chairs in the name of persons, who have made immense contribution for the national movement/s and have also contributed for making modern India, e.g., Mohandas Karam Chand Gandhi, former Prime Ministers, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri and Dr. Manmohan Singh. In fact, Dr. Manmohan Singh had made immense contribution in liberalizing their economy in 1992 when Shri P.V. Narsimha Rao was Prime Minister of India by making structural reforms in the economy. It is worthwhile, the manner in which the names have come up. They are constituting a Chair in the name of former Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh and has recommended his name for one of the Chair Professorships. Although they are passing through a difficult time, especially in the case of budgetary constraints, financial constraints, etc., what would be the budgetary implications of these Chairs. Whatever Chairs they already had in the University, what are their contributions. So it would be worthwhile to know. However, he has no objection to any of these Chairs, which they are going to constitute.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that wherever they had these Chairs in the Universities all over the world, these Chairs meant certain responsibilities and the responsibility is academic and lies in delivering lectures, sharing of new ideas with the whole motive of promoting knowledge. He appreciated the appointment of Dr. Manmohan Singh on one of the Chairs; he is a world renowned economist and has globalized the economy of the country. But he must ask one question – whether Dr. Manmohan Singh would join Jawaharlal Nehru Chair Professorship and how long he would stay here in the University and what kind of infrastructure they have for the security of the former Prime Minister. Would it be only a kind of a Chair which could be more in the nature of honouring rather than any kind of a genuine academic concern of a University. If they look at the academic credentials of Shri Kailash Satyarthi, whose name has been recommended for Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair Professorship, they would find that he has actually taught at some undergraduate College. No doubt, he is a Nobel Laureate, but as the Chair which is being given to him, he (Professor Shelley Walia) thinks that he (Shri Kailash Satyarthi) would have to interact with the faculty, lecture to the faculty on a particular subject. Does he have the capacity to do that in the University or not? Secondly, he also wants to know whether there is dearth of academics in the country that they could not think of people, who are really in academic streams. Or is it only in the sense of honouring these people. He thought that they do need to honour Dr. Manmohan Singh repeatedly, but as a Chair Professor are they not going beyond the academics.

Professor Anil Monga stated that he wanted to congratulate the Vice-Chancellor for thinking for creating these Chairs and offer these Chairs to these distinguished persons, who have excelled in their lives and made significant contributions to the society. He fully support this because the association of Ms. Ela Bhatt, Dr. Manmohan Singh and Shri Kailash Satyarthi to the Panjab University would itself be big thing for the University. Therefore, he compliments and supports this idea.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he did not agree with the viewpoint expressed by Professor Shelley Walia as it is not necessary that only academicians should be offered these Chairs. The person/s, who have contributed to the society or have done any work

for the humanity, could also be offered these Chairs so that they get highlighted and the so called academicians could follow their footprints. Though Bhagat Pooran Singh did not do any work relating to the degrees, but whatever he had done, no one else could do that. So it is wrong to say that they would examine every person on similar parameters. Instead of seeing whether the person/s has/have done scientific research, publications, etc., they should also keep in view and rather accept the persons, who have done 'karam', which has been accepted and recognized by the mankind all over the world. To honour such personality/personalities is itself an honour.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he completely agrees with Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa. Though Shri Seechewal is not an academician, what work has done/is doing, if he is associated with any of the University, it would be an honour for that University. If the name of such a personality is associated with Panjab University, it would be an honour for them.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he thinks that Professor Shelley Walia has been misunderstood. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa has said that the Chairs should not be named in the name of academicians only. He has said that if somebody is to hold the Chair Professorship, what is he expected to do. So far as honouring is concerned, they have already *Honoris Causa* degrees. They had also awarded the *Honoris Causa* degree to Shri Kailash Satyarthi. There is no doubt, that associating his name with the Panjab University would definitely enhance the prestige of the University. His only concern was that if he is appointed on that chair what would he be doing, not that he has any objection to that. Secondly, he has to make a suggestion. Professor Yoginder K. Alagh has also a name in the world. The Committee has suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should approach Professor Yoginder K. Alagh, former Vice-Chancellor, Jawaharlal Nehru University, to explore his acceptance to Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair Professorship. The Vice-Chancellor has approached him and got his consent also, and thereafter, the item has been brought to the Syndicate for consideration. Now, there are two ways – either the Syndicate and Senate should take it granted that he (Professor Yoginder K. Alagh) has no option except to say 'Yes' or if it is considered by the Syndicate. He is saying that without any disrespect to Professor Alagh or anyone else. He remembers at one time, for whatever reason/s, Dr. Manmohan Singh was not appointed as Professor in the Panjab University and they regretted that decision till date. Suppose for whatever reason/s, the Syndicate or the Senate did not accept one of the recommendations, then are they trying to honour such a person. His suggestion in this regard is that in such a situation, their step should be that let there be the mandate of the Syndicate first and then approach the person concerned to request, "you please accept the request", instead of taking the consent first and then placing the matter before the Syndicate as that is not only in the interest of the University and also not in the interest of the person whom they wanted to honour.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he has already told the worthy members of the Syndicate that he has no objection to the Chairs being constituted. He has also told them that he has tremendous respect for these people as they have made unparallel contributions in the freedom movement and making of modern India. His only concern is that these Chairs might not turn up mere symbolism. It needed to be

seen as to what is/are the contribution/s of the previous Chairs and whether they are ready to face the budgetary implications.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that he appreciated the recommendations of the Committee and the Vice-Chancellor, as it is a good step. They should not forget the persons, who have made a lot of contributions for the society. In fact, it is a wonderful step.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he appreciated the recommendations of the Committee. In fact, they are not honouring them, and instead if they accept the University's offer, they (these persons) are honouring Panjab University.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, in fact, it is an honour for Panjab University. They are stressing/emphasizing time and again that these Chairs should be offered only to the academicians. He wanted to know as to what is the purpose of education. What does the academician give them? In fact, academicians are meant for imparting education as to how the people should spend and save the their lives of other people. They learn this from the education imparted by the academicians. All would agree with him, if names of personalities like Bhagat Pooran Singh and Shri Seechewal are not there, half of the Punjab would vanish. Some of the persons are of the opinion that one could become a big academician by writing a few books. They should also keep in mind the personalities, who have made significant contribution to the society without comparing them with the academicians. If Shri Seechewal is offered one of the Chairs, it would prove to be good/beneficial for the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he wants to congratulate the Vice-Chancellor for putting in a lot of efforts for filling up these Chairs. He also appreciated the Committee, which has recommended the names for these Chairs.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that all of them have made valuable comments. Now, it is his duty to respond. There are certain facts that by virtue of Vice-Chancellor, he became aware and let him share all those. This idea of having such high profile Chairs, on behalf of the University, was conceived by the leaders of this University when the 125th Year of the University was commemorated. All this go back to the years 2007-2008 when that book "Flight of the Phoenix" was conceived, released and a vision document for the University "Vision 2020" was enunciated. At that stage, he (Vice-Chancellor) was given to understand that Professor R.P. Bambah and several others eminent people, who have been the beginning academic leaders of this University, they came up with an idea that the University should have such high profile Chairs like Mahatma Gandhi Chair, Jawaharlal Nehru Chair, Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair, Rajiv Gandhi Chair, Aurobindo Chair, and their idea was that in the name of these Chairs, that eminent people from India should be invited to visit the University whenever they have time to interact with the young people as long as they want and the University was generating some money over and above its regular income. It was thought that some proceeds from the so called "Fund for Foundation for Higher Education & Research" should be utilized for this agenda. Though it was a very noble idea, it was not implemented in a vigour, it ought to be. In the meantime, Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair was created and Professor Ajit Singh, who was an eminent Economist at Cambridge was offered that Chair. He visited the University

sometimes twice a year. He used to come to the University and interact with the young faculty and some good publications and Ph.Ds. did come out with his interaction with the faculty and the students. So it did something good to the academics of the University. When it came to looking for another individual, who would carry the legacy of Professor Ajit Singh, he (Vice-Chancellor) approached Professor R.P. Bambah. Professor Bambah told that now time has come that, in the background of this successful experiment, they should try to hold a colloquium. So a meeting was convened and Professor Bambah was requested to guide as to how they should go about it. In the meanwhile, he (Vice-Chancellor) had invited Professor Manmohan Singh to come and honour Professor R.P. Bambah on his 90th birthday. He agreed in principle, but for whatever reason/s he could not make it on the day of 90th birthday of Professor Bambah. He arrived in the city the next day and stayed at CRRID, where he usually stayed, and honoured Professor Bambah during that meeting. There Professor Bambah took up with him that whether he would like to come and spend some time with his old *alma mater* and interact with the young faculty and students. Dr. Manmohan Singh said that he would consider it. Dr. Manmohan Singh asked him (Vice-Chancellor) as to how long he wants him to stay in the University, to which he replied that at least about a week. Dr. Manmohan Singh smiled and said that he would consider it. So this is the background in which the Committee has made the recommendations. So when they met, Professor Bambah proposed that they should invite Dr. Manmohan Singh on one of these Chairs, i.e., Jawaharlal Nehru Chair. Professor Bambah had said that since Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru symbolized the development of modern India and Dr. Manmohan Singh has carried that legacy, it would be great if in commemoration of that they should commence Jawaharlal Nehru Chair with someone, who has realized the dream of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru. When it came to filling up Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair, various names were proposed. So in this context, the decision to recommend these names to the Syndicate has been made. When it came to finding a successor to Professor Ajit Singh for Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair, there was a proposal to invite someone, who has given an outstanding colloquium at Panjab University in recent past and that was a colloquium by Professor Arun Kumar of Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU). Though there was more than 30 colloquiums, one of the outstanding colloquium was given by Professor Arun Kumar, who has recently visited as Chair Professor at JNU, who was also an occupant of Sukumar Chakravorty Chair. Sukumar Chakravorty was a very great Economist of India. In fact, the recommendation was to Professor Arun Kumar to occupy Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair Professorship. However, during the meeting Professor Bambah said that why not ask for Professor Yoginder K. Alagh, who has mentored Professor Arun Kumar at JNU. So they decided who not to ask Professor Alagh – whether he would be willing to accept Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair Professorship. In this context, they recommended the name of Professor Yoginder K. Alagh. Professor Alagh has been told about all the circumstances. Professor Alagh has very high regards for Professor Arun Kumar, but Panjab University is an Institution, which has produced great Economist for India, and he would be delighted to be a part of Panjab University and teach at a University, which nurtures such students. He is aware that Panjab University has Honours School in Economics and he (Vice-Chancellor) has also made him aware of commencement of Institute of Social Sciences Education & Research. Professor Alagh has given his consent, but he (Vice-Chancellor) has told him that he needs to

process it through the Syndicate and the Senate, and he was just exploring with him. In fact, Professor Alagh is aware of all such technicalities as he has occupied the Chair of Vice-Chancellor of JNU. As such, he is aware of the system. Similarly, Professor R.P. Bambah suggested that Mahatma Gandhi Chair should be given to someone, who has really realized the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi, and one of the peers name which came to his mind was of Professor Ela Bhatt. In this context, the name of Professor Ela Bhatt has been recommended. When it comes to Shri Kailash Satyarthi, he has been given the *Honoris Causa* degree. He has, in fact, agreed to come and offered to spend at least a week's or 10 days' time at the University. He has also agreed to station himself here in the University. Panjab University is an Institution, which has whole spectrum of things. If they have strong Departments in Arts and Humanities, they also have Departments in the form of Emerging Areas in Social Sciences, a Department which has a very strong connection with the society, under-privileged sections of the society and so on. Shri Kailash Satyarthi is a Technologist/Engineer and then he has shifted to socialism. He felt that University is a very big platform where he could interact with a community which would be a source of inspiration. Now, he has time at his disposal and could visit the University several times in an year. He could come and spend a week's or 10 days time and interact with different communities and his presence could be a source of inspiration for engaging in society's causes whatever might be his background. Once these people are stationed here in the University, they could also utilize them for P.U. Regional/Rural Centres. While they are here, they could also request them to visit the affiliated Colleges and interact with the young faculty and students there. Chandigarh gives them a platform to connect them to the whole region, which is not a small region. In fact, they are sitting at the centre of four States, i.e., Punjab, Haryana, Himachal and Jammu & Kashmir, and every region could be reached within a day. Professor Bambah has rightly provided that whenever these people would be here, transport would be provided to them so that they could have freedom to travel. They would do it on behalf of this University. So all this is very good for the University, and they should actually be very grateful to Professor Bambah to motivate him (Vice-Chancellor) to be part of it and he is privileged to make it a part of today' agenda. He remembered that several well-wishers of the University had got together and said it in 2007 and 2008. They are doing it in 2016, which is a year of celebration/commemoration in the form of Balwant Gargi. It is not that they are commemorating Balwant Gargi here. In fact, they are commemorating the commencement of the University at Chandigarh Campus, and the Campus which they see around today. They have to be conscious that this Campus in this form was not existing at Lahore. It was a dream of those people to have a Campus of a kind at Lahore, which was not there because the support of the State of the University was not of a kind which the University is enjoying since the beginning of the University Campus at Chandigarh. When the University came up here, the Punjab Government supported it whole-heartedly and it kept on supporting reasonably well until the turn up of 21st century. The problem arose when the salary component expanded after the implementation of the recommendations of 5th Pay Commission. When the salary budget expanded and in the 21st century, they added many professional dimensions to the University, i.e., University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, University Institute of Hotel Management, etc., but they have not got any financial sanction/s

from the Punjab Government while doing this. They all know that their budget is enhancing astronomically and the Punjab Government reached a limit as they have already get ridden because of bad time during the 80s. In fact, Punjab Government has a huge debt, which they are unable to serve. Now, they (University) have added so many dimensions to it.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is other way also that Punjab Government stopped giving grant to the University beyond a particular limit, and thereafter, the University has come up with these Institutes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that but the point is that they have started these Institutes hoping that these would provide them additional income. The Punjab Government is not in a position to provide them enough grant because the capacity of the society is not there to pay for the professional courses. Certain seats in the professional courses did not fill up because the society has no capacity to pay the fees. Now, they are trying to approach the Central Government to support them, but these Chairs are not to be supported by the Central Government money, but from the Fund "Foundation for Higher Education & Research". They could have used the Fund "Foundation for Higher Education & Research" for other development causes also. So he seeks the approval of the Government of the University to make a choice that they would set aside a small part of their income to promote this cause of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that on such an item before anybody else speaks, he requests that the Vice-Chancellor should give the background to them. Secondly, his objection was only that there is a proposal to appoint four persons and the Vice-Chancellor has spoken only about three. There is only one mention that he (Vice-Chancellor) has taken consent of Professor Yoginder K. Alagh. He urged it should not be put on record. Firstly, they should invite him formally.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Fine".

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had said in the beginning that it is very good, but his only concern is that these persons should also visit the P.U. Regional Centres. Does the Vice-Chancellor promise that they would visit the P.U. Regional Centres?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has to motivate them to visit P.U. Regional Centres.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that an idea could also be mooted to get them sponsored from the big houses.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that on all the Chairs eminent persons, politicians, writers, scholars are working. In fact, the contribution of Panjab University always remained in sports, but no Chair on Sports has been established in the Panjab University. He cited the example of Colonel Balbir Singh, who is the winner of three Olympic Gold Medals. Even the alumni, who have been highlighted, the name of persons like Babu Maan existed, but the names of Olympians are missing.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could create a Chair. Someone, who symbolizes Sports in Punjab, is S. Milkha Singh. So they could create a Chair in the name of S. Milkha Singh or Dhian Chand. The Vice-Chancellor urged the members to give him the names of sportspersons, in whose name a Chair could be created.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thought a Chair could be created in the name of Colonel Balbir Singh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they not decide it today. They should give him the names so that the same could be examined and one of them is decided.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in principle, at the moment Colonel Balbir Singh name is there for creating a Sports Chair in his name, and if later, someones name cropped up, the same could be considered.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed as Chair Professors at Panjab University of the Chair Professorship mentioned against each:

1. Ms. Ela Bhatt as Mahatma Gandhi Chair Professorship.
2. Dr. Manmohan Singh as Jawaharlal Nehru Chair Professorship.
3. Shri Kailash Satyarthi as Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair Professorship.
4. Professor Yoginder K. Alagh as Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair Professorship.

The following Items 5, 6, 7 and 18 on the agenda were taken up together:

Appointment of the two Syndics on the Board of Finance, various Committees, Committee comprising 3 members of Syndicate to decide objections, if any, against the decision of the Registrar and Joint Consultative Machinery

5. Items 5, 6, 7 and 18 on the agenda were read out, viz. -
5. To appoint two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2016 to 31.01.2017, under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
6. To appoint the following Committees for the period noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
1.	Revising Committee	Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32, P.U. Calendar, Volume- II, 2007	Calendar year 2016, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016
2.	Regulations Committee	Regulation 23.1 at page 33, P.U. Calendar, Volume- I, 2007	Calendar year 2016, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016

3.	Youth Welfare Committee	Regulation 4 at page 155-56 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017
4.	Publication Bureau Committee	Regulations 3.1 and 3.2 at page 179 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017
5.	Standing Committee to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations	Regulation 31 at page 14 of P.U. Calendar Volume-II, 2007	Calendar year 2016, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016

- NOTE:**
1. Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 for composition of Revising Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015 was enclosed **(Appendix-XX)**.
 2. Regulation 23.1 for composition of Regulation Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015 was enclosed **(Appendix-XX)**.
 3. Regulation 4 for composition of Youth Welfare Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2015 was enclosed **(Appendix-XX)**.
 4. Regulations 3.1 and 3.2 for composition of Publication Bureau Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2015 was enclosed **(Appendix-XX)**.
 5. Regulation 31 for composition of Standing Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015 was enclosed **(Appendix-XX)**.

7.

To appoint a Committee comprising 3 members of the Syndicate nominated by the Syndicate annually for the Calendar year to decide objections if any, against the decision of the Registrar regarding entry in the Register of electors for the Election of Ordinary Fellows-2016, under Regulation 7.4 at page 63 of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1, 2007 which reads as under:

“7.4: Objection, if any, against the decision of the Registrar, if received within the prescribed date, shall be decided by a Committee, comprising 3 members of the Syndicate nominated by the Syndicate annually for the Calendar year.”

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

18. To consider the formation of Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 1.1.2016 to 31.12.2016.

NOTE: The composition of Joint Consultative Machinery is as under:

(a) Chairman	To be nominated by the Syndicate from amongst its members
(b) One member of the Syndicate	To be nominated by the Syndicate
(c) Two non-Syndic Senators	To be nominated by the Syndicate
(d) Registrar, the Member-Secretary	
(e) Controller of Examinations	
(f) Finance & Development Officer	
(g) Five Office Bearers of P.U. Staff (Non-teaching) Association (PUSA)	
(h) President and General Secretary of P.U. Stenographers Association (PUSTA)	
(i) President and General Secretary of P.U.C.C.S.A.	
(j) President of Laboratory & Technical Staff Association	

Professor Navdeep Goyal proposed that, so far as the above-said items are concerned, the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky and Professor Keshav Malhotra seconded the proposal made by Professor Navdeep Goyal.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to appoint/constitute/form, on behalf of the Syndicate, -

1. two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2016 to 31.01.2017, under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007;
2. the following Committees for the period noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
1.	Revising Committee	Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32, P.U. Calendar, Volume- II, 2007	Calendar year 2016, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016
2.	Regulations Committee	Regulation 23.1 at page 33, P.U. Calendar, Volume- I, 2007	Calendar year 2016, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016
3.	Youth Welfare Committee	Regulation 4 at page 155-56 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017
4.	Publication Bureau Committee	Regulations 3.1 and 3.2 at page 179 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2017

5.	Standing Committee to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations	Regulation 31 at page 14 of P.U. Calendar Volume-II, 2007	Calendar year 2016, i.e., 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016
----	---	---	--

3. a Committee comprising 3 members of the Syndicate nominated by the Syndicate annually for the Calendar year to decide objections, if any, against the decision of the Registrar regarding entry in the Register of electors for the Election of Ordinary Fellows-2016, under Regulation 7.4 at page 63 of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1, 2007; and
4. form Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one year term commencing 1.1.2016 to 31.12.2016.

Issue regarding re-appointment of certain Assistant Professors at University Institute of Engineering & Technology

8. Considered if the following Assistant Professors in U.I.E.T. (Sr. No.1 to 37) be re-appointed (afresh) w.e.f. 04.01.2016 to 30.04.2016, i.e., up to end of academic session 2015-16 with one day break as usual, purely on temporary basis or till the post/s is/are filled by regular faculty, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person	Branch
1.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Maths
2.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Mgt.
3.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Mgt.
4.	Mr. 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	Bio-Tech.
13.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Mathematics
14.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Bio-Tech.
15.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Bio-Tech.
16.	Ms. Jyoti Sood	Physics
17.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
18.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
19.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
20.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
21.	Mr. Gurmukh Singh	IT
22.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
23.	Mr. Manu Bansal	IT
24.	Ms. Shweta Mehta	IT
25.	Ms. Manisha Kaushal	CSE
26.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
27.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Bio-Tech.
28.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	Micro-Electronics

29.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
30.	Dr. Gursharan Singh	Bio-Tech.
31.	Mr. Chander Prakash	Mech.
32.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	EEE
33.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
34.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Physics
35.	Ms. Leetika	Maths
36.	Mr. Munish Kansal	Maths
37.	Mr. Gurjinder Singh	Maths

NOTE: 1. The present term of temporary appointment of the above mentioned Assistant Professors enlisted at Sr. No. 1 to 37 had expired on 31.12.2015.

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that they have sent names of 37 persons for re-appointing them afresh as Assistant Professors at University Institute of Engineering & Technology. There was also a representation from someone. Besides, it needed to be seen especially from the point of view that a lot of appointments have been made at University Institute of Engineering & Technology during the last 4-5 years. In many cases they have not relieved the temporarily appointed persons even after making the regular appointments on the posts against which the persons were appointed on temporary basis. The representation says that although the workload is not there, many people are continuing especially in the subjects like Mathematics, Applied Sciences, etc. In such matters, they usually authorize the Vice-Chancellor. He, therefore, suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to take care of this problem. If nothing is found objectionable, the Vice-Chancellor could approve re-appointment of these Assistant Professors afresh, on behalf of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that right now these are the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committees of University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET) and it is assumed that the Academic and Administrative Committees have done their job, but the manpower audit is on. The AICTE is very insistent that the faculty should be appointed on regular basis. The NAAC report is also insisting that the faculty should be appointed on regular basis at UIET and particularly they want that there should be Ph.D. faculty at UIET because the research output of UIET is a little bit lower side vis-à-vis of other Departments of the University. There is also a structural problem because when the UIET was conceived, it was conceived as an Engineering College. Right from the beginning, the construct of the building happened in such a manner that adequate space has not been kept aside for the research labs. of the faculty of UIET. This lacuna is there in most of the Engineering Colleges and even IIT's of the country. The Engineering research today is needed more than anything else because if the manufacturing base of the country and entrepreneurship of the country is to be improved, the engineering base, i.e., M.Tech. needs good research labs. As such, innovation part has to be encouraged in the UIET. Some bit of resources are also needed for the purpose and there has to be a campaign, on behalf of the UIET, that they should have tie up with the industry and they should create research labs. in the premises of the UIET or South Campus so that the research

infrastructure for UIET could be created. In IIT Kanpur and Mumbai all these things have been done and they need to do these at UIET. UIET faculty also has to be regularized as the non-regularized faculty is also creating problem. Professor Keshav Malhotra said that even though more than 100 faculty members are working in the UIET, these 37 are recommended to be re-appointed afresh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why, there is a need to complete the manpower audit at UIET at the earliest. In fact, there is need to complete the manpower audit immediately – (i) at UIET; (ii) at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital; and UIAMS also.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that as suggested by Professor Navdeep Goyal, they must see whether there is extra faculty members working at University Institute of Engineering & Technology in spite of so many regular faculty members. He stated that M.Phil. course is being offered at P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar. Whenever they invited candidates for Walk-in-Interviews, Ph.D. and meritorious candidates, did not come for Walk-in-Interviews. Resultantly, simple M.A. candidates got appointed and are working there. Since M.Phil. contained dissertation and students needs guidance, he thinks simple M.A. teacher cannot provide the guidance for the purpose. He, therefore, suggested that, if Ph.D. candidates are not available for appointment at P.U. Regional Centre/s through Walk-in-Interviews, at least M.Phil. candidate/s should be appointed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the arising out of matter/s would be discussed later on. At the moment, they should discuss the issue of UIET, and at this juncture they have no option because the session is on. As such, they should go ahead with these appointments, but before their term comes to end, they must complete the manpower audit. Actually, he had talked to Professor A.K. Bhandari that before they advertise the positions next time, they must do the assessment of this component of the University because this is a very large component.

Professor Navdeep Goyal urged the Vice-Chancellor to form a Committee to examine whether appointments on temporary/*ad hoc*/contract basis are actually required or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said, “Okay”, he would make a Committee of Syndics for the purpose.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is also needed to be looked into whether the appointments of non-teaching staff on temporary/*ad hoc*/contract basis is also actually required or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, they needed to delink the issue of non-teaching staff from the teaching staff; otherwise, the issue is becoming so bulky that they are unable to attend to it. Though it is required in both the cases, they have to adopt different procedure/s.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that actually the resolved part is that they are authorizing the Vice-Chancellor to take the decision in the matter, including the formation of the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No". He suggested that these appointments should be approved as the Vice-Chancellor had already reasoned that the session is on, but by the time their term expires, the recommendations of the Committee, whichever to be appointed, must be received.

The Vice-Chancellor said that before the commencement of the next academic session, they must have the recommendations of the Committee, so that they could have a system in place.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether all these teachers have come through a panel and are qualified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that *prima facie* they are qualified.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all are not qualified.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, in fact, he also wanted to say this because they are also facing such problems in the Colleges. He drew the attention of House towards few lines mentioned at page 28 of the Appendix, which say "that a teacher appointed on contract/temporary basis, on his/her appointment as such, be not interviewed again until his/her interview for appointment on regular basis is held or the break is required as per law for temporary service". Since they are also facing similar problem in the Colleges, they should be told as to what is the legal position of the University. Whether they could not advertise these positions again on contract/temporary basis? So far as he knew, the legal position is that the eligible person/s could not be replaced on the same terms and conditions until his/her/their work and conduct is satisfactory, but those who are not eligible, as said by Professor Navdeep Goyal that perhaps some of these persons are not eligible, whether they could allow them to join without the advertisement. He should be enlightened about this as it is a very important matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and couple of other members said that such persons could not be allowed to be continued/join again.

Continuing further, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that but what is happening is that they in their Government Colleges are offering certain self-financing courses under higher education institutions and the constitution of that society permits them to admit students and appoint faculty only on contract basis. But what most of the Colleges are doing is they did not advertise the posts against which eligible persons are working, if their work and conduct is satisfactory. And right from the start of the academic session, they give them the appointment. So far as ineligible persons are concerned, they do advertise the posts. He wanted to know as to what is the legal position of the University. Out of these 37 persons, as said by Professor Navdeep Goyal, several are not eligible.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that he did not know whether several persons out of these are ineligible, but a couple of them are ineligible.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could figure it out. If they authorize him, he could appoint a small Committee of the Syndicate, which would check the eligibility of each one of these persons, and if

any one of them is found to be ineligible, the matter would be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there are 2-3 types of cases and what Shri Raghbir Dyal has said is that, maybe somebody amongst these 37 persons is not eligible. The first question is that whether they appointed any ineligible person at the first stage. The second is that the person was eligible at the time of his/her initial appointment, but with the passage of time, the eligibility changed. A decision was taken in view of judgement of Punjab & Haryana High Court that those, who are continuing on temporary basis, they may not be relieved till they are replaced by the regular appointees.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that they could be relieved, but appointments against them could not be made.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the question is if a particular person is not required anymore, they could relieve him/her and there is no bar on them, but no person could replace him/her. They would relieve those persons because they are neither required nor eligible. But what about a person, who is not eligible, but they require a person and they could neither relieve him/her nor replace him/her. Meaning thereby, if they take this step, they would be discriminating, maybe they are compelled to make discrimination. So instead of taking this thing into account, if some of the people are not required, they could relieve them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to keep in mind human, technical and legal positions.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have also to see the angle as they are facing in the case of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital that there are big number (6-8) teachers, who right from the inception of Dental Institute are working there and they really got support from them, but in the meantime, the eligibility changed. Now, they also feel that those persons should not be shunted out.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could ask somebody to leave who has served their (University) own interest.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the same is the case in University Institute of Engineering & Technology, where also certain persons are working for the last so many years, and in the meantime, the eligibility has changed. So it would be really painful, if they are thrown out now. Probably, this is one of the reasons that since they have the orders of the High Court, they should be allowed to continue. But Professor Navdeep Goyal has rightly suggested that if some of them are not required, they should be relieved.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the University is always expanding. So it could be possible that a person is not required at UIET or Dental Institute, but he/she might be required somewhere else, where they could accommodate him/her. The way the governance of this University happens, he does not think that anyone is appointed wrongly at the initial stage because it passes through several stages. Only a rare case could be there, where a wrong appointment could have been made at the initial stage. Personally, he does not think that any wrong has been done, but they should look

into it, so that they do not get into any technical problem for violating UGC Regulations.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has talked about the human angle that those who have served their cause for several years, they should be compensated. He said that in their Constituent Colleges, several persons have been worked, who have been appointed through panels and have been allowed to join after getting Medical Certificate that they are fit and are also eligible. Now, if the posts are advertised and they are made to compete with other eligible persons, it is quite possible that other meritorious persons are recommended for appointment.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the persons referred to by Shri Raghbir Dyal were, in fact, appointed through Walk-in-Interview, and in the Walk-in-Interviews meritorious persons do not come.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would give consideration to all kinds of things.

Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi said that certain persons have been appointed, who were eligible at the time of their initial appointment, but in the meantime, the eligibility conditions changed. Now, they could ask them to fulfil the revised eligibility conditions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is what they are doing in the case of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital. In fact, they are trying to find a via media, so that there is least dissatisfaction.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that, in future, whatever is received from the UGC or MHRD or other regulatory body should not be adopted and implemented in toto; rather such problem should be taken care of.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the following Assistant Professors, who were working at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (Sr. No.1 to 37), be re-appointed (afresh) w.e.f. 04.01.2016 to 30.04.2016, i.e., up to end of academic session 2015-16 with one day break as usual, purely on temporary basis or till the post/s is/are filled by regular faculty, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person	Branch
1.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Maths
2.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Mgt.
3.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Mgt.
4.	Mr. 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	Bio-Tech.
13.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Mathematics
14.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Bio-Tech.
15.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Bio-Tech.
16.	Ms. Jyoti Sood	Physics
17.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
18.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
19.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
20.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
21.	Mr. Gurmukh Singh	IT
22.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
23.	Mr. Manu Bansal	IT
24.	Ms. Shweta Mehta	IT
25.	Ms. Manisha Kaushal	CSE
26.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
27.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Bio-Tech.
28.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	Micro-Electronics
29.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
30.	Dr. Gursharan Singh	Bio-Tech.
31.	Mr. Chandar Prakash	Mech.
32.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	EEE
33.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
34.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Physics
35.	Ms. Leetika	Maths
36.	Mr. Munish Kansal	Maths
37.	Mr. Gurjinder Singh	Maths

- (2) the Vice-Chancellor, be authorized to appoint a small Committee of the Syndicate, which would check the eligibility of each one of these persons, and if any one of them is found to be ineligible, the matter be placed before the Syndicate.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 10.12.2015 regarding pre-ponement of date of promotion of Dr. (Ms.) Mamta Rani, Assistant Professor

9. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 10.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to look into the representation of Dr. (Ms.) Mamta Rani, Assistant Professor in Education, University School of Open Learning, regarding pre-ponement of date of promotion as Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2).

RESOLVED: That the Dr. Mamta Rani, Assistant Professor in Education, University School of Open Learning, be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **07.09.2009**, after giving her benefit of 10 marks for participation in the workshop at New Delhi w.e.f. 1st June to 8th June 2009, and giving the benefit of exemption in attending Orientation/Refresher Course (as per UGC letter No.F.1-2/2009(EC/PS) Pt. VIII, dated 17th December 2012 extending the date up to 31.12.2013 for participation in Orientation/Refresher Course ...), as she fulfils all the requirements for promotion, i.e., Refresher Course/Orientation Course, etc., up to 31.12.2013.

The following Item 10 on the agenda was withdrawn:**Withdrawn Item**

10. To consider if, by-election, for 02 seats of Senate vacated by Dr. (Mrs.) Puneet Bedi, and Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath is to be conducted for the remaining term of the Senate i.e. upto 31.10.2016.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 18.10.2015 (Para 20) has resolved that by-election for the 3 vacant seats of Senate, (i.e. two from the Heads of affiliated Arts Colleges and one from the Faculty of Law) which fell vacant recently, be conducted for the remaining term of the present Senate, i.e., up to 31.10.2016 and the Registrar be appointed as Returning Officer and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized for other by-election related issues, if any.

2. An office note enclosed.

Schedule for certain constituencies for the Election of Section 2016

11. Considered the schedule (**Appendices-XXIV**) for the following constituencies for the Election of Senate 2016, pursuant to the dates of the Election duly approved by the Chancellor (**Appendix-XXIV**), under Regulation 9 at page 64 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

- (i) Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University;
- (ii) Readers and Lecturers on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University;
- (iii) Principals of the Technical and Professional Colleges;
- (iv) Members of the staff of Technical and Professional Colleges;
- (v) Principals of affiliated Arts Colleges;
- (vi) Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers of affiliated Arts Colleges;
- (vii) Members of various Faculties

NOTE: 1. Regulation 9 at page 64 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“Whenever an election is due to be held, the Registrar shall notify the date of election (for form of Notification, see Regulations), and shall publish the Register of Electors of all the categories by causing a copy of each of them affixed on the office Notice Board in accordance with the schedule

of dates approved by the
Syndicate xxx xxx xxx.

- (i) xxx xxx xxx
- (ii) xxx xxx xxx
- (iii) xxx xxx xxx

2. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the schedule **(Appendix-XXIV)** for the Election of Ordinary Fellows by the Registered Graduates Constituency to be held on 25.09.2016.
3. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXIV)**.

Initiating the discussion, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would like to seek the opinion of the House on the reforms required in the Registered Graduate Constituency. He was elected as a member of the Senate from the Graduate constituency. There are so many practical difficulties and lacunae in the enrolment process. He pointed out that when the new votes for this constituency are being prepared, 4-5 forms of a single graduate or postgraduate are received for enrolment. It is learnt that the data about the graduates/postgraduates is collected from the colleges and due to the fake residential address being filled in those forms, they are allotted the polling booths somewhere else. He could cite examples of the students, the forms of which he himself had got filled up and originally signed from the students. However, their polling booths were set up at Rampura Phul, Nabha, Chandigarh, etc. They did not have a mechanism through which they could verify the residential address of the voters. He requested that the residential proof of the voters should be checked. He has come to know the electoral rolls have not been revised since the year 1948. However, it might not be possible to revise the same at this stage. But, they could do one thing that when the fresh enrolment of voters is being done, a separate register could be prepared and the identity of the voters could be verified. This exercise could solve two problems – (i) that the identity of the voters would be established and the fake voting would be curbed. It is a very important issue for the House to discuss. There are so many identity proofs mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar which are required to be produced at the time of voting. One of those identity proofs is that a certificate having photograph of the voter attested by the Head of the Institute or Gazetted Officer would be valid. The Election Commission has given a list of so many documents, which every person would be having like Voter Identity Card, Aadhar Card, Driving License, Passport, etc. But it has been seen that anyone could cast the vote on the identity certificate having photograph of the voter attested by the Head of the Institute or Gazetted Officer. This should be stopped. Being in Government service, he had worked as Presiding Officer in various elections where the polling agents are provided a ballot paper account after the completion of the voting process mentioning that how many votes have been polled in a ballot box. During the last election of Senate, he had seen at the time of counting that the counterfoils were found in the ballot boxes due to which the counting process was stopped for about 3-4 hours. The teams deputed for counting worked days

together tirelessly. The counting work is a very difficult job. The team worked very hard continuously for 6-7 days with the Returning Officer. He requested that the ballot boxes should be properly sealed and an account of the votes polled should be provided. The counting process is a long one and time tested and they do not any doubt. At the time of counting of votes, there is no way that they could see how many voters were cancelled and for what reasons. The candidates should have the right to randomly check the cancelled votes so that they could come to know the reasons for which votes had been cancelled, whether it is due to wrong choice of preference or writing in a wrong way. These are very important issues and needed to be reformed. Whether the Registered Graduate Constituency is to continue or not, it could be discussed later on. He is not talking about it. Referring to the last date for receipt of application for fresh enrolment alongwith fee, he said that they are having just one month for fresh enrolment of voters from the date of notification, which is as per the provisions of the Panjab University Calendar. As far as he knew, whether it is in violation of the Calendar or not, they had been extending the last date for fresh enrolment and in the year 2012, it was 31st May or 30th April. He had no objection to the proposed last date, but it is to be extended or as the House might feel, the same should be extended today itself. Later on, some members might not say that the fresh enrolment could not be done due to which they could not get adequate votes. He did not want that the Calendar be violated. He would stick to the proposed dates. He would be the last person to say that the Calendar be violated. But if it is to be violated by majority or some other decision, it should be seen. He had given his viewpoints regarding the reforms to be brought in the election process.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he agreed with what Shri Raghbir Dyal has said about the identify proofs required for casting of the vote particularly that a certificate with photograph attested by Principal of a College affiliated to Panjab University should not be considered. They had seen in the past that fake votes are cast on the basis of such certificates. Secondly, if there was any violation of any provisions of the Panjab University Calendar, it should not be repeated in future.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that marking of the preference by the voters in numerals could create problems as due to some bad intention by someone, the numeral 1 could be easily changed to 7, 9, etc.. During the last Senate election, there was some objection that the preference 1 was changed by using the sketch pen. The Bar Council of India has also the same election process and the preferences are marked by the voters by writing the preference in words. He suggested that the preferences should be written in words, such as First, 1st, etc.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the as per the guidelines of the Election Commission, the intention of the voter should be clearly understood and the preferences could be written in words.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the election to various bodies of the University, if somebody instead of cross puts a tick mark, that vote is cancelled and they as members of the Senate in every election observe that though the intention of the voter is very clear. There is a particular style of marking of preference to be used so that nobody is

able to put any kind of a sign which could be recognized. That was the reason why a particular style of marking of preference had been prescribed. He agreed with the presumption of Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa that the numeral could be changed. Why should there be apprehension at all that the preference could be tempered with. That means that they are apprehending that the ballot boxes are opened and the ballots are treated differently when the voters have gone after casting the votes. That needs to be checked because but that again would be against the Regulations because in the Regulations, it has been clearly mentioned that only a particular style would be considered. He suggested that they should rather emphasize that no irregularity or illegality is allowed to be committed by the voter or the polling staff. The University is following the Regulations and the Calendar especially in case of election. The election law is the only law throughout the world of which even comma or full stop could not be changed, perhaps Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa would agree with him. All other laws could be reframed. In the University instead of referring to the Statute, they are referring to the practices which had been followed previously. If any such illegally had been committed since the last 10 years, instead of rectifying that, they continue to repeat the same. He has been saying so in the past also and again saying that the same could be due to oversight. He pointed out on page 36 of the Agenda, that the preliminary list of voters is to be made available in the University 47 days before the date of election, he has not been able to understand from where this deadlines of 47 days and others have come specially on the fact when the schedule is already given for the Faculties also, it has been explained that instead of 47 days, it has to be 19 days. He is sure that this must have come from the practice. Regulation 4 appearing at page 61 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I clearly says that for the election of Ordinary Fellows by the various categories mentioned in Section 13, sub-section (1) Clauses (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (h), except (a) meaning thereby the Registered Graduates, the Registrar shall issue to the institutions or electors of the category concerned, as the case may be, a notice in writing (Appendix B) and Appendix B is to be followed for six constituencies. As far as the schedule for the Registered Graduate Constituency is concerned, that is given separately. The Appendix B (Page 78) says that the preliminary register of electors to be made available 90 days before the date of election. He said that the schedule given on page 35 of the Agenda has to be followed in case of Faculties also which has been mentioned on page 36 except that the date which is 31.08.2016

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would adhere to the Calendar and after revising the schedule before finalizing, a draft would be sent to the members to check for oversight, if any.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he suggested all these things only in the interest of protocol. They have already got the approval from the Chancellor and after getting the approval from the Chancellor, the matter is placed before the Syndicate for consideration which should not have been so. In fact, the approval of the Chancellor is required only for the purpose of by-election and not for regular election. Every time they have been extending the dates for enrolment of voters for the Registered Graduates Constituency. Now, it is only one month left for the enrolment of voters. As per the Regulations, the Registrar is to issue notice every year for inviting enrolment applications and the voters get a chance to vote once in four years. They would be surprised that the Act provides for by-

election only for one Constituency which is Registered Graduates. If there is any vacancy in the Registered Graduates Constituency, by-election has to be held. It is good that the schedule has been got approved from the Chancellor otherwise the Syndicate would have approved the same. It would have been an embarrassment had they got it approved from the Chancellor in violation of the Regulations following the practice. These things should be taken care of.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the notice for enrolment of voters for the Registered Graduates Constituency should be issued every year on a fixed date.

This was agreed to.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the notice could be issued on 1st January every year. Sometime ago, it was thought that the notice is being issued. But when enquired, it came to light that the notice is not issued. The Senate elections are held every leap year. The whole process is to be completed before 31st October as the term of the Senate starts from 1st November. But since the approval is also to be obtained from the Chancellor after the elections are held, it will take time. After the elections are over, they have to again send to the Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the provisions of the Calendar would be followed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired what is resolved regarding the identity of the fresh enrolment of voters whose multiple enrolment forms are received. How could they know the genuine voters?

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that it should be mentioned that only the identity proofs issued by Government should be valid.

Professor Anil Monga enquired whether the videography of the polling booths is being done?

Shri Raghbir Dyal also said that the videography of the polling booth should be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as of today, the videography is not being done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the videography is to be done, then they have to take a decision in advance that the videography is to be done and if anything wrong is found, that booth is to be cancelled. He read in the newspapers that the University intends to use the Electronic Voting Machines (EVMs) where there are large number of voters. The intention is very well received. But the election laws could not be changed mid-way unless they change the Regulations under which the ballot paper has been prescribed. In the year 2004 also, an effort was made how to develop the software keeping in view the complex system of transferable votes. No such software could be available as the election of the President of India through the transferable votes is also held through ballot papers. He could not say as to how far that is correct. If such software could be available now, it could be thought of because the counting process is a very cumbersome one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that unless they have tested the available software, if any, they could not implement the same.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had also read in the newspapers that the EVMs would be used where the number of voters is large and ballot papers would be used where the number of voters is less. Such is not the case in the case of general elections. If they have any such technology, it should be used for all the polling booths. They could not have different parameters for different booths. Once they have approved the election schedule and the election process has been set in motion, they could not change that and whatever decision the House took that should be adhered to.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that his query is regarding the changed names. He said that in the College where he is serving, there are two teachers by the name of Iqbal Singh. When the voters were being enrolled, my name was written as Iqbal Singh Sandhu by the College Administration to have identification. Most of the Senate members know him by the name of I.S. Sandhu while others know by Iqbal Singh. There could be some misunderstanding of names at the time of voting. Has any date been fixed for getting the names corrected?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the schedule clearly provides for displaying the list of voters and there is a time for calling objections also. Citing his example, he said that if his name has mentioned as Ashok Kumar and he says that his name is Ashok Goyal. That is the claim made. Thereafter the final list is displayed for inviting objections and there is an opportunity for getting the corrections made. As far as the request for changing the name is concerned, it was discussed in the Syndicate also that if Iqbal Singh is popularly known as Iqbal Singh Sandhu, he would like his name to be mentioned as Iqbal Singh Sandhu alias Iqbal Singh. But in the University for reasons not known, it is mentioned as Iqbal Singh alias Iqbal Singh Sandhu. His name is Ashok Goyal alias Ashok Kumar. But it has not been corrected. The name has to be changed in the University records.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he had seen during the last 10-15 years that the participation of the rural graduates of Haryana in the Registered Graduate Constituency is very less as compared to the graduates from Punjab State because it is not being advertised there. No one from the State of Haryana has been elected in the Registered Graduate Constituency whereas a large number of students belonging to Haryana study in Panjab University. The graduates of remote areas could not get themselves registered as voters because the voter lists are not sent to those areas. Since the motive is to strengthen the democratic process, by sticking to a particular date for enrolment of voters, they are violating their rights to become voters. If it does not amount to violation of Calendar, as earlier the date had been extended up to 31st May, a special campaign could be initiated and a chance could be given to the people to get themselves registered by extending the date. It would be very good for everyone. This way, the percentage of participation would increase. The laws are made for the betterment of the society and could be amended.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it actually meant opening the decision which they had taken earlier.

Continuing Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he wanted to know what is the share of the students belonging to Haryana in this democratic process? If they really needed to strengthen the democratic process, the graduates of Haryana could be enrolled by launching a special campaign.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why such campaigns could not be launched in Uttar Pradesh, Delhi, Goa and Andaman & Nicobar Islands. He remembered that 2 polling booths were used to be set up at Port Blair. So it is not snatching a right from Haryana.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would stick to the Calendar and an advertisement would be given in the vernacular newspapers in addition to English newspapers. He requested the members to suggest the names of two vernacular newspapers and English newspapers.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested The Tribune as the English newspaper.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested Ajit as Punjabi newspaper.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that most of the people in rural areas of Haryana read Dainik Bhaskar and Amar Ujala newspapers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is nothing new. In fact, it is mandatory for them to give advertisement as per Regulation 3 to give wide publicity for enrolment of voters.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as suggested by the members, the advertisement would be given in Dainik Bhaskar, Amar Ujala and Ajit newspapers and press release to other newspapers.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired what kind of identity proof would be required at the time of voting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already decided that the identity proofs having photograph issued by Government such as Driving License, Aadhar Card, Voter Identity Card, Passport, PAN Card would be considered as valid proofs.

Professor Anil Monga suggested that the videography at the time of voting should be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could try to do it.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the photographs of the voters should be printed on the voter lists as is being done in the case of electoral rolls.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that for fresh enrolment, photograph of the candidates should be asked for along with the enrolment forms.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for fresh enrolment of voters, the photograph and a copy of the residence proof would be required to be submitted along with the enrolment form. The clause of producing certificate with photograph attested by Principal of a College affiliated to Panjab University would be deleted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the voter has to produce one of the identify proofs at the time of voting. For reasons best known to some members, the Registered Graduate Constituency has got a bad name. But it is not so. There are other constituencies also. He would not like to mention the name of any particular person but the fake voting also took place in the Teachers Constituency and that also of a teacher of the College, who was abroad or was hospitalized. If there are 2 lacs voters in the Graduate Constituency and 2000 bogus votes are polled, it is 1% of the total votes and if 1 bogus vote is polled out of 25 votes in any other constituency, it is 4% of the total votes. So it could be seen where the malpractices are more. He had also earlier suggested that in big centres like Regional Centres at Hoshiarpur, Ludhiana, Muktsar, a centralized booth for the College teachers and Principals could be set up to curb this practice as well as to save the money.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that it should not be so. He cited the example of a College at Sukhanand where out of 22-23 votes, only 12 votes were polled. If the polling booth is shifted to other places, the teachers would not be able to cast their vote.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying that for example if there are 5 Colleges at Abohar, a booth of all the Colleges could be set up in a single College so that the teachers could cast the vote a one place. It is obvious that a voter would not go to the other city to cast the vote. If they compare the data of last 24 years, an opportunity which is being given to the Graduate Constituency voters to cast their vote, in fact has been shrinking every day. The reason for this is that the voters from small cities were asked to cast their vote at bigger cities, thereafter to more bigger cities and in the last Senate election, the polling booths in Himachal Pradesh and Haryana were set up at district headquarters. If a teacher of an affiliated College, who is a part of the University could not go for casting the vote how do they expect from a graduate, who has nothing to do with the University except that he/she takes pride in saying that he/she is a graduate of Panjab University, to travel to 50 kilometer to cast vote. But at the same time, it was realized that it is not possible to create a booth where there are only 10 votes. They should take a rational view that at least at a particular booth, there should be a centralized booth. Of course Dr. I.S. Sandhu might agree, that in case of teachers, at the instance, instructions and pressure of the management of the College, votes are being cast. It is good that they have taken a decision that videography would be done. What the genuine candidates would do. It is in the interest of the candidates and the University and for the smooth conduct of election that he is suggesting this in case, it is acceptable.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that last time also some votes were made at other places. Where there are Centres for the Graduate constituency, the teachers could also cast their votes there. If there was not a centre for 2-3 Colleges, the teachers and the Principal could cast their vote at another place.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the Graduate Constituency, a limit had been fixed that if a particular number of votes are there, the polling booth would be created and if less than that number, the polling booth would not be created. A problem was faced that a voter who had the address of Malout, his/her name was printed in the voter list of Jalandhar. Due to this, the number of voters at Malout was

reduced and the centre could not be created and that person could not go to Jalandhar to cast the vote. It was not intentionally but due to some mistake. This should be rationalized.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to look at the data of the year 2008 and 2012, a small Committee of Syndics experienced in the matter could be formed to examine the issue.

This was agreed to.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested the names of Principal B.C. Josan, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Shri Raghbir Dyal. He said do not take it otherwise, that the office is creating a panic regarding the election schedule by taking the approval of the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate only in the case of Graduate Constituency and the reason given is that the people come and ask for the last date for enrolment of voters. Now the election process is to start 240 days before the date of election. So it could be easily said that still it is not decided. Only the last date for enrolment is to be informed for which the approval could be taken in anticipation of approval of Syndicate. The only thing which is to be decided is the date of election. He knew that all the things had been done in good faith keeping in view the smooth functioning.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) schedule (**Appendices-XXIV**) for the following constituencies for the Election of Senate 2016, pursuant to the dates of the Election duly approved by the Chancellor (**Appendix-XXIV**), under Regulation 9 at page 64 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, be approved as under:
 - (i) Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University, as per **Appendix-XXIV**;
 - (ii) Readers and Lecturers on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University, as per **Appendix-XXIV**;
 - (iii) Principals of the Technical and Professional Colleges, as per **Appendix-XXIV**;
 - (iv) Members of the staff of Technical and Professional Colleges, as per **Appendix-XXIV**;
 - (v) Principals of affiliated Arts Colleges, as per **Appendix-XXIV**;
 - (vi) Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers of affiliated Arts Colleges, as per **Appendix-XXIV**;
 - (vii) Schedule for members of various Faculties be prepared as per schedule given on Page 78-79 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I, 2007

- (2) an advertisement be given for fresh enrolment of voters for Registered Graduate Constituency in one English newspaper (The Tribune) and two vernacular newspapers, namely Dainik Bhaskar, Amar Ujala (Hindi), Ajit, Tribune (Punjabi) for giving wide publicity in addition to the press release in more newspapers. Besides, a notice in this regard be uploaded on the Panjab University website;
- (3) fresh enrolment forms be entertained only if supported by residence proof and a latest photograph;
- (4) videography of the polling of all the polling booths be done;
- (5) at the time of casting of vote, only the identify proofs as per Government of India such as Aadhar Card, Voter ID, Driving Licence, Passport, etc. would be valid. A certificate with photograph attested by Principal of a College affiliated to Panjab University will not suffice;
- (6) as provided in Regulation 3 at page 61 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, the notice for enrolment of fresh voters for the Registered Graduates Constituency be issued every year in the first week of January;
- (7) a small Committee of Syndics including Principal B.C. Josan, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Shri Raghbir Dyal be constituted to examine the issue related with creation of polling booths keeping in view the data of number of voters of the year 2008 and 2012.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the schedule, for the Election of Ordinary Fellows by the Registered Graduates Constituency approved by the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, be ratified.

Appointment of new Dean of University Instruction

12. Considered the appointment of new Dean of University Instruction, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date of joining, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U., Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U., Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

“The Senate, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, may, from time to time appoint one of the University Professors to hold the office of the Dean of University Instruction. The term of appointment shall be for one year which may be renewed for one

year more. *The amount and nature of the allowance to be granted to the Dean of University Instruction for performing the duties attached to this office shall be as determined by the Syndicate at the time of appointment”.

2. Professor A.K. Bhandari, Department of Mathematics was appointed as Dean University Instruction, w.e.f. 1.2.2014 and his term was extended for another year w.e.f. 1.2.2015, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 vide Senate Para VIII dated 29.3.2015. His term as such will be ending on 31.1.2016.
3. List of Professors in Panjab University as on 01.12.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the regulation says that the Senate, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, may, from time to time appoint one of the University Professors to hold the office of the Dean of University Instruction. As per the seniority list, Professor P.S. Jaswal is the senior-most Professor. Therefore, they should appoint Professor P.S. Jaswal as Dean of University Instruction and ask him whether he would like to join the Panjab University as Dean of University Instruction (DUI), and if he refused, the next senior person should be offered DUIship, for which the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor P.S. Jaswal is on leave up to 27th February 2017.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that most likely, Professor P.S. Jaswal would ask for extension in leave after the expiry of his present leave.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there was a news item stating that when somebody asked Professor P.S. Jaswal that he has been appointed as Dean of University Instruction of Panjab University, whether he would join or not. Professor P.S. Jaswal had told that he could reply only after the receipt of the offer.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the proposal made by Professor Navdeep Goyal is very good. Professor P.S. Jaswal should be offered the DUIship. However, he was really surprised and at the same time also disturbed that the list which has been annexed is not the seniority list of Professors of Panjab University, but tentative seniority list of Professors of Panjab University, which meant till date they do not have the seniority list of Professor of Panjab University. When this tentative list of Professors is going to be finalized is yet to be seen. Either the word “Tentative” has wrongly been mentioned or there are some decisions which are still to be taken as to who is the senior or who not. Professor P.S. Jaswal should be appointed the next Dean of University Instruction of the University and should be given the offer, and if he did not accept the same, the matter should be again placed before the Syndicate, as it is a serious matter. Secondly, he also wanted to point out that he has received another list of

Professors (as on 11.01.2016) yesterday. He thought that it would not take much time for the University to ensure, at least before the appointing the next Dean of University Instruction, the exact/correct seniority list of Professors of Panjab University is prepared. In the list of Professor received by him yesterday, against more than 60 Professors, the words “yet to be confirmed” have been mentioned. As such, there seems to be problem in the annexed list and the list which they received yesterday, on which nowhere it has been mentioned that it is the seniority list of Professors. He, therefore, suggested that they should prepare a seniority list of Professors once for all. However, since in both the lists Professor P.S. Jaswal is the senior-most Professor, he should be appointed next Dean of University Instruction and should be offered the position, and they should wait for the outcome. In the meanwhile, prepare the correct seniority list of Professors of the University. In case, Professor P.S. Jaswal declines, the matter should be placed before the Syndicate again, and till then, Professor A.K. Bhandari be requested to continue as Dean of University Instruction. He further said that his request in this regard is that they should not take the decision regarding Dean of University Instruction in haste. In fact, it has given them an opportunity to correct all the things relating to the seniority list of the Professors.

Professor Shelley Walia pointed out that there are certain Professors, promoted under the Career Advancement Scheme of the UGC, who have been shown as confirmed exactly after one year of their becoming eligible for Professorship. Hence, there is discrimination.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would get the same corrected.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) since Professor P.S. Jaswal is the senior-most Professor in both the lists, it be recommended to the Senate that Professor P.S. Jaswal, be appointed the next Dean of University Instruction of Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date he joins, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007;
- (2) Professor P.S. Jaswal be given the formal offer of DUIShip, and wait for the outcome. However, if he declines, the matter be again placed before the Syndicate along with the final/approved seniority list of Professors of Panjab University. In the meantime, the correct seniority list of Professors of the University be prepared; and
- (3) until the next Dean of University Instruction joins, Professor A.K. Bhandari be requested to continue as the Dean of University Instruction of the University.

Arising out of the above, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to make a request that they should be believed that the members of the Syndicate be given time to go through the item/s and apply their

minds. He urged that, in future, no supplementary and table agenda should be brought, and if supplementary/table agenda is to be brought at all, only urgent matters, which require urgent attention/consideration of the Syndicate should be brought as supplementary/table agenda.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that he received some agenda when he was leaving Muktsar for Chandigarh to attend the meeting of the Syndicate. Certain agenda papers he received in the University Guest House and some more here in the Syndicate Room.

Qualifications for the post of Dean, College Development Council

13. Considered qualifications for the post of the Dean of College Development Council (DCDC), P.U. to be advertised.

- NOTE:**
1. Existing qualifications for the post of Dean College Development Council (DCDC) enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).
 2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that the post of Dean, College Development Council was advertised some years ago with certain qualifications and now only two three things have been added.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the qualification B, i.e., "An outstanding Professional with established reputation in the relevant field who has made significant contributions to the knowledge in the concerned/allied/relevant discipline, to be substantiated by credentials" should be deleted.

Shri Raghbir Dyal also said that Clause 'B' should be deleted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the qualification at "B" as pointed out by Professor Navdeep Goyal would be deleted.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the Vice-Chancellor has proposed qualifications *inter alia* that score of category I & II not to be taken into consideration for determining eligibility. But it is not clear which score it related to. In fact, it should be score of category I & II in a API. Secondly, number 4 should be "approved Principals of Colleges working in Professor's grade be also made eligible.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have a very rigid criteria for the post of Dean, College Development Council. In fact, they are following UGC Rules.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are approved Principals, who have been appointed in accordance with the UGC norms and there are certain Principals, who had been appointed before the implementation of new UGC Regulations/Rules, and might not fulfil the new conditions. So they should include all approved Principals of Colleges who meet the criteria as per the API. If they did not include all the approved Principals, it would amount to discrimination. Since they have not suggested that only the serving Professors of Panjab University are eligible and instead they have suggested serving Professors in Indian Universities (including affiliated Colleges) appointed and/or promoted under Career Advancement Scheme following UGC norms, are eligible for

consideration of appointments as Dean, College Development Council, approved Principals of Colleges who meet the criteria as per the API should be made eligible.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that approved Principals of NAAC Accredited Colleges affiliated to other Universities should be made eligible for the post of Dean, College Development Council.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, Clause 4 should be "Approved Principals of NAAC Accredited Colleges working in the Professor's grade be also made eligible to apply".

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should give importance to only approved Principals of NAAC Accredited Colleges and make them eligible for the post of Dean, College Development Council, and it could be done only in the case of Principals and not Professors.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Vice-Chancellor has proposed certain additional qualifications, but the question is whether the additional qualifications are really required. He added that they had adopted the UGC Guidelines 2009 relating to extension of affiliation, wherein it has been mentioned that the Recruitment Committee would be strictly in accordance with the UGC Guidelines.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out, in fact, in May 2011 the Syndicate had decided that the UGC Notification/Guidelines relating to the post of Dean, College Development Council, be followed strictly.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that the High Court might grant stay to Professor Naval Kishore up to the age of 65 years and in that eventuality he would continue as Dean, College Development Council.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that the process for filling up the post of Dean, College Development Council should be started immediately as the filling up would take a long time.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that even if they start the process for filling up the post of Dean, College Development Council now, the post could not be filled up by the time the Senate meets in March 2016.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is their suggestions not contradictory to the fourth condition, i.e., "a minimum score as stipulated in the Academic Performance Indicator (API) based Performance Based Appraisal System (PBAS)".

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for appointment of Professors in open selection only category III is to be counted and not categories I & II.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the following qualifications be prescribed for the post of Dean, College Development Council, Panjab University, to be advertised:

1. A minimum of 10 years of teaching experience in University/College, and or experience in research at the University/ National level Institutions/Industries, including experience of guiding candidates for research at doctoral level.
2. An eminent scholar with Ph.D. qualification(s) in the concerned/ allied/ relevant discipline and published work of high quality, actively engaged in research with evidence of published work with a minimum of 10 publications as books and/or research/policy papers.
3. Contribution to educational innovation, design of new curricula and courses and technology – mediated teaching learning process.
4. A minimum score as stipulated in the Academic Performance Indicator (API) based Performance based Appraisal System (PBAS).
5. API Score of category I & II, not to taken into consideration for determining eligibility.
6. In category III, capping to be operative, as in the case of Professors.
7. Serving Professors in Indian Universities (including affiliated Colleges) appointed and/or promoted under Career Advancement Scheme following UGC norms, are eligible for consideration of appointments as Dean, College Development Council.
8. Approved Principals of NAAC Accredited Colleges working in the Professor's grade be also made eligible to apply.

NOTE: The appointment will be on a tenure basis for three years and the person can be re-appointed for another three years or up to maximum age of 60 years, whichever is earlier.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they have adopted UGC Regulations in toto so far as affiliation conditions for Colleges, other requirements, etc. are concerned. The UGC allows the required land of 5 acres to be scattered at three places in hilly areas provided the lands are not separate by more than 2 kms. But they have probably in the University insisted that the 5 acres land should be only at one place. Fortunately, there are some hilly areas in the territorial jurisdiction of Panjab University, including Hoshiarpur, Ropar and Ferozepur Districts, and maybe at some more places. The Government of India's Gazette notification also says so. He pleaded that this should be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to get it as an agenda item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not required to be placed as an agenda item, and instead they authorized the Vice-Chancellor for the purpose.

This was agreed to.

**Letter dated 4.1.2016 of
Under Secretary, MHRD,
Government of India**

14. Considered letter dated 04.01.2016 received from the Under Secretary to the Govt. of India, MHRD, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi, with regard to necessary changes to be incorporated in the PUCASH Policy in consonance with the Central Act. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor gave the background of the item. They have PUCASH, a policy which they have adopted and PUCASH is the constitution of a Committee that they have adopted via ACASH. As per the Government of India Act, that ought not to be there. PUCASH has to be constituted in a certain way as per the Act. They have done that now. But, they overwrote the procedure, and finally the PUCASH has to be recast as per the Act processing it through the Syndicate and Senate. The Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) now requires that they have to make certain changes in their policy so that next time when they constitute PUCASH, they do not have to go through all these things. The Syndicate had decided that a job be given to the Committee of the Syndicate having Chairperson, PUCASH as a member, and come up with the changes that ought to be made in the PUCASH document. But for a variety of reasons, the Committee could not give the output and the term of the Syndicate came to an end on 31st December, 2015. The matter is again back to the new Syndicate. The previous Committee constituted by the Syndicate made a Sub-Committee which was being chaired by Professor A.K. Bhandari, who was a member of the Syndicate. Now the whole matter has come to a halt. Now they should constitute a Committee on behalf of this Syndicate which would do that process, give the output and that output would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting. They have some time because the present PUCASH has passed through a process. The only urgency in the matter is that they have to send a reply to the MHRD that they have taken some action in the matter. The MHRD is sending letters time and again to update them. He would ask for some time on behalf of the University and Syndicate that they would place the matter before the Syndicate in its next meeting. He requested the members to suggest names or he could form a small Committee amongst the present Syndicate having Professor Nishtha Jaswal as a member and the Committee could give the output which would be placed before the Syndicate. In the meanwhile, he would seek some time from Ministry of Human Resource Development giving all these details.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that some letter was circulated. He wanted to clarify because the way it has been circulated in the form of a note as if the Committee which was constituted by the Syndicate has failed to perform its duty, has failed to function and has failed to meet the deadline by not giving the recommendations before 31st December, 2015 and as the term of the Syndicate has come to an end on 31st December, 2015, it is mentioned specifically that the Committee has become infructuous. First of all, he did not know that there was any such deadline given to the Committee that the report has to be submitted before 31st December, then there was no occasion for the Committee to become infructuous. If that was so, have they made all the Committee infructuous formed by the earlier Syndicate? It is probably for the first time that such a problem has been faced that at the end of the term of the Syndicate, the Committee appointed by the Syndicate has become infructuous. Secondly, it has been mentioned by the office that twice a man happened to visit the residence of Shri Ashok Goyal though he gives concession to the

language used by the office. It is mentioned that he was told that Shri Ashok Goyal is not there, as if he was at home and conveyed wrongly that he was not there. It could have been mentioned that Shri Ashok Goyal was not available at home. As if he had not signed the minutes. He wanted to clarify that a man came for getting the minutes signed. Of course, he was not to discuss with that man as to what were the discrepancies. He informed the Chairman of the Committee about the discrepancies, to get the same corrected and as and when he would come, he would sign the minutes. Finally, he was not told that one day somebody goes to his house who was told to come after two days. There was a telephonic call also which he could not attend as he was not available. Next day, he got a message from the Vice-Chancellor to finalise the minutes in consultation with the Dean of University Instruction. Leaving everything in between, he came to the University talking to Dean of University Instruction if he was available, he would come. The Dean of University Instruction was available, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) came to the University. But suddenly the Dean of University Instruction had to go to the Secretariat for some meeting and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) waited there for 2½ hours only to finalise the minutes. After the finalization of the minutes, the Dean of University Instruction said that these minutes are to be placed before the Syndicate to which he (Shri Ashok Goyal) enquired the reason. The Committee has formed a Sub-Committee which has been told what has to be done and submit the report to the main Committee for consideration and onward recommendation to the Syndicate. Till that time, he wondered if a Sub-Committee has been constituted, then why it is to be taken to the Syndicate, he could not understand it. Then thereafter, yesterday he got a note that the Committee has become infructuous. Now, for all practical purposes, Dean of University Instruction was the Chairman of the Committee which had Professor Navdeep Goyal, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) as members, probably the Registrar and may be Professor Ronki Ram. All the members except Professor Ronki Ram are sitting in this meeting. His simple submission is that let them not try to give a message that a particular Committee has failed to discharge its functions unless and until it has been specifically suggested to give its report by a fixed date. He wondered that when the decision was taken that the Sub-Committee would meet, why the Sub-Committee did not meet for that the minutes were not to be approved. The members were authorized to finalise the report and that was the spirit that the minutes could be prepared within 2-3 days and finalised. But the way it has been projected as if Shri Ashok Goyal is intentionally evading signing the minutes, as if the Committee did not intentionally finish the job, as if the Committee had been informed that its term would end on 31st December, 2015, he had no objection to that. In fact, 20 years back, he had raised this that if some Syndicate had taken a decision, that could not be followed now. They said no, it is to be followed and a decision taken by the Syndicate has to be followed till it is amended. He has not been able to comprehend how with the term of the Syndicate coming to an end, the Committee has become infructuous. His suggestion is that let the same Committee function and if the Vice-Chancellor wanted to add some members, 1-2 members of the present Syndicate be added. Let them not try to give an impression that as if the Committee, he would not use the words, is completely inefficient. Secondly, it was explained as if it was necessary to do this job immediately because probably the term of PUCASH has not ended on 31st December. PUCASH is still in existence. It is only to take care of PUCASH. Otherwise it should not also be taken as if the Committee has become infructuous. As far as

MHRD's letter is concerned, he did not know why the MHRD has separated the issue of Professor Rajesh Gill from that of the constitution of PUCASH by saying that the matter be taken to the Chancellor of the University for discussion but whatever letter the MHRD has written for incorporating some changes in PUCASH, they are still giving the same title 'complaint of Professor Rajesh Gill'. It gives an impression as if the incorporation is to be done only to take care of the complaint of Professor Rajesh Gill, which is not correct. As far as the reply to the letter that what is to be responded to MHRD is concerned, they simply have to say that the matter is under process, the Committee has met, probably it should be done by February. Let them not seek time that they have constituted another Committee sending a signal that they have not done anything. They could say that the Committee is working on it. They have foolproof policy. If that is only to give the reply, that is what he wanted to suggest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now Professor A.K. Bhandari is not a member of the Syndicate. He was Chairman of the Committee as a member of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor A.K. Bhandari was Chairman of the Committee as Dean of University Instruction and not as Professor A.K. Bhandari. He would tell why because, this was also discussed in detail because he did not want to make the Committee of Syndics only since he wanted to have the Chairperson, PUCASH also. As far as the reservation of the Vice-Chancellor about the recommendations of the Committee is concerned, he could understand the same. Since everything was discussed in detail, it was to give an official draft/shape.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he tried to work on it and figured it out that the Sub-Committee was constituted during the meeting of the Committee on 8th December and the Sub-Committee never met. He asked Professor A.K. Bhandari why the Sub-Committee could not meet who said that since the minutes were not finalized, the meeting of the Sub-Committee could not be convened. So, he is in a catch-22 situation. He could not share all these things with MHRD because that reflects even worse how the University is functioning. That is the reason. The Sub-Committee could not decide the matter and let the matter go back to the main Committee and they could replace Professor Ronki Ram with another member of the Syndicate and proposed the name of Professor Shelley Walia.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that alright. The Sub-Committee was constituted in the same spirit as sometimes they do it in the Syndicate also that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to look into a matter. The word is that a Sub-Committee be constituted to prepare a draft policy because all the points were discussed there. They thought that Professor Nishtha Jaswal, the Dean of University Instruction and the Registrar are well conversant with the requirements as well as the Act as well as whatever is to be changed. So it was only to prepare a draft. But still if the Vice-Chancellor feels, the Committee could meet and again the Sub-Committee could be requested to prepare the draft policy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee should submit its recommendations before 21st February so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting which could be held on 27th February. 27th February is Saturday and if the meeting of the

Syndicate is held on Sundays, the office staff has to work on Saturdays also due to which they could not get off-day. That is why the Syndicate meetings are preferred on Saturdays so that the staff could avail an off-day on Sunday. However, he is okay with Sunday also.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the meetings could be scheduled sometimes on Saturdays and sometimes on Sundays.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Committee gives its recommendations by 21st February, the same could be placed as supplementary agenda before the Syndicate in its meeting to be held on 28th February.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be tried that supplementary agenda is not sent except emergency cases.

RESOLVED: That Professor Shelley Walia be made a member of the Committee in place of Professor Ronki Ram, earlier constituted by the Vice-Chancellor as per the decision of Syndicate dated 18.10.2015, Para 9, to recommend changes to be incorporated in the existing Policy Against Sexual Harassment (Rules and Procedures) of Panjab University, ensuring that it is in consonance with the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. The Committee be requested to make recommendations by 21st February, 2016 so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate meeting to be held in the month of February, 2016.

Issue regarding letters forwarded by the Chancellor's Office

15. Item 15 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

15. To examine issues contained in the letters forwarded by the Chancellor's Office.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that these are the letters, which have come from the Chancellor's Office, and he did not know as to what is to be done of these letters.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what does he (Vice-Chancellor) suggest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is confused and does not know what is to be done. The point is that matter needs investigation one way or the other. Either the aggrieved person agrees to present himself/herself before the Standing Committee of the University; otherwise, he does not know as to what is to be done. The Chancellor is also not telling what is to be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Chancellor is not telling and the aggrieved person is also not presenting himself/herself before the Standing Committee. Now, only the Vice-Chancellor could guide them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all of them had volunteered to resolve the matter in an unofficial manner. They themselves should try to resolve the matter again, but he could not do anything in the matter. At least, he could not do anything in the matter.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that this has not brought any good name at all, and instead it is bringing a bad name to the University. If anything happens at their homes, being the head of the family they try to solve the problem. In the same manner, they should try to resolve the matter here.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the colleagues sitting on that side had assumed the responsibility to resolve the matter. If they could not succeed, what could he do? Now, the matter is before all of them, and they should convene the meeting and try to resolve the matter sitting across the table. One of them could convene the meeting by not involving any office. Let Professor Shelley Walia, who is senior amongst the present members of the Syndicate, convene the meeting and try to resolve the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, they themselves had taken an initiative about 3-4 months back that they should stop writing letters, and instead sit together, including the Vice-Chancellor and resolved the matter as they do as head of the families. But the Vice-Chancellor said that he would not involve himself in the process. He at that time had said that they would not allow him (Vice-Chancellor) to run away. Maybe, there is some defect in his conveying or there was some communication gap. But what he meant to say was, anybody who is the head of the family could not escape from the responsibility of the family. However, the Vice-Chancellor had reacted, no, no, no, do not involve him in the matter. Thereafter, Dr. I.S. Sandhu had said that it is not good to involve the Vice-Chancellor in the matter; rather, they themselves would try to resolve the matter. It was also requested that both the parties should stop writing letters, but the same did not stop either from this side or that side. That was the only time he was involved in the matter, but the way the Vice-Chancellor reacted, he immediately withdrew. He is still of the view that such problems should be resolved by sitting in house as it not only brings bad name to the individuals, but also to the institution and also to those people, who in spite of the fact, are not playing any kind of politics. Aspersions are being cast as if politics is being played on the issue. Some persons are saying that they have the call records of certain people, who talked with Professor Rajesh Gill on how many occasions, and they have the record Professor Rajesh Gill visited whose house on how many occasions and have accompanied Professor Rajesh Gill to Chief Minister, Chancellor's Office, MHRD, etc. The Vice-Chancellor should have this much confidence that there is none who is giving air to the issue. There are people who would come and try to prove that they do not do anything. Let him tell them that they have to become very-very conscious of those people, who would make intentional efforts to prove that they are the people, who are doing all this. In fact, he (Vice-Chancellor) believes only those people, who do not take any extra step to establish that this right or wrong. He had said at that time also that at least he (Vice-Chancellor) should have some confidence in his own Syndicate, Senate, in his own in house mechanism, but somehow or the other, he could not convey his feelings well and the same were not taken in right spirit. He could understand that he (Vice-Chancellor) is helpless, but this much guidance could be sought from him, as a Chairman of the Syndicate, that he should tell them as to what is to be done by the Syndicate. A letter has been addressed to B, B has forwarded the same to C, and C has forwarded it to D, and D does not know as to what is to be done. After all, it could be said that every time this time it should be kept pending and would be attended to

next time. So he (Vice-Chancellor) please guide them, as a Chairman of the Syndicate, as what is to be done. He knew that he (Vice-Chancellor) is also in a difficult position because his name is there in it. Had his (Vice-Chancellor) name been not there, perhaps, he might have guided them that this could be the way out, but that guidance could be given of the record also, outside the meeting also, at personal level also. If he (Vice-Chancellor) is confused, they are much more confused. If the Scientist of his (Vice-Chancellor) level is confused, he could well understand how much the persons like them could be confused. If at all, they have to deal with it, then appropriate response, on behalf of the Syndicate, has to be sent to the Chancellor, who is sending letters addressed to him, meant for him, to the Vice-Chancellor and because of which the Vice-Chancellor finds himself confused and helpless. So let the Syndicate express its helplessness by explaining the reasons, but that is only as a last resort. If something could be done so sort out the issue amicably, he would be the first man to welcome that kind of step. If he (Vice-Chancellor) feels that he (Shri Goyal) has failed in that, yes, he has failed in that. Yes, Professor Shelley Walia could take up the responsibility along with certain other friends, that should be done, and they are not at all ever against it. Again at the cost of repetition, he is requesting that please do have some confidence nobody has ever instigated anybody to go against anyone.

Professor Shelley Walia said that couple of people who are aware of all the matter should be associated with him.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, in fact, they themselves had tried to resolve the issue. If they talk about Professor Arun Kumar Grover, the Vice-Chancellor, since he himself is involved, if they seek suggestion/s from him, no suggestion would be forth coming from his side. Since Professor Rajesh Gill is of the cadre of Professor Shelley Walia, if he (Professor Shelley Walia) along with a couple of friends try, maybe, they would succeed. Therefore, he suggested that they should try to resolve the matter amicably.

Shri Raghubir Dyal said that he would like to make a request to the entire House that one more honest effort should be made to resolve the issue amicably.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if the whole Syndicate wanted some sort of reconciliation or some kind of sorting out, this should be conveyed to the complainant. It now depends on her whether she is willing to sort out the matter.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since now a long time as past, perhaps, now the reconciliation is possible and both the parties would agree.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the question is as to why the papers have been placed before the Syndicate. In future, it should be ensured that such papers should not be placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if he was asked to do something on behalf of the University, he would have to place the matter before the Syndicate, as the Syndicate is the Government of the University. The members should understand that he is not the Government of the

University and the responsibility of governance rests with the Syndicate. As such, he has to bring the matter to the Syndicate.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if a communication is received from the Chancellor's office, he (Sandhu) thinks the Vice-Chancellor is compelled to place the matter before the Syndicate. Therefore, they should try to resolve the matter before it necessitated to place before the Syndicate. He suggested that Professor Shelley Walia along with couple of members of the Syndicate, including Shri Ashok Goyal, should meet Professor Rajesh Gill and try to resolve the matter amicably. They could also tell her that if any mistake on the part of the Vice-Chancellor, they feel sorry for that, on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor. He urged Shri Ashok Goyal to give his consent to be associated with the proposed Committee/delegation.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that whenever a tedious problem is faced in Army, they used the word strategy to resolve the problem and in civil also the word strategy is used. So, they say that whatever tedious problem they faced, has to be handled tactfully. According to him, this issue has not been handled properly and that is why he has requested 4 months back that let the things be allowed to cool down. As said by him (Dr. I.S. Sandhu) that about 6 months have elapsed and the things have completely cool down. Still, it is the unanimous wish of the Syndicate of 2015 and as well as 2016 that the matter should, be sorted out, but at the same time there is another formula in the army as well as in civil that if the tedious problem becomes more dangerous and serious, then that has to be handled in a proper manner in accordance with the laid down norms. Therefore, an effort should be made and if something could be done, it would be good, and if not, it would be bad for the University. In the meantime, reply to these letters be not given as they have not asked for any reply and instead have simply forwarded the letters. So let there be stoppage to any kind of exchange. In the meanwhile, Professor Shelley Walia along with a couple of Syndicate members should try to resolve the matter amicably.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That, as suggested by the members, the following Committee of Syndics be constituted to make another honest effort to resolve the matter amicably:

1. Professor Shelley Walia (Convener)
2. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
3. Professor Navdeep Goyal
4. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
5. Shri Ashok Goyal.

Confirmation of certain faculty members

16. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor, and

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

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR:**(i) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Science**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Jai Malik	Assistant Professor in Pharmacognosy	11.04.1977	11.09.2012	09.09.2013
%2.	***Ms. Vandita Kakkar	Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutics	16.01.1981	11.09.2012	11.09.2013
%3.	***Dr. Amita Sarwal	Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutics	29.10.1975	12.09.2012	12.09.2013
+ 4.	Dr. (Ms.) Sangeeta Pikhwal Sah	Assistant Professor in Physiology	02.12.1978	14.09.2012	14.09.2013

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

% Subject to decision of the Hon' ble Court in CWP No. 17162/2012

+ Subject to decision of the Hon' ble Court in CWP No. 17723/2012

(ii) Department of Mathematics

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
>1.	Dr. Surinder Pal Singh	Assistant Professor	6.6.1984	1.8.2014	24.7.2015
>2.	Dr. (Ms.) Aarti Khurana	Assistant Professor	21.4.1980	17.10.2014 (AN)	25.7.2015
>3.	Ms. Sarita Pippal	Assistant Professor	11.6.1985	25.7.2014 (AN)	26.7.2015

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

(iii) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
@1.	Ms. Sonia Kapoor	Assistant Professor	08.11.1984	08.08.2014	08.08.2015
@2.	Dr.(Ms.) Madhu Khatri	Assistant Professor	27.07.1981	12.08.2014	12.08.2015
@3.	Dr. (Ms.) Mary Chatterjee	Assistant Professor	30.12.1978	13.08.2014	13.08.2015

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

(iv) Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Jadab Sharma	Assistant Professor	19.05.1974	27.08.2014	27.08.2015

(v) Department of Geology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Debabrata Das	Assistant Professor	28.11.1981	02.09.2014	02.09.2015

(vi) University School of Open Learning

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
*1.	Dr. Bhupinder Singh	Assistant Professor	6.9.1965	16.9.2014	27.8.2015
<p>Note: Dr. Bhupinder Singh has joined as Associate Professor on temporary basis in Department of Indian Theatre for one year w.e.f. 18.11.2015 with permission to retain lien on his substantive post of Assistant Professor in Punjabi at University School of Open Learning.</p>					
*2.	Dr. Parveen Kumar	Assistant Professor	30.8.1975	28.8.2014	28.8.2015
*3	Mr. Harmail Singh	Assistant Professor	8.7.1983	1.9.2014	1.9.2015

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

(vii) P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. (Ms.) Pooja Sikka	Assistant Professor	24.10.1981	2.9.2014 (AN)	3.9.2015

(viii) School of Punjabi Studies

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Sarabjit Singh	Assistant Professor	23.4.1964	15.10.2014 (AN)	16.10.2015

(ix) Botany

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
#1.	Dr. (Ms.) Shalinder Kaur	Assistant Professor	3.9.1976	18.9.2014	16.9.2015
#2.	Dr. Santosh Kumar Upadhyay	Assistant Professor	5.2.1984	23.9.2014	17.9.2015

#3.	Dr. Jaspreet Kaur	Assistant Professor	24.1.1974	18.9.2014	18.9.2015
#4.	Dr. Papiya Mukherjee	Assistant Professor	23.11.1979	28.11.2014	28.11.2015

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

(x) Chemistry

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
\$1.	Dr. Subash Chandra Sahoo	Assistant Professor	12.07.1980	23.09.2014	22.08.2015
\$2.	Dr. (Ms.) Gurpreet Kaur	Assistant Professor	14.06.1980	27.08.2014	23.08.2015
\$3.	Dr. (Ms.) Savita Chaudhary	Assistant Professor	06.06.1981	27.08.2014	24.08.2015
\$4.	Dr. Deepak B. Salunke	Assistant Professor	25.11.1979	27.11.2014	25.08.2015
\$5.	Dr. Palani Natarajan	Assistant Professor	03.03.1981	04.09.2014	26.08.2015
\$6.	Dr. (Ms.) Jyoti Agarwal	Assistant Professor	15.07.1984	27.08.2014	27.08.2015

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

(xi) Zoology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
^1.	Dr. (Ms.) Archana Chauhan	Assistant Professor	15.08.1978	29.10.2014	22.08.2015
^2.	Dr. Ravinder Kumar	Assistant Professor	26.10.1982	27.08.2014	23.08.2015
^3.	Dr. (Ms.) Ravneet Kaur	Assistant Professor	16.07.1978	27.08.2014	24.08.2015
^4.	Dr. (Ms.) Mani Chopra	Assistant Professor	03.08.1981	27.08.2014	25.08.2015
^5.	Dr. (Ms.) Indu Sharma	Assistant Professor	27.02.1982	01.09.2014	26.08.2015
^6.	Dr. Vijay Kumar	Assistant Professor	19.02.1982	27.08.2014	27.08.2015

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

Recommendation of the Committee dated 4.1.2016 on Audit and Inspection Report

17. Considered minutes of the meeting of the Interest Committee dated 04.01.2016 (**Appendix-XXVII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider Audit and Inspection Report that the Panjab University has allowed higher rate of interest i.e. 9.25% against the rate fixed by the Govt. of India i.e. 8.70% to GPF/PF subscribers for the year 2013-14.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, maybe, some people wanted to approach the Court. He suggested that everybody should

be individually informed as to what amount would be deducted from his/her General Provident Fund or Provident Fund account.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 4.1.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved. However, before deducting the amount, all the employees be individually informed as to what amount would be deducted from his/her General Provident Fund/Provident Fund account.

Item 18 has been taken up along with Items 5, 6 and 7.

Modified mechanism for redressal of grievances of students

19. Considered if, the modified Mechanism (**Appendix-XXVIII**) submitted by Dean Student Welfare, P.U., for Redressal of Grievances of Students to ensure transparency in all the activities of students at different stages, be approved. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.09.2015 (Para 11) (**Appendix-XXVIII**) has resolved that in view of the suggestions made by the members, the Mechanism submitted by Dean Student Welfare, Panjab University, for redressal of grievances of students, be redrafted and resubmitted for approval again.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that, in all these Committees, a person with rural background, a person from reserved categories and a student leader should be appointed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is minimum, and they must do it. He requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to include these people in all the Committees.

RESOLVED: That the modified Mechanism (**Appendix**) submitted by Dean Student Welfare, P.U., for Redressal of Grievances of Students to ensure transparency in all the activities of students at different stages, in principle, be approved, with the stipulation that the Dean Student Welfare would include a person each with rural background, from reserved categories and student leader.

At this stage, Professor Shelley Walia said that he would like to raise an issue, which is very important in terms of victimization of students. The whole idea of seeking permission from the University whether one could publish his/her thesis or not, is something very ridiculous. If one wanted to publish his/her thesis, and this is the case all around the world, one takes his manuscript and give it to the publisher and there is no harm in it. But what he has seen is that a number of students in Delhi or America, who did Ph.D. with him, had requested him to get them permission to publish their thesis. The establishment had asked him to see if changes had been made to the theses. Why should he take the pains to read the thesis again? It is upto the publishers to have the thesis refereed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that once the thesis is approved, why they are coming in the way of the student, who wishes to publish the thesis. Since the thesis is already stood uploaded and made known to

the whole world, the publication of the thesis should be allowed, and if there is any clause which is coming in the way of the publication, the same should be removed.

Professor Shelley Walia requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to prepare a proposal so that the students do not face any problem on the issue anymore.

This was agreed to.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 30.10.2015 regarding issuance of Certificate of Course Work

20. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 30.10.2015 (Item-II) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that those candidates who have taken admission in M.Phil. based on the entrance test and have done equivalent course work in M.Phil./LL.M./M.Tech., including research methodology course and have done Ph.D. after 2009, be given certificate by the Chairperson of the concerned Department, Panjab University on the recommendation of the Academic Committee to the effect that their course work is equivalent to the course work of Ph.D. and also be countersigned by the Controller of Examinations.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that here it has been mentioned that the student should have taken admission to M.Phil. after qualifying the Entrance Test, but earlier, in certain Departments admissions to M.Phil. were made on the basis of Entrance Test conducted by the Department itself. Whether they accept that Entrance Test? Secondly, those who have qualified UGC-NET, they are not required to appear and qualify the University Entrance Test. Some persons who have done M.Phil. and UGC-NET, they are not covered in this decision.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that basically those who have done M.Phil. are exempted from Pre-Ph.D. course work. He felt that the purpose of this item is that the candidates who have done M.Phil. should be issued a certificate by the Department concerned that they have done Pre-Ph.D. course work in M.Phil., so that they do not face problem while appearing in the interview. Citing an example, he said that if a candidate appeared in the interview in an affiliated College, and the Dean, College Development Council received a phone call, whether this candidate, who has done Ph.D., but has done Pre-Ph.D. course work in M.Phil., is eligible for the post of Assistant Professor. If the Department concerned issues a certificate that this candidate has done M.Phil. on the basis of Entrance Test and has done Pre-Ph.D. course work during M.Phil., it would help the candidate in the interview. When Professor Keshav Malhotra sought certain clarification, Dr. I.S. Sandhu clarified that it is in the UGC Guidelines issued in the year 2009 that to be eligible, the candidate should have been registered to Ph.D. on the basis of Entrance Test and the candidate must have done Pre-Ph.D. course work. The candidates who have qualified UGC-NET and have also done M.Phil. are not required to do Pre-Ph.D. course work.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that but it has not been mentioned in the item.

Professor Anil Monga said that, in fact, the minutes are confusing. The minutes show that if the candidates have done Pre-Ph.D. course work in M.Phil. to which they have been given admission

on the basis of an Entrance Test, the said Pre-Ph.D. course work is equivalent to the Pre-Ph.D. course work of Ph.D. In fact, it has been recommended that “Those candidates who have took admission in M.Phil. based on the entrance test and have done equivalent course work in M.Phil./LL.M/M.Tech., including research methodology course, and have done Ph.D. after 2009, be given certificate by the Panjab University to the effect that their course work is equivalent to the course work of Ph.D.” In fact, there is not course work in M.Phil., which they are teaching in M.Phil., like Pre-Ph.D. course work.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that M.Phil. is a course, which is of duration minimum of one year, but actually it is of more. M.Phil. is at least equal to Pre-Ph.D. course work, but actually it is more. If someone has done M.Phil. via crossing any kind of filter, i.e., Entrance Test conducted by the Department itself, Entrance Test conduct by the University or any other specified filter, he/she supposed to have done far more than what UGC Regulations 2009 stipulate.

Professor Anil Monga said that the Vice-Chancellor is absolutely right, but the minutes are not in this spirit. Whosoever has done M.Phil., should be exempted from Pre-Ph.D. course work.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the filter/s has/have to be pre-specified, which might include topper of the University, etc. However, right now, they do not have such filters. In fact, they should encourage their own students to do well in the University examinations. They should come up with certain kinds of incentives so that the students excel while studying here.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that there are three conditions, i.e., entrance test, course work and then Ph.D. If a candidate has qualified UGC-NET, for him/her the condition of Entrance Test is goes, and he/she could straightaway take admission in M.Phil., and the student who has done M.Phil. that is equivalent to Pre-Ph.D. course work of Ph.D. However, those who have taken admission in M.Phil. on the basis of Entrance Test conducted by the Department, their M.Phil. is not equivalent to Pre-Ph.D. course work. Similarly, if one has qualified UGC-NET, he is not required to qualify any Entrance Test.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, there are two things – (i) M.Phil. to be equated with Pre-Ph.D. course work; and (ii) M.Phil. by way of Entrance Test. It is just possible that somebody might have done M.Phil. by appearing any Entrance Test conducted by the Department itself or by the University. Similarly, somebody might have done M.Phil. even without Entrance Test. Again there could be two categories – (i) that somebody might have done M.Phil. without Entrance Test, but has qualified UGC-NET. So he/she is exempted from the Entrance Test. Since he/she has done M.Phil., he/she is exempted from Pre-Ph.D. course work. The Committee, in fact, has recommended in very-very fine way and has clarified only to the effect that those, who have done M.Phil., be given a certificate that their course work is equivalent to that of Pre-Ph.D. course work. The Committee has taken note of other thing also that whether such a person is eligible to be appointed as Assistant Professor or not because a certificate is required that the Ph.D. of the candidate is in terms of UGC Regulations 2009. Once they follow the first para that it is equivalent to Pre-Ph.D. course work, the Committee has said that for this purpose, another item should be brought to consider this only

if such a certificate is issued to a person whether he/she is eligible for appointment as Assistant Professor. It has been mentioned that "On the issue raised by Professor Karamjeet Singh, University Business School, regarding the issuance of a certificate to the effect that a candidate has done Ph.D. under UGC Guidelines, 2009, or not, it was resolved that another Committee be constituted to explore the possibility of issuing such a certificate. As such, there are two certificates – (i) that his/her course work is equivalent to the Pre-Ph.D. course work of Ph.D.; and (ii) that this Ph.D. is eligible for appointment as Assistant Professor considering the Ph.D. to be under UGC Regulations 2009, which is left and the same could be taken up next time. On a query made by Professor Keshav Malhotra, Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that whosoever has done M.Phil. either through Entrance Test or without Entrance Test, but has qualified UGC-NET is eligible for appointment as Assistant Professor.

Giving the background, Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that, in fact, the problem was that their University (Panjab University) has already exempted those candidates from the Pre-Ph.D. course work, who have done M.Phil. Hence, they were doing Ph.D. without Pre-Ph.D. course work as they were exempted from it. Now, question arises as to when they have completed the Ph.D. and if it was before 2009, obviously, for becoming eligible for appointment as Assistant Professor, they have to qualify UGC-NET, but those who have completed their Ph.D. after 2009 and they have taken admission in M.Phil. on the basis of Entrance Test and have done course work in M.Phil. and immediately after that they have joined Ph.D. programme, they could easily presume that they have taken admission in Ph.D. So they should be given a certificate that they are eligible for appointment as Assistant Professor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that arising out of issues could be taken later on because they are taken much time on it.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the candidate after doing M.Phil. must have enrolled for Ph.D. within the permissible time, which is 2 years.

Professor Anil Monga said that there are two things in it and one is that M.Phil. is equivalent to Pre-Ph.D. course work, but something else has been mentioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could do it in the next meeting of the Syndicate. At the moment, they could defer the consideration of the item. In the meantime, they should correct/collect all these things and then they would come back to it because this issue is not so urgent that it is to be done today itself. When Professor Shelley Walia said that it is a very important matter for the University, the Vice-Chancellor said that though it is an important matter, but it could be done on 28th February also. When certain members insisted, the Vice-Chancellor proposed that alright they should authorize him and he would take decision in consultation with some of them and the outcome would be placed before the Syndicate for ratification.

This was agreed to.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should slightly be clarified that those who have done M.Phil. and have also qualified NET irrespective

of the fact whether after doing M.Phil. or before that, they be exempted from the Pre-Ph.D. course work.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would resolve these matters.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that in the University Teaching Departments, wherever the M.Phil. has been stopped, should be restarted.

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that the Entrance Test for admission to M.Phil. and enrolment to Ph.D. should be separate.

Issue regarding grant of benefit of service for pension to certain persons

21. Considered the cases of following employees for grant of benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension under the Pension Regulation 3.9 at page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, in view of the recommendation of the Committee dated 12.8.2015 Appendix-I (**Appendix-XXIX**):-

1. Dr. O.P. Mittal (detail at Appendix-_)
2. Dr. R.D. Anand (detail at Appendix-_)
3. Dr. D.V.S. Jain (detail at Appendix-_)
4. Dr. M.P. Khanna (detail at Appendix-_).

NOTE: 1. The Regulation 3.9 at page 184-85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, is reproduced below:

3.9. 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.

2. In the above cases the original advertisement against which the concerned teacher was appointed was not available in the record of the Establishment Section. Therefore, the Committee considered the above cases in the light of the essential qualification as per other advertisement in the contemporary period.
3. The meeting chaired by the D.U.I on 12.8.2015 recommended that in cases where the original advertisement was not available and decisions were taken on the basis of other advertisement in contemporary period, the approval of the Syndicate may be obtained before its implementation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that 25 cases were cleared earlier, why the 12 have not been cleared.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is what, he is trying to work out.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that now four cases have been placed before the Syndicate. Whether these have come later on or they themselves are placing now?

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are so many cases. As and when the cases are being cleared, the same are being placed before the Syndicate.

It was clarified that there are so many such cases. As and when a few are being received from the Establishment Branch after having been cleared, they are being placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is trying to clear as many cases as he could.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that the more the cases would be old, more the arrear would become. He said that if there are more cases, the same should be placed before the Syndicate as and when the same are cleared. Secondly, whichever cases are being cleared, the arrear of the same should be given to the persons concerned simultaneously. He enquired whether the amount of arrear ranges between Rs.10/- lac to Rs.15/- lac.

It was clarified that nobody's arrear would be in the range of Rs.10/- lac to Rs.15/- lac because the arrear would be paid w.e.f. the year 2009 as it has been decided that the arrear would be paid w.e.f. the year 2009.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why such a decision has been taken. Firstly, they have given less pension to somebody, and thereafter, they took five years to correct the deficiency in pension. Thereafter, they are saying that since the decision is taken now, the arrear would also be paid from now onwards. Anyhow, is it final

decision that the persons concerned would be paid arrear w.e.f. the year 2009.

The reply was given in affirmative.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that from 2009 onwards, the arrear should be given simultaneously; otherwise, the amount would be increasing, which might create problem for them.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 12.8.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Correction in Guidelines for admission to MBA programmes, MBA for Executive (MBAfEX) M.Com. (Hons.) under sports category

22. Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 09.11.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the proposed Guidelines after making correction in existing Guidelines for the admission under reserved category of sports for MBA programmes, MBA for Executive (MBAfEX) M.Com.(Hons.) in UBS, P.U., Chandigarh UBS, Ludhiana and in various teaching departments of P.U. Campus/ P.U. Regional Centres for the session 2016-17, be approved.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that at page 102 of the Appendix that under 17 has been mentioned as youth, but according to him, under 17 should be junior.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that it is definitely like this.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the mistake, which was earlier there, has been rectified. In fact, earlier the players of University, who were representing the University, were placed higher and those, who were representing the State, were placed lower.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that earlier, those, who were representing the State, were placed higher. Similarly, those who were representing open junior, were placed higher and those, who were representing the University, were placed lower. Now, all have been equated. When Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether senior State and University have been equated, Professor Navdeep Goyal replied in affirmative, and also described the logic.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a player, who has represented State at least ten years ago, was never equated with a player, who has represented the University. In Panjab University also, the player, who represented the State was placed higher and the player, who represented the University, was placed lower. It was somewhere in 2010 or 2011, the player, who represented the University was placed higher and the player, who represented the State, was placed lower, and the same was on keeping in view the Chandigarh Federations, because everybody was obtained State participation certificate from them. As the UGC framed Regulations/Rules/Guidelines keeping in view Delhi University, they have do so keeping in view Union Territory of Chandigarh. They, in fact, do not take care of people who are coming from rural areas and represent the State. According to him, the player, who represents the State should be placed higher.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that, in fact, the problem has lessened by equating them; otherwise, there was much more problems.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired were they doing it only for MBA or for all the courses.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, they are doing this for all the courses, but since the University Business School is requesting since quite some, it has been done for them first.

Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that it has been mentioned at page 84 of the Appendix that "The sports trials will be held as per schedule mentioned in the respective Handbook". Since most of the students do not purchase the Handbook, it should be mentioned that "The sports trials will be held as per schedule mentioned in the respective Handbook/Website". He further said that, earlier, they used to upload the schedule for sports trial on the Website of the concerned Department.

The Vice-Chancellor said that necessary addition/amendment would be made ensuring that it be read as "The sports trials will be held as per schedule mentioned in the respective Handbook/Website".

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Sports Guidelines/policy which they have framed for admission to various courses do not exist in the affiliated Colleges. Certain affiliated Colleges allow admission to students to B.Com. and B.Sc. courses just only the basis of certificate that the student concerned has studied Physical Education subject.

Principal S.S. Sangha clarified that, in fact, they make admission to various courses under sports category on the basis of gradation.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Government Colleges in Punjab obtain the Sports certificate from the students and send the same to the University. The University prepared the gradation list of the students and asked the College to make admission accordingly. But this practice is not been followed by the private affiliated Colleges. He suggested that a circular should be sent to all the affiliated Colleges for making admission to various courses under sports category as per the gradation list.

When Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would like to draw the attention of the House towards the first line at page 86 (in the right side), the Vice-Chancellor said that if it needed further discussion, the item would be taken up for consideration in the next meeting of the Syndicate, which is scheduled for 28th February 2016.

This was agreed to.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that since a couple of members, including Shri Ashok Goyal and Principal B.C. Josan have to leave, they should have a quick look and the items of urgent & emergent nature should be taken up for consideration. After considering the urgent item and taking decision on them, the meeting would be adjourned, and the adjourned meeting would be held before 15th February 2016 to finish the unfinished agenda.

This was agreed to.

At this stage, it was decided that Item-39 on the agenda be taken up for consideration first.

**Appointments on
Compassionate Ground**

39. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 13.01.2016 (**Appendix-XXX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 13.01.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

At this stage, Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that one day, a statement of the Vice-Chancellor had appeared in the newspapers that they are increasing fees by 20%.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all that is a part of long term negotiations and that has no link with it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his is full dissent on the approval of Item 30.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it looks nice that the job, which they wanted to do in the year 2013 that the fees should be enhanced up to such an extent, is being done now. Had they done it four years ago, today they might have reached much higher position.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, the fees are being enhanced in the same spirit as in the last year. Hence, it is just a token increase.

**Last dates for change of
Subject/Faculty/Option
and Inter College
Migration under
Semester System of
Examination**

23. Considered the minutes dated 15.12.2015 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding fixation of last date for change of Subject/Faculty/Option and Inter College Migration under Semester System of Examination.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that now, the Semester System has been introduced in the University, and some of their students, got job in Navy, Air Force, etc. after completing first/third semester. Some of the students have approached him with the request that their requirement of attendance of lectures should be fulfilled, but they would not attend the classes, to which he has denied. He instead asked them to seek admission at University School of Open Learning (USOL) in the 2nd Semester or as the case may, but there they were asked to seek admission in the 1st Semester or 3rd Semester, as the case may be. Why do the students waste their whole year? He pleaded that all such students should be allowed admission at USOL in the 2nd Semester or 4th Semester, as the case may be.

The Vice-Chancellor said that alright, Professor Keshav Malhotra should give in writing. He is okay with it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that Controller of Examinations should be authorized to take decision on the issue.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 15.12.2015, be approved.

At this stage, it was decided that items 30, 31 & 33, which are of urgent nature should be taken up for consideration first.

Fee structure of the University teaching Departments & Regional Centres

30. Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 01.12.2015 (**Appendix-**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to finalize the fee structure (**Appendix-**) of the University Teaching Departments, Regional Centres for the session 2016-2017.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if this item is approved, his dissent should be recorded.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all those, who are against this fee hike, could record their dissent.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is not against the fee hike, but he would like to clarify his position. If he is not allowed to speak here, he has the right to speak in the meeting of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Raghbir Dyal has a right to speak here as well as in the Senate. If the majority of the members is in favour of approving this fee hike, the member/s, who is/are against it, could record their dissent.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that since he is also against this fee hike, his dissent should also be recorded.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that, in the meanwhile, he would like to state that all the fee related issues – whether of University Teaching Departments or affiliated Colleges irrespective of examination, entrance tests, etc., should be placed before the Syndicate in one go, so that they are aware of the financial position of the University. He remarked that in the meeting the issue relating to fee hike of University Teaching Departments is being place and in the next meeting, the issue of fee hike of affiliated Colleges would be place. Thereafter, the issue relating to funds being charged by the Dean, College Development Council would be placed and the process would go on like this. He urged that the issue of fee hike relating to all subjects should be brought to the Syndicate in one go.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have prepared a document. He would add him (Shri Raghbir Dyal) as a member of their Think-Tank. He asked the Registrar to make him (Shri Raghbir Dyal) available all the documents.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that he (Vice-Chancellor) has forgotten to include the name of Professor Keshav Malhotra on the Think-Tank, though he has promised it in the Senate meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Keshav Malhotra would also be made a member of the Think-Tank. He said that his only concern for pushing this item of fee hike is that, that after the approval by the Syndicate, the matter would be placed before the Board of Finance, the meeting of which would be held in the 2nd or 3rd week of February 2016. He understands that a sizeable number of them has some reservations about this fee hike because they have expressed their reservations last time also. However, this fee hike is just a token increase like last year. In fact, they are not proposing anything more than what was approved last year. Hence, this is just a token increase. Though this is not going to add much income to the

University, it is just to have negotiations with the Government that the University has not frozen the fees, and instead it is also doing a bit. The 20% fee hike, which has been suggested by the Think-Tank, it is not just on behalf of fee increase, but it is on behalf of the total consideration for increasing the income of the University, and the University has income from various sources. Now, all those components are tabulated nicely and he would make available to both of them everything, which was made available to the members of the Think-Tank for the 2nd meeting, which was held on 12th January 2016.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he has a very consistent stand on the fee hike that fee hike is justified only if it is backed by strong mechanism and good citizen charter. Secondly, there are a lot of components where they could easily increase the revenue of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why, the Think-Tank has been constituted and all the data are being compiled for placing the same before the Think-Tank.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it is wrong that they are increasing the fees just because they should be seen to be increasing the revenue of the University.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that to add value to the course, they should bring all financial matters once.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is not so difficult job. Now, it is being said that it is just a nominal fee hike just to convince the Government that they are seen to be doing a little bit. He said that it is just possible that with this proposed fee hike, perhaps, they might be able to get an additional some of Rs.1-2 crore, but for increasing this sum, how much resistance/controversy they would face in the Syndicate, Senate and the society. What he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) is trying to say, is that maybe there are some other channels where they could increase revenue by Rs.10 crore or more. In the light of that, he had requested that they should have head-wise income.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the data of head-wise income stood already prepared.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal suggested as to how the head-wise data could be prepared, e.g., income from the College in the shape of affiliation fee. When they think the University as a whole and somebody else intervened, and he could not complete his statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not so simple.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said, "Sir", it could be done. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to bring all the data.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that either discussion should be allowed on the item or the consideration of the item should be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item related to fees to be put up before the Board of Finance. Those who have reservations, should raise their hands. He would record their numbers, and those who

wanted to record their comments, he is sitting here, and he urged the members to go ahead.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he has not gone through the agenda, but has read in the newspaper that the Think-Tank has recommended that fees should be increased by 20%, but there is no possibility of increasing the Hostel fee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that perhaps, that has not been placed before the Syndicate and only NRI fees have been placed.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they could easily increase their income by increasing the fees of NRI students. He added that it is very important issue to be considered by all of them as to what is the definition of Academic Council of Panjab University. Academic Council, probably consists of teachers, and what is the definition of teacher, has been mentioned in P.U. Calendar, and all of them know the same also. But unfortunately, there are number of Colleges which have appointed ineligible teachers, who do not possess even basic qualifications for appointment as Assistant Professor, but are members of Academic Council of Panjab University by virtue of teachers of affiliated Colleges. It is not that it is backdoor entry, their returns are being sent to the University along with their names and qualifications, from where it could be made out that they are not eligible for the post/s, but they are made members of the Academic Council. And out of them, not all, but some are included in the list of approved teachers while preparing the list of voters for "Teachers Constituency of affiliated Colleges". When somebody points out that as to how they are members of the Academic Council, they told that they are continuing for the last 10-20 years. So what they are ineligible, they had been the paper-setters, evaluators, members of Academic Council and had been the voters of "Teachers Constituency of affiliated Colleges". He urged the Vice-Chancellor to take care of this.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that they would have a continuing meeting of today's meeting before 15th February 2016 in the evening, in which the unfinished agenda would be finished.

This was agreed to.

At this stage, the members started general discussion.

- (1) Dr. I.S. Sandhu, referring to Sub-Item R-(ix) at page 184, stated that whatever mistakes were there in the template, the same have been removed. But a condition has been kept that no male teacher could be appointed in girls/women Colleges. In fact, this condition was imposed a long time ago when the situation was entirely different. This condition was imposed keeping in view the fact that in subjects like Music and Physical Education, Physical involvement of the teacher/s with the students was required. Now since the situation has completely changed and several male teachers, including Dr. Parvinder Singh (Controller of Examinations), has worked in a Girls College and Dr. Dalip Kumar and Dr. RPS Josh are working in the Girls Colleges since long time. Moreover, some time ago they have allowed appointment of male teachers in Girls Colleges through a Committee and the Dean, College

Development Council might be knowing this. However, Deputy Registrar (Colleges) has stopped the approval of a couple of male teachers in Girls Colleges. He pleaded that the appointment of these teachers should be approved by the University.

When clarification was given, the Vice-Chancellor said that he would take an appropriate decision in the matter.

- (2) Dr. Ajay Ranga said that every year the University used to give Golden/Special/Mercy Chance to the students to clear their reappear/s, to improve their marks, etc., but this year no such chance has been given. He pleaded that this year also a Golden/Special/Mercy Chance should be given to the students to clear their reappear/s, to improve their marks, etc. He added that with this the University would also generate some additional revenue.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Ajay Ranga.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Ajay Ranga to get an agenda item prepared, so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate.

- (3) Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Child Care Leave has been approved by the Syndicate and Senate and certain teachers have also availed the same, but their salary is not being released.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is being looked into.

- (4) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he wanted to draw the attention of the members, especially of those who belonged to Colleges. They have filled up 1925 posts of teachers in the Colleges and a template had been prepared for the purpose. The teachers who are already working in the Colleges for the last 10 or 12 years, needed to be given weightage. Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University have given the weightage of total experience. But in Panjab University, he did not know how it was decided that since in certain subjects, e.g., Computer, Fashion Designing, etc., the eligible candidates are not available, the experience of the candidate/s would be considered after his/her becoming eligible. On the one hand, the person concerned is serving in one of the Colleges and the College is not paying him/her full salary, and on the other hand, his/her experience is not being counted. In fact, such persons are imparting education to the students, but their experience is not being considered. Unfortunately, there are a category of candidates, who could not qualify the NET in a particular subject. He pleaded that whosoever is working in a College/Institute and imparting education to the students, his/her total experience should be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. I.S. Sandhu to bring an item for consideration.

- (5) Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, last year also, he had sent a message to him (Vice-Chancellor). They are two most important examinations, viz. OCET and CET, but the Centres for these examinations are created only in Chandigarh, and the students of far off places (especially Abohar, Fazilka, Muktsar, Ferozepur, etc.) have to come to Chandigarh to take the examinations. He pleaded that the Centres for these examinations should be created at least at the P.U. Regional Centres.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "no issue at all". The Centres for holding CET/OCET could be created at the Panjab University Regional Centres.

- (6) Shri Raghbir Dyal further said that the students are a suffered lot as their re-evaluation results are not being declared in time. There is a condition that the student would be allowed to take admission in the 3rd Semester only if he/she clears at least 50% of the papers of 1st and 2nd Semesters. Though the examinations of 3rd Semesters have been conducted, but the re-evaluation results of 2nd Semesters have not been declared despite best efforts of the Controller of Examinations, who has started even table marking of re-evaluation. The reason for not declaring the re-evaluation might be less number of examiners, but a year of the students is being wasted. If the students filed a case in the High Court and claimed damages, they would be in trouble as the financial position of the University is not healthy. If the student/s become eligible for admission to 3rd Semester after the re-evaluation, how he/she would get admission when the examinations for the 3rd Semester have already been conducted.

It was informed that all the results of re-evaluation have been declared. The problem which has been pointed by Shri Raghbir Dyal, it relates to only left over cases, whose examinations they have been conducting. In 50% of the cases, there is a wide choices, and if any of the students failed in the optional paper, they have to conduct the paper again in the month of February so that their one precious year could be saved.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that they needed to resolve some of the problems being faced by them in the Semester System, which they were also facing in the Annual System. Continuing, he said that suppose one of the students leave the course after passing the 1st Semester due to one reason or the other, if he/she wishes to join the course again next year, he should be allowed admission to 2nd Semester. But since under the Semester System, they make admission to both the Semesters once, i.e., only during the months June/July or August and there is no admission dates in January, they are facing the problem. To come over this problem, they should take a decision in the Standing Committee so that such students could take admissions to even Semesters.

It was informed that when the Semester System was introduced, it was decided that whichever problems they would

be facing, the same would be resolved through the Standing Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Controller of Examinations to get the said Standing Committee revived and the problems resolved quickly so that the recommendations of the Standing Committee are placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that whenever such problems are resolved, the circular should be sent to the affiliated Colleges.

- (7) Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that the work relating to construction of boundary wall of P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar, is yet to be started. Earlier, when he had raised the issue, the Vice-Chancellor had informed that the tenders have been floated.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. P.S. Sandhu that the finalization of the tenders should be expedited.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that they could well imagine as to how much partiality is being meted out to the affiliated Colleges. Recently, Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha has inspected a College, which has built temporary boundary wall of wooden planks as the College has not enough money, but it has been recommended that a concrete boundary wall should be built, only then the affiliation would be granted, whereas their own P.U. Regional Centre is functioning without boundary wall for the last several months.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that they have been given five acres of land and they are supposed to have a boundary wall. They are also supposed to have a temporary structure there before the concrete building comes up. This is the commitment, which they have given to the Chief Minister, Punjab.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether the work of construction of boundary wall would be started by the commencement of next financial year, i.e., April 2016.

- (8) Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since Guru Nanak College, Muktsar, is a very good College and has enough infrastructure, if an Evaluation Centre is created there, the teachers would be saved of a lot of harassment and also save some money as they have to go to Abohar for evaluating the answerbooks. He has also handed over a letter in this regard to the Controller of Examinations. He suggested that an Evaluation Centre should be created at Guru Nanak College, Muktsar.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, earlier, there used to be an Evaluation Centre at Muktsar, but the friends from Muktsar had refused. Although he endorsed the suggestion made by Shri Raghbir Dyal, the consent of the Principal of the College concerned should be taken before creating the Evaluation Centre there.

Shri Raghbir Dyal informed that the consent has already been given by the Principal of the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that an Evaluation Centre would be created at Guru Nanak College, Muktsar.

- (9) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that a circulation has gone from the University to the Presidents and Secretaries of the Managements of the Colleges regarding Pre-Ph.D. Though as per the provision/s of Panjab University Calendar, Provident Fund @ 10% of the total salary minus House Rent Allowance is to be deducted, the Colleges are deducting a lump sum Rs.1,500/- and the College subscription/share is also being taken from the teachers. When the Vice-Chancellor asked, "has he the proof", Shri Dua replied in affirmative.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have the Chief Vigilance Officer to look into such cases.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he has raised the issue in general because when a particular issue is raised, it become a big issue. He pleaded that though he could arrange a representation from the affected persons, it would be better if the circular is sent to the Colleges again stating that the Provident Fund of the teachers should be deducted as per the provisions of the University Calendar.

- (10) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had moved a Resolution in the last meeting of the Senate in December 2015 that, earlier, an exemption from capping was given to Panjab University teachers in October 2014.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, exemption was not given. They were asked to adopt and they adopted it that it could not be from retrospective effect. Now, they have implemented the same with effect from 2013. Only a handful of people have been promoted without capping in the intervening period. Now, the capping is effect from June 2013.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the benefit which has been given to certain people during that period, should also be given to other people.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 'Okay', he would write to the Punjab Government.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that at that time also it was done in the Senate and they met the concerned Officers separately. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to expedite the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would write a letter to Punjab Government, which he had written to the U.T. Administration.

- (11) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he would like to seek a clarification in the absence of which certain teachers are facing problem. When the teacher has to move to Senior-Scale or Selection Grade, he/she is asked to obtain 5 years API score.

If they have adopted it in the year 2013, how could they ask the teacher to obtain API score for the years 2011 and 2012. In that eventually, how could such teachers get Senior-Scale or Selection Grade. He suggested a letter in this regard must be issued by the Dean, College Development Council to the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not issue any letter, which is violative of UGC Regulations/Rules.

- (12) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the last meeting of the Senate held in the month of December 2015, certain cases of Colleges for affiliation were brought to the Senate for information, even though by then the Colleges had already started the courses. Now, since the applications from the Colleges for extension of affiliation have been received in the University, the Committees for the purpose should be formed so that they could inspect the Colleges and submit reports in such a manner that the same are placed before the Syndicate and the Senate in their meetings to be held in the month of March 2016 and discussed there threadbare. Usually, the Inspection Reports come in the months of May/June and without any compliance, the Colleges made admissions, and the cases are placed before the Senate in the month of September, when half of the session is already over and they could not do anything.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has already cleared majority of the files and only a couple of files are pending, which would also be cleared by tomorrow.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that what he (Shri Dua) meant to say is that the Inspection Committees for grant of extension of affiliation to the Colleges, should be sent in the month of February.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Affiliation Committees are very important. Though it is the prerogative of the Syndicate, he would like to talk about it. He has seen in many cases that the names of the members of the Syndicate are mentioned at the bottom, and the persons, who are appointed by them, are mentioned above them. He urged that the protocol should be maintained.

- (13) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is a College namely G.M.T. College of Education, Ludhiana.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, perhaps, it is a College, where a Team was sent and the College Management has agreed.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the report of the Committee on that College has not been placed before the Syndicate for consideration. Though more than a month has elapsed, the report has not been placed before the Syndicate. On the one hand, they have closed down the College and the teachers have been relieved, and on the other hand, they have granted the College affiliation again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would provide an update in the adjourned meeting.

- (14) Professor Shelley Walia stated that he knew that M.Phil. used to be a rigorous programme because he has been teaching M.Phil. for several years in the Department of English & Cultural Studies. He has observed that M.Phil. is slowly dying out. This year, only four students have taken admission to M.Phil., whereas earlier there used to be about 20 or more students, including faculty members and students from the Colleges. The reason for decline in the number of students for M.Phil. Programme is that there is a Common Entrance Test for both M.Phil. and Ph.D. Programmes, and he has pointed out it in various meetings. When the students qualified the Entrance Test, obviously, most of the students opted for the Ph.D. Programme, it being a higher degree. Resultantly, only few students, who could not get themselves registered due to one reason or the other, took admission to M.Phil. As such, the M.Phil. Programme is very-very conspicuously on the decline. In order to strengthen M.Phil., he was just thinking whether they could introduce/offer M.Phil. Programme across the board in all the disciplines, which is integrated with Ph.D. When M.Phil. Programme is integrated with Ph.D., then it become a compulsory Pre-Ph.D. course. In this way, the students who would come out from this Programme would be far more qualified than the students who straightaway join Ph.D. Programme, because they have no idea about documentation, footnote, etc. In fact, they are playing with the system with the result that their one good Programme is slowly dying/disappearing. He, therefore, suggested that they separate the Entrance Test for these two Programmes or M.Phil. and Ph.D. should be integrated.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Shelley Walia to get the same approved from the Academic and Administrative Committees, and send an agenda item through the DUI, thereafter, they would take an appropriate decision.

Supplementing Professor Shelley Walia, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that instead of M.Phil. and Ph.D. Integrated Programme, they should go for M.A. and M.Phil. Integrated Programme, which would be opted by a number of students.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that if they create a notion of Graduate School Programme of a given faculty, the Graduate School Programme would commence after undergraduation. Once they have a formal structured Graduate School Programme, then these things would become automatic.

- (15) Professor Shelley Walia said that they have decided to invite eminent persons for the Chair Professorship of different Chairs. Would they grant them accommodation in the University Guest House or have funds to re-furnish their Foreign Teachers Flats?
- (16) Professor Shelley Walia said that he has also written to him (Vice-Chancellor) as to how they could improve the

financial position of the University and he has written a long letter regarding some of the proposals. One proposal, which was coming to his mind was, which he has seen in other Universities because one learns from others as to how they do and grow in their financial stature, that if the quality of publication, in the sense of Journals and Books and the way the books are monogrammed. Monograms are the ones, which had Ph.D. thesis, and then reformulated and modified into a book form. Thereafter, the Deans have the duty to perform and it is not that the Research Degree Committee would attend to it. The Dean should attend to this kind of programme that they in their Faculty try to ask the Chairpersons to tell as to which are the important Ph.Ds., i.e., 2-3 in each Department, which are of excellent quality, where the reports are to be published by the University. Thereafter, the same should be sold.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Shelley Walia to take this agenda to IQAC so that quality could be ensured on behalf of the University. He also requested him to give him (Vice-Chancellor) a note, which he in turn would send to the IQAC and would work with IQAC.

- (17) Professor Shelley Walia said that another thing, which has come to his mind, is he did not know as to why they are not charging heavy amount for parking at the Campus from the people who are coming to the University. In fact, in a foreign country, he was fined 40 \$ for parking his car at a place, which was earmarked for the students because the students were paying rent for that particular parking. Instead they are allowing people to park their cars all over without levying any handsome parking charges.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Shelley Walia.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that since the parking problem is being faced in front of or near the Administrative Block, the pond in front of the Administrative Block, which is lying as such for the last about 15 years, should be used as Parking Lot.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University has certain architectural layout, and if they make any such important changes in the architectural layout, they might be in a serious problem. They have some space, and if that is converted into parking place, parking problem could be solved up to some extent.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that when they go to PGIMER, on the left side of the new OPDs, they see multi-level parking place. Similarly, multi-level parking is there in the Punjab & Haryana High Court and the same is being now provided in Sector 17 also. Since the University has enough land on its western side, they should also plan to construct multi-level parking there. He suggested that tenders for the purpose should be given to a big Company on BOT basis. Everyone could park the vehicles there and walk to

their respective departments. E-rickshaws could be provided to handicapped persons.

Professor Shelley Walia said that due the problems of parking in the campus, he has not used his car for the last one year. The people should develop a culture of not using the car.

18. Professor Shelley Walia said that he wanted to point out that the evaluation of the answer sheets of the examination conducted by the University is done by the University teachers only because of the remuneration that is being paid to them. Many teachers do not check the papers and therefore the papers are sent to the Colleges. The people who really matter to the University and say that they did not have time, he suggested that if the Syndicate could come down heavily on those teachers to make the evaluation of the papers compulsory.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the evaluation of the answer sheets by the teachers is already a compulsory duty that the teachers of the Departments who conducted the examination, have to evaluate the answer sheets.

Continuing Professor Shelley Walia said that what he meant by compulsory that it should be integral to teaching because as teacher one is getting the salary for this. When they are being paid salary, they could not say that they would not evaluate the answer sheets. When a faculty member evaluates the answer sheets without remuneration, he/she would become a model for the others. He has done the evaluation without any remuneration. Since the teachers are getting the salary, the University could save this money of remuneration of Rs.20/- per paper being given to the teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in IITs, IIMs and some Universities, evaluation of the papers is part of the duty of the teachers.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the teachers of the University keep pending the evaluation of the answer sheets for months together due to which the re-evaluation is not done and the results are not declared in time and the students have to suffer for that.

19. Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had given a letter to the Vice-Chancellor related with Mrs. Chawla, a retired teacher, which may be considered.
20. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is not his personal view but he has been getting the information that the Vice-Chancellor nominees on the Inspection Committees are repeated. There should be a rotation in the nomination.
21. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that regarding the LL.M. Course he would like to say that since he is in practice, there are so many colleagues who have passed Law are interested in pursuing LL.M. in evening shift. There is a condition that the candidate seeking admission in LL.M. should have 55% marks in LL.B. whereas the UGC does not

put any such condition. That condition should be removed and even higher fee could be charged from such candidates.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa to give a proposal in this regard which would be examined from the Dean of University Instruction.

22. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that since there is no provision for the students who have passed the LL.B. and LL.M. examination to improve the performance, they should be allowed to improve their performance.

23. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa handed over a copy of the proposal made by Professor Yog Raj Angrish and Professor Ronki Ram regarding re-employment of the Principals in affiliated Colleges to the Registrar on the floor of the House.

It was clarified that a circular has been issued. Since he has received the representation only a day before, there was not enough time to place the matter before the Syndicate. However, the same could be placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

24. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there is an office order vide which the executive as well as financial powers given to Shri Kulwant Singh vide Syndicate decision dated 29.8.2011 stand ceased off and would be exercised by Executive Engineer-I. Shri Kulwant Singh deserves to be promoted long time back and his case was not considered properly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is already being looked into and he could discuss it with the Registrar.

25. Principal S.S. Sangha said that retirement age of the Principals of all the affiliated Colleges whether Arts, Science, Home Science, Physical Education, Education, Law, etc. should be uniform. However, there is some confusion in the matter. As per UGC norms, it should be up to 65 years for all the Colleges.

It was clarified that though the Syndicate had taken a decision in this regard, the same could not get recorded.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the Dean, College Development Council to put up the case for approval and he would approve the same, which would be placed before the Syndicate for information/ratification.

26. Principal S.S. Sangha said that about 30-35 Colleges had applied for integrated B.A.B.Ed. course. The NCTE has to inspect the Colleges but now the procedure for issuance of Letter of Intent (LOI) has changed. Earlier, it was such that after the inspection by the team, the LOI used to be issued and condition for fulfillment of requirement of teachers was imposed. But now the procedure is that firstly the teachers should be appointed, only then the LOI would be issued. This year, the last date for inspection of the Colleges has been fixed

by the NCTE 29th February. A message for inspection of a College is given just a day prior to the inspection. Since the appointment of the teachers is a pre-requisite for inspection of the College, the panel for Selection Committees should be approved as and when the same is sent by the Colleges.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE, which was adjourned on **23rd January 2016**, held on **6th February 2016** in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

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

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

At the beginning of the meeting, the Vice-Chancellor said that in the previous meeting held on 23rd January, 2016, they had discussed the items up to 23. Now they would start discussing from Item 24 onwards. They have to hold the meeting of the Board of Finance before the next meeting of Syndicate. Therefore, some of the items have to go to the Board of Finance.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that Item 23 was not discussed in the previous meeting and needs to be discussed.

Last dates for change of Subject/Faculty/Option and Inter College Migration under Semester System of Examination

23. Considered the minutes dated 15.12.2015 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding fixation of last date for change of Subject/Faculty/Option and Inter College Migration under Semester System of Examination.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the last date for issue of Inter-College Migration has been mentioned as 20th September whereas the last date for admission was 28th September. The date should not be mentioned because there are different last dates for admission with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor for University and Colleges. There was some confusion due to the dates. The last date for issue of Inter-College Migration should be 15 days after the last date of submission of returns because the registration is done only after submission of returns. The last date for admission was 28th September, especially in case of B.Ed. and M.Ed. How could the migration be done before the admission? Therefore, the last date should be 15 days after the last date of admission. If instead of fixing a date, the number of days after the last date of admission is fixed,

then there would be no problem. In the courses, where the last date for admission is 15th July or later with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor, the date of 20th September could be fixed but not for the courses where the last date for admission is 28th September. Sometimes also the Syndicate extends the dates of admission by 10 days. For example, a student who took the admission in Punjabi University, Patiala, how he/she could come to Panjab University after getting migration in a short period. As per Panjab University Calendar, it is one month after the date of returns, it could be 15 days in the case of semester. The grant of 15 days after the last date of submission of returns would facilitate the migration.

Some of the members agreed with the viewpoints expressed by Principal S.S. Sangha.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Principal S.S. Sangha would have to help in preparing all these details.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the last date for change of subject/faculty/option under semester system has been fixed on 16th August for the first semester and what about those students who want to change the option in the other semesters.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that under the annual system, the last date of admission used to be 31st August with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor. But now they are having the semester system. There was a communication regarding the guidelines for admission from the office of the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) in the first week of August, 2005. Usually, they extended the last date for admission up to 31st August. He thought that they should not extend it up to 31st August when the semester system is in place. On the one hand, the admission process is in the pipeline, a student could take admission with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor up to 31st August and at the same time, they have given the last date for change of subject as 16th August. Since the admission process is already on, they could not deny the opportunity to change the subject. Firstly, they have to close the admission process and after 15 days, they have to decide about the change of subject. He suggested that first of all, they have to clearly specify the last date of admission with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor. Under annual system, it used to be 31st August. If the last date is 10th or 15th August, then the question of change of subject comes.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as said by Shri Raghbir Dyal there are some problems because the supplementary examination of the Punjab School Education Board and Central Board of School Education are held and the results are declared during the 1st or 2nd week of August. Those students who clear their supplementary examination get a chance to take the admission up to 31st August and one precious year is saved. Earlier there was no such provision. The number of such students is in thousands.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would take up the item again and go back to a Committee comprising Principal S.S. Sangha to prepare the details properly.

Professor Shelley Walia said since it is not mentioned whether it is for undergraduate or postgraduate classes, it should be clearly specified.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that after the last date of admission, 15 days for submission of returns and 15 days for migration be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee should give a draft which would be considered again.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item in principle seems to be okay, but a Committee of 2-3 members could submit the draft.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Principal S.S. Sangha would talk to some of the members and would submit the draft which he (Vice-Chancellor) would consult with the Dean of University Instruction.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that the teaching work starts on 15th July and one month has been for change of subject.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are two cases. One is that the classes start on 15th July and they have given one month for the change of subject. But what about those students who are admitted after 31st August? Maximum of the students get admission within time and also get the subjects of choice. But Principal S.S. Sangha is talking about the practical difficulty not for change of subject but is referring to inter-college migration. There are two different things. As far as change of subject is concerned, they have a provision in the Panjab University Calendar itself that if there is no fault of the student, the change of subject could be allowed at the end of the year also. In such circumstances, if special permission is required, then to say that after this date, they would not allow the change of subject. If the last date of admission is 15th August, then it should not be extended beyond 10th August under any circumstances, and for change of subjects for the students admitted up to 10th August, all should be allowed to change subject/s up to 25th August (15 days after the last date of admission). But if they are extending the last date beyond the last date of change of subjects then it is not understandable. As far as last date and migration is concerned, Principal S.S. Sangha is right that let the dates be fixed. To say that most of the syllabus is concerned, in case of inter-college migration, whatever syllabus is covered in one College, the same is covered in the other College also. So, there is no difficulty in case of inter-college migration. It is only in the case of change of subject. It should be 10th August for change of subject and inter-college migration 15 days after the last date of submission of returns.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the interests of the students who have got supplementary should also be taken care of.

Professor Navdeep Goyal endorsed the viewpoints of Shri Harpreet Singh Dua.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 2-3 members should discuss the issue in detail and prepare a draft which would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there was a problem of the students they are talking about. The students who got less than 20% marks in 10+2 were eligible to seek admission in Punjabi University,

Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar since they were not allowed the admission in Panjab University. What used to happen that the students used to get admission in the first year in other Universities and in the second year they used to come to Panjab University resulting into net loss to Panjab University in spite of the fact that the University had to give them the degree after 3 years. With the introduction of semester system, those Universities must also be facing the same difficulty. Have those Universities kept the last date of admission as 31st August in the case of semester system also? If those Universities have not kept 31st August, then they have to see. If those Universities have kept the dates as 31st August and not facing the problems that they are facing, they have to look into it.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that if the results of Kurukshetra University are declared late by month and those students if interested for migration, they could also face the problems.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are talking about only inter-college migration and not inter-university migration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Principal S.S. Sangha should accept the responsibility to draft and submit the policy along with Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua before 17-18 February so that the same could be considered in the next Syndicate meeting.

It was informed that the dates of the academic calendar are also to be decided.

The Vice-Chancellor said the item be deferred and Principal S.S. Sangha, Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Dean College Development Council should prepare the draft of the policy and submit the same.

RESOLVED: That the item be deferred and a Committee including Principal S.S. Sangha, Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Dean College Development Council be constituted to prepare and submit the draft of the policy before 17-18 February so that the same could be considered in the next Syndicate meeting.

Permission to submit the thesis after condoning the delay of more than 8 years

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

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

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

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 30.08.2015 vide Para 22 (**Appendix-XXXI**)

considering the above recommendations of JRB and resolved that the relevance of Ph.D. thesis to be submitted by Mr. Danesh Hor, be got assessed and thereafter, the matter be placed before the Syndicate.

2. The Chairperson & Supervisor, Department of Urdu has written that:

“The reply submitted by Mr. Danesh Hor is attached (**Appendix-XXXI**) as required. This is further to certify that I have assessed the Ph.D. thesis of Mr. Danesh Hor as Supervisor and that the facts and findings in his thesis has been not alternated due to the long delay in submitting his Ph.D. thesis.”

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Joint Research Board dated 07.05.2015 (Item 28) (**Appendix-XXXI**), the delay of about 8 years in the submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Danesh Hor, be condoned and he be allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis within 15 days from the date of communication of decision.

Guidelines regarding special incentives to the outstanding sportsperson

25. Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 23.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXXII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for special incentive to the outstanding sportspersons from the session 2015-16.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there is no provision of providing incentives to those students of the affiliated Colleges who represent the University in inter-University competitions during their stay in the College. He drew the attention towards Incentive Scheme I and II appearing on page 119-120 of the agenda, for those students who have excelled in inter-University competitions, they are giving incentives like free education, free hostel accommodation and a data has been given that during the last year, i.e., 2014-15, 29 students from the various departments of Panjab University were refunded tuition fee only in the form of subsidy of Rs.6,65,293/- only and if the full fee exemption will be given the excess amount would have been Rs.7.31 lac approximately. But what about those students who are from the affiliated Colleges, could not they do something for those students?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the Colleges have their own funds, the Colleges have to decide on their own level and it could not be decided at the University level. This is a recommendation regarding tuition fee exemption of the University for the campus students.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the University is charging Rs.150/- as sports fund from the students of the affiliated Colleges.

Some members said that, that fund is a separate one.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the formation of the Sports Committee could be the same like the Board of Finance and Academic Council.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the guidelines are related with the campus students.

Principal S.S. Sangha enquired whether those students who hold first positions in international games, are provided free hostel accommodation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the seats in the hostels are provided even to those campus students who represent the University.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that special seats in hostels have been reserved for first three position holders in the Inter-University competition. Those students should be provided free accommodation also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it could be considered.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired why the President of the Sports Committee was not included in this Committee?

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the present Committee is not the Sports Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since Principal S.S. Sangha is having more knowledge related with the Colleges, his advice should be taken.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the advice of Principal S.S. Sangha would be taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said no issue at all. They would consult Principal S.S. Sangha in the matters related with sports.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired what is the blueprint for sports activities? He has been associated with a professional body of State level for several years now. That body gave good sportspersons. In that body, it is their policy is to tap the children when they are young of the age of 13-14 years, then harness them to, give specialized coaching with modern techniques. Sports is a good and interdisciplinary field. What they are doing in the Panjab University that Sports Committee is exclusively the domain of some Principals of Colleges of Education, ex-officio members of Panjab University. They have Fellows on the Board of Finance, Syndics in the Board of Finance and nominate the members on Board of Finance and Academic Council. He thought that the time has come to put some fresh air in the Panjab University Sports Committee by bringing a proposal to have some Syndics or Fellows on the Sports Committee. Secondly, one important thing what he has been seeing for the last few years in the conduct of inter-college competitions. Then after final selection, he did not knew whether they have a list of selectors from the Colleges or some persons sitting here. He did not challenge it. Of course, the selectors must be selecting the good sportspersons. But it is his personal opinion that they should have a policy to tap the young students of the Colleges in the very first year of various sports like shooting, etc. They are producing world level shooters in India. In

the Senate meeting also, he had said that he had an opportunity to go to the shooting range and found that it is a good shooting range. But it is not computerized. If they could computerize some part of the shooting range, they could hold world level competitions. His emphasis is that they should have a policy to have a pool of players. In cricket, what they used to do that the body has centres all over the district. The House would be surprised that in a tiny district like Muktsar, has approved grant by the State Association. They have got a pool of players in the category under-16, under-19, under-22. There are separate grounds. There is a person who is the head of the coaching department who is in-charge of taking the daily and monthly reports from the district headquarters. It is not only during the tournaments. There are specialized coaching schemes during the competitions. They should have a pool of players from the affiliated Colleges and Panjab University campus.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that a policy is being made. Summer coaching camps were also organized and the results are comparatively better.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University is doing well.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that Shri Raghbir Dyal meant that a member of the Syndicate should be a member of the Sports Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that some Senators like Varinder Gill and Shri Raghbir Dyal have been good players. Their guidance could be taken.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Syndics and Senators could guide in the administrative matters, but for the promotion of professions, only those having experience in sports or celebrity sportspersons from different fields could be involved while constituting the Sports Committees.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever Shri Raghbir Dyal was saying, they are already moving in that direction. Firstly, as he said that catch them when they are young. It has already been approved in the Sports Department that they would have some sports clubs like, Cricket, Tennis, Shooting and also for most of the games, they now have full-time coaches and having enrolment for the games beyond Panjab University and even enrolling the students of schools to avail the facilities, of course with some nominal charges. They have started a few games and with the time, they could add more games. Right now they are having basketball, badminton, cricket, tennis, shooting and having full-time coaches for these games. They have allowed the young students to join these games.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he meant to say that the coaches of the University should check the monthly progress of the outstanding player of any discipline from the affiliated Colleges whether they are nurtured properly or not if they have to get performance from the sportspersons. They should be nurtured and harnessed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let them get an update from the Director, Sports as to what are the new initiatives he has taken to see that the talent is spotted because most of the teams are not coming

from the campus but from outside. Let him talk to the Director, Sports and ask him to provide the status report as to what is in place and what could be done more to see that they are seen to be doing something. He had to go to Delhi to attend a meeting convened by Ministry of Human Resource Development. Justice Mudgal, former Chief Justice of Punjab and Haryana High Court is the Chairman of a National Committee which has been given a mandate as to how to incorporate the sports agenda of the nation into the higher education. He (Vice-Chancellor) did not have a copy of the report. The purpose was that the Universities should be incentivized to maintain the sports facilities of a competitive nature and these facilities should be available to anybody and everybody even to the school children.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that for example take the areas of Mahilpur and Hoshiarpur, supposedly excelling in football. These areas are an asset of Panjab University. They should send good persons there, make a pool and send good coaches there instead of inviting the players from there. They need to have some changes in the policy with the passage of time. If possible and the provisions of the Calendar allow, there is no harm in inviting the Director Sports to attend the Syndicate meeting whenever the items related with sports are to be discussed.

Dr. Ajay Ranga and Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Raghbir Dyal and Shri Varinder Gill and other sports celebrities as suggested by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa could be involved to suggest modifications in the sports policy.

This was agreed to.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no issue at all. But the more important thing is to have a concrete policy. The Ministry of Sports and Skill Development is supposed to provide the resources and then they could have some additional coaches who could be sent to various points. Shri Raghbir Dyal has made a good point.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Ministry has already provided NIS coaches.

The Vice-Chancellor said that well taken, he would see what could be done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that typically the Associate Professors and Professors are sent as observers. Some of the teachers are very good in sports and have represented at different levels. Those teachers should be identified and the observers be appointed in such a way that only those who have excelled in a particular game should be sent as observer for that game and not of the other game.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they need a database. They would have it collected through the office of Dean of University Instruction. Some resources have also been provided on behalf of the State Higher Education Council. Sports has to be an integrative part of higher education.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the incentives like free education (no fee to be charged except examination fees), free hostel accommodation are to be provided to the sportspersons. Is it a part of any policy?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the examination fee is to be paid because the students have to take examinations so many times.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they have the resources, the facilities could be provided.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the late fee should not be charged from the sports persons.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that exemption is given in the late fee.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 23.11.2015 (**Appendix**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for special incentive to the outstanding sports persons from the session 2015-16, be approved.

Deferred Item

26. Considered if, the permanent affiliation for B.Com course (3 units) and BBA course (2 Units), be granted to Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce & Management, Village- Jhande, P.O. Threke, Distt. Ludhiana, w.e.f. the session 2015-16. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

Initiating the discussion, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the list of teachers required for these courses has been attached with the item. As far as he knew, at least 4 regular teachers are required for one unit of Commerce. Since the College is asking for three units of B.Com, there should be at least 12 regular teachers. Secondly, the College has asked for two units of BBA for which at least 3 regular teachers are required. Is the College having the required number of teachers? The reports of the teachers and their salary statements are not attached. If a College wants to take permanent affiliation after completion of 5 years, the data is to be given. The given data is vague and incomplete as the salary statement, date of appointment, approvals, whether the College has got the regular faculty, whether the faculty is paid full salary as per UGC requirement, are not provided. There are lacunae in the case and how they could consider it.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that a teacher of Physical Education is a necessary requirement.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Inspection Committee which visited the College has given the unanimous recommendation for not granting the permanent affiliation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no mention of the conditions required for permanent affiliation.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the College has made good 1-2 discrepancies. But the overall data is not there. He is not saying that permanent affiliation may not be granted as the College is doing good work. But the complete data has not been provided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the recommendation of the Inspection Committee is there. He could not do all such microscope. If the members wanted to do the microscope, verify the data and if

there is a lacunae, the item could be deferred. The members should be satisfied. There is no issue.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that a team of the National Commission for SC/ST visited the campus. Some of the persons specifically pointed out the name of this College that the reservations is not being given in admissions and the College has specifically said that they would not provide the reservation in admission. Could they grant affiliation in the absence of reservation policy not being followed?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is a very serious issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment there is nothing to that effect in the report. He requested Dr. Ajay Ranga to give in writing and the same would be put up to the Committee. Whatever they are raising, it would go to each and every College. If they ask compliance from one College, it would have to be asked from all the Colleges.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the data may be sought from the College and till then the item could be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members could have a relook.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not this College only. He did not know under what circumstances the recommendation of the Committee whether of 2013 or 2014. The office note says that such and such happened in such years. It is only on the basis of the claim made by the College. As per the Panjab University Act and Regulations, the inspection report of the Committee must be annexed with the agenda. Secondly, he did not know about this College. Otherwise, there are some minimum norms which have been prescribed not only in Panjab University but UGC also. Unfortunately, they are concerned only about the number of teachers, their pay scales, but do not bother about the other conditions that all the non-teaching staff should be appointed on permanent basis. None of the reports has ever pointed out that non-teachers have been appointed on permanent basis and they are getting the pay-scales as prescribed by the concerned authorities. Of course an advisory has to be sent to the Committee, that they must confirm that the College is adhering to all the guidelines issued from time to time by Panjab University in case of admission schedule, appointments, salaries and in case of service conditions of the teachers of the affiliated Colleges because after all the purpose of getting permanent affiliation, of course, it is known that, it is only to be eligible to get grants from UGC. But there are Colleges who take permanent affiliation and after having permanent affiliation once, just do not bother to follow the guidelines. Of course, mechanism is there. But somehow they have to strengthen the system so that the Colleges do not take it for granted. Secondly, he did not know, this must be known to the Dean College Development Council, the permanent affiliation is not granted for a particular course, the affiliation is granted to a College whether the College is affiliated permanently or provisionally. But here the College is seeking permanent affiliation for 3 units of B.Com. and two units of BBA. Why, because for the purpose of getting grants from the UGC, the College could say that they are permanently affiliated to Panjab University and the College does not say that they

are permanently affiliated for a particular course. All these things could be looked into after the Committee's report in the next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever they wanted to do, they have to make an advisory which has also to be followed in each and every case.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that some of the Colleges have permanent affiliation in some subjects and not in others.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a College is granted permanent affiliation. Once that College is granted permanent affiliation, then that College as it is granted permanent affiliation. Thereafter, if the College wanted to add a course, then the College has to apply for extension of affiliation and that course, though the College is permanently affiliated, is affiliated provisionally. At present when the College is permanently affiliated, then they could not consider the course wise affiliation.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that initially the Colleges do not apply for permanent affiliation because they are not sure whether the College is going to run smoothly or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is why there is a difference between provisional and permanent affiliation. Until the College is 100% sure, they would not apply for permanent affiliation and that is also what the UGC says that if a particular College is going to exist, they could release a grant of Rs.10 crore so that after a year, the College says that they are not able to run the College. That is the purpose.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that means that they could get a certificate from the Dean College Development Council that the College is permanently affiliated. The Government Colleges could also say that they are permanently affiliated to Panjab University since they are running for the last about 60 years. He faced tremendous difficulty in getting such a certificate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the University, there is no data as on date as to which College is affiliated permanently and which provisionally. But, UGC for the purpose of releasing grants needs this certificate from the University that this College is permanently affiliated to Panjab University. As Shri Raghbir Dyal is saying that despite the fact that the College is existing for the last 60 years, presumably must be having permanent affiliation with the University and the University is not in a position to certify that the College is affiliated and it is just possible that the Government College must not have applied for permanent affiliation. That means earlier there was no difference between provisional and permanent affiliation and the fact is this only that earlier there was no such need and it is only after that the UGC came out with the scheme that unless and until a College is permanently affiliated, the College would not be considered for the grants.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no time is late. It is well taken that the University must have a clarity on the issue what is the permanent affiliation de facto and permanent affiliation de jure. The point is that they ought to have a clarity. Tomorrow, the UGC could ask the University or a directive from the UGC Secretary could arrive

to provide some data. Without waiting for such a situation, they can start collecting the data on behalf of State Level Quality Assurance Cell. Panjab University has been asked to create a State Level Quality Assurance Cell for Colleges of U.T. Chandigarh. This would be an instrument which is different from the IQAC of Panjab University campus. He asked the Secretary to Vice-Chancellor to initiate the steps to create such a Cell. For the creation of State Quality Assurance Cell, the University has been provided money by the Central Government at least for the next two years. State Level Quality Assurance Cell is separate from the State Project Director for SHEC.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item, be deferred and SLQAC, on behalf of Panjab University, be asked to collate data on affiliation status of Colleges affiliated to Panjab University in U.T., Chandigarh as well as Colleges in Punjab State.

**Recommendation of the
College Development
Council dated 7.12.2015**

27. Considered the minutes dated 7.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) of the College Development Council.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he feels good that Principal Madhu Prashar, Principal Navjot Kaur and Principal Sushma Sharma have been nominated as members of the College Development Council by which the area to which he belongs has been given the representation and such persons make it sure to attend the meeting. He said that the representatives of big Government Colleges of Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur should also be added as members by rotation.

The Vice-Chancellor agreed and asked the Dean College Development Council to include the persons from those areas also.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the funds of the Dean College Development Council seems to be a luxury fund. He pointed that Sr. No. 9 on page 131 relating to scholarship to the students of affiliated Colleges in the categories of Means-cum-Merit, Sports, Physically Challenged, Single Girl Child and Cancer/AIDS patients, the amount for the year 2014-15 is shown as Rs.55,08,000/- whereas the estimates for the year 2016-17 has been shown as Rs.30,00,000/- meaning thereby that a cut of Rs.25 lacs has been imposed on the scholarships. He enquired as, how it would be compensated. He further stated that they have incurred an expenditure of about Rs.7 to 8 crores on the construction of College Bhavan and an expenditure of Rs.1,17,22,941/- (Sr. No.18) has been incurred for purchase of DG Set, CCTV camera and furniture, landscaping, railing, fixing of fountains, balance payment of Construction Office, etc. A lot of expenditure is being incurred. He felt that the College Bhavan has become like a marriage palace/banquet hall. He suggested that they should try to curb the unnecessary expenditure as the fund of the College Development Council was meant for providing scholarship to the students and for organizing Seminars. He further observed that the wards of the regular teachers were being provided 25% scholarship out of this fund. As far as he knew if the ward of a regular teacher of affiliated Colleges takes admission in the University, the teacher might be of the age of 40-46 years and drawing a salary of more than Rs.1 lac. He thought that some money of this fund could be utilized for infrastructure development, reduce the unnecessary expenditure and use for construction work at Regional Centres. There are so many funds like College Development Council Funds, Holiday

Homes Funds out of which they could save money and use that fund for building quality infrastructure and academic blocks for the Constituent Colleges and Regional Centres. It needs to be looked into. When the College Development Fund was started, it was having 2-3 budget heads of expenditure, but now there are about 20-25 budget heads. They are spending money on seminars etc. If they collect the data, and that who is using the money for the seminars, they could come to know that most of the Colleges of Chandigarh and a couple of Colleges of Ludhiana might be using this fund. The major part of expenditure is in terms of seminar subsidy, tuition fee subsidy. He alleged that these are being used by the people of a particular area. In nutshell, he said that this fund should be used only for the purpose/s for which it has been created.

It was informed that the amount of scholarship to the students of affiliated Colleges in the categories of Means-cum-Merit, Sports, Physically Challenged, Single Girl Child and Cancer/Aids Patients was not reduced from Rs.55 lacs (for the year 2014-15 to Rs.30 lacs (for the years 2015-16 & 2016-17). In fact, the matter got delayed due to one reason or the other and even the month of March had passed, and they had no other alternative but to carry over the balance amount to the next year. The said amount of Rs.55 lacs, which has been mentioned for the year 2014-15, was of two years and not for only one year. So far as expenditure of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhavan for (i) Purchase of DG set, CCTV Camera and Furniture, etc., (ii) Landscaping Railing, Fixing of Fountains, etc.; and (iii) Balance payment of Construction office (Rs.1,17,22,941) is concerned, since a balance payment of about Rs.45 lacs was there, a provision for the same was made, that too, on the basis of estimates, revised estimates, etc. The DG Set, CCTV Camera, furniture, etc. are the basic requirements for the Seminar Halls. It was also informed that the money for the renovation of the Seminar Hall, music system, sound system and air conditioners has been given by DAV College, Chandigarh. Once the facilities are created, it would be very good for the teachers.

Principal BC Josan stated that he has also attended the meetings of the College Development Council and has observed that the facilities of College Bhavan are not being availed by the teachers of Chandigarh Colleges alone but also by the teachers of all the affiliated Colleges.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he has never said that the facilities of College Bhavan are not being allowed for the College teachers of his area. He is just saying that the major portion of the subsidies is being used only by the teachers of the Colleges situated in Chandigarh and Ludhiana.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he meant to say that a teacher, who is getting a handsome salary ranging between Rs.1.25 lac p.m. to Rs.1.5 lac, what is the need of giving subsidy of Rs.25,000/- to him/her.

It was informed that these decisions were taken by the Syndicate and Senate long time back.

The Vice Chancellor said that the points made by the members are well taken. They would make aware all the principles of the affiliated Colleges about the facilities available in the College Bhavan.

More funds could be given to the College teachers from the State Higher Education Council on performance basis to enable them to engage the students in activities other than classroom teaching. The U.T. Chandigarh Administration, in principle, has accepted that the College teachers interested for going on sabbatical, the expenditure on account of replacement would be covered by the State Higher Education Council so that the managements did not hesitate to pay for that. The Ministry of Human Resource Development is also okay with it and says that the money could be used for some innovative things.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that on page 132 (Sr. No.2) the income from rent which was originally Rs.10 lacs has been revised to Rs.20 lacs, his apprehension was that would they get this much money.

It was informed that since they are receiving enough money through the rents (about Rs.30-32 lacs), that means that the people are satisfied with the facilities provided at College Bhavan and the revised income target is expected to be met.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa intervened to say that they should raise the amount of rent of College Bhavan. Instead of raising the income through effecting hike in fees, they should raise the income by increasing the rents of various University accommodations (Guest House, Golden Jubilee Guest House, Faculty House, College Bhavan, etc.) as the rent for the Guest House is so nominal that it is equivalent to "*Rain Basera*". He pointed out that if they see the catalogue of Guru Nanak Dev University, they would find that there are different slabs of rents for official visits of Professors and Senators, other Universities' officials, etc.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to revise the rents of various University accommodations, especially of Panjab University Guest House.

Professor Shelley Walia pointed out that the room rent of College Bhavan is Rs.500/-, whereas the rent of Guest House is Rs.300/- which is like a suite and much better to that. Therefore, they should hike the rent of University Guest House at least to Rs.800/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the purpose for which the amount of Rs.70 lacs has been proposed for renovation of College Branch.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the College Branch could be shifted to the College Bhavan.

It was clarified that it is an estimate for the workstations to be prepared on the pattern of Accounts Branch.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his question is that if they are taking this amount from the College Development Council Funds, from where the expenditure on the workstations of Accounts Branch had been incurred. This fund is not meant for upgradation of College Branch. For that matter, all the offices of the University, in one way or the other are functioning for the affiliated Colleges. Then why not spend the whole money for the upgrading the infrastructure of the administrative block. What is happening is that a particular fund they charge, if it belongs to a particular head, then take it out from

the liability and responsibility of the University as a whole and start spending as if that is a parallel fund. It is not that he is opposing it but there has to be some justification that for upgradation of a particular building, which is owned and occupied by the University, the funds from a particular head are used which are not, in fact, meant for that. Why should they spend the funds of the College Development for upgradation? Ultimately, they would have to face problems. Why he is saying so for the last 20 years that they started getting the hostel messes and buildings renovated out of the Amalgamated Fund which, of course, he thought is not happening now. So much so, out of those funds, the tables, utensils and other equipments which are being used in the hostels and extension of the hostel building also, the funds were spent, which of course should not have been done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is permissible out of the Amalgamated Fund.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Amalgamated Fund could be used for a particular purpose which is open only to all students. The student may or may not be aware of that facility, but should have access to that facility. The hostel facility is not available to the day scholars, it is available only to the hostellers. But the Amalgamated Fund belongs to all including day scholars. If the departments have provided the drinking water facility, that facility is available to all the students. At the moment, they are not having discussion on Amalgamated Fund, whenever the item related with it would come, he would discuss in detail. Could that fund be used for extension of the hostel building, but he is sure that it has been used. It should be looked into.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would look into the records. The funds of Amalgamated Fund could be utilised for a purpose like that if a canteen is to be constructed in a department, they could not say that the canteen facilities would be used only by a particular department, but all the students could avail of the facilities.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since the money is coming from the students, it should be utilized properly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a large Committee has made this recommendation, but since he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) has raised the point, he (Vice-Chancellor) would look in the matter.

Professor Anil Monga said that though the words 'modernization/upgradation' have been used, the amount might have been sought for the purpose of computerization.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the demand has been made for Rs.70 lac, they would ask the Dean, College Development Council to provide the details of expenditure and for what purpose the expenditure would be incurred.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that even if a sum of Rs.1 crore is provided, he has no problem, but firstly they must see what for the funds have been sought. Secondly, Shri Raghbir Dyal has raised a very pertinent issue that it has been discussed on numerous occasions that when this introduction of 25% concession to the wards of the teachers of the affiliated Colleges was discussed out of this

fund, the argument which was given, was that ultimately the teachers of the affiliated Colleges are teaching the students of the University only. So if the College Development Fund is not to be used for the teachers, then for whom it is to be used. Then the second question came as there was an idea, which was mooted by one of the members of the Senate at that time, that the Principals and teachers of the affiliated Colleges should have tour of different Colleges in South and rest of the country and see what improvements could be brought in and it was decided that their entire TA and DA expenses would be borne by the College Development Council and they had said that it is their money and it is for them to see where it is to be spent as after all they are also doing it for the development. How that formula has succeeded or failed, it is for the University to see? How did it stop, he does not know? Twice or thrice the teams went and in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate it was demanded that at least the reports of those teams should be placed before the Syndicate and Senate, which never came, and ultimately, the practice was stopped. He (Shri Raghbir Dyal) has rightly pointed out as to how the College Development Fund is going to help, if they are giving concession to the wards of the teachers of affiliated Colleges out of this fund and how the Colleges are going to be developed? But still as was being said in the case of Amalgamated Fund, he is not debating because this decision has already been taken, and if the Syndicate and Senate think that it is time to revisit that decision, that could be discussed. It is only in the light of that, he said that he has no objection for spending Rs.70 lacs, but they must see whether it is provided for that they could spend this money. Then why Colleges Branch only, why not R&S Branch also, which in fact is dealing directly with the Colleges, and why not the Examination Branch, which deals with only about 15% students from the Campus and about 85% students from the affiliated Colleges. If this fund could be used for this purpose, then they should also use it for other purposes. They should also see that before the concept of Dean, College Development Council, which was introduced by the UGC, whether the Colleges Branch in Panjab University existed or not. Whether the Colleges Branch was created by way of office of Dean, College Development Council? So obviously, they would know that in addition to the Colleges Branch, which was existing, the purposes of College Development Council, which was created by the UGC, must be something else, which was already existing at that time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is 25 year old story as the office of the Dean, College Development Council was created in early 90s.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that they are collecting a sum of Rs.1 crore from the students, but if a student, who wishes to take admission in one of the affiliated Colleges, visits the Dean, College Development Council, Website, he is not able to find as to which course is being offered in a particular College. Last week, he visited the Website of Punjabi University, Patiala, wherein he found that there is a separate column for the Colleges and the courses offered by them. If a student wishes to take admission to M.Sc. (Mathematics) courses in one of the Colleges affiliated with Panjab University, he/she has no information in which Colleges M.Sc. (Mathematics) course is being offered. He suggested that if Programmer/s is/are required to be given to the Colleges Branch, he/she/they should be given so that computerization of the Branch could be done and everything relating

to the Colleges is uploaded on the website of the Dean, College Development Council.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that one of the programmers, who have recently been appointed, should be posted in the Colleges Branch. He suggested that in addition to the Courses offered by the affiliated Colleges, information relating to vacant teaching positions and NET qualified candidates should also be uploaded on the website of the Dean, College Development Council, so that they could know in which subject/s the candidates for the post of Assistant Professor are not available.

It was clarified that the software has been provided and a Programmer is also being posted to Colleges Branch shortly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he felt that as the software has already been provided to the Colleges Branch and the Programmer would also be provided to them. Hence, it is a matter of days only that the entire information would be uploaded on the website of Dean, College Development Council, which would be something fantastic.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that their sole purpose should not be collecting of money from the students, but also bring in reforms.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Shri Raghbir Dyal is well taken.

Referring to Sr. No.16 of the Appendix (page 131) on the agenda, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that a provision for "Furnishing of College Bhavan Building- including purchase of Furniture, AC.s, other required infrastructure, and fitting of the lift, etc." has been made. Though he did not know as to who were the members of the Construction Committee, but no provision for outlet of water from the ACs has been made and the pipes (plastic pipes) are hanging outside. Though the contract of the University is always double the amount of the contract given by the private person, despite that such discrepancies are there. Nowadays, even if one room flat is constructed, provisions for CCTV, Cable, AC, Telephone, etc. are made, whereas in the new buildings constructed by the University no such provisions are made in spite of the fact that so many XENs, Technical Advisor, Architect, etc. are involved.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that though a lot of complaints are there against the XEN Office, they are deliberately keeping their eyes closed.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that despite there being a lot of complaints against the XEN Office, no action is being taken, and he did not know the reason for that and what attachment and love is with the XEN Office and what benefit is from the XEN Office.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that though the Syndicate Room is so old, only one pipe of the Split Air Conditioner is in the open, and that too, because when this was constructed, the Air Conditioners were not there. However, if they visit those rooms, they would be astonished to see that lengthy electrical wire are hanging in the rooms. They are suggesting hike in room rents of the Guest House, Faculty House, Golden Jubilee Guest House, College Bhavan, etc., but they should introspect whether they are providing facilities. If they

see the condition of the refrigerator/s provided in the Guest House kitchen, they would find the tomatoes thrown in it as is being done in the vegetable market, and if seen, nobody would take the meal there. So far as College Bhavan is concerned, there is no provision for dressing table and condition of bathrooms is also worse.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if provision has not been made, is it not a serious matter. Any building which has come up in the University after 2000, if these basic provisions have not been kept there, then it is a very serious matter.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they should spend the money for construction of University buildings, as they do while constructing their own house.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if they did not know about certain provisions in the new buildings, the contractor would be knowing about them.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua urged the Vice-Chancellor to provide all the papers relating to construction to them for the meeting of the Syndicate which is scheduled for 28th February, so that they could see whether the provision, which they have pointed out, had been made or not.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky suggested that, first of all, they should implement the e-tendering system in the University.

It was informed that e-tendering system is already in place in the University.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they wanted to see the tender documents so that they could see whether these provisions had been made or not, and if not, whether the Committee has approved the same keeping its eyes close.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, personally, he does not recommend placement of tender document before the Syndicate. He could authorize Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and couple of other members of the Syndicate to visit XEN office, examine the document and submit the status report.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the status report could be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that what is the need of status report as he is already pointing out that such and such provisions have not been made in the building. He just wanted to say that whether these provisions existed in the tender document.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would convene a meeting where the XEN would be present. He requested the members to suggest 3-4 names of the members for the meeting, which would be chaired by him. There would be a follow up of the said meeting.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that all these things should be done at the time of proposing the tender.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever Shri Harpreet Singh Dua is saying is right and they were facing the problem. Now, a Committee has been constituted and a decision taken that, from now onwards, if any building is to be constructed, one of the users would be made the Project Officer and associated with the construction work, which was earlier missing. He added that the Dean, College Development Council might not be aware of what was happening at the College Bhavan.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this suggestion is very good because if such buildings are to come up in Panjab University, they have Advisors, Architect, Architectural Advisors, Experts Engineers also, what are they doing.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are the Governing Body and have the right to assess.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if deficiency/deficiencies which have come to their minds, why the same have not come in the minds of the technical persons, is a serious matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is very well taken. He would have the meeting convened. He urged the members to give him three members from the Syndicate. He would call XEN, Architect, Electrical persons. He should be given an authorization that the Governing Body needs the status report on whatever they have done. They would not say that the status report be submitted before 28th February 2016, rather they would give them a month's time.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that there are sensors, and if one left the room, the electricity gadgets are automatically switched off.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, anyway, both of them (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Dr. Ajay Ranga) have to serve on the Committee proposed to be constituted.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that they should stop constructing parking in the green areas.

Professor Shelley Walia said that there is no supervision over the XENs. He was a Director of Academic Staff College and they built a full floor above the Golden Jubilee Guest House. Since the money had come from the UGC in his name, he wanted to supervise the activities of the XENs, i.e., what kind of air conditioners are being fitted there, and whether the water flow in the bathrooms is in correct manner. They would be surprised that every time, he went there to supervise, he was told by the XEN that everything has been done, and he just got the keys and got all the bills cleared from the Audit as his retirement was also approaching. He wanted to tell them that he went to a bathroom and observed that the water was flowing actually out of the door instead of drain. He had to actually insist that they must remove the tiles and do the work properly. What he wants to say is that there has to be Supervisory Committee to supervise the work of the XEN, whichever building they construct so that XEN, Architect, technical staff, etc. do not have free for all. In fact, they (construction staff) love it that there is no one to supervise them. He, therefore, suggested that 2-3 persons, either from the Syndicate or the Senate

along with the Chairperson of the Department, where the building is coming up should be requested to supervise the work of the XEN.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he agreed with Professor Shelley Walia to the extent that at least the Chairperson of the Department, whose work is being carried out by the XEN Office, should be there to supervise the work of the XEN Office.

It was informed that this aspect has been deliberated upon. The Registrar had noticed that at a lot of places, they are not complying to the requirements of the user. Thereafter, he insisted upon it that there has to be Project Officer delegated right from the start of the project to oversee each and everything relating to the construction.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if everything is to be seen by the Project Officer, then what for the huge paraphernalia is created in the form of XEN, SDO, etc. When they get their home constructed, they do all the exercises.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he had raised the issue at different platforms about the expenditure on various projects. In fact, a sum of Rs.3.25 crore was given to the XEN Office in the year 2013-14 for renovation of bathrooms of residential areas, but the work has not been carried so far. Even he had written a letter to the XEN, and in response the that Shri R.K. Rai, Executive Engineer, has given in writing that "we cannot supply this information". Being a Fellow, he has sought the information, even then the information was not supplied to him. He has requested the University authorities on numerous times that the XEN should be asked to give the information to him.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is a very serious issue.

Professor Anil Monga suggested that as directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, a ramp should be constructed or provision of Escalator should be made for the Physically Challenged persons in all the new building/s whichever they construct. When the members said that provision of Escalator should be made in all the buildings, Professor Anil Monga said that the Escalator sometime does not work. Therefore, the ramp is must; otherwise, they would land themselves in trouble.

Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed that in all the buildings the provision of exit and entrance is made, but no alternative provision for exit is made.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it should be seen whether the proposed expenditure of Rs.70 lac could be incurred on the renovation of Colleges Branch.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would get the details of the expenditure of Rs.70 lac to be incurred, along with purpose and the break-up and also whether they could do so or not.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested focus should also be given to all the discussion, whichever is held, other than the item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is going to be a meeting with the senior Officers engaged in the construction activities of the University (XEN, Architect, etc.), which would be provided by him, as early as possible. Thereafter, he would take three Syndicate members to give an authorization that whatever replies/answers would be sought from the XEN, etc., the same should be made available.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that if the XEN has given in writing that this information could not be supplied, it must be seen.

Principal S.S. Sangha pointed out that, earlier, for all kinds of Seminars/Workshops equal grant was given, but now they are giving a grant of Rs.25,000/- to Education & Law Colleges and Rs.40,000/- to the Degree Colleges. Whosoever holds the Seminars, Workshops, etc., the expenditure would be the same. With this, the difference would be only of about Rs.1 lac or Rs.1.5 lac. He suggested that from next year, equal amount of grant should be given to all the Colleges for holding Seminars, Workshops, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that this is just a token amount and with this no seminar/workshop could be held. On this basis, they could just apply. However, from next year, equal amount of grant would be provided to all the affiliated Colleges for holding Seminars, Workshops, etc.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the recommendations of the College Development Council dated 7.12.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved, except Sr. No.15, i.e., a provision of Rs.70 lac for renovation/modernization/upgradation of infrastructure facilities of College Branch;
2. the details of the expenditure of Rs.70 lac to be incurred, along with purpose and break-up and also whether they could do so or not, be got and placed before the Syndicate for consideration;
3. the list of courses offered by the affiliated Colleges (College-wise) be uploaded on the website of the University (Dean, College Development Council); and
4. from next year, equal amount of grant be given to all the Colleges for holding Seminars, Workshops, etc.

Recommendation of Executive Committee dated 23.11.2015

28. Considered the minutes dated 23.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) (Item No. 17, 21 & 22) of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that at page 142 of the Appendix, a provision of Rs.55 lac has been made for creation of new infrastructure, but the details of the same is missing. Whenever an item is placed before the Syndicate, it is better that all the details and documents pertaining to the same, should also be placed before the Syndicate. It would be better, if an annexure containing the details of

the infrastructure to be created, is enclosed at least with the proceedings.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Okay". The point made by Shri Raghbir Dyal is well taken. The annexure containing the details of the infrastructure to be created would be enclosed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether the outsiders are also allowed the facility of Physiotherapy?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all the players, students and employees are allowed the facility of the Physiotherapy.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that since there is only one Physiotherapist, only limited number of persons could be allowed the facility of Physiotherapy.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the retired employees of the University should also be allowed the facility of Physiotherapy.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Executive Committee of PUSC Committee dated 23.11.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved, with the modification that retired P.U. Employees be also be allowed the facility of Physiotherapy at the advised rate of Rs.50/- per head per machine per sitting.

Recommendation of Academic and Administrative Committees regarding introduction of P.U. CET (PG) for admission to Masters in Social Work

29. Considered the minutes of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 15.10.2015 (Item Nos.1 & 4) (**Appendix-XXXV**) regarding introduction of P.U. CET (PG) for admission to Masters in Social Work (MSW) and new fee structure of Department fund (Field Work Experience) with effect from the session 2016.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in one of the meetings of the Chairpersons, it was decided that the admission to all the Masters Courses be made on-line. He suggested that from the next academic session admissions to all the Masters Courses be made centralized on-line, so that the students are not harassed by personally visiting various Departments where they wish to take admission.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into and he would also talk to Professor A.K. Bhandari on the issue.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committee of Centre for Social Work dated 15.10.2015 relating to Item Nos.1 & 4, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Fee structure of the University teaching Departments & Regional Centres

30. Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 01.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVI**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to finalize the fee structure (**Appendix-XXXVI**) of the University Teaching Departments, Regional Centres for the session 2016-2017.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the tuition fee hike @ 5% subject to a minimum of Rs.500/- and maximum of Rs.1200/- for all courses of University Teaching Departments and Regional Centres has been proposed, and if they calculate the average it would come to Rs.1000/-. About 15,000 students are studying at the campus and P.U. Regional Centres, and if they take even an average of Rs.1200/-,

the total additional income would be around Rs.2 Crore, out of which 50% is being allocated to Mean-cum-Merit Scholarship.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are not changing anything and they would continue with providing 50% of the additional income to Mean-cum-Merit Scholarship as per the previous practice. The Vice-Chancellor further stated that this fee hike is just on the line what they had done last year, and no new things have been proposed. They have given a commitment that they would not get to a stage that they would not be able to increase the fees. This is not to generate a great deal of income, on behalf of the University, to meet the deficit of the University. They do not want to get into a situation that the governing body of the University again gets into a slumber. Earlier, they did not increase the fees for 6 years and they went into a slumber. Actually, it is not to generate income. Whatever they did last year, they would stick to that. The extra money which would be generated, would be spent for the welfare of the students. In fact, it is just to prevent the criticism that the governing body of the University has gone into a slumber again.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he has understood the point made by the Vice-Chancellor, that they should be seen to be increasing the fees, although the net income is not of great deal. At the same time, they should also be seen to be reducing their expenditure.

The Vice-Chancellor said that already three meetings of the Think-Tank have been held.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that during the last 4-5 meetings of the Senate, he had put certain points, and one of the points was that the Emerging Departments of the University should be clubbed, so that infrastructure and space could be properly utilized and the additional staff is shifted to the Administrative Block, but the University could not do anything in this regard. The second point was that they should call a meeting of the Heads of various University Teaching Departments to contemplate whether they could increase their intake or not without any additional workload. In the Department of Mathematics, there are 30 seats + NRI seats, and when the students go to the 3rd Semester, two branches becomes, i.e., Pure and Applied Mathematics, where they could easily increase the seats from 30 to 40 seats. If the Administrative Committee or Academic Committee of the Department is rigid, then it is a separate issue. There are several University Teaching Departments where they could easily increase the seats without any additional workload, but they have not done any work in that direction. He has also said that they had several losses (inventory stocks), which had never been written off, from where they could general income of a few lakhs of rupees, if not crores of rupees,. He further said that when they open the University Website, there is an Admission Portal, where they could add NRIs Admission Portal so that they could attract more and more NRI students. Secondly, their PGDCA and M.Sc. (IT) courses being offered in the affiliated Colleges are losing their sheen because several other Universities have started offering these courses through lateral entry. Therefore, they should also allow admission to the courses like M.Sc. (IT), M.C.A., etc. through lateral entry, but without any dilution in the academic standard. In this way, if the students of affiliated Colleges join the University, the revenue of the University would be enhanced. The University, after deducting all the expenditure,

collects about Rs.2.5 lac from the affiliated Colleges. He meant to say that they did not do any work in this direction during the last 3-4 years, perhaps thinking that as if his (Shri Raghbir Dyal) suggestions are superfluous. They have Alumni Portal, where they should mention as to how much annual contribution they have got from their alumni. He had also said that whenever they increase the fees, it should be done in one go. Now, they are increasing the fees of University Teaching Departments, in the next Syndicate they might place the matter relating to increase in the fees of affiliated Colleges, then the funds & charges of Dean, College Development Council, and so on. He pleaded that all the issues relating to the hike of fees/funds/charges, should be placed before the Syndicate in one meeting, so that they could know the clear picture. He pointed out that at page 169 of the Appendix, certain miscellaneous fees/funds/charges have been mentioned, but there is no uniformity in them. Citing an example, he said that at Sr. No. 3, the University Migration Fee has been mentioned as Rs.300/-, but according to him, it is Rs.440/- plus Rs.70/- (cost of form). He meant to say that these fees/charges/funds are not being upgraded as there is no tuning/collaboration between the different Departments/Branches of the University. He suggested that a notice should be issued to all the concerned Departments/Branches to collaborate and set the things right. In fact, something else is uploaded on the University Website and here something else has been mentioned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that does he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) mean to say that here something else has been mentioned, but they are charging something else.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he has been told that earlier, the migration fee was Rs.400/-, and when it was increased by 10%, it became Rs.440/- + Rs.70/- (cost of the form). However, it should be verified. He is pained to see the system under which the University is working. He suggested that all the concerns units should be asked sit together and remove the all deficiencies.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting had been chaired by the Dean of University Instruction. He also read out the names of other members of the Committee.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that when the top brains of No. 1 University of the country sit together and deliberate on an issue, it should not look as a futile exercise.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that if a student deposit a sum of Rs.1000/- as inter-University fee, but the actual fee Rs.1050/-. Resultantly, the result of the student is with held and at that time the student is asked to deposit a fine of Rs.3000/-. He pointed out that the students suffer in such manner.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had enough time to write him a letter beforehand enabling him to check such discrepancies beforehand.

Shri Ashok Goyal, going through the recommendations of the Committee, stated that the Committee has given the figure of 5% hike in tuition fee subject to a minimum increase of Rs.500/- and maximum Rs.1200/- and nothing more has been recommended. Who has done the rest of the work, they are unable to find. This is also

kept in mind that when they are talking about Rs.500/- and Rs.1200/-, they are talking about only in Indian Rupees. In fact, similar lower and upper limit has to be fixed for NRI's also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all the NRI seats are not being filled up.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the NRI seats are not being filled up not owing to high NRI fees. If the NRI seats are to remain vacant, they would remain vacant. If they are not being filled up, the fees for the same should be increased more, so that they might be able to demonstrate that they have also increase the NRI fees; otherwise, it could be alleged that they have not increase the NRI fees.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he fully agreed with Shri Ashok Goyal that the same percentage of increase should be applied to NRI, but in their currency and not in Indian Rupees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then it should be minimum \$500 and maximum \$1200.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they might not impose the capping of minimum and maximum on NRIs, but in their case the increased should be 5%.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, that is why, he records his symbolic dissent.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the capping of minimum and maximum should not be there for the NRIs, and instead it should be 5% hike.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that fee structure for all the University Teaching Departments, affiliated Colleges, funds/charges of the Dean, College Development Council, Sports, etc. should be brought together, so that they are aware of the entire position of the University and look at the issue at its entirety.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that additional revenue would be generated only to the tune of Rs.1.5 crore to Rs.2 crore. He suggested that the revenue so generated should be utilized for the benefits of the students. He suggested that it should be mentioned here.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has already been mentioned.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when they increase the fees in general, they faced the problem. He has also made a study, and has found that in UIAMS already the fee is about Rs.4 lac and there also they have increased the fee by Rs.1200/-. There are several Departments in the University, where even then admissions are not made, and there also they increase the fee by Rs.1200/-. Resultantly, the number of students decreased in those Departments.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the number students does not decrease only because of hike in fees.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have stated certain M.As., where the fee is already between Rs.30,000/- and Rs.40,000/-.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that nowhere it is happening that the students are not coming due to hike fees, but the students are not coming because the courses are not popular.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that in professional courses, fees should be increased at least by Rs.5,000/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they already have a Think-Tank, which is looking into the University finances. Let that report come. At the moment, they should approve what they have done last year.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that the resolved part (1.) is exactly same which was there last year, and agitation was there against it. He pleaded that they should follow on which later on consensus was arrived.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, they are following only that. So far as certain mistakes pointed out by the members, including Shri Raghbir Dyal, are concerned, a 2-3 member Committee of Syndicate could be appointed to verify that the mistakes are corrected by the office.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that a Committee comprising Professor Emanuel Nahar and Shri Raghbir Dyal be constituted to verify that the mistakes pointed out by the members are corrected by the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, a lot of things are needed to be corrected. He pointed out that it has been mentioned that "In addition to the above, all students are required to pay the following fees/funds/charges" – Inter-College Migration/Duplication Migration Certificate, Inter-University Migration/Duplicate Migration Certificate. He enquired why all students are required to pay these.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, no problem, these would be corrected.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that corrections would only be made, if pointed out. Similarly, there are so many fees and funds, which are not included in this chart. What Shri Raghbir Dyal was saying that in those case they effect 5% increase in all those cases. Here they are doing something else and there they would do something else. Citing an example, he said that there is very high fee for obtaining the transcript. The students who go abroad, need transcript, and the same are attested by the Registrar or other competent Officer/s. In certain cases, the students need 10-15 copies and the fee prescribed per copy is to the tune of Rs.400/- (only attestation fee). There are two types of people – one they bring the photocopies of the certificates and get the same attested from the competent officers by making them request and did not pay any fee for the purpose. The people who request for transcript of the prescribed form have to pay the requisite fee and also wait for 7-8 days. On the other hand, those who get the transcript attested by request neither pay the fee nor have to wait.

The Vice-Chancellor said that every University charged for transcript because certain people tampered with the transcripts.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that certain Universities accept the transcripts submitted by the University only. There are certain Universities which accept the transcript submitted by the candidates, but in sealed envelope.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that one of the practice is that the concerned University would ask the Panjab University to send the transcript of the concerned student to it directly. The second is the student concerned has to apply and the University would send the transcript to the concerned University. The third is that the student applies and he/she gets the transcript in a sealed envelope and submits the same in the concerned University. The fourth is that the candidate applies and requests the University to send the same through the travel agency. Lastly, the fifth is that the transcripts should be send to the Counsellor who is pursuing the case of the candidate concerned. Out of these five, the real issue is that the sealed envelope should go at the address, where it is required. So far as the signatures are concerned, the same should be of the authorized officer/s with his/her stamp. Whether this is being done by paying the prescribed fee or without fee, there is no record.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Registrar should not attest such documents without ensuring payment of prescribed fee.

Citing an example, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he requests him (Vice-Chancellor) to attest certain documents, he (Vice-Chancellor) would ask him to show the original documents and after his showing the same, he (Vice-Chancellor) would attest the documents and he is using them as transcript.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Registrar should not attest the transcripts.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nowhere it is mentioned that these are the transcripts. In fact, transcript mean exact copy of the document. Without quoting, let them tell that there was an Officer of Chandigarh Administration, who came here with 37 envelopes having 14 copies each. When he (Shri Goyal) met he was waiting in the car, and when he asked him what for he is waiting for, he told that he is waiting for the Registrar because he has to get these documents attested from him. When he told him that there is a set procedure for it, including payment of fee, he told him (Shri Goyal) that don't teach him. On further asking, the officer told him that he has told the Registrar in advance that it would take him (Registrar) at least 1.5 to 2 hours. In this way, the attestation was done without any fee. Why they are doing so? Are they not charging very high fee for the purpose they have not to do anything?

When the Vice-Chancellor asked the Registrar not to do such things, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not talking about the present Registrar or the previous Registrar. In fact, several Officers, including the Registrar are authorized to attest the transcripts.

It was informed that the Registrar attest the transcript only after ensuring that the proper procedure has been followed, including payment of fee.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that if they look at page 169 of the Appendix, they would find certain figures mentioned against Sr. Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8. He enquired whether these figures are in dollars or rupees. Rs.60 for admission form is equivalent to 1 dollar, which is nothing for foreign students. In fact, it should be 60 dollars.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the admission form might be of Rs.60/- only.

Continuing, Professor Shelley Walia said that a lot of amount is being earned by the Universities around the world through the foreign students. However, they give very little focus on getting foreign students. Do they have any publicity Department or agency, which advertises Panjab University. Once upon a time, they used to have 2000 to 3000 students only from Nigeria and Africa, but now the figure has drastically gone down. According to him, there is still a market in this University and they could, if they focus on it, find some ways for getting more foreign students. However, they are charging very nominal fees from the foreign students, whereas they could actually charged very high fees from the foreign students and they would never hesitate to pay the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that until they provide proper residential accommodation to the foreign students, there is no point in raising their fees.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they should make an NRI hostel for boys on the pattern of girls.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that all the foreign students, even if they are allowed to stay in the University hostels, they used to prefer private accommodation and they were living in thousands. Probably, in certain courses, after sometime, entrance test for admission has been introduced for the foreign students also owing to which the number of foreign students has decreased drastically.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to have some quality control. If they did not have any quality control, the foreign students would roam here for years together.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that basically the aim of giving admission to more and more foreign students is to increase the revenue of the University.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that though they should do less work, it should be done with full focus. Why do they not take work from the Dean International Students. Why do they not tie up with the Embassies of various developed and underdeveloped countries and give relaxation to them. If they visit Australia and Canada, they are very liberal while giving admissions to foreign students. Resultantly, majority of the students moved to those countries and that is way, they generate resources. They should focus on the financial crunch and ask the Dean International Students, as to what he/she is doing on this aspect. He urged that the admission process for the foreign students should be made easy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee would be constituted under the chairmanship of Dean International Students

and he (Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) and Professor Navdeep Goyal would also be made members of the said Committee.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that a candidate, who wishes to take admission at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital and UIET, should be asked to deposit the fee for all the five years in one go. Thereafter, they should not worry whether the student/s concerned qualify the course or not.

RESOLVED: That –

1. tuition fee hike of 5% subject to a minimum increase of Rs.500/- and maximum of Rs.1200/- (instead of Rs.1500/- on the request of the student representatives) for all courses of the University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres for the session 2016-17, be approved;
2. so far as other fee/fund charges (**Appendix-XXXVI**) are concerned, a Committee comprising Professor Emanuel Nahar and Shri Raghbir Dyal be constituted to verify/ensure that the mistakes pointed out by the members are corrected by the office, and the revised **Appendix**, be annexed with the final proceedings;
3. a Committee under the chairmanship of Dean International Students including Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Professor Navdeep Goyal be constituted to explore the possibility of having admission of more foreign students;
4. the Electricity & Water Charges Fund and Library Development Fund, be merged in Development Fund Account; and
5. the fee/fund structure be incorporated in the Handbook of Information of Rules for Admission for the session 2016-17 onwards.

Issue regarding allotment of single room to NRI/Foreign students at par with Research Scholars

31. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 08.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to take the decision regarding charging of hostel fee from NRI/Foreign National students.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 08.12.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

At this stage, when diaries and calendars were supplied to the members, just a few minutes before they had increased the fees. In the previous meeting of the Syndicate, similar type of diary and calendar were given to them. Now, again these are being given to them.

It was clarified that earlier, they were given the single page calendar, whereas now they are being provided a 12 page calendar.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired could they afford to spend this much extra expenses?

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are using this as a memento to the people, who come to the Vice-Chancellor's office and other VIPs, and this is also being given to Senate and Syndicate members.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the diaries which were earlier given to them, were very good.

It was informed that these are University diaries.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired whether it is a directory or diary.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they should reduce/cut down their expenses.

It was informed that it is a diary only. So far as directory is concerned, it was given last year. The same is not being provided as there is no change in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why 3, 4, 5 pages of the telephone directory have been reduced from this diary.

It was informed that last time, a full-fledged directory was provided to all separately. Since the directory was provided very late, there is only certain minor changes. That is why, it is not being provided now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all the Departments which print the diaries, including the Government, they provide separate directories and in the diaries also, the telephone numbers of important persons are given.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that around the University campus, there are a number of Coaching Academies, they should approach them to bear the expenses of the Directory and Diaries by offering them 2-4 pages of advertisement.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he did not agree with the suggestion put forth by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, in future, directory must be there in the diary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, alright, they would upload the University telephone directory on the University website. Those who wish to change, they would change periodically. There would be a pdf file also, and if anybody, wishes to download it, he/she could do so and could also down load the same in his/her phone.

The members said that an app. of telephone directory should be there.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the High Court and certain other good organizations give the photograph of the persons along with

telephone number and other particulars. If possible, they should also do so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on the University Website, it could be done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra reiterated that, in future, directory should be there in the diary itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the telephone numbers of the members of the Syndicate and Senate must be there in the diary, and the same was being done for the last so many years. More surprisingly, he does not know under what circumstances the telephone number of the Chancellor has also not been mentioned in the diary as if it is not an important number for Panjab University. The Chancellor happens to be the first member and the Chairman of the Senate. Earlier, they used to mention his telephone number in the diary. It is something, which at least he is not able to console himself that the names of the faculty members, probably if they were there in the diary and the names of the members of the Governing Body, have been taken out of this diary. It is expected that he should be taking along with this diary, the directory also, if he has to contact somebody, who is a member of the Senate. Anyhow, whatever has happened has happened. Diaries were given to them in the last meeting and if it is being given as souvenir to the visiting people, he could understand that the names are not required, but then these be given to them only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the souvenir was the calendar and the diary is being given as per the previous years' practice. He added that nobody has pointed it out. However, they would go back to the old practice/system.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to tell them so that they must know the background. He remembers that till 23 years back, though he did not know whether it was earlier also, in every January all the members of the Syndicate were given briefcase, and as rightly pointed out by the Vice-Chancellor that there are some like Ashok Goyal, who are always repeaters in the Syndicate and there it was seen that how many brief cases, he has got. None of the members of the Syndicate, as is being done today also, ever brought briefcase to the meeting, and those who were denied the chance to become the members of the Syndicate, they neither become the members of the Syndicate nor got the briefcases. So it was about 23 years back, when the briefcases were given in the Syndicate, at that time also it was said that unless and until the briefcases are given to all the members of the Senate, they would not accept the briefcases. So it started 22 years ago that all the members of the Senate also getting the briefcases. It is something else that no member of the Senate ever used the briefcase. But since he was the one, who said that unless and until these are also given to the members of the Senate, who really required the same, because it is not possible to bring so much agenda to the Senate meeting. He remembers that he brought that briefcase twice to the Senate meeting and made fool of himself, "that see the most learned man is coming with a briefcase" and he also stopped bringing the briefcase. In the light of this since they are talking about controlling their expenses, he felt that these types of luxuries should not be afforded to the members of the Syndicate and Senate as these are not required, so that they are able

to sent the message that they are not only engaged in fee hike or other such activities, but are also trying to curtail the expenditure.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the pages of the calendar are too good. Whosoever has designed these pages, should be appreciated/felicitated from his side.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that whosoever has designed the pages of calendar, should be felicitated on behalf of the Syndicate.

On an information sought by the members, the Vice-Chancellor said that these pages have been designed by the young person/s and have come via Shri Bhupinder Pali.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that though the quality of the calendar is very good; however, they should try to curtail their expenses.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the photographs have been provided by their own students & employees and nothing has been paid to anybody.

RESOLVED: That appreciation and felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to the designer/s of the calendar through Bhupinder Pali.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that when they were informed that the University would commemorate 2016 as Balwant Gargi Centenary year, at that time he has wanted to say that a calendar should be given in his name.

Continuing, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired that whether the person, who is engaged for videographing of the proceedings of the meetings of Syndicate, Senate and other bodies, has been given the contract.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has been outsourced.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that one of the Professors along with a couple of talented students of Department of Fine Arts should be assigned this job, so that they could show their talent and also earn something.

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

**Writing off articles of
Centre for Industry
Institute Partnership
Programme**

32. Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 20.08.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**), and

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired that after writing off the articles, how the same are disposed off.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after writing off the articles, the same are auctioned and the income so generated is deposited in the Depreciation Fund Account of the University.

RESOLVED: That the following items/articles of the Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be written off:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Quantity	Date of Purchase	Purchase Value
1.	Laptop	1	20.03.2002	Rs.1,35,000/-
2.	LCD Projector	1	06.02.2001	Rs.1,98,000/-

Issue regarding authorization to Manager, State Bank of India to verify the Life Certificate

33. Considered if, the Manager of the State Bank of India, be authorized to verify the Life Certificate, where the pension holder has the account to which his/her pension is credited. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXXIX**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. Request dated 09.10.2015 of Dr. B.N. Mehrotra, Professor (Retd.) U.B.S., P.U., Chandigarh enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIX**).
 2. At present the followings are the attesting authority of Life Certificate:
 1. Head of the P.U. Teaching Department/Branch.
 2. University Officer not below the Rank of Assistant Registrar.
 3. Class 'A' Government Gazetted Officer and
 4. First Class Magistrate.

RESOLVED: That the Manager of the State Bank of India, be authorized to verify the Life Certificate, where the pension holder has the account to which his/her pension is credited.

Judgement of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in the case of Dr. Latika Sharma, Department of Education

34. Considered the minutes dated 03.12.2015 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court (CWP No.8417 of 2005) in the case of Dr. Latika Sharma, Department of Education (as this judgement is quoted by some employees to get similar benefit for counting of their past service). Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the case of Dr. Latika Sharma has been cited in it, whereas she has been given the benefit individually. UGC has neither changed its Regulations nor is aware about this issue. Even in the case of retirement, every teacher approached the Court and he/she is granted stay. They have not done this that since Professor B.S. Ghuman has been granted stay, all the persons attaining the age of 60 years is being granted stay. He has enquired from the UGC and certain other places, and they have told him that they have not changed their regulations, and instead they stood by what they have done. If they want to do it, at least it should be got done from the UGC, and then take a final decision. In the last time also they had said that they should not violate the UGC. The teachers of the Colleges are not being given this benefit and similarly teachers of GNDU, Punjabi University and other Universities

are not being given this benefit. They usually first create a problem in their University and thereafter, the UGC reprimands them. They should not favour anybody due to which they might face problem at a later stage. Now, the person/s has/have two options – either they should get the benefit from the Court as is being done in the case of retirement or get it from the UGC by getting the UGC Regulations amended, so that all the persons working in the Colleges and Universities get this benefit.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the Committee has tried to find out as to what is the difference in it. Obviously, whether this benefit is to be given to everyone or not, is not yet decided. That is why, the Committee has just found this way. He could only suggest that a Committee should be formed to look into the issue from various angles as there are certain other things which are not required. In fact, the UGC does not deny, because if we logically see, if a person has to come and join after leaving his/her previous job, which required at least 3-4 days time, they could not treat that period as break in service. As such, they have to correlate the judgement of the High Court with the Service Regulations/Rules of State and Central Governments.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Government not only gives sufficient time for joining, but also gives money for the purpose.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that is why, he is suggesting that in the light of this, a Committee should be formed to find out as to what is to be adopted, which should be in commensurate with the Judgement of the High Court and the Service Regulations/Rules of State and Central Governments.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed that they are following the Regulations/Rules of the UGC and not the Service and Conduct Rules of State and Central Governments. In fact, Government has nowhere said that it would be 'break in service'. However, the UGC has also not defined the 'break in service'. Dr. Latika Sharma has challenged the 'break in service', and the High Court has given her the benefit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are doing only whatever is being considered. So don't add things. Right now, they are considering something humanistic. To the best of his knowledge, the 'break in service' in Central Government is permitted and he was sure that it must be permitted in Punjab Government also. They could find out that also. So they could form a Committee of the Syndics to deliberate and then they would get back to it, and Professor Keshav Malhotra would be a member of the said Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that his simple submission is that if in a particular case, the High Court has given a judgement, is it obligatory on their part to deal with all such similarly cases in the Syndicate and Senate. The Vice-Chancellor has rightly pointed out that there might be provision in the State and Central Governments that such kind of 'break in service' is not considered 'break in service' for this purpose. If this is so, then there was no reason for Dr. Latika Sharma to knock the door of the High Court. Had there been a provision, it would have been done earlier, but since it was conceived that "Yes" it is a break in service, she knocked the door of the High Court. They have also approved after the decision of the High Court, and nobody said that this order of the High Court should be appealed

in the Higher Court and LPA should be filed. No such thing happened because they had defence in their hands that tomorrow if the UGC says that they had done something in violation of the UGC, they would say that they had no alternative except to follow the directive of the Court. Now, in the light of that Court order, if they start considering the cases treating them at par, tomorrow if somebody ask them, they would have no defence that it is the direction of the High Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it means, they have to get it done from the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that "Yes", in fact, it is what Professor Keshav Malhotra is saying that in view of the orders passed by the Court, they could write to the UGC and thereafter, bring the same to the Syndicate and get the rule/s changed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Sub-Committee would be formed, which would give him the draft.

This was agreed to.

**Recommendations of
PUSC Committee dated
11.01.2016**

35. Considered the minutes (Item No. 5 & 12) of the PUSC Committee dated 11.01.2016 (**Appendix-XL**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has come to the Syndicate because it is to be placed before the Board of Finance; otherwise, there was no need to bring it to the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of PUSC Committee dated 11.01.2016, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

At this stage, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it has been learnt that the Board of Finance has been constituted. Two members of the Syndicate were to be appointed on the Board of Finance, for which the Vice-Chancellor was authorized. At that time, the Vice-Chancellor had categorically said that all would be consulted for the purpose. But at least he was not consulted.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he did not consult anyone. He has appointed two Syndics on the Board of Finance, the names of whom would be sent to all of them. If he gets alternate suggestions, he could reverse the decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said, "No Sir". Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he has already done it, he (Shri Goyal) would be the last person to ask him to change the decision.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if it has been done, there is no need to change the decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he should have adhered to his words, but since the minutes did not come, he forgot. He said that he stands committed to what he had said. However, he still says that if after his circulating the names, he gets name/s, he would add them as Special Invitee/s. When Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Syndicate had authorized the Vice-Chancellor to appoint two

members on the Board of Finance, on behalf of the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that he was supposed to adhere to his words. If he has defaulted, why should he not admit that.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the Vice-Chancellor was authorized to appoint two members on the Board of Finance, on behalf of the Syndicate, then there was no need to consult anybody.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is – if he has given a categorical assurance that he would consult, and if he has failed in that, he must admit it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Navdeep Goyal is right that the Vice-Chancellor has not said that he would consult everyone. The Vice-Chancellor says that he has not consulted anyone, but from Professor Navdeep Goyal's tone, it looks as if he was consulted.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that he has not consulted anybody. So he has defaulted. If he has made an error, he is willing to take his nominations back, and there is no issue at all. Now, there are two ways – either he sends those names to all of them asking for their concurrence, and if he gets additional 1 or two names, out of them at least one he would add as Special Invitee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not start a new practice and play with regulations. Whatever he (Vice-Chancellor) has done, they have no objection to that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since he has defaulted, he has no hesitation in accepting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since at least the persons, who have been nominated by the Vice-Chancellor on the Board of Finance, are also members of the Syndicate, if he circulate their name to them, nobody is going to object.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they might not object, but could suggest one or two more names, out of whom one would be added as Special Invitee.

This was agreed to.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at least now he congratulates him (Vice-Chancellor) because in the Senate it was wanted that people from the University should be there on the Board of Finance. Now, persons from the University (namely Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Ajay Ranga) have been nominated. So he is happy. However, if one or two names comes, he (Vice-Chancellor) should accommodate them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has already said that he would be happy to add one or two Syndics as special invitee. The meeting of the Board of Finance is fixed for 15th February, the member should send the name/s to him by 9th or 10th February 2016.

Budget Estimates (**as per Annexure-A**) for the year 2016-17, be approved.

RESOLVED: That the PUSC Budget Estimates for the year 2016-17, (**as per Annexure-A**), be approved.

Qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security

37. Considered the qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security, be re-advertised.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that even before issuing the advertisement for the post of Chief of University Security, immediately a letter should be sent to all the organizations/institutions seeking persons on deputation, so that if names are to come from them, let them come well in time.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Okay fine".

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that a clause should be added that the candidates could also send a copy of their application directly, because it take a lot of time to send applications through proper channel, resultantly certain candidates get late and are deprived from applying.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the person, who was selected earlier, had a service of about 17 years in his previous organization. There are officers with the BSF, who have service of 20 years or more, and they would be interested to move on.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he is only suggesting that the persons should be allow to send an advanced copy of their application to the University. The final copy of the application would come through the Department concerned.

On an enquiry made by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, it was informed that the retirement age of the Chief of University Security is 60 years.

Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that the height of the candidate has been sought to be 166 cm, which seems to be on the lower side. In fact, they needed a tall and healthy person as Chief of University Security.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified these are the qualifications, with which the post had earlier been advertised, and nothing has been changed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the maximum age has been fixed at 56 years, whereas the police personnel retired after attaining the age of 58 years. Why are they debarring them.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa clarified that the main purpose of fixing the maximum age at 56 is that the appointee could serve the University at least for 4 years.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that even if the person is appointed after attaining the age of 58 years, he would serve for two years, which is not a less period in any manner.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if a person with the age of 58 years is made eligible, then they have to advertise the post again and again and the process of selection is quite lengthy.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the person is allowed to serve for a long period, he would serve efficiently with more responsibility.

Professor Anil Monga said that the upper age has been fixed as 56 years, perhaps because in certain organizations the defence services officers retire after attaining the age of 52/54 years.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that by fixing the upper age at 56 years, they are debarring a full cadre from becoming eligible. He added that the Punjab Government had made a provision for continuing in service after attaining the age of 58 years up to the age of 60 years. According to him, no police personnel would be willing to join the University as Chief of University Security on leaving his job.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the Central Government has lowered the minimum service for pension benefit(s) to 20 years, many officers with 20 years or more service would be willing to join the University as Chief of University Security because it is a non-transferable job.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Police personnel have more knowledge to resolve the cases of the University, whereas they are completely debarring the Police personnel.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it has been mentioned in the qualifications that Police Officer (DSP preferable; however, Inspector & above with suitable experience could also be considered). However, he did not know why they are debarring them after retirement because nobody would join the University after leaving his job. Sometimes persons have extra medal of commendable service/sports, why they are debarring him. He suggested that the option for serving the University even for a period of two years should not be closed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no such person has been debarred. When the post would be filled up after advertising, screening of applications and selection, almost one year would be over and only one year would remain.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, in fact, persons knew that they would be attaining the age of 58 years in a particular month, they are eligible and would definitely apply.

The Vice-Chancellor said that but their process is so slow that even the interview would not be held for more than six months. Secondly, these are exactly the same qualifications, with which the post was advertised last time.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there is no harm in making the changes, but the changes should be discussed threadbare. However, he clarified that the upper age of 56 years has been prescribed so that the appointee could get at least four years to do justice to his appointment. Therefore, he suggested that the upper

age limit should be brought down from 56 years to 55 years so that he could get full five years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, personally, he is not recommending that the person should be appointed on year-to-year basis.

Professor Shelley Walia said that educational qualifications are must for the post of Chief of University Security because he has to deal with the students. Though he has nothing against the army, since they are facing traffic problem at the campus, the person who has dealt with the traffic during his service, should be given preference.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that when he was a student at the campus, since he was involved in the students activities, he knew that at that time, the Chief of University Security was a Police Officer and he used to handle the students very rashly. He pointed out that they had diluted the qualifications, e.g., (DSP preferable; however, Inspector & above with suitable experience could also be considered) having minimum -5 years of experience out of which at least 06 months experience should be of supervising in an area where an educational institution is situated. First of all, he should be told, to which rank in the army, pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP Rs.6,600/- is equivalent to.

It was informed that in army this pay-scale is equivalent to Major.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that so far as Police is concerned, it should be Superintendent of Police instead of Deputy Superintendent of Police. Since Inspector is much lower rank, it should be Major, Superintendent of Police and above. They could well imagine a person, who was dealing with the criminals during his entire service, how he would deal with the students. On an information sought by Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa informed that the Major is equivalent to Superintendent of Police. He is saying this on the basis of rank and file and not on the basis of pay-scales.

The Vice-Chancellor said that alright, they would come back with the Item on 28th February 2016 with more details.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the detailed instruction annexed with this item, probably, is meant for the whole advertisement. On the one side, they are advertising a single post and on the other side, they are saying that reservation would be up to such and such extent, and so on. Therefore, these instructions should not be brought again.

Professor Anil Monga said that this is what he also wanted to point out. He added that as per the instructions, there would be 5 years relaxation for SC/ST. They are fixing the upper age at 56 years and after giving the relaxation of five years, it meant the person would be appointed at the age of 61 years. Secondly, for the post of Chief of University Security, no reservation for Physically challenged is required. So all these things needed to be checked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on 28th February, they would be doing it correctly.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred. The item be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting, and in the meanwhile, the suggestions made by the members be examined and the qualifications/instructions for the post of Chief of University Security be revised accordingly.

Qualifications for the post of Assistant Registrar

38. Considered if, the following qualifications for the posts of Assistant Registrar, be re-advertised as per Advertisement No. 1/2013 or as per the corrigendum:

Qualification of Assistant Registrar as Advertised vide No. 1/2013	Qualification as per corrigendum
<p>1(i) Masters degree with at least 55% marks (50% marks in case of SC/ST candidates) or equivalent grade thereof from a recognized University.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Graduate with LL.B. degree with at least 55% marks (50% marks in case of SC/ST candidates) or equivalent grade thereof in both graduation and LL.B. from recognized University,</p> <p>(ii) At least 5 years experience of working in responsible position in an Education/ Research institution or Govt. Office, preferably with experience of administration at a College/University, such as Head of the Department, Bursar, Registrar(Exams) Lecturer/Assistant Professor or eight years of experience as Office Superintendent or PA.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>2. Graduate with CA/ICWA with at least 55% marks(50% marks in case of SC/ST candidate) in graduation with at least five years of working experience in case of CA/ICWA.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>3. A candidate having Masters Degree or LL.B. degree with not less than 20 years of service in a University out of which he/she must have worked as Superintendent/PA/ASO/ ASO (Stenography) Senior Assistant/ Stenographer for a period of not less than 5 years.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p>	<p>1(a) Masters Degree with at least 55% marks (50% marks in case of SC/ST candidates) or equivalent grade thereof from a recognized University; and</p> <p>1 (b) Five years as Assistant Professor in the AGP of Rs. 6000/- and above in Educational/Research Institution having experience in Educational Administration.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Five years of administrative experience as Superintendent or in an equivalent post or above in an Educational/Research Institution.</p> <p>2. A candidate with not less than 20 years of service in Panjab University out of which he/she must have worked as Superintendent/Personal Assistant or above position, for a period of not less than 1 years, shall be eligible irrespective of qualification prescribed above at 1 (a) & (b).</p>

4. A candidate having Graduate Degree with not less than 25 years of service in a University, out of which he/She must have worked as Superintendent/ PA/ ASO/ ASO (Stenography)/Sr. Assistant/ Stenographer for a period of not less than five years.	
--	--

Information contained in office note was taken into consideration

Professor Anil Monga said that they are diluting the qualifications as the provision of having LL.B. degree with not less than 20 years of service in a University out of which he/she must have worked as Superintendent/ PA/ASO (Stenography)/Senior Assistant/Stenographer for a period of not less than 5 years is being deleted. According to him, the candidate having LL.B. degree should be preferred.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, they are not doing anything. The item is that the post of Assistant Registrar be re-advertised with the existing qualifications. But the item has been framed as "To consider if, the following qualifications for the posts of Assistant Registrar, be re-advertised as per Advertisement No.1/2013 or as per the corrigendum, as if they are to re-advertise the qualifications. In fact, they are to re-advertise the posts of Assistant Registrar as per the existing qualifications. So far as the qualifications as per the corrigendum are concerned, the same are already stood approved. So they are not changing anything. The only thing is whether they are to re-advertise these posts and they have to say "yes or no" only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this very corrigendum is a part of the corrigendum which was given for the posts of Deputy Registrars, but that corrigendum never came to the Syndicate for approval. So it had been argued that technically it did not have the approval of the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal also said that the corrigendum has never been approved by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the item should be "To approve the qualifications for the posts of Assistant Registrars, which were given as corrigendum, but were not approved".

The Vice-Chancellor said that at that time, during the discussion, the Syndicate authorized the Vice-Chancellor, but the qualifications were never brought back to the Syndicate. So now it is being placed back to the Syndicate for approval.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that then the item should again be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting, after properly reframing the same.

This was agreed to.

Item 39 on the agenda has been taken up for consideration in the last meeting.

Routine and formal matters

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

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Programmers for further period of six months, i.e., w.e.f. the dates as noted against each after giving them one day's break, or till the posts of System Manager/Programmer (against which they are appointed) are filled in through regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions:

Sr No	Name of employee/ Department	Term up to	Date of break	Period of further extension
1.	Mr. Bhavan Chander Computer Centre, P.U.	9.11.2015	20.11.2015 & 18.02.2016	21.11.2015 to 17.02.2016 (89 days) & 19.02.2016 to 17.05.2016 (89 days)
2.	Mr. Deepak Kumar Computer Centre P.U.	03.12.2015	04.12.2015 & 03.03.2016	05.12.2015 to 02.03.2016 (89 days) & 04.03.2016 to 31.05.2016 (89 days)

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Programmers for further period of six months i.e. w.e.f. the dates as noted against each after giving them one day's break, or till the posts of Foreman (against which they are appointed) are filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions:-

Sr. No.	Name of Employee/ Department	Designation	Term upto	Dates of Break	Period of further extension
1.	Ms. Cheshta Arora Computer Unit, P.U.	Programmer	01.12.2015	02.12.2015 & 01.03.2016	03.12.2015 to 29.02.2016 (89 days) and 02.03.2016 to 26.05.2016 (86 days)
2.	Mr. Neeraj Rohila Computer Unit, P.U.	Programmer	07.12.2015	08.12.2015 & 04.03.2016	09.12.2015 to 03.03.2016 (86 days) and 05.03.2016 to 01.06.2016 (89 days)

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Dr. Shruti Sahdev, Medical Officer (Homeopathic), SSGPURC, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, for further period of six months i.e. w.e.f. 21.11.2015 to 17.02.2016 (89 days) with one day break on 20.11.2015 & further w.e.f. 19.02.2016 to 17.05.2016 (89 days) with one day break on 18.02.2016, on the previous terms & conditions.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Shri Karan Gandhi, Assistant Professor in Commerce (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Moga, w.e.f. 01.10.2015 & due amount may be paid to him after deducting one month salary from the period he has worked in the College in lieu of not giving one month notice, under rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

NOTE: Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, reads as under:

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

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has sanctioned six months extraordinary leave (without pay) to Dr. Sawarn Singh, Assistant Director, Population Research Centre, P.U. w.e.f. 18.12.2015, under Regulation 12.2 (C) (IV), b.12.2 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, to work as Secretary-cum-Advisor to Vice-Chancellor, Akal University, Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda.

NOTE: Dr. Sawarn Singh, Assistant Director, was sanctioned six months Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) w.e.f. 18.06.2015 vide letter No. 2408/GP dated 02.07.2015 (**Appendix-XLII**)

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of the Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XLIII**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and The University of Birmingham of Edgbaston, Birmingham, West Midlands, U.K.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University and Nottingham Trent University on 10.12.2015 (**Appendix-XLIV**).

- (viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of the Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XLV**), to establish an endowment, between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Mr. Jaswant Singh Gill, Sun Deep Inc., 31285 San Clemente St, Hayward CA 94544.

NOTE: 1. As per MoU, the donation of Rs.1,31,98,520/- (One Crore thirty one lac ninety eight thousand five hundred twenty only) was made by PU Alumnus Mr. Jaswant Singh Gill for Institution of Endowment named as “Gill Family Charitable Fund (GFCF)”. The corpus amount will be divided into two portions namely Jaswant Singh Gill Pharma Scholarship (JSGPS) and Jaswant Singh Gill Pharma Research Fellowship (JSGPRF) for the creation of research Fellowship named as Jaswant Singh Gill Pharma Research Fellowship (JSGPRF) to support the research scholars in the UIPS, and the same has been deposited as Fixed term deposit in State Bank of India.

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

- (ix)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 03.12.2015 (**Appendix-XLVI**), constituted by the Syndicate dated 18.10.2015 (General Discussion 3) with regard to the summary of the approved case/s of the Assistant Professor/s (as per **Annexure**), which have been received in the office without template and/or without approved format of template/with incomplete template/with template but wrong calculations/corrections in the affiliated Colleges of the Panjab University.

- (x)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the amended template included in the advertisement No. 6/2015 (**Appendix-XLVII**) for the post of Principals in P.U. constituent Colleges.

NOTE: The advertisement No. 6/2015 with amended template has been uploaded on the P.U. website.

- (xi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following facilities to be provided to the persons with disability for the conduct of written examination with immediate effect:

“Criteria like educational qualification, marks scored, age or other such restrictions for the scribe/reader/lab. assistant should not be fixed. Instead, the invigilation system should be strengthened, so that the candidates using scribe/reader/lab. assistant do not indulge in malpractices like copying and cheating during the examination.”

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 4.1.2014/16.1.2014 vide Para-16 **(Appendix-XLVIII)** has approved the following recommendations of the Committee:

Sr. No.	The existing position/ recommendations of the Committee for providing facilities to the persons with disabilities
V	<p>Under the rule of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, Chapter XXX Page 381, there is already a provision to allow the person with disability to have his/her scribe shall be a lower grade of education but he/she must not have secured more than 50% marks.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Committee has recommended to waive off the condition of 50% marks. This will facilitate the disabled person to find out the scribe easily.</p>

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendations of the Committee regarding difference in the scheme of syllabus taught to the students of MBA 3rd semester at PURC, Ludhiana and at the UBS, P.U. Campus, for the session 2015-16:

- (i) The paper of Strategic Management which the students of PURC have not studied in 3rd Semester, will be offered as one time exception in 4th semester. The examination of the same will be conducted in 4th semester as per new syllabus in the month of April/May, 2016, along with one compulsory and four optional papers.
- (ii) The Research project work which already done by the PURC students in 3rd semester stand scrapped as Research Project is not a part of the syllabus of MBA Programme at present.
- (iii) The students of PURC, Ludhiana will have to forgo any one of the three specialization papers opted for in the third semester so that the parity as per the new syllabus is maintained.
- (iv) In the 4th semester PURC, Ludhiana is directed to strictly follow the new syllabus.
- (v) PURC, Ludhiana is advised to regularly browse the website of Panjab University for any change in the course curriculum and also stay in touch with the Chairman, UBS, in this regard.

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Dean University Instruction, regarding amendment in Ph.D. Guidelines for uploading the Ph.D. theses in Shodhganga Repository:

1. The candidate must store in a C.D. and upload each chapter in a separate pdf file using file naming convention as prescribed by “Shodhganga” and adopted by Panjab University. Format to start the file with 01_title, 02_Certificate_, 03_Abstract and so on, so that the contents of thesis are displayed in the record as they appear in hard copy of theses (detail is attached).
2. The Supervisor/HOD must authenticate the CD submitted by the researcher to ensure that the soft copy is complete and exact replica of the print version accepted for award of Ph.D. A letter of the effect be issued by the department at the time of submission.
3. Theses must be checked by the respective Supervisor for plagiarism and accordingly “Certificate of Originality” may be issued to the candidate, which will be submitted to the Secrecy Branch at the time of submission of thesis. The A.C. Joshi Library will facilitate issue of the certificate of plagiarism check called the plagiarism Verification Certificate, by the concerned Supervisor at the time of submission of thesis.
4. Chairman of the Department will certify that no corrections have been suggested during viva-voce and on the basis of this recommendation Deputy Registrar (Secrecy) will verify the CD. If some corrections were suggested, then revised CD is to be submitted immediately by the candidate otherwise degree will not be awarded.
5. Ph.D. degree will be awarded only after D.R. (Secrecy) certifies that CD of the thesis (after corrections, if any) to be uploading on “Shodhganga” has been submitted by the student.
6. Immediately after declaration of Ph.D. result, the thesis is to be uploaded on the “Shodhganga” website, by the Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh, who will be supplied approved CD by the Deputy Registrar (Secrecy).
7. The candidate is to give non-exclusive rights in the specified format to archive and distribute their doctoral work through “Shodhganga” as well as through University’s IR in full text at the time of submission.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the following facilities to Small Scale Industrial Units (SSI) registered with the Government with regard to procurement of goods and services by the University:-

1. Issue to tender sets free of cost.
2. Exemption from payment of earnest money deposit.
3. Waiver of security deposit upto the monetary limit for which the unit is registered with the government.

NOTE: Copy of letter No.4695-4895/FDO/F-110 dated 21.12.2015 along with an office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XLIX)**.

(xv) In continuation to the office letter No.6324/ST/FC dated 06.10.2015 and No.7102-7160/ST/FC dated 30.11.2015**(Appendix-L)**, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved Tuition Fee \$1200 + \$ 150 Development Fund (\$ 1350 p.a.) for Foreign National/NRI candidates seeking admission to M.Phil. courses for the session 2015-16.

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the date of admission to all classes under semester system, through USOL upto 13.11.2015 with late fee of Rs.20,000/-.

NOTE: The last date of admission with late fee of Rs.15,000/- (with permission of the Vice-Chancellor) was extended upto 30.10.2015.

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted permission to Ms. Tanvi Gupta for admission in B.B.A.-III course in Govt. College for Girls, Ludhiana, for the session 2015-16, if otherwise she is eligible.

NOTE: Request dated 17.11.2015 of Ms. Tanvi Gupta duly forwarded by the Principal, Govt. College for Girls, Ludhiana vide Memo No.5181 dated 18.11.2015 for grant of permission for her admission to B.B.A.-III enclosed **(Appendix-LI)**.

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has ordered that Shri Paramjit Kumar, Superintendent (Retd.) who has been assigned the task of assisting the members of committee constituted for the purpose of checking of pension accounts and to find out the exact amount of misappropriation, be paid honorarium on the basis of half of the salary last drawn (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowance) rounded off to nearest lower 100, out

of the Budget Head “General Administration- Sub Head” “Temporary Establishment/Contractual Service/Hiring Service/ Outsourcing/Casual Workers” w.e.f. the date he reported for duty till co- terminus to the enquiry Committee.

(xix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the request of Dr. Rajinder Bhandari, Associate Professor, Department of Art History and Visual Arts, P.U., for voluntary/pre-mature retirement w.e.f. 08.03.2016 from the University Services, under Regulation 17.5 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and sanctioned the following retirement benefits as admissible, under Rules/Regulations:

“Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.”

(xx) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the roster prepared for teaching posts at P.U. Constituent Colleges as recommended by the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor dated 16.01.2016 (**Appendix-LII**).

NOTE: The corrigendum to advertisement No.7/2015 for the post of teaching faculty at P.U. Constituent Colleges (**Appendix-LII**) has been uploaded to the P.U. website.

(xxi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the financial/administrative powers vested with the Dean Research shall be exercised by the Director-RPC & the word Dean Research be substituted with Director-RPC in all rules of the University with immediate effect.

(xxii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to transfer an amount of Rs.10.00 crore from UIAMS Exam fund to Panjab University Non Plan Account No.1044978333, State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh to meet the shortfall for the payment of the salaries to be released on 1.1.2016 and the said amount shall be replenished back on receipt of grant from UGC.

(xxiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-LIII**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Sarbat Da Bhala Charitable Trust, Patiala.

(xxiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the meeting of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider the various issues relating to B.Voc. courses being run by Colleges under Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Kaushal Kendras, UGC Community College Scheme, NSQF etc, and accordingly also approved guidelines as well as the syllabi of B.Voc. courses for the session 2015-16.

- NOTE:** 1. The Committee dated 15.12.2015 (**Appendix-LIV**), to consider various issues relating to B.Voc. courses has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to approve the syllabi and guidelines of 13 B.Voc. courses presently being run in different affiliated Colleges, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate.
2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-LIV**).

Referring to Sub-Item R-(x), Shri Ashok Goyal enquired is this amended template for the post of Principals in Panjab University Constituent Colleges different from the template formulated by the UGC?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, perhaps earlier, there were different templates for the posts of Principals of affiliated Colleges and Principals of P.U. Constituent Colleges, though it is confirmed to him that the template annexed at page 214 of the **Appendix** was for the Principals of affiliated Colleges. Now, it has been made uniform. He also clarified that the UGC at its own has not provided any template for the posts of Principals. UGC has just provided the module for awarding the marks for different activities.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified they have provided the break-up for 60 marks and thereafter the break-up of 40 marks has been given. He added that this break-up has been provided by Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why he is asking because this issue has been discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate about 3-4 months back, wherein the UGC qualifications for appointment of Principals were discussed and the same were approved by the Syndicate. If he correctly remembers, there was some weightage given for the post to the experience of a candidate as Principal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that weightage has been given to the experience, i.e., 5% for Academic, 5% for Teaching, and 10% for Administrative.

On a query made by Shri Ashok Goyal, the Vice-Chancellor said that the posts of Principals of P.U. Constituent Colleges have been advertised.

When Professor Navdeep Goyal said that same template is there for the posts of Principals in the affiliated Colleges and P.U. Constituent Colleges, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, same template was not there and the issue was discussed in the Syndicate meeting that no template has ever been sent to the affiliated Colleges. At that time, the Vice-Chancellor instructed that this template be sent to the affiliated Colleges for implementation from today onwards.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor A.K. Bhandari made this template on a request from them.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to when this template has been formulated.

It was informed that there were not certain things in the earlier template, but this is as per the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that since the advertisement has already been released, they should consider it next time. Because earlier also there was some confusion in it, and they were under the impression that as per UGC there is no template for the posts of Principals of affiliated Colleges. Ultimately, it was brought out that there is a specific template for the posts of Principals in the UGC Regulations. It was resolved at that time in the Syndicate that from today onwards that template would be applicable. Probably, that has not been sent to the affiliated College till date.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is, what Professor A.K. Bhandari has done, is that he has incorporated all the details with fractions in the template.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether the 40% marks to be assessed by the Selection Committee is the mandate of the UGC?

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have not changed anything. Professor A.K. Bhandari has just incorporated "Score of one for each year of experience as a regular Principal (not-officiating) in a College and a score of $\frac{1}{2}$ for each year of experience as Principal (officiating)/ Vice-Principal/Bursar/Registrar (exam)/Dean in a College or as Chairperson of a University Teaching Department (for a fraction of an year, marks have to be reduced proportionately). Professor Bhandari has done this just to make the job easier to compute.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired what has been suggested by the UGC?

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that no such details have been provided by the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the UGC has also given this, but they have mentioned only Principal, whereas they have included Bursar, Registrar (exam), Dean in a College, etc. According to him, Bursar could not be counted as administrative experience.

Principal S.S. Sangha pointed out that the person officiating as Principal could not be given even half mark, if he/she is not eligible.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that it should be considered next time as all the details are not readily available.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that what for half mark has been given to Bursar. Usually, the junior-most person is assigned the job of Bursar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is his (Shri Dua) impression, but in the College where he studied forty years ago, the Bursar was a very senior teacher of the College.

A couple of members said that now it is got reversed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that the Principal assigned the job of Bursar to a very responsible person.

Principal S.S. Sangha cited an example of a new College, where only two persons are there, i.e., one Principal and an afresh teacher and he is assigned the job of Vice-Principal. A person having 15 years of teaching experience in a degree College is eligible for the post of Principal, and he would be given one mark, whereas the person who has worked as Vice-Principal for 20 years, he get 10 marks and the other would be given five marks. As such, they would face such types of problems.

It was informed that the UGC in its regulations has given broad guidelines and they have kept the same, i.e., Aptitude for teaching, ability to communicate, etc.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they would authorize the Vice-Chancellor and if the variance is found, the same would be pointed out to him (Vice-Chancellor), which should be removed.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in **Sub-Items R-(i) to R-(ix) and R-(xi) to R-(xxiv)** on the agenda, be ratified; and
- (2) so far as the information contained in **Sub-Item R-(x)** is concerned, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to ratify the same, on behalf of the Syndicate, after 15th February 2016 so that, if there is any variance in the template, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua would point out variance by 15th February to the Vice-Chancellor.

Routine and formal matters

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

- (i) (i) Since the interim orders dated 26.11.2015, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (23067 of 2015) has now been adjourned to till the next date of hearing, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. (Mrs.) Veena Sachdeva, Professor, Department of History, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

NOTE: The next date of hearing has been fixed for 20.01.2016.

- (ii) In continuation to the office letter No.11642-48/Estt.-I dated 27.11.2015 (**Appendix-LV**), the Vice-Chancellor has allowed that retiral benefits which have already been conveyed to all concerned branches in respect of Dr.(Mrs.) Veena Sachdeva, Professor, Department of History be treated as withdrawn till the Court Case is finalized.

- (ii) Since the interim orders dated 26.11.2015, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (23067 of 2015) has now been adjourned to 7.12.2015. The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Sanjay Chhibber, Professor, Department of Microbiology, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

NOTE: The next date of hearing has been fixed for 20.01.2016.

- (iii) Since the interim orders dated 24.08.2015, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (17435 of 2015) has now been adjourned to 28.10.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Sween, Department of Life Long Learning & Extension be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

NOTE: The next date of hearing has been fixed for 20.01.2016.

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to transfer the pro-rata service benefits except leave encashment of Dr. Pawan Kumar, Ex-Reader in Law, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, to the Registrar, Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU), Amritsar.

NOTE: 1. Earlier, the Syndicate in its meeting dated 29.04.2012 (Para 5) (**Appendix-LVI**) has resolved that Pro-rata gratuity be released to Shri Ajay Kumar Garg, (Ex-Reader, University Business School) on the basis of requirement of IIM, Lucknow, as contained in Punjab CSR Volume-II.

2. Request dated 29.09.2015 of Dr. Pawan Kumar enclosed (**Appendix-LVI**).

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

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Mr. Gaurav Gaur, Assistant Professor, Centre for Social Work, Panjab University, as Programme Officer in National Service Scheme (N.S.S.) of Panjab University, Chandigarh, in addition to his own duties.

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, as per authorization given by the Syndicate dated 26.04.2014 (Para 31), has approved the Travel Subsidy Committee minutes dated 15.09.2015 (**Appendix-LVII**), for the grant of Travel Subsidy for attending International Conferences outside India by the faculty members out of the UGC 12th Plan grant under General Development Assistance Scheme under the budget head Travel Grant.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.04.2014 vide Para 31 has resolved that:

(i) the recommendations of the Travel Subsidy Committee dated 03.03.2014, as per Appendix be approved.

(ii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to sanction Travel Subsidy to the teachers, on behalf of the Syndicate. Thereafter, item be brought to the Syndicate for information

- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor has accepted the Endowment of Rs. One Lac made by P.U. Alumni Mr. Baldev Singh Dhunej, settled in Holland for 'Panjab University Institute of Social Science Education and Research' and the same has been

deposited in the Special Endowment Trust (S.E.T.) Fund A/c No.10444978140.

(viii) The following candidates have been disqualified by the Standing Committee dealing with the Unfair Means Cases (UMC), from appearing in any University examination for the period noted against each, for being found impersonated, under Regulation 20 at page 13 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate/Impersonator	Period of disqualification
1.	<p>Jasvir Singh S/o Shri Darshan Singh Roll No. 10813000121 April/May, 2015 (Impersonated Candidate) B.A. II</p> <p>The impersonator not attended the office or before the Committee, no record of whereabouts and identity of Impersonator is Known, it is not possible for the Committee to pass any judgment against him at this state.</p>	<p>Disqualified for five years i.e. from April/May, 2015 to Sept./Oct., 2019 (Ten Exams.)</p>
2.	<p>Gurpreet Singh S/o Shri Rashpal Singh Roll No. 13111000177 September/October, 2015 (Impersonated Candidate).B.A. III</p> <p>The impersonator – Gurnam Singh attended the office and also before the Committee. He accepted that he attempted the answerpaper in place of Gurpreet Singh. He is not a candidate of Panjab University. So as per Regulation 20, that person is not on the rolls of a recognized school or college, he shall be declared as not a fit and proper person. The Committee has not taken any action against the impersonator.</p>	<p>Disqualified for five years i.e. from Sep./Oct., 2015 to Mar./April, 2020 (Ten Exams.)</p>
3.	<p>Pawan Kumar S/o Shri Sumer Chand Roll No. 13111000264 September/October,2015 (Impersonated Candidate).B.A. III</p> <p>The impersonator – Sukhwinder Singh attended the office and also before the Committee. He accepted that he attempted the answerpaper in place of Pawan Kumar. He is not a candidate of Panjab University, he did his B.Tech. from Punjabi University on 2014. So as per Regulation 20, that person is not on the rolls of a recognized school or college, he shall be declared as not a fit and proper person. The Committee has not taken any action against the impersonator.</p>	<p>Disqualified for five years i.e. from Sept./Oct., 2015 to March/April, 2020 (Ten Exams.)</p>
4.	<p>Sandeep Kumar S/o Shri Ramesh Kumar</p>	<p>Disqualified for five years i.e. from Sep./Oct., 2015 to March/April,</p>

<p>Roll No. 13111000301 September/October, 2015 (Impersonated Candidate) B.A.III</p> <p>The impersonator - Bhupinder Singh attended the office and also before the Committee. He accepted that he attempted the answerpaper in place of Sandeep Kumar. At present, he is not a candidate of Panjab University, he did his B.A. from Panjab University on 2014. So as per Regulation 20, that person is not on the rolls of a recognized school or college, he shall be declared as not a fit and proper person. The Committee has not taken any action against the impersonator.</p>	2020 (Ten Exams.)
--	-------------------

NOTE: Regulation 20, at page 13 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, reads as under:

“Any person who impersonates a candidate shall be disqualified from appearing in any University Examination for a period of five years, if that person is a student on the rolls of a recognized school or college. But if that person is not on the rolls of a recognized school or college, he shall be declared as not a fit and proper person to be admitted to any examination of the University for a period of five years and the case, if necessary, may be reported to the police. The candidate who is impersonated shall also be disqualified for a period of five years. All cases of impersonation shall be reported by the Controller of Examinations to the Syndicate.”

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

Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
Dr. Poonam Bakshi, Associate Professor Department of Economics	19.03.1990	30.11.2015	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and 15.2 at pages 131-132 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007. (ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for

			accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.
--	--	--	---

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Anil Kumar Singh Senior Technician (G-II) UIPS	24.12.1975	31.12.2015	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Savita Rani Senior Technician (G-II) Department of Economics	01.08.1974	31.01.2016	
3.	Shri Kuldip Singh Junior Technician (G-III) Department of Education	24.01.1979	30.11.2015	
4.	Ms. Kiran Sharma Assistant Registrar Examination-II	14.01.1977	31.01.2016	
5.	Ms. Saroj Bala Assistant Registrar Re-Evaluation	13.07.1979	31.01.2016	
6.	Shri Ram Asra Plumber (Technician G-I) P.U. Construction Office	01.10.1986	31.01.2016	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
7.	Shri Dhan Singh Junior Technician (G-III) Department of Mathematics	18.05.1973	31.12.2015	
8.	Shri Pritam Chand Ware House Operator P.U., Press	16.09.1974	31.12.2015	
9.	Shri Ram Dass Daftri Public Relations	01.08.1973	31.12.2015	
10.	Shri Jagdish Ram Daftri School of Punjabi Studies	08.01.1968	31.12.2015	
11.	Shri Nirmal Singh DMO-cum-Daftri Department of Economics	17.07.1970	31.01.2016	
12.	Shri Shinder Paul Security Guard Conduct Branch	11.04.1988	31.01.2016	
13.	Shri Ram Raj Cleaner Central Instrumentation Laboratory	02.04.1980	31.12.2015	
14.	Shri Mohinder Singh Cleaner Boys Hostel No. 5	01.07.1997	31.01.2016	

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

(xi) The Vice- Chancellor has sanctioned terminal benefits to the members of the family of the following employee who passed away while in service.

Sr. No.	Name of the deceased employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of death (while in service)	Name of the family member/s to whom the terminal benefits are to be given	Benefits
1.	Late Shri Naresh Tuli Professor Department of Geology	28.10.1988	02.12.2015	Smt. Alka Tuli (Wife)	Gratuity and Ex-gratia grant as admissible under the University Regulations and Rules
2.	Late Shri Rishal Singh Daftri Accounts Branch	01.03.1985	22.09.2015	Smt. Bira Devi (Wife)	
3.	Late Shri Prem Chand Cleaners Jamadar P.U. Construction Office	01.12.1974	18.09.2015	Smt. Rekha Rani (Wife)	

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

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

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name of the candidates	Father's Name	Faculty / Subject	Title
1.	3240	Anu Bala	D/o Shashi Bhushan	Science/ Physics	STUDY OF B → X (3872) Kπ DECAY WITH BELLE DETECTOR AT KEK B-FACTORY
2.	3241	Sarvnrinder Kaur	D/o Harbans Singh	Science/ Biophysics	STUDIES ON HEAT INDUCED HYPOXIA, OXIDATIVE STRESS AND APOPTOSIS IN MICE TESTES: MODULATION BY ANTIOXIDANTS
3.	3242	Chandan Rana	S/o Madan Chand Rana	Science/ Biophysics	DOWN REGULATION OF TELOMERASE AND CYCLOOXYGENASE BY DICLOFENAC AND CURCUMIN IN CHEMOPREVENTION OF COLON CANCER

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name of the candidates	Father's Name	Faculty / Subject	Title
4.	3243	Mohammad mehdi Heydari	S/o Abdollah	Science/ Anthropology	RECONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY AMONG IMMIGRANT MUSLIMS: A CASE STUDY OF MUSLIM POPULATION OF MANIMAJRA, CHANDIGARH
5.	3244	Neha Jindal	D/o Jawahar Lal Jindal	Science/ Chemistry	PREPARATION, CHARACTERIZATION AND OPTIMIZATION OF NIOSOMES AND MIXED MICELLAR SYSTEMS AS DRUG DELIVERY VEHICLES FOR LABILE AND POORLY WATER-SOLUBLE DRUGS
6.	3245	Harpreet Kaur	D/o Hakam Singh Gill	Science/ Zoology	PROTECTIVE EFFICACY AND IMMUNOGENICITY OF 31 KDA, 36 KDA AND 51 KDA ANTIGENS OF <i>LEISHMANIA DONOVANI</i> ALONG WITH VARIOUS ADJUVANTS AGAINST MURINE VISCERAL LEISHMANIASIS
7.	3246	Guneet Singh Assi	D/o Charanjit Singh	Arts/ Psychology	ROLE OF DRIVING ANGER, VENGEANCE, BOREDOM PRONENESS AND SENSATION-SEEKING IN PROPENSITY TOWARDS UNSAFE DRIVING
8.	3247	Priya Markanda	D/o Krishan Mohan Markanda	Arts/Mass Comm.	PHENOMENON OF CITIZEN JOURNALISM AND THE EMERGENCE OF FIFTH ESTATE: A STUDY IN INDIAN CONTEXT
9.	3248	Namit Kumar	S/o Inder Raj	Arts/Public Admn.	THE APPLICATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES IN POLICING: A STUDY OF CHANDIGARH POLICE
10.	3249	Ashrafalsadat Giti Ghoreishi	D/o Seyed Naghi	Arts/ Psychology	A STUDY OF PERSONALITY, OPTIMISM, HOSTILITY, STRESS AND COPING STYLES OF CANCER PATIENTS IN IRAN
11.	3250	Ashin Dhammacara	S/o U. Aung Kyi	Arts/ Philosophy	ASOKA'S DHAMMAPARIYAYA: ITS ORIGIN AND IMPACT ON THE PITAKA LITERATURE
12.	3251	Shweta Sharma	D/o Baldev Sharma	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	WOMEN EMPOWERMENT: A CASE STUDY OF WOMEN LEGISLATORS IN HIMACHAL PRADESH
13.	3252	Shweta Dhir	D/o Naresh Kumar	Law/Law	REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM: A HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO INDIA

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name of the candidates	Father's Name	Faculty / Subject	Title
14.	3253	Sabina Salim	D/o Salim Ahmad	Law/Law	TRANSBOUNDARY ENVIRONMENTAL HARM: A CRITIQUE OF EMERGING LIABILITY PRINCIPLES
15.	3254	Navita Sandhu Nee Navita Sharma	D/o S.K. Sharma	Law/Law	EVOLUTION OF MITAKSHARA COPARCENARY UNDER THE HINDU LAW: A STUDY
16.	3255	Gurpreet Singh	S/o Gurmej Singh	Law/Law	INTERVENTION UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY
17.	3256	Navneet Kaur	D/o Sher Singh	Languages/ Hindi	PRAVASI HINDI SAHITYA KA VARNANATMAK SARVEKSHAN
18.	3257	Kusum Lata	D/o Paras Ram	Languages/ Hindi	MADHYAM PURUSH SARVANAM KEE DRISHTI SE SHAILESH MATIYANI KE KATHA-SAHITYA KA ADHYAYAN
19.	3258	Lalita	D/o Matu Ram	Languages/ Sanskrit	JĀTAKA ATTHAKATHAOM MEM NARI VIMARŚA-EKA ADHYAYANA
20.	3259	Amarjit Kaur	D/o Parkash Singh	Languages/ Punjabi	AMARJIT CHANDAN DI KAVITA DA SUHAJ-SHASTARI ADHIYAN
21.	3260	Reena Sharma	D/o Kewal Krishan Sharma	Languages/ English	MOVING BEYOND NATURE-CULTURE DUALISM: A STUDY OF SELECTED NOVELS OF GITHA HARIHARAN
22.	3261	Himanshu Dwivedi	S/o Harendra Kumar Dwivedi	Design & Fine Arts/ Indian Theatre	BUNDALKHAND MAIN SWANG KI PARAMPARA AUR USKA ADHUNIK SWAROOP
23.	3262	Aditya Sharma	S/o Arvind Sharma	Design & Fine Arts/ Music	VOICE CULTIVATION IN HINDUSTANI CLASSICAL AND WESTERN MUSIC: A COMPARATIVE STUDY
24.	3263	Kiranjit Kaur	D/o Jarnail Singh	Education/ Education	ACHIEVEMENT IN MATHEMATICS OF ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS MATHEMATICS
25.	3264	Anuradha Sekhri	D/o Madan Lal Sekhri	Education/ Education	EFFECT OF COMPUTER BASED INDIVIDUALISTIC AND COOPERATIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES ON ACHIEVEMENT AND RETENTION IN CHEMISTRY IN RELATION TO SCIENTIFIC CREATIVITY AND SCIENTIFIC APTITUDE

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name of the candidates	Father's Name	Faculty / Subject	Title
26.	3265	Jasbir Kaur	D/o Kulwant Singh	Education/ Education	ALIENATION OF RURAL AND URBAN ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND FAMILY ENVIRONMENT
27.	3266	Tina	D/o Parkash Chand	Education/ Education	AN INVESTIGATION INTO AWARENESS ABOUT BULLYING ITS EFFECTS AND COPING STRATEGIES AMONG TEACHER TRAINEES WITH RESPECT TO THEIR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
28.	3267	Gurmeet Kaur	D/o Darshan Singh	Education/ Education	TEACHER'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY (ICT) IN RELATION TO GENDER, MOTIVATION, COMPUTER COMPETENCE AND COMPUTER ANXIETY
29.	3268	Shilpa Kakkar	D/o Ashok Kakkar	Pharm. Sciences	DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF OCULAR FORMULATIONS OF ANTIFUNGAL AGENTS
30.	3269	Manpreet Kaur	D/o Rattan Singh	Bus. Mgt. & Comm.	MULTICHANNEL MANAGEMENT: A STUDY OF SELECT PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR BANKS' PRACTICES AND THEIR CUSTOMERS' RESPONSE TOWARDS IT

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

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor has executed afresh agreement between the Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh (Hereinafter called PU) on the one part and Punjab Postal Circle, Chandigarh (Hereinafter called DOP) on the other hand **(Appendix-LVIII)** for the one year period w.e.f. 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016 for collection of Examination/Re-Evaluation Fees of Panjab University, Chandigarh, through the various Post Offices under e-payment service throughout the country.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 17.08.2014 vide Para 26 has resolved that:

“the contract agreement for collection of Examination/ Re-

Evaluation Fees of Panjab University, Chandigarh, through the various Post Offices under e-payment service throughout the country, be executed, between the Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh (Hereinafter called PU) on the one part and Punjab Postal Circle, Chandigarh (Hereinafter called DOP).

2. Earlier, the agreement between P.U. and Punjab Postal Circle was executed for one year i.e. w.e.f. 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015.

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

(xiv) To note contents of series of letters received from Professor V.K. Chopra and replies sent to him.

(xv) To note the following achievements of the Men & Women teams of Panjab University, performing well in the Inter-University Competition for the session 2015-16:

I. Overall Combined Championship

Sr. No.	Game	Section	Position
1.	Aquatics	(Men & Women)	Winner
2.	Shooting	(Men & Women)	Winner

II. Overall Positions Secured in the All India Inter-University Competitions

Sr. No.	Game	Section	Position
1.	Swimming	Men	Winner
2.	Shooting	Men	1 st Runners-up
3.	Shooting	Women	1 st Runners-up
4.	Yachting	Men	Runners-up
5.	Diving	Men	Runners-up
6.	Diving	Women	Runners-up
7.	Swimming	Women	Runners-up
8.	Judo	Men	Third
9.	Judo	Women	Third
10.	Boxing	Men	Fourth
11.	Yachting	Women	Fourth

III. Positions Secured in the All India Inter-University Competitions

Sr. No.	Game	Section	Position
1.	Badminton	Men	Winner
2.	Waterpolo	Men	Winner
3.	Squash	Women	Winner
4.	Kabaddi	Men	Third

IV. Individual Medals/Positions Secured in the All India Inter-University Competitions

Sr. No.	Game	Section	Medals/Position
1.	Swimming	Men	Seven gold and 4 th position in one individual event
2.	Swimming	Women	Three gold, two silver & 4 th position in four individual events
3.	Athletics	Men	Two gold, one silver and two bronze
4.	Athletics	Women	One gold, one silver & one bronze
5.	Boxing	Men	One gold, one silver & three bronze
6.	Judo	Women	One gold, one silver & one bronze
7.	Diving	Women	One gold
8.	Boxing	Women	One silver and one bronze
9.	Judo	Men	Two silver and one bronze
10.	Diving	Men	Two silver
11.	Yachting	Men	Two silver and 4 th position in one individual event
12.	Yachting	Women	Two bronze and 4 th position in one individual event
13.	Cycling	Women	One bronze

V. Positions Secured in the North-Zone Inter-University Competitions

Sr. No.	Game	Section	Position
1.	Badminton	Men	Winner
2.	Basketball	Men	Winner
3.	Football	Men	Winner
4.	Chess	Men	Second
5.	Badminton	Women	Third
6.	Handball	Women	Third
7.	Tennis	Men	Third
8.	Tennis	Women	Third
9.	Kabaddi	Men	Third
10.	Volleyball	Men	Fourth
11.	Kabaddi	Women	Fourth
12.	Hockey	Men	Fourth

(xvi) To note the brief report of the Committee dated 19.01.2016 (**Appendix-LIX**) with regard to various activities undertaken by SWACHH BHARAT ABHIYAN (SBA).

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the letter, which has been received from the Chancellor in the case of Professor Rajesh Gill, should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Alright".

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the advertisement, which they had made for the post of Principals of Constituent

Colleges, the Punjab Govt has made two amendments in it. He enquired how much service as Principal is required.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that the day the next meeting of the Syndicate (28th February 2016) has been fixed, on that day the Chandigarh Administration has declared vehicle free.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, if the Chandigarh Administration declared vehicle free on 28th February 2016, they would see and re-fix the meeting on 27th February 2016.

Referring to Sub-Item I-(xiv), Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this issue needed to be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not allowing discussion on that matter today as it is only for their information. If they wanted it as an Item for consideration, he would bring it for consideration. In fact, he does not want to curtail the responsibility and duty which all of them have willfully accepted.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, of course, the Vice-Chancellor has said it and given the ruling also. If he (Vice-Chancellor) has given some documents about a particular case, which has been received by them only a couple of days before relating to an item, which is covered under Items for Information. In fact, there are serious discrepancies in the document. Do they take it like that only or have any right to suggest correction/s? He mean to say that some information has been given to them, e.g., a letter which has been received from the office of the Chancellor, that letter says something else and means something else.

The Vice-Chancellor said that alright, he would bring it for consideration and they would have open discussion on the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been written that it be placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has placed the same before the Syndicate, and is also willing to bring it as a consideration item in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that probably, in the light of what was discussed in the last meeting of the Syndicate and, probably, the kind of letter could have waited and there was no need for bringing it to the Syndicate. Anyway, when the item comes to the Syndicate, they would discuss it because he has said in that meeting that till 10th February, he would not be available and in that response, the Vice-Chancellor had said that do not worry, he would fix the adjourned meeting around 15th February 2016, but for the reasons beyond his (Vice-Chancellor) control, maybe, the meeting was fixed for 6th February 2016. In that context only which was discussed that if he wants his (Shri Goyal) assistance, he would not be available before 10th February 2016, but before the 10th or 15th came, this letter has also come and has been placed before the

Syndicate, which has again become a matter of discussion in the media, which they wanted to avoid. Anyway, if something unfortunate has to happen, it had happened.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that all the letters written by Dr. V.K. Chopra to the University and the letters written by the University to him have not been provided to them. He pleaded that all the letters written by Dr. V.K. Chopra to the University and the letters written by the University to him should be provided to them, whenever the item is placed before the Syndicate next time.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in Sub-Items I-(i) to I-(xiii) and I-(xv) & I-(xvi) on the agenda, be noted;
- (2) so far as Sub-Item I-(xiv) is concerned it along with all the letters written by Dr. V.K. Chopra and responses given by the University be placed before the Syndicate; for consideration ; and
- (3) the letter received from Chancellor's Office in the case of Professor Rajesh Gill is concerned,, the same be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR