

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Saturday, 27th February 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. Dr. Balbir Chand Josan
5. Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi
6. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
7. Professor Emanuel Nahar
8. Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky
9. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
10. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
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)

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

Condolence Resolution

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

- i) Smt. Champa Devi Goyal, mother of Shri Ashok Goyal ji, Senior Fellow & Syndic, on February 23, 2016;
- ii) Professor Saran Kumari Sharma (Retired), Department of Psychology in the University School of Open Learning on February 15, 2016;
- iii) Professor Kiran Pawar (Retired), Department of History, PU, on February 25, 2016.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Smt. Champa Devi Goyal, Professor Saran Kumari Sharma and Professor Kiran Pawar, 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 feel immense pleasure in informing the honourable members of the Syndicate that –

- (1) Shri Anupam Kher, well known actor and P.U. Alumnus has been named for the honour of Padma Bhushan by the Government of India for his contributions in the field of cinema

and arts. Earlier, he was honoured with Padma Shri Award in 2004.

- (2) Dr Satish Kumar, Director General, Missiles and Strategic Systems, DRDO, a PEC Graduate & P.U. alumnus and Professor (Smt.) Veena Tandon of North-Eastern Hill University (NEHU), Shillong & P.U. alumnus, would be honoured with Padma Shri by the Government of India for their contributions in the field of Science and Engineering. Three alumni of Panjab University out of 20 odd selected for Padma Shri itself talk of a great achievement on behalf of this University.
- (3) The Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry of India (ASSOCHAM) has adjudged the Panjab University, Chandigarh, as the 'Best University Campus' in Chandigarh. P.U. Vice-Chancellor, received this award from Hon'ble Union Minister of State for Human Resource Development, Professor Ram Shankar Katheria on February 17, 2016 at the award ceremony in New Delhi during ASSOCHAM Higher Education Summit 2016.
- (4) Ministry of Human Resource Development has sanctioned a grant of Rs.10 crores under the aegis of National Initiative for Design Innovation Scheme for establishing a Design Innovation Centre (DIC) at Panjab University, Chandigarh. University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Dr H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, PU, PEC University of Technology, Chandigarh and Central Scientific Instruments Organization, Chandigarh will work together under this project.
- (5) Four colleges affiliated to Panjab University have been placed in the 'A' Grade by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC). Postgraduate Government College for Girls (GCG), Sector-11 and DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh, have secured CGPA of 3.53 and 3.31 respectively while SCD Government College, Ludhiana secured CGPA of 3.20 and DAV College, Abohar, secured CGPA of 3.06.
- (6) Professor S.K. Kulkarni, former Dean University Instruction (DUI) and Emeritus Professor at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) has been conferred the title 'Eminent Pharmacist 2015' by the Association of Pharmacy Professionals at an International Convention held at the Anna University, Tiruchirapalli, Tamil Nadu on January 22, 2016.
- (7) Professor O.P. Katare, Director, Research Promotion Cell, P.U. has been conferred with 'Life Time Achievement Award 2016 by the Dr. H.S. Gour Vishwavidyalaya, Sagar (M.P.) on February 7, 2016 for his recognition in the field of Pharmaceutical Sciences.
- (8) Dr. Sonia Kapoor, Assistant Professor in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), has been awarded with the Young Scientist Award for the year 2015-16 by the Indian Science Congress Association at its 103rd Indian Science Congress held at Mysuru in January 2016, for her research work entitled 'Identifying the causes for limited neurotoxicity of a chemotherapeutic molecule'. In addition to the Award, she was also awarded a cash prize of Rs.25,000/-."

Professor Keshav Malhotra congratulated all of them, particularly the horticulture team lead by Shri Anil Thakur, for getting the campus adjudged Best University Campus (Clean & Green) in the country. The team has done a wonderful job.

This gesture of the horticulture team was applauded by the members by thumping of desks.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that a lot of funds, as quoted in the media, are available under the Swachh Bharat Abhiyaan. They should explore at different levels, i.e., City, State and Central, from where the University could get funds under the Swachh Bharat Abhiyaan, so that they could use those funds for keeping the University clean and green.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he fully agrees with Professor Keshav Malhotra. In fact, he did talk to Shri Vijay Dev, Advisor to the Administrator day before yesterday, when he came for the Hotel Management Function. They would form an EPS in the University, because once a tag of Best University Campus is given to P.U., they must continuously improve on that.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that it had been pointed out in the Chairpersons meeting that their Entrance, especially Arts Block I & II and Gandhian Bhavan areas are not as green and clean as they should be, as there are certain dark areas. They should identify those areas and make them green and clean.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was also aware of this and apprised that they have allocated some money for landscaping also.

Continuing further, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the Chairpersons meeting, he (Vice-Chancellor) told him that he would be associated with it, but till date he has not received any communication that he is a member of the Landscaping Squad for Arts Blocks I & II.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get back to him.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that he wanted to congratulate the affiliated Colleges, which have been awarded 'A' Grade. One of the Colleges is of Principal B.C. Josan and another of Dr. I.S. Sandhu, and they should be congratulated.

The members applauded this achievement of the Colleges by thumping of desks.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Shri Anupam Kher, well known actor and P.U. Alumnus, on having been named for the honour of Padma Bhushan by the Government of India for his contributions in the field of Cinema and Arts;
 - (ii) Dr Satish Kumar, Director General, Missiles and Strategic Systems, DRDO, a PEC Graduate & P.U. alumnus and Professor (Smt.) Veena Tandon of North-Eastern Hill University (NEHU), Shillong

& P.U. alumnus, on having been named for the honour of Padma Shri by the Government of India for their contributions in the field of Science and Engineering;

- (iii) the horticulture team lead by Shri Anil Thakur, for the 'Best University Campus' in Chandigarh;
- (iv) Postgraduate Government College for Girls (GCG), Sector 11 & DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh, SCD Government College, Ludhiana and DAV College, Abohar, for having been awarded 'A' Grade by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC);
- (v) Professor S.K. Kulkarni, former Dean University Instruction (DUI) and Emeritus Professor at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), on having been conferred the title 'Eminent Pharmacist 2015' by the Association of Pharmacy Professionals at an International Convention held at the Anna University, Tiruchirapalli, Tamil Nadu;
- (vi) Professor O.P. Katare, Director, Research Promotion Cell, P.U., on having been conferred with 'Life Time Achievement Award 2016' by the Dr. H.S. Gour Vishwavidyalaya, Sagar (M.P.) for his recognition in the field of Pharmaceutical Sciences;
- (vii) Dr. Sonia Kapoor, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), on having been awarded with the Young Scientist Award for the year 2015-16 along with a cash prize of Rs.25,000/- by the Indian Science Congress Association at its 103rd Indian Science Congress held at Mysuru for her research work entitled 'Identifying the causes for limited neurotoxicity of a chemotherapeutic molecule';

- (2) the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Serial Nos.(3) and (4), be noted; and

Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under the CAS, in the Department of Computer

2(i). Considered minutes dated 27.01.2016 (**Appendix-I**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Anu Gupta be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **13.07.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and 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 the CAS, at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 27.01.2016 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Computer Science) (Stage-4) to Professor (Computer Science) (Stage-5) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Manish Kumar be promoted from Associate Professor (Computer Science) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (Computer Science) (**Stage-5**) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **16.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 + 67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform 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 CAS, at UIET

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 27.01.2016 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (ECE) (Stage-4) to Professor (ECE) (Stage-5) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sunil Agrawal be promoted from Associate Professor (ECE) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (ECE) (**Stage-5**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **11.12.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 + 67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the

post would be personal to the incumbent and 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.

Appointment of Associate Professor in Food Technology at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology

2.(iv) Considered minutes dated 27.01.2016 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor in Food Technology-1 (General) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Santanu Basu be appointed Associate Professor in Food Technology-1 (General) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 +AGP Rs.9,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

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

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. (Ms.) Gargi Ghoshal be placed on the Waiting List.

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. A summary bio-data of the selected 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 the CAS, at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib

2.(v) Considered minutes dated 27.01.2016 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Punjabi) (Stage-4) to Professor (Punjabi) (Stage-5) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Baljinder Kaur be promoted from Associate Professor (Punjabi) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (Punjabi) (**Stage-5**) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **29.07.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 + 67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform 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 CAS, in the Department of Sociology

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 27.01.2016 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Sociology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kumool Abbi be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Sociology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **26.03.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 + 67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and 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.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of promotion/ appointment to the persons promoted/ appointed under Item **C-2(i) to C-2(vi)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 19.02.2015

3. Considered the following recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 15.02.2016 (Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 & 15, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22,24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34 and 35:

Item 1

That the Revised Estimates of 2015-16 and Budget Estimates for the financial year 2016-17 with non-plan deficit of Rs.306.72 crore as per **Appendix I, II** (Budget Part-I & II), be approved.

- NOTE:** The Budget estimates have been prepared as per the recommendation of the Estimate Committee constituted by Vice-Chancellor in meetings held on dated 10.12.2015 & 15.01.2016.

Item 3

That a vacant post of Tutor-cum-Curator in the pay-scale of Rs.15600+39100+GP5400 be converted to that of Programmer in the same pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP5400 in the University School of Open Learning as per **Appendix – IV (Page 2)**.

- NOTE:**
1. The Academic Committee of USOL as per its minutes dated 16.07.2015 has recommended that there is an urgent need of one post of Programmer in the USOL on immediate basis for smooth functioning of the department **Appendix – V (Page 3 - 6)**.
 2. There are five sanctioned posts of Tutor-cum-Curator in the department out of which four posts are lying vacant and one is filled.

Item 5

That the amount of Department share (i.e. 50% of University Share) of a consultancy project is not utilized within a period of one year, the same shall be utilized by the CIIPP for strengthening the infrastructure of CIIPP, conduct of Seminars, Workshops and promotion of industry/academic interaction activities.

- NOTE:**
1. As per Chapter IV (v) of Calendar Volume III, 2009 Page 64-67 the total amount received from a Consultancy work shall be shared by the University and the Consultant in the ratio of 70:30 amended vide Syndicate Para 14 dated 15.03.2014.

Out of the total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be credited to "Development Fund Account" and 50% will be available to the Department concerned, for the purchase of equipment and/or material, or for any academic activity and promotion of industry participation.

2. The Syndicate meeting dated 08.03.2015 vide Paragraph – 38 has approved that the consultant needs to utilize the department share within a period of one year after the completion of the project.

Item 6

That the two posts of System Manager in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 7600 lying vacant in the Computer Centre and P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri, Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur be converted to that of Programmer in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400 to meet the requirement of the Department as per **Appendix – VIII (Page11-13)**.

Financial Liability : NIL**Item 7**

That the norms to be followed uniformly by all the departments while bearing the partial expenditure under the Budget head "Field Work/Study Tours/Education Trips/Training/Internship etc." as under with the condition that the total expenditure should not exceed the sanctioned Budget provision as per **Appendix - IX (Page 14)** be approved:

1. **Accommodation Charges:** Rs.200/- per student per night or actual whichever is less.
2. **Subsistence allowance:** Rs.100/- per student per day.
3. **Transportation Charges:** Rs.150/- per student per day or actual whichever is less. However, if travelling by train then not more than AC-III Class and if travelling by Chartered Bus then not more than University Bus Charges.

Item 8

That -

- (i) the following vacant posts of Library Attendants existing in the different pay scales be converted to that of Library Restorers in the pay-scale of Rs.5910-20200 + GP 2400 w.e.f. the date of the approval of the Board of Finance **Appendix - X (Page 15-16)**.

Sr. No.	Existing	Proposed
1.	Centre for Human Rights	
	Library Attendant - 1 (Rs.5910-20200 + GP2800)	Library Restorer - 1 (Rs.5910-20200 + GP 2400)
2.	Institute of Dental Sciences	
	Library Attendant - 1 (Rs.4910- 10680 + GP 1800)	Library Restorer - 1 (Rs.5910-20200 + GP 2400)
3.	Swami Sarvanand Giri, P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur	
	Library Attendant - 1 (Rs.4910- 10680 + GP 1650)	Library Restorer - 1 (Rs.5910-20200 + GP 2400)

NOTE: There is no need of the post of the Library Attendants in the various departments as the work is now being done by the Library Restorers as per requirement of the Libraries.

- (ii) the above post shall be filled after the finalization of Manpower Auditing.

Item 9

That the following recurring budget provision for Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan under Non-Plan for its smooth functioning w.e.f. the

financial year 2015-2016 onwards be created as per **Appendix - XI (Page 17-19)**, as under:

Heads of Expenditure	Revised Estimate 2015-2016	Estimates for 2016-2017
Office & General Expenses	100000	200000
Annual Maintenance/Repair (Civil/Electrical/Public Health etc.)	200000	300000
Electricity & Water charges	1200000	1500000
Housekeeping & Sanitary	200000	200000
Outsource of Services of Sanitation/Cleanliness, Horticulture and Security etc (Care Taker - 1, Attendants -4, Mali-1, Cleaners - 2, Security Guards-4)	1500000	1500000
Internal Furnishing	200000	200000
Operational & Maintenance of Gen Set	100000	200000
Total (Expenditure)	3500000	4100000

Heads of Income		
Contribution from the College Development Council Rev. Fund to Non- Plan to meet the proposed expenditure.	2500000	2500000
Rooms Rent/Seminar Hall Rent/Dinning Hall Rent etc	2000000	2000000
Total (Income)	4500000	4500000

Item 11

That the benefit of Assured Carrier Scheme (10/20/30) be extended to the 'Multipurpose Health Workers (Female)' working in the BGJ Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh as the policy of Punjab Government Health Department cannot be implemented in BGJ Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Items 12 and 15

That the pending advances as per Agenda Items **No.12** (the decision of the Executive Committee of Directorate of Sports dated 12.6.2015) & **15** (an advance of Rs.20,000/- drawn in favour of Dean Student Welfare) be treated as adjusted without production of Vouchers/ Bills/Cash Memos etc. subject to the condition that an office order be issued to the effect that the above adjustments have been settled as an exception not to be quoted as precedent and if in future any such incidence recur, the concerned person shall be personally responsible for the same.

A. Detail of Item 12

1. The expenditure of Rs.2,78,455/- was incurred for various coaching camps and participation in North-Zone and all India Inter-University games during the session 2007-08, for which the original vouchers are not available in the office record. The actual incurred expenditure was worked out based on minimum rate towards the participation of various teams in North-Zone and all India Inter University championships and keeping in view the No. of players, coaches, Managers,

number of days spent by the teams, concessional 2nd class railway fare with reference to their distance travelled/bus fare for the stations connected by road, local conveyance and Match fees etc. The facts regarding participation of the team has been verified from the Manager, report and other documents available in the relevant club files. Detail of expenditure available as **Appendix-XVI (Page 29)**.

2. A sum of Rs.25,000/- drawn as advance on 4.9.2007 in the name of Dr. Vishav Mohini, Deputy Director out of budget head "PUSC-Contingencies". The payment was made to the Post Office for feeding currency in the Franking Machine. Office record regarding detail of consumption of postage stamps worth Rs.25000/- was not traceable. Copy of receipt of payment of Rs. 25,000/- available as **Appendix – XVII (Page 30)**.
3. A sum of Rs.19,435/- was drawn as advance in name of Dr. Vishav Mohini, Deputy Directress during session 2007-2008 on account of Misc payments i.e. Hostel Rent, Booking of Lake Sports Complex and purchase of coats for rowing team etc. Detail of expenditure available as **Appendix – XVIII (Page 31)**.

NOTE: (i) The decision of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 12.06.2015 was brought to the notice of the Audit Section to adjust the total amount of Rs.3,22,890/- (Rs.2,78,455 + 25,000 + 19,435) out of pending advances/unadjusted amount.

(ii) The Resident Audit Officer has observed to seek the approval of the BOF/Syndicate for adjustment of above said advances without production of Vouchers/Bills/ Cash Memo, etc.

B. Detail of Item 15

- (i) A Cheque No. 414797 dated 07.03.2008 for Rs.20,000/- was made in favour of the Dean Student Welfare, Prof. Naval Kishore out of the Amalgamated Fund sub head “ Hiking Tracking/Council Tours” for and educational trip from Chandigarh to Dharamshala and Macloudganj.
- (ii) The amount of Rs.20,000/- was handed over to the Secretary, PUCSC, Mr. Sunny Bhardwaj in good faith but no receipt was obtained for this by Prof. Naval Kishore. The vouchers on this account were not submitted by the recipient and the advance is standing unadjusted against the name of Prof. Naval Kishore.
- (iii) In this regard, the Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.02.2014 vide Paragraph 40 resolved that, due to non-supply of the expenditure vouchers by the then Secretary, Sunny Bhardwaj, Panjab University Student Council, Tour Organizer, the advance of Rs.20,000/- drawn in favour of Prof. Naval Kishore, former D.S.W. be written off.
- (iv) As per the decision of Chandigarh Administration No.RAO/93/707-709 (Flag “B”) dated 12.10.93; adjustment of advances without Production of Vouchers requires the approval of the Board of Finance **Appendix-XXIII (Page 39-40)**.

Item 13

That the enhancement in the existing limit of Sumptuary Expenses and grant of Sumptuary Expenses to the following senior functionaries of the University out of budget head ‘General Administration’ sub-head “Expenses for meetings in the University including TA for members & Sumptuary Expenses etc.” for smooth functioning of their Office w.e.f. the financial year 2015-2016 be approved as under **Appendix – XIX (Page 32)**:

Sr. No.	Designation	Existing Limit	Proposed Limit
1.	Controller of Examination	Rs.2500/- p.m. (w.e.f. 11.02.2013)	Rs.6000/- p.m.
2.	Finance & Development Officer	Rs.2500/- p.m. (w.e.f. 11.02.2013)	Rs.3000/- p.m.
3.	Chief Vigilance Officer	Nil	Rs.3000/- p.m.

Additional Financial Liabilities : Rs.84,000/- p.a. (approx.)

NOTE: The Board of Finance in its meeting dated 11.02.2013 vide Item No.17 & 05.09.2014 (Item No. 2) has revised the existing limit of Sumptuary Expenses of Senior functionaries of the University which was also approved by the Syndicate/Senate **Appendix – XX (Page 33-35)**.

Item 14

That –

- (i) supernumerary post of Superintendent be created in the following pay band + GP + Allowances to promote Shri Surinder Kumar as Superintendent on notional basis as under:
1. He may be promoted as Superintendent (on notional basis) against supernumerary post w.e.f. 03.06.2011 (i.e. the date when his Junior Sh. Ram Jiwan was promoted as Superintendent) to 30.11.2011 in the pay band of Rs.10300-34800 + GP 5000/- (initial pay of Rs.18,750/-) revised pay scale w.e.f. 01.01.2006.
 2. Further, as Superintendent (on notional basis) against the supernumerary post w.e.f. 01.12.2011 to 25.08.2014 in the pay band of Rs.15600 -39100 + GP 5400 (initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) Re-revised pay-scale w.e.f. 01.12.2011.

Additional Financial Liabilities : Rs.1,35,000/- (approx.)

- (ii) financial benefit be given to Shri Surinder Kumar from the actual date of promotion i.e. 26.08.2014.

Item 16

That during the ongoing manpower audit, a post of Assistant Professor (Tabla) in the department of Music might be got recommended and the said post be filled by following proper procedure.

Item 17

That the pay-scale & re-designation of 'Work Inspector' (3120-5160:un-revised (5910-20200+GP-2400: revised) working in the Construction Office to that of 'Chargeman Grade-I' in the pay-scale of (5000-8100: un-revised & 10300-34800+GP-3200: revised) be approved as per Punjab Govt. Notification No. 7/1/97-FPI/7370 dated 19.05.1998 (Clause No.- VIII) with respect to Technical Supervisors **Appendix-XXVI (Page 43-47).**

Additional Financial Liabilities : Rs.27,600/-p.a. (approx.)

- NOTE:** 1. The Panjab University has already adopted the Punjab Govt. Notification No. 7/1/97-FPI/7370 dated 19.05.1998 Clause (VII. Skilled and Semi-Skilled Staff) on the recommendation of the Syndicate/ Senate meeting dated 27.09.2009 & 06.12.2009, respectively & thereafter got noted &

ratified the decision of the Senate from the BOF meeting dated 21.02.2012 and also got approved by the Syndicate/Senate meetings dated 29.02.2012 & 31.03.2012.

As per above decision of the BOF/Syndicate/Senate, the following posts have been designated as noted against each & the benefit was given to them w.e.f. 01.01.1996 to 05.12.2009 (notionally) and w.e.f. 06.12.2009 (with financial benefit):

Cadre/ Post	Designated as	Remarks
Work Inspector, Carpenter, Electrician, Plumber, White Washer, Welder, Mechanic, Mason, Painter, Glazier-cum-Polisher, Computer etc.	Jr. Technician 3120-5160 (UR) 5910-20200+GP-1900 (revised)	The post of Jr. Technician shall not exceed 50% of the posts of Technician at various level.
	Technician (G- III) 4020-6200 (UR) 5910-20200 + GP- 2400 (revised)	This level shall not exceed 30% of the posts of Technician at various level. The level of Technician (G-III) shall be re-designated as Technician (G-II).
	Technician (G- II/I) 4550-7220 (UR) 5910-20200 + GP- 3000 (revised)	This level shall not exceed 20% of the posts of Technician at various level. The level of Technician (G-II) & Technician (G-I) shall be merged & re-designated as Technician(G-I).

- The Panjab University Field Workers Union raised the demand that the pay of Work Inspector may be increased **or** enhanced as per the pay-scales and present policy adopted by the University which incorporated in the green pages of Panjab University Budget Estimate of 2015-16 at Page xix **Appendix-XXVII (Page 48)** i.e. Technician Grade-I & II (Rs.10300-34800+GP-3200) and Technician Grade-III (Rs.5910-20200+GP-2800) and further promoted as Work Inspector (Grade-III) in the lower pay-scale of Rs. 5910-20200 + GP 2800, is having inherent default i.e. when one gets promotion as per this Rule, his GP gets decreased i.e. from Rs.3200 to Rs.2800 and it is against the principle of natural justice to give less GP on promotion.

The Committee in its meeting dated 08.09.2015 finally recommended that the GP should be increased at par with the Punjab Govt. Notification No. 7/1/97-FPI/7370

dated 19.05.1998 meant for Technical supervisory staff (Chargeman Grade-I).

3. There are 16 sanctioned posts of Work Inspector in the Construction Office & the post of 'Work Inspector' is a promotional post and is filled in from amongst the in-service Carpenters, Masons, Plumbers, Electricians, Painters etc. etc. (now re-designated as Technician (Grade-I & II) as per the promotion policy approved by the Syndicate meeting dated 19.9.1998. **Appendix-XXVIII (Page 49 - 50)**. The post of 'Work Inspector' has been included in the cadre of Skilled & Semi-Skilled inadvertently which should have been kept separate from this cadre as the Work Inspector supervise the work of above stated Skilled & Semi-Skilled staff.

Item 18

That the Punjab Govt. Notification No. 3/10/2010-5FP2/481 dated 05.07.2011 **Appendix - XXIX (Pages 51-52)** & 3/10/2010-5FP2/671 dated 14.11.2011 **Appendix - XXX (Page 53)** regarding grant of Special Allowance of Rs.1400/- p.m. (which stands already converted by the Punjab Govt. as Secretariat Pay vide Notification No.3/10/210-5FP2/786-91 dated 15.12.2011 duly approved by the BOF meeting dated 17.02.2012) be adopted and accordingly Secretariat Pay be allowed to the following Drivers working in the Deptts/Offices of University on Staff Cars, Buses, Tractors & other vehicles etc. w.e.f. the date of approval of the Board of Finance with condition that they shall not be entitled to claim overtime for performing duties after office hours and shall give their consent to be part of the general pool.

Sr. No.	Name of Drivers	Department
1.	ShriAllaudin Khan	Anthropology
2.	Shri Kulbir Singh	PURC, Muktsar (Posted in PURC, Ludhiana)
3.	Shri Randhir Singh (Tractor Driver)	Construction Office
4.	Shri Shamsher Singh (Tractor Driver)	Construction Office
5.	Shri Lakhvir Singh (Tractor Driver)	Construction Office

Additional Financial Liabilities : Rs.1,52,500/- p.a.(approx.)

- NOTE:**
1. An Office note regarding brief contents of the case available as **Appendix - XXXI (Page 54-55)**.
 2. The Board of Finance/Syndicate/ Senate meetings dated 19.07.2013, 24.08.2013 & 29.09.2013 respectively has already approved for grant of Rs.1400/- p.m. as Secretariat Pay to all Drivers working only in the Common/General Pool in P.U. The implementation of this special pay was made w.e.f. 19.07.2013 i.e. the date on

which the BOF already approved the same, with the condition that they will not be entitled to claim overtime for performing duties after office hours in future.

3. The Divisional Engineer (Horticulture) vide letter No.3112/Hort. Dated 24.04.2015 by enclosing a Notification dated 14.02.2012 issued by the Chandigarh Administration **Appendix-XXXII (Page 56)** has requested that the 3 (Three) Tractor Drivers (Sr. No. 4-6) working in the Horticulture Division of the Construction office may also be given the special allowance of Rs.1400/- p.m. as like other Drivers of the University of General Pool to avoid any anomaly as per the Punjab Govt. notification No. 3/10/2010-5FP2/671 dated 14.11.2011 as well as Chandigarh Administration Notification dated 14.02.2012 in which *“it has been decided by the Chandigarh Administration to adopt the above referred Punjab Govt. letter in respect of Drivers working in the Departments/offices other than the Secretariat offices as well as those working on deputation from the State of Punjab w.e.f. 01.12.2011 on the same terms and conditions as mentioned therein.”*

Item 19

That the Stage of Rs.14940/- which had already been granted to the teachers who were appointed/promoted as Lecturers (Selection Grade)/ Readers after 01.01.1996 be withdrawn and their pay be re-fixed accordingly but the recovery may not be affected till the final disposal of the case.

Brief facts of the case are as below:-

1. In the pay revision notification of 1996 there was a provision for grant of a stage of Rs.14940/- to the Readers/Lecturers (Selection Grade) after the completion of 5 years in such grade. The relevant para is reproduced here below:-

“The fixation of pay of Lecturers(Selection Grade)/Readers in the pre-revised scale of Rs.3700-125-4950-150-5700/- who were selected strictly in accordance with the Rules and Regulations framed by the UGC and who were in position as Lecturers(Selection Grade)/Readers as on 01.01.1996, will be made in a manner that they get their pay fixed at the minimum of Rs.14940/- in the revised scales of Rs.12000-420-18300 as and when they complete five years in the grade.”

The University has allowed the benefit of stage of Rs.14940/- to all Reader/Lecturer (Selection Grade) in respective scale as and when they completed the 5 years service irrespective of date of their appointment/promotion as such.

All such pay fixations were duly admitted by the audit also. Thereafter in 2012, the Resident Audit Officer vide memo dated 04.01.2012 pointed out that as per the notification, only those Readers/Lecturers(selection Grade) are eligible for the stage of Rs.14940/- who were in position as such as on 01.01.1996 and completed 5 years of service. Those who are in such position as on 01.01.1996 but did not complete 5 years of service will also get the initial start of Rs.14940/- as and when they complete 5 years of service. But the Readers/Lecturers (Selection Grade) appointed/promoted to such position after 01.01.1996 are not eligible for the stage of Rs.14940/-.

The above observation of audit was based on the cutoff date of 01.01.1996 as mentioned in the above notification.

2. On the same issue, the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh in case of Shri Ashok Kumar Gupta Vs. Union of India and others, (the first petition No., 4667 of 2009) decided on 31.05.2012 held that all Readers/Lecturers (Selection Grade) are eligible for the stage of Rs.14940 after completion of 5 years service in such grade irrespective of their date of appointment/promotion in such grade. The relevant part of judgment is as follows:-

*“Accordingly, in view of the observations and analysis made hereinabove, all the petitions are allowed. **The cut-off date, i.e. 01.01.1996 mentioned in para 1 (v) (b) of Appendix-I to Annexure P-2, para-1 (ii) of Annexure-III to Annexure P-2 dated 06.11.1998 and para 4(b) of Annexure P-4 dated 07.05.1999 is struck down**, after applying the principle of severability. Annexure P-6 dated 18.08.2009 is also quashed and set aside. Petitioners are entitled to get their pay fixed at the minimum of Rs.14940/- after completion of five years as Lecturers (Selection Grade). Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.”*

3. The Board of Finance in its meeting dated 19.07.2013 vide Agenda Item No. 7 considered the above issue in the light of decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh and recommended that the stage of Rs.14940/- already granted to all the Lecturers/Readers (selection grade) in the scales of 1996 (as and when they completed five years service), is in order and therefore, no further action is required to be taken.
4. With reference to above decision of the Board of Finance, the Special Secretary (Finance) vide letter No. F&PO (6)-2013/7719 dated 14.08.2013 conveyed that the Chandigarh Administration does not agree with the proposal approved by the Board of Finance and desired that the Panjab University should seek guidance from the Govt. of Punjab and UGC before implementing the orders of Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh.

5. In pursuance of above, the Panjab University sought clarification from the Govt. of Punjab vide letter No.3992-93 dated 30.08.2014 & UGC vide letter No.70-72 dated 09.01.2015 respectively.
6. Although, the UGC did not give the specific clarification as requested by the University in reference to the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh for quashing the cut-off date of 01.01.1996, yet, the UGC has provided the University with a copy of general clarification issued by MHRD vide letter No.F.1-22/97-U.I dated 24.03.1999 according to which the stage of Rs.14940/- was to be given only to the Readers/Lecturers (Selection Grade) who were promoted/appointed as such before 01.01.1996.
7. In the mean time some of the teachers who were allowed the stage of Rs.14940/-, were retired and their retirement benefits were not admitted by the audit due to their observation regarding the stage of Rs.14940/- as explained in para (1) above.
8. The Board of Finance again considered this issue in its meeting dated 07.08.2014 vide Agenda Item No.18 and approved the following:
 - (a) That the matter may be referred to Punjab Government as well as UGC to seek the clarification as required by the UT Administration, Chandigarh.
 - (b) That the Law Officer may be requested to verify the status of appeal, if any filed by the respective State Government or UGC against the decision of Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh.
 - (c) In the meantime, the teachers who are retired may be released the retirement benefits after fixation of their pay as per UGC regulation and the amount of excess payment may be withheld out of the Gratuity or Leave Encashment or Provident Fund, as the case may be, till the final decision is taken on this.
9. The Department of Finance, U.T. Administration, Chandigarh has made available a copy of judgement of Division Bench of Kerala High Court dated 10.09.2012 on the same issue. As per this judgment, the Hon'ble Court held that the Lecturers (Selection Grade/Readers) who were appointed/promoted as such after 01.01.1996 will not be entitled to get the minimum pay of Rs.14940/- after the expiry of 5 years. The benefit of minimum pay of Rs.14940/- after completion of 5 years service shall be admissible only to those Lecturers (Selection Grade)/Readers who were appointed/promoted as such on or before 01.01.1996.
10. Thereafter the affected teachers filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide CWP No. 1340 of 2015 in which the Hon'ble Court on 27.01.2015 has passed interim order that **"recovery may not be effected"**.

11. The Resident Audit Officer vide letter No.RAO/2015/895 has requested that the pay of concerned teacher be re-fixed in terms of clarification issued by the UGC to the Special Secretary, Finance-cum-Director Local Audit Department, Chandigarh Administration, Finance Department, Chandigarh vide letter dated 10.08.2015 wherein it was stated that the fixation of pay of Lecturers (Selection Grade)/Readers in the pre-revised scale of Rs.3700-125-4950-150-5700/-, who were selected strictly in accordance with the rules and regulations framed by UGC and who are in position as Lecturers (Selection Grade)/Reader as on 01.01.1996, will be made in a manner that they get their pay fixed at the minimum of Rs.14,940/- in the revised scale of rs.12000-420-18300/- as and when they complete five years in the grade.

Item 20

That:

- i) a provision of Rs.100/ per day for players as refreshment charges be approved during campus Coaching Camps.
- ii) the rates of Honorarium to external coaches be enhanced from Rs.150/- to Rs.500/- per day during coaching camps.
- iii) the D.A. rates for players be enhanced from Rs.190/- to Rs.300/- per day during outstation inter college tournaments (i.e. outside Chandigarh).
- iv) the salary of Life Saver (2 Nos.) be enhanced from Rs.15,000/- p.m. each to Rs.20,000/- p.m. each out of the Campus Sports, budget head "Salary".
- v) the provision of salary of fitness trainer (for Sports quota students) be enhanced from Rs.10,000/- pm to Rs.12,000/- pm out of Campus Sports, budget head "Salary".
- vi) the provision of salary of Cricket Coach be enhanced from Rs.25,000/- pm to Rs.30,000/- pm out of Campus Sports, budget head "Salary"

NOTE: The existing rates were sanctioned in the meeting of the Amalgamated Committee dated 14.01.2014.

Item 21

That the report of Institute of Public Auditors of India on the statement of affairs prepared by the University as on 31.03.2015 for the purpose of implementation of Double Entry Accounting System be approved as per **Appendix - XXXIII (Page 57-125)**.

NOTE: The above report has been submitted by the Institute of Public Auditors of India (IPAI) as per the MOU signed with them as per **Appendix - XXXIV (Page 126-128)**.

Item 22

That as per the Punjab Government clarification, the fraction in the top slot is to be ignored and therefore, in this case also the fraction in the top slot of 20% post be ignored and the resultant increase could be allowed in the lower slot. Following the same principle, the actual distribution of 08 posts in the ratio of 50:30:20 comes out to 4:3:1 respectively, in case of re-designation of Lift operators as Junior Technician, Technician Grade-II and I.

Financial Liabilities : Rs.1,54,800 (approx.)

- NOTE:**
1. On the circulation of the above orders, the Audit observed that the formula of ratio (for 08 sanctioned posts) i.e. 50:30:20 (i.e. $50 \times 8 = 4.00$ - 4 posts (Jr. Tech.) $30 \times 8 = 2.40$ - 2 posts Technician Grade-III and $20 \times 8 = 1.60$ - 2 posts as implemented in the case of Lift Operator is in order but ratio given in the case of Technician Grade-I i.e. $20 \times 8 = 1.60$ - 2 posts may be got approved from the same competent authority who framed the policy.
 2. The above item was deferred as per the decision of the Board of Finance vide Agenda Item No.14 as it was tagged with the Agenda Item No. 14(i). However, the subject matter of this Agenda was different as per 14(ii). In this case, the ratio of 50:30:20 has been applied as per the Punjab Govt. Notification No.7/1/97-FPI-7370 dated 19.5.1998.

Item 24

That instead of ratio of 50:30:20, benefit of Assured Carrier Progression Scheme of Punjab University (i.e. 10:20:30) be given to Shri Jagdish Lal Gogna, Mechanic (Type-Writer).

Financial Liabilities : Rs.2,83,000/- (approx.)

- NOTE:**
1. In reference to above circular, the Audit observed that in the decision of the BOF meeting dated 11.2.2013, there was no mention for allowing the re-designation to the employee on the basis of service span i.e. 8/16 years or by ignoring the ratio of 50:30:20 and desired that this should be got approved from the same competent authority in the first instance.
 2. The Senate in its meeting dated 24.3.2013 (Para -XXII) on the recommendations of the BOF/ Syndicate meetings dated 11.2.2013 & 5.3.2013, respectively already resolved that Sh.

Jagdish Lal Gogna, Mechanic (Type-Writer) (Ex-cadre post) be re-designated in the scale of Technician Grade-III, II & I as per Punjab Govt. Notification No. 7/1/97-FPI-7370 dated 19.5.1998 already adopted in the case of re-designation of skilled & Semi-Skilled Staff working in the Works Department & PU Press w.e.f. 1.1.1996 (notionally) & w.e.f. 24.3.2013 (with financial benefits) (the date on which the Senate has approved with some terms & conditions) (circulated by the Estt. Branch vide No. 12430-432/Estt. dated 4.6.2013 **Appendix-XL (Page 137)**).

3. The Punjab Govt. in their Notification No. 7/1/97-FPI-7370 dated 19.5.1998 **Appendix - XLI (Page 138-141)** as stated above, has given the re-designation of Technician Grade -III , II & I to their employees in the ratio of 50:30:20 as there are so many slots of posts are available. But in the present case, the ratio of 50:30:20 has not been implemented being a single/isolated post in the University. Therefore, the Committee has been decided to re-designate him as Technician -III, II & I by counting his service span of 8 years & 16 years as is being followed in the case of Laboratory Technician Group-IV, III , II & I in the University.
4. To re-designate the staff of PU Press as Technician Grade-III , II & I, the ratio of 50:30:20 was followed by the Panjab University by making its own following policy as per recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Registrar which held on 22.9.2014 **Annexure- XLII (Page 142)** as follow:

“That the newly appointed/ promoted persons after 1.1.1996 by the recruitment/ promotion policy (old/new) in PU Press, the senior most persons i.e. 20 % of the total posts in Junior Cadre shall be entitled/given the scale of Rs. 5910-20200+GP-2800 & 3000, next 30 % may be given the scale of Rs. 5910-20200+GP-2400 & 50% may be given the scale of 5910-20200+GP-1900.”
5. The above case was discussed in the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 17.08.2015 vide Agenda Item No.13 in which it was resolved that a clarification

be sought from the Punjab Govt. as to how the formula of ratio of 50:30:20 is to be applied in case where there is single post in a cadre. In pursuance of that the office sought clarification from Punjab Govt. vide letter No. 19141/Estt., No.22026/Estt & No.563/Estt. dated 17.09.2015, 19.11.2015 & 13.01.2016, respectively. But no clarification has been received so far from the Punjab Govt.

Item 25

That the salary of Laboratory and Technical Staff be refixed from 01.11.2012 instead of 01.12.2011 and recovery of the excess payment be made in installments to be decided by the Vice-Chancellor.

- NOTE:**
1. In the meeting of Board of Finance dated 27.05.2014 vide Agenda Item No.13 the matter was discussed by the members in which it was decided that a subcommittee of the members of the Board of Finance be constituted to re-examine the case.
 2. In pursuance of above the Sub Committee met on 23.12.2014 and gave its recommendation as per **Appendix – XLIII (Page 143-144)**.
 3. The recommendation of the Sub-Committee were considered by the Board of Finance in its meeting held on 19.02.2015 vide Agenda Item No.4 where the decision was deferred. The relevant part of the Minutes of the meeting is enclosed as **Appendix-XLIV (Page 145)**.

Item 26

- (A) Noted and Ratified** the decision of the Syndicate dated 19.07.2015 Paragraph 52 R(XVIII) **Appendix – XLV (Page 146)** which reads as under:

The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the rate for Checking Assistant/Decoding without OMR answer book in the Re-evaluation Branch from Rs.1/- to Rs.1.25/- per answer-book w.e.f. April, 2014.

Additional Financial liability : Rs.50,000/- p.a. (approx.)

- NOTE:**
1. An Office note regarding brief contents of the case available as **Appendix – XLVI (Page 147-151)**.
 2. The earlier rate of Rs.1/- for Checking Assistant/Decoding

without OMR answer book was fixed w.e.f. 31.03.2012.

3. The Audit has admitted the case under objection to meet the urgency with observations that the revision of rates involves the financial implications and it exceeds the limit of Rs.10,000/-, therefore it requires the approval of BOF/Syndicate.

(B) Noted and Ratified the action taken by the Vice-Chancellor:

in sanctioning the fixed local travelling allowance w.e.f. 01.05.2015 in pursuance of the Punjab Govt. Notification No.2/6/2010-2FPI/295 dated 21.5.2010 to the persons whose duties involve touring on an average for more than 12 days in a month and 3 k.m. in a day for which a Certificate will be issued by the concerned Head of the Department every month along with the absentee statement as per the instructions issued by UT Chandigarh vide Circular No. 3854-57 dated 12.06.2014 in terms of Punjab Govt. Notification dated 21.05.2010 **Appendix - XLVII(Page 152-153)**. Full allowance will be payable only if these conditions are strictly fulfilled otherwise amount should be suitably reduced as per Rule 2.6 of Punjab Civil Services Rules, Volume III.

Each Head of the department shall declare the posts fulfilling the above conditions and will be solely responsible for issuance of such certificate.

Additional Financial Liabilities : Rs.12,15,360/- per annum (approx.)

NOTE: 1. In pursuance of Punjab Govt. Notification No. 2/6/2010-2FPI/295 dated 21.5.2010, which was duly adopted and circulated vide No.B/7515-7714/A dated 14.09.2010, the Vice-Chancellor has granted/ sanctioned the fixed Travelling Allowance w.e.f. 01.05.2015 to the following employees (the date on which the orders of the Vice-Chancellor have been conveyed vide No.10771-81/Estt. dated 01.05.2015):

Sr. No	Name of Post (designated as Technician G-I/ II/III & Jr. Technician)	Pay Band + Grade Pay	Amount of Local Travelling Allowance (per month)
1.	Work Inspector, Carpenter, Mason, White Washer, Plumber, Painter, Electrician, Glazier-cum-Polisher & Welder	Technician G- I/II PB 10300-34800 + GP 3200	720/-
		Technician G-III PB 5910-20200 + GP 2800	720/-
		Jr. Technician PB 5910-20200 + GP 2400	480/-
2.	Helper/Beldar	PB 4900-10680 + GP 1650	480/-
3.	Mortar Mate	PB 4900 -10680 + GP 1650	480/-

(C) Noted and Ratified the decision of the Syndicate:

- (I)** dated 20.09.2015 Paragraph – 20 **Appendix-XLVIII (Page 154)** for allowing non recurring budget provision, under the Budget Head “Election of Ordinary Fellows” to meet the expenditure on conduct of Senate Election in September, 2016 as follows:

(i)	2015-2016	(RE)	-	Rs.15,00,000/-
(ii)	2016-2017		-	Rs.1,20,00,000/-

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

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

(ii) The term of present Senate will expire on 31.10.2016. Thus the election of the next Senate of various constituencies is due.

- (II)** dated 15.04.2013 & 25.04.2013 vide Paragraph -13 (revised), 15.03.2014 (Para-14) & 08.03.2015 (Para-38) **Appendix-XLIX (Page 155-160)** that the following existing Consultancy rules appearing at Page No.64-66 of P.U. Calendar, Volume – III, 2009 be modified as under:

Existing Rules as per Clause V, page No. 62-64, PU Calendar, Vol III	Modified Rules
4. Permission to undertake consultancy work upto ₹1 lac rupees may be given by the Officer In-Charge of the Liaison Cell (IIPP) on the recommendation of the Head of the Department or by any other person authorized to do so. Consultancy work of above ₹1 lac of rupees shall be approved by the Vice-Chancellor.	Permission to undertake consultancy work upto ₹5 lacs rupees may be given by the Officer In-Charge of the Liaison Cell (IIPP) on the recommendation of the Head of the Department or by any other person authorized to do so. Consultancy work of above ₹ 5 lacs of rupees shall be approved by the Vice-Chancellor.
As per rule 9: -The distribution of consultancy amount received will be as under. 9.1. In case of Advisory Consultancy, 50% of the amount received for item 5.1 (cost of consultants’ time, including intellectual fee) will be paid to the	As per rule 9: -The distribution of consultancy amount received will be as under. 9.1. In case of Advisory Consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 (cost of consultants’ time, including intellectual fee) will be

consultant(s) and 50% will accrue to the University. 9.2. Similarly, in case of Service consultancy, 50% of the amount received for item 5.1 above will be paid to the consultant(s) involved and 50% will accrue to the University.	paid to the consultant(s) and 30% will accrue to the University. 9.2. Similarly, in case of Service consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 above will be paid to the consultant(s) involved and 30% will accrue to the University.
13. On the completion of the consultancy project, a copy of the synopsis of the work, keeping in view the confidentiality clause of the project and the audited statement of accounts will be submitted to the University/IIPP for its records. Any un-utilized amount will be transferred to the “Foundation for Higher Education & Research” of the University, which has been changed to “Development Fund Account” vide Syndicate Para 33 dated 29.02.2012.	On the completion of the consultancy project, a copy of the synopsis of the work, keeping in view the confidentiality clause of the project and the audited statement of accounts will be submitted to the University/IIPP for its records. Any un-utilized amount from the Department share will be retained in the CIIPP account for utilization of infrastructural development and any other un-utilized amount of the other budget heads will be transferred to the ‘Development Fund Account’ of the University.
Sanction sought from the Vice Chancellor to release the consultancy fee/honorarium	The Director, CIIPP is competent to accord the financial sanction for the payment of consultancy fee/honorarium to the consultant, transfer of university share to the PU current account without any limit if the claim/payment is as per rules.
Sanction sought from the Vice Chancellor for the re-appropriation of the budget heads	The Director, CIIPP is competent to allow re-appropriation of the budget heads in the consultancy projects with the condition that the sponsoring agency has given no objection certificate for the same.

(D) Noted and Ratified the following action taken by the Vice-Chancellor:

- (I)** in sanctioning a sum of Rs.10,15,000/- for 2015-2016 and Rs.2,54,000/- for the year 2016-2017 under the Budget head ‘General Administration’ sub-head “Re-audit of Accounts” for making the payment in favour of Institute of Public Auditors of India (IPAI) for re-audit of Pension Fund from its inception i.e. from 2006-2007 onwards and also Provident Fund (GPF/CPF) and Non Plan Account for the last three financial years to enquire into the case of misappropriation of funds in the pension section.
- (II)** in sanctioning the amount as interim payment of Honorarium to the following persons out of budget head “General Administration-sub-head- Allowances & Honorarium to hold enquiries” to enquire into the case of misappropriation of funds in the pension section in terms of the decision of the Syndicate dated 18.10.2015 vide Agenda Item R (xiii) & (xi) for approval

of payment of Honorarium to Committee members
Appendix – L (Page 161-164) as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Persons	Amount
1.	Justice Harbans Lal, Enquiry Officer, Former Judge Punjab & Haryana Court	25000/-
2.	Sh. Ashok Raj Bhandari, Presenting Officer, Ex FDO, P.U. Chandigarh	5700/-
3.	Sh. Amrik Singh Bhatia, IAAS, AG (Retd.) (Member Enquiry Committee)	23000/-
4.	Sh. B.L. Gupta, Ex FDO/Ex Registrar, P.U. Chandigarh (Member Enquiry Committee)	23000/-
5.	Sh. Ashok Raj Bhandari, Presenting Officer, Ex FDO, P.U. Chandigarh (Special Invitee Enquiry Committee)	23000/-

(III) in anticipation of approval of the Board of Finance for payment of Rs.1,53,733/- as refund to University Grants Commission out of Budget head 'Overhead Charges' on account of adjustment of UGC Assistance provided to the department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh under Special Assistance Programme for the period 01.04.2010 to 31.03.2015.

NOTE: On the recommendation of the Selection Committee dated 19.01.2000 Dr. (Ms.) Gayathiri Pathmanathan was appointed as Research Associate in the Department of Anthropology under (UGC-SAP) at the initial pay of Rs.10500/- p.m. (fixed) + HRA. She joined her duty on 14.02.2000 (F.N). The University paid her fellowship amount @Rs.10500/-p.m. + HRA for the period 14.02.2000 to March,2003 whereas the UGC had approved the appointment of Research Associates @Rs.8000/-p.m. instead of Rs.10500/- etc. Due to this an excess payment of Rs.1,53,023/- had been given to the Research Associate during the period 14.02.2000 to March,2003. The UGC did not admit the excess expenditure of Rs.1,53,023/- and intimated to the University to refund the excess expenditure of Rs.1,53,733/- (alongwith interest) lying with the University vide letter No.F.4-20/2003(SAP-III) dated June,2014. The University paid the excess expenditure of Rs.1,53,733/- out of budget head "Overhead Charges" to the UGC through RTGS/NEFT vide State Bank of India advice No.SBIN 165083187050 dated 24.03.2015 in anticipation approval of BOF.

(IV) in sanctioning the following provisions out of Estate Fund Account as under:

- A.** Rs.6,55,000/- for providing and fixing BRC fabric grill in BMS Block, Panjab University Campus, Sector-14, Chandigarh **Appendix -LI (Page 165-167).**

NOTE: The BMS Block P.U. Sector -14, Chandigarh was facing the problem of monkeys menace. Expenditure was necessary to secure the Labs./classes.

- B.** Rs.6,28,932- for construction of extension of Community Centre, Sector-25, South Campus, P.U., Chandigarh **Appendix-LII(Page 168-169).**

NOTE: The Board of Finance in its meeting held on 27.07.2011 vide Agenda Item No.12 has sanctioned Rs.204.00 lacs. However, the actual expenditure comes out to Rs.210.28 lac which falls within the admissible limit of 5% of the total estimated cost.

(V) in sanctioning the honorarium to the Director & Associate Director (Research Promotion Cell) as under:

1. Director - 1
(Honorarium @ Rs.4000/- p.m.)
2. Associate Director - 1
(Honorarium @ Rs.2500/- p.m.)

NOTE: The Board of Finance in its meeting held on 17.8.2015, vide Agenda Item No. 16 has approved the honorarium of Rs. 4000/- p.m. to Dean Research. With the revamping of Research Promotion Cell, the nomenclature of the post of Dean Research has been changed to that of Director Research Promotion Cell.

Item 27

That the audit may admit the cases of child care leave in terms of the rules already approved by the Syndicate and Senate.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 08.03.2015 (Para-9) **Appendix-LV (Page 174-176)**, on the recommendations of the Committee dated 16.01.2015 **Appendix-LVI (Page 177-186)**, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, has approved the Child Care Leave to the University female employees (teaching and non-teaching).

The Child Care Leave Rules have been framed by the University in view of the policy of the Government of Punjab as well as Central Government for grant of Child Care Leave to their female employees.

2. In spite of the above decision of the Syndicate and Senate, the Resident Audit Officer (RAO) has made an observation that provisions of Child Care Leave is to be incorporated in the Panjab University Regulations, under Section 31 (1) of the Panjab University Act, 1947 which require approval of Government of India. In support of this, the RAO has cited the legal opinion rendered by the Legal Remembrance, U.T., Chandigarh (which was obtained by the RAO at his own level) **Appendix - LVII (Page-187).**
3. The Panjab University has also obtained legal opinion from the University Legal Retainer Shri S.C. Sibal. The Legal Retainer has opined that the Rules in question (i.e. Child Care Leave) framed by the Syndicate require approval of the Senate. There is no need of sending the same for approval to the Central Government mainly for the reason that the resolution is not inconsistent with the Act **Appendix - LVIII (Page 188-190).**
4. The Senate while approving the Child Care Leave has also allowed that the decision of the Senate will be applicable retrospectively to cover the pending cases of Child Care Leave where the Administrative sanction has already been granted by the authorities.

Item 28

That the audit may admit the advance increments as per the decision of the Senate dated 25.05.2014 (Para-IX).

“Two non-compounded advance increments at the entry level be granted to all those teachers, who possessed postgraduate degree in the professional course such as LL.M./ M.Tech./ M.Arch./ M.E./M.V.Sc. /M.Pharma/ MDS, including M.D. recognized by the relevant statutory body/council, as is being given to the teachers holding similar degrees in Punjab Engineering College and other neighbouring Engineering Institutions.”

NOTE: 1. On the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 4/16.01.2014 (Para-17) **Appendix-LIX (Page 191-196)** , the Senate at its meeting

held on 25.5.2014 (Para-IX) **Appendix-LX (Page 197-200)** has granted two advance increments to those teachers, who possessed the Postgraduate degree in the professional courses such as LL.M./M.Tech./M.Arch./etc., recognized by the relevant statutory bodies, in terms of Clause 9.0, sub-clause 9.3 of UGC Regulations, 2010 **Appendix-LXI (Page 201-202).**

2. With respect to the above decision of the Senate, the Audit has observed that copies of necessary clarification sought from the UGC/Punjab Government be supplied **Appendix-LXII (Page 203-206)** as to whether such advance increments is to be given even in those cases where the minimum qualifications for appointment of teacher in professional courses was Post-graduate degree i.e. LL.M./ M.E./ M.Tech. etc.
3. The office is of the view that no such clarification was required because UGC has allowed two advance increments to the teachers for possessing Master's degree in professional course without any condition or stipulation that whether the Master's degree was essential qualification or not.

However, to resolve this issue, the Establishment section requested the UGC/AICTE **Appendix-LXIII (Page 207-213)** to give specific clarification on this point, followed by reminders, stating specifically that in case necessary clarification is not received within two months' time, it will be presumed that UGC/AICTE has no policy in this regard and the University will be at its liberty to grant two non-compounded advance increments at the entry level to those possessing post-graduate degree in the professional course such as M.Tech./M.E. etc., as per clause 9.3 of UGC Regulations, 2010.

4. The Senate has approved two advance increments to teachers of professional courses for acquiring Master's degree on the pattern as being followed in other Technical Institutions such as Punjab Engineering College (which also falls under the jurisdiction of the U.T. Admn., Chandigarh) that they have allowed two advance increments to teachers possessing Master's degree irrespective of the fact that Master's degree was essential qualification for appointment, because there is no such

condition imposed by the UGC that these advance increments would not be allowed if Master's degree was essential qualification **Appendix-LXIV(Page214-219).**

Item 29

Noted the status of the Inspection Report of Principal Director Audit (Central) and Local Audit Department, Chandigarh Administration as per **Appendix- LXV (Page 220 - 224) & LXVI (Page to 225-240).**

Item 30

Noted and ratified the decision of the Vice-Chancellor as per the authorization of the Senate dated 27.09.2015 (Para – XXXIX) for approving the pending cases of Pay Protection of teaching staff (as per list attached at **Appendix- LXVII (Page 241-242)** for which Office Orders have been issued in terms of pay protection rules framed by the Syndicate vide para 6 dated 31.5.2015 duly approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 27.9.2015:

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.5.2015 (Para 6) while considering the minutes dated 30.1.2015 **Appendix-LXVIII (Page 243- 249)** of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider/frame the Rules for pay protection of the P.U. employees has decided as under:-

RESOLVED: that the recommendations of the Committee dated 30.1.2015, as per Appendix, be approved with the modification that these rules be made applicable even in the pending cases and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to protect the pay of the teachers in accordance with these rules, on behalf of the Syndicate and the Senate.

2. The above recommendations of the Syndicate contained in item C-40 have been approved by the Senate at its meeting held on 27.9.2015 (Para XXXIX), **Appendix-LXIX (Page 250)** the decision is re-produced as under:-

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in Item C-40 on the agenda, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision regarding protection of pay of teachers and counting of past service in accordance with the proposed rules."

3. It is relevant to mention that the above rules have been approved by the Syndicate

and the Senate being the Competent Bodies under the Panjab University Regulations.

4. Under Chapter II (A) (i) containing Regulation 10.1 (e) at page 29 of P.U., Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, as reproduced below, the Senate is authority to fix the salaries and pay scales of teaching staff:-

10.1. Without prejudice to the generality of its powers of management and of superintendence over the affairs, concerns and property of the University, the Senate shall, in particular, consider and take decision on the recommendations of the Syndicate in the following matters.

(a) to (d) xxx xxx xxxxx

(e) Creation of posts of Professors, Readers and other teachers and also to fix their salaries and pay scales.

5. In compliance to the above, the Establishment Section processed the pending cases of pay protection of employees and issued orders of pay protection after taking the approval of the Vice-Chancellor as per the authorization of the Senate. When the Accounts branch processed these cases for fixation of pay, the Audit has made the following observations:

(i) If Panjab University authorities want to make these Rules applicable in the pending cases with retrospective effect then financial implication of all the pending cases be worked out and got it approved from the BOF of Panjab University. The pending cases which have been got approved from the Vice-Chancellor on the basis of rules framed by the Senate in its meeting held on 27.09.2015 be kept pending till final decision is taken by the Board of Finance in this regard.

(ii) The specific retrospective date be got decided from the competent authority i.e. BOF/Syndicate/

Senate to avoid litigation by the employees whose cases have already been decided as per the Pay Protection Rules in force at that time.

Item 31

That the appointment of Dr. Luxmi as Reader be considered w.e.f. 29.06.2010 on notional basis and she be considered Associate Professor after three years i.e. on 28.06.2013 in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000+AGP9000 notionally and accordingly her pay be also fixed notionally and financial benefit shall accrue to her from 1st December 2014.

- NOTE:**
1. Two posts of Associate Professors/ Readers (SC- 1, ST -1), in the pay band of Rs.37400 -67000 + AGP 9000, were advertised vide Advt. No.1/2010 dated 04.01.2010 in the University Business School.
 2. Against the above advertisement, Dr. Luxmi (who was working as Assistant Professor in University Business School) was selected for the post of Reader by the duly constituted Selection Committee in its meeting held on 01.06.2010 in the pay scale of Rs. 12000-18300 under the UGC Regulation 2000.
 3. On the basis of the recommendations of the Selection Committee dated 1.6.2010, the Syndicate in its meeting held on 29.6.2010, vide Para-2 (xviii), approved the appointment of Dr. Luxmi (SC) as Reader, subject to fulfillment of new UGC conditions, if applicable.
 4. The new UGC Regulations 2010 were notified on 30.06.2010. At the time of above advertisement, the old UGC Regulations were applicable and thus the qualifications were got advertised as per the UGC guidelines 2000. It had already been clarified by the UGC vide its letter dated 18.2.2010 that a University may go ahead with the qualifications as per UGC Regulation of 2000, till the new guidelines and regulations are notified.
 5. The case did not get put up to the Senate. Instead the matter was again placed before the Syndicate on 26.9.2010 vide Para-16, and the decision was kept in abeyance.
 6. Dr. Luxmi submitted a representation in respect of her appointment and the Vice-

Chancellor after going through the case allowed to seek a clarification from the UGC, if the candidates so selected by following proper procedure as per the then qualification laid down in the UGC Regulations, 2000 can be appointed as Associate Professor.

7. In response to University's letters, the Deputy Secretary, UGC vide his letter dated 13.1.2012 conveyed the requisite clarification with the remarks "clause 6.8.0. of UGC Regulation (on minimum Qualifications for appointments), 2010, is self explanatory i.e. the candidate concerned be given Rs. 8000/- AGP to begin with at the time appointment as Associate Professor."
8. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 17.5.2012 (Para -21) while re-considering the issue under reference decided as under:

'that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate, after seeking legal opinion'.

9. The legal Retainer of the University opined as under:

"Dr. Luxmi's appointment was approved by the Syndicate on 29.6.2010 when the required experience was 5 years. The required experience was amended to 8 years only on 30.6.2010 so the same cannot apply to Dr. Luxmi's case"

10. As per authorization given by Syndicate dated 17.5.2012 (para-21), the Vice-Chancellor accepted the Legal opinion given by Legal Retainer **Appendix - LXX (Page 251-253)**.
11. The case was placed before the Senate at its meeting held on 28.9.2014 **Appendix-LXXI (Page 254-256)**, which decided as under:-

"RESOLVED: That as recommended by the Selection Committee, the appointment of Dr. Luxmi at University Business School, be approved from the date of Syndicate decision i.e., 29.06.2010."

12. In the light of above, Dr. Luxmi was given appointment w.e.f. 29.6.2010, i.e., the date of decision of the Syndicate with the condition that her appointment for the period 29.6.2010 to the date of joining will be treated as notional (i.e., no salary to be paid in the higher scale/designation) and probation period of one year ought to be treated w.e.f. the date of her joining. She was given appointment vide letter No.11029/Estt. dated 01.12.2014. She joined on 01.12.2014.
13. After obtaining the legal opinion from Senior Law Officer, Panjab University, she was designated as Associate Professor w.e.f. 29.6.2013 (Notional) and 1.12.2014 with salary in the pay band of Rs.37400 - 67000 + AGP 9000.
14. The appointment of Dr. Luxmi as Reader was put up to the Audit by the Accounts branch for admitting the entries in the service book. On this, the Audit has made certain observations vide its note dated 11.5.2015 **Appendix - LXXII (Page 257-261)**, out of which one of the observations was that the Legal advice may be taken from the Legal Retainer who has earlier rendered the advice in this case.
15. The Vice-Chancellor after going through the matter, referred the case to Legal Retainer, for his opinion, who has given his detailed opinion **Appendix -LXXIII (Page 262-264)**.
16. After considering the opinion of Legal Retainer and the office records, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that since Dr. Luxmi has been duly selected by the Selection Committee to the higher post and in view of her appointment having been approved only on 01.12.2014 instead of 29.6.2010, she deserves to be compensated for higher starting salary, than the minimum due on 01.12.2014. In order to compensate her for loss of salary for four years and future promotional aspects, the Vice-Chancellor recommended that (5) Five Increments be given on the minimum, in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP 9000 w.e.f. 01.12.2014.

Item 32

NOTED the Minutes of meetings of the 'Think Tank' Constituted in pursuance of the discussion in the Senate meeting dated 27.09.2015, which were held on 27.10.2015 **Appendix - LXXIV (Page 265-277)**, 12.01.2016 **Appendix - LXXV (Page 278-286)** & 01.02.2016 **Appendix - LXXVI (Page 287-289)**.

Item 34

That -

- (i) ratified the decision of the Senate dated 26.4.2015 (Para XX) with the modification that the dated of Notification of 13th June 2013 be read as 24.07.2013.
- (ii) that audit may admit all the promotion cases under CAS which had already been approved by the Syndicate and Senate.
- (iii) the annual increment of 44 number of admitted cases be released.

NOTE: 1 The Panjab University has apprised the Finance Secretary, UT Administration Chandigarh the whole case concerning Carrier Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Panjab University and Government Colleges of UT vide letters No.21/R/DS/DR Estt dated 21.01.2016 and 131/R/DS dated 09.02.2016 **Appendix-LXXIX (Page 296-308)**.

2. The Finance Secretary issued a clarification vide letter No.PA/FS/2016/23 dated 10.02.2016 **Appendix-LXXX (Page 309-310)**.

Item 35

That the case of grant of non-compounded increments to Dr. Prasanta K. Nanda, for acquiring Ph.D. degree, at the time of appointment, which he qualified from IIT, Kharagpur be admitted by the audit.

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Prasanta K. Nanda appointed as Assistant Professor in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology. He joined as Assistant Professor on 06.05.2013.
 2. Dr. Prasanta K. Nanda was already Ph.D. holder at the time of joining in P.U. Service which he obtained from the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur in the year 2007.

3. The Establishment section issued office orders vide no. 7715-21/Estt.-I, dated 14.08.2014 **Appendix-LXXXII (Page 312-313)** for granting him five non-compounded advance increments on account of acquiring Ph.D. degree before his joining in the Panjab University as Assistant Professor w.e.f. the date of joining P.U. service i.e. 06.05.2013, in terms of Senate decision dated 29.09.2015 (Para-XVII).

4. On the above office orders, the RAO has observed as under:

“It may be got incorporated in the orders that whether these officials has done their Ph.D. by following the process of Registration, Course work etc. as prescribed under UGC Regulation 2010”

5. Accordingly, revised office orders were issued vide no.4671-77/Estt.-I, dated 30.05.2015 **Appendix-LXXXIII (Page 314)** by mentioning that he has acquired Ph.D. degree with course work as per UGC guidelines 2010.

6. the RAO again observed as under **Appendix-LXXXIV (Page 315-318):**

“the Estt. Branch has verified the Pre-Ph.d. course work at page C/18 to C/22. At pages C/18 to C/22 official had attached course work certificates of different time period. As per requirements of UGC notification at page C/8 marked ‘X’ a student has to undertakes course work for a minimum period of one semester and must include a Course on research methodology, which may include quantitative methods and compute application. It may also involve reviewing of published research in the relevant field. In view of this it may be examined by the Estt. Branch, whether the certificate attached page C/18 to C/22 fulfils the requirement of Pre-Ph.d. course work as defined in the UGC notification dated 11.07.2009 as page C/8. Regarding external evaluation how it can be verified from the documents attached in support at page C/17”

7. The UGC Regulations, 2010, (under Clause 9.0: Incentives for Ph.D./M.Phil. and other

higher qualification to take effect from 01.09.2008, sub-clause 9.1 of UGC Regulations, 2010), has prescribed as under:

“9.1 Five non-compounded advance increments shall be admissible at the entry level of recruitment as Assistant Professor to persons possessing the degree of Ph.D. awarded in a relevant discipline by the University following the process of admission, registration, course work and external evaluation as prescribed by the UGC.”

NOTE: The Minutes of BOF has been circulated to the members and comments/observation if any received from the members would be brought to the notice of the Syndicate on the table.

Referring to Sub-Item 1, Professor Shelley Walia pointed out that at page 6 the words “Deputy Directress” have been mentioned, which should in fact be “**Deputy Director**”.

Referring to Sub-Item 19, Professor Shelley Walia stated that this item is full of repetitions. For instance, as a result of this anomaly, there are many junior persons who are going to get more salary than their seniors. Only a handful of people have been picked, who have not been given this. When they asked the Audit Officer, he is of the argument that when they would retire, they would catch them, which meant, the whole analysis has not been done on who are the people who have not been given Rs.14940, and who would be given. He also thinks that about 13 people have gone to the Court, and for three years (from 1996 to 1998), they have not been given this particular grade. This being sub-judice, no decision should be taken on this issue. He suggested that a Committee comprising financial experts from University Business School, etc. should study this and see why this has not been applied across the board. He knew many persons, who have been left out of this.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that at the moment the issue is what is before them. It is true that the Court is looking into it. The Court would give its decision and that would be binding. At the moment, it is that in order to abide by the directive that no recovery is to be made. It is just re-fixation of salary and move on. Right now, they have difficulty that they have to satisfy a directive. While satisfying the directive, not affecting, almost anybody and no recovery is to be made as the matter is sub-justice, this matter is out of focus. Otherwise, the issue came to them again and again as if they are doing something for which they are not competent. Suddenly when the route of funding of them is shifted, i.e., through U.T. Administration to through Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD), they have come under a more severe scanner,

and the scanner is focusing on minor things, and they have become a bone of contention, and the University has got entangled. When they gave less rate of interest on Provident Fund to their employees, nobody objected, but when once they gave a little bit of more interest, they asked us to make the recovery. Though they were able to convince the MHRD, the CAG did not agree. Why this Institution, which is a centrally funded, is being permitted to do so. However, when it comes to enhancement of age of superannuation of teachers to 65 years, then there is a doubt whether Panjab University is a Central University or not. But when it comes to imposing a dictat, they have a little bit (½%) advantage that recovery should be made. However, when less interest is paid, no compensation is given. This is the difficulty that this Institution, given its history, is passing through, and he does not have a solution to this other than expressing his anguish.

Professor Shelley Walia said that do they not involve the Government Officers while taking the decision/s.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he tried his level best and they do this. Even today, the two representatives of the Government, i.e., Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh and Director, Higher Education, Punjab, are not present in the meeting. At least, he managed to get the Deputy Secretary, MHRD, and also a very senior Officer of U.T. to attend the meeting of the Board of Finance this time. Though the things are changing, not to the entire satisfaction.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that, first of all, he would like to thank the Finance & Development Officer for providing him the Audited Report. He had called him yesterday and requested him to provide the Audited Report. He also thanked the Registrar for providing him the copy of the fee structure of the affiliated Colleges, which implemented in the academic session 2015-16. Secondly, they have tried to discuss in the meeting of the Board of Finance, but did not get enough time. They are sitting in one of the top bodies of the University, wherein they would like to discuss certain things in holistic manner. In the Audited Report for the year 2014-15, which has been given to him by the Finance & Development Officer, the revenue receipts is Rs.181 crore, whereas in the Budget given to them, the income is Rs.191 crore. He enquired from where the difference of Rs.10 crore is coming.

It was clarified that the Audited Report, to which Shri Raghbir Dyal is referring to, is actually the individual Audited Report only for Non-Plan. As per the new format, which they have adopted as per the UGC directive, in the consolidation of income after taking into account the income from sports and hostels, the total income is Rs.191 crore, on the basis of which they have prepared the consolidated balance sheet of the University, which has also been appended with the agenda papers.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, it meant, that the additional income has come from the sports and hostels funds.

It was clarified that, actually, it is not additional income; rather, earlier it was shown separately, but now it has been consolidated. When Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he has not got the point, he was requested to refer to page VI of the Budget, where the whole break-up is given.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that now, he has got the point. He further stated that looking at the Budget, an excess expenditure over income is being projected as Rs.306 crore, which meant the University is going to have a deficit of Rs.306 crore. Now, if they take into account the grant coming from the UGC and add 8% to it after implementing the notional increment plus a grant of Rs.20 crore from the Punjab Government, which they receive from the Punjab Government per annum, the total grant from the UGC and Punjab Government would be Rs.200 crore. He enquired from where the deficit of Rs.100 crore would be covered/met. He had also said in the meeting of the Board of Finance that it is very important for them to discuss the fiscal roadmap of the University as the situation is going to be very bleak/tight for them. If they see the statement of the Vice-Chancellor made by him in the meeting of the Board of Finance, in which he was also present, they have constituted a Think-Tank and the Think-Tank would submit the concrete proposal to enhance the revenue of the University by 20% in the year 2016-17 taking the base of year 2014-15. If they take the base year 2014-15, in the year 2014-15, the income happened to be Rs.190 crore, and if they add 20% to it, the additional income would be about Rs.38 crore, and the total would come out to approximately Rs.230 crore. Now, if they see the revenue projection, the revenue projection for the year 2016-17 is already Rs.210 crore, but according to his calculations, it would go on the higher side, and would touch approximately Rs.220 crore. Why it would touch Rs.220 crore, because the revised income from the examinations fees had been put Rs.96 crore, which is only 5% increase from what they are getting from the year 2015 and 2016. They had projected Rs.92 crore (revised) for the year 2015-16 and they had increased it by only Rs.4 crore for the year 2016-17. But the way they are increasing the fees and the undergraduate courses like B.A., B.Sc., B.Com., etc. would come under the Semester System for which they would charge fees twice in a year, according to him, it would reach Rs.105 crore. As such, their entire income would be about Rs.220 crore. The deficit of about Rs.6 crore to Rs.7 crore could be covered/met by curtailing their expenditure alone. In that way, the purpose of the Think-Tank is diluted/defeated. According to him, the Think-Tank should give a clear roadmap to the University as to how they could make their courses world class, so that more and more NRIs take admission in the University and the revenue of the University get more increased. In the last meeting also, he had said that their revenue model needed to be re-designed so that it becomes more attractive. To the extent they make their courses world class at par with the leading Universities of the world, the more they would be able to enhance their revenue and quality. He further said that they had projected in the Audited Report Rs.22 crore from the tuition fees from the University Teaching Departments. Though he could go into the details as he had not time, it could not be tuition fee alone, and instead it might include other funds as well because if they divide Rs.22 crore by 15,000 students of the campus, the tuition fee would be around Rs.14,500 per student, which according to him could not be.

It was clarified that in this the tuition fee of the students of University School of Open Learning (USOL) might also be there.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that the USOL is stagnant for the last so many years. He urged the members to find as to how much income the University has been able to increase from the USOL. According to him, the income from USOL is stagnant for the

last so many years. In fact, the income of USOL could not be clubbed with the University Teaching Departments, and it should be shown separately.

It was clarified that the University Tuition Fee has been divided into two parts – (i) Traditional Course from where they are expecting to get Rs.7.57 crore during the year 2015-16.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that Rs.7 crore is fee from the University Teaching Departments and Rs.48 crore is from partially financed courses, which come to Rs.55 crore. It was enquired in the last meeting of the Board of Finance as to what extent the affiliated Colleges are contributing, and he had told that the data should be given to him. Now, he has tried to go through the data of the Audited Report, according to which, an income of Rs.7 crore is from the University Teaching Departments and Rs.48 crore from partially self-financing courses, which comes to Rs.55 crore. On the other hand, the expenditure of the University Teaching Departments is Rs.123 crore. In this way, there is a revenue loss of Rs.70 crore from the University Teaching Departments. In addition, if they take into consideration the Pension Corpus and the funds of the University which are contributed by the affiliated Colleges, the house would agree with him that the loss of Rs.100 crore is only and only because of the University Teaching Departments.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that for that only the University would get grant from the Government. He added that for the aided posts in the Colleges, grant is being given by the Government.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that that loss of Rs.100 crore, which they are having, is only and only because of the University Teaching Departments, whereas there is a surplus from the affiliated Colleges.

Professor Navdeep Goyal reiterated that a grant of Rs.200 crore, which is being given to them by the Government, is only for that reason.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they are going to have a full one day meeting to discuss the whole gamut of University finances. At the moment, the matter before them is the recommendations of the Board of Finance, of which he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) is also a part. Therefore, he should ask the things pointedly and also comment pointedly so that the members, who might not have seen the details which he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) had, are enlightened.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that Shri Raghbir Dyal is a member of the Board of Finance and he is a part of these recommendations. He should have checked these in the meeting of the Board of Finance itself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) should tell him pointedly as to what he wants to say. These are the recommendations, which have come from the Board of Finance. He should point out if there are some lacunae.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, first of all, he had to ask the mandate of the Board of Finance – whether they could discuss it or

not. When he enquired whether he would be allowed to speak, he (Vice-Chancellor) said that he could take two minutes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was given full freedom to speak.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he was given just four minutes to speak in the meeting of the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he is not doing the microscopics here. He urged Shri Raghbir Dyal not to indulge in the quantification of numbers. He (Shri Raghbir Dyal) should say things which amount to enlightening of the members and point out the shortcomings in whatever the Board of Finance has recommended. As the member/s of the Senate they would get a full-fledged day for discussion, where the agenda would only be the finances of the University, and the finances would be not only of the University Campus, but also of the affiliated Colleges and how the affiliated Colleges are going to survive as financial units, because when it comes to fee structure and every thing of the affiliated Colleges, everything has approval from the University. This matter was also in focus yesterday in the panel discussion in the Social Science Congress where somebody, who is not a part of the University, very correctly said that the state of State Universities in India today is that the State Universities are the Universities which were created with the help of State at one stage, whose Vice-Chancellors and Governing Bodies are suggested by the State. In fact, now the situation is that 85% of the running expenditure of the State Universities is to be generated by the Universities themselves, and this is the crisis which the State Universities in India are facing. Punjab is the only State of which all the three State Universities are very healthy, when it comes to academic excellence as measured by the national standards. The NAAC score of Guru Nanak Dev University is over 3.5, Panjab University has a NAAC score of 3.35 and Punjabi University has a NAAC score of 3.34. All three Universities of the State are A-Graded. There is no other State University in the country, all Colleges of which are affiliated to A-Graded Universities. But all the three Universities are facing a serious crisis. Yesterday, when the former Secretary, Higher Education, Shri Ashok Thakur, who handled Panjab University for so many years, was chairing this panel, a question was asked and he personally made a proposal that time has come that there should be a inter-University Team. He (Vice-Chancellor, PU) asked Professor Lakhwinder Singh who was trying to articulate and educate everybody to come forward as they would like to induct somebody like Professor Jai Rup Singh, and have a small group of people representing the three Universities to come out as to how Higher Education agenda of Punjab has to be sustained in view of limits on the grants released to the three Universities. They are trying to serve the people, who have limited capacity. As such, they could not increase the fees exorbitantly; otherwise, Higher Education would become non-inclusive. This is what, Shri Ashok Thakur said. In fact, he said that the challenge is – could they come out with an algorithm to sustain their system where the admissions are blinded. Blinded meant, where the admissions to Higher Educational Institutions are made on the basis of performance and not on the basis of income of parents of students. Shri Ashok Thakur had said that there has to be something which leads to a system of cross-subsidy and the institutions should be of such a high level of excellence that the products of these institutions should get sought after by the

employers. He cited the example as to why do the people pay high fees in IIMs, IITs, Central Institutions, etc. because they take loans from financial Institutions knowing well that they would be most sought after their passing out and they would be able to repay the loans. He stressed in so many words that they have to optimize as to how to continuously maintain the standards high and how to give that kind of training to their students that the students after passing out are sought after. Only when they are sought after, they would be able to implement this concept of cross-subsidy. Nowadays, the students pay the fee of the order of Rs.10,000/- per month in the privately run schools, but when they came to the University, they are not ready to pay even the fee of few thousand per month. As such, they have a very serious crisis/situation and this is serious to Panjab University also because they have not received the balance grant for this year, i.e., year 2015-2016, and even the balance of Rs.16-17 crore of the previous year (2014-15) has not been received so far. The Deputy Secretary had come, gone and the minutes of Board of Finance have reached him. So he has taken the message. They have to see what would happen by 31st March 2016 – whether they would get the balance grant by 31st March 2016 or not. The next meeting of the Board of Finance is to happen in the month of July, any proposal on behalf of the Think-Tank would get made in July in the background as to what is PU's position on 31st March 2016. If the money does not come from Delhi by 31st of March, then they have a very serious 'Summer of Discontent'. 'Summer of Discontent' meant, whether the University would be able to make admissions in August or not. If they do not have money to pay salaries, would the Institutions, including the affiliated Colleges, function or not, because if the University would not function, the Colleges would also not function. As such, they have a very serious situation at hand, but it would get handled step by step. Today the duty, which they have, is to look at the recommendations of the Board of Finance and understand the conditions under which these recommendations have been made, in the meanwhile, they also appreciate the crisis, which they are facing. He has articulated the crisis, and in the background this, he could enlighten them.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that his only request to his worthy friend (Dr. Raghbir Dyal) is that he should pin-point the deficiencies, if any, and make concrete suggestion.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he did not know where they have the consistency. In the report of the Board of Finance last year, it was said that the academic and administrative audit would take at least two years as they have to involve professionals, and now they are saying that they would complete it within two months. He does not know what has happened now. As such, they have no consistency. On the one hand, they are saying that it is not good to have guest faculty/*ad hoc* staff against the permanent vacancy, and on the other hand, they had not paid any attention towards their Regional Centres. Whether for the Regional Centres, their funds have exhausted? Though they have made more than 250 appointments in the University, he does not think that even a single Assistant Professor has been appointed at the Regional Centres during the last 5 years. He should be told what the Think-Tank would do. How the deficit of Rs.100 crore would be met and he should be given the roadmap for the same. Every year, they hiked the fee and collected additional sum of Rs.2 crore annually. If they see the heads, i.e., Students Holiday Home, College Development Fund, Sports & Youth Welfare, they would find fixed deposits amounting to Rs.5 crore to Rs.10 crore everywhere as

security. They did not have way to increase the revenue of the University. He had suggested that a meeting of the Chairpersons/Heads of the Departments should be convened to increase the intake of all the courses through which the revenue of the University would be increased without any additional infrastructure and expenditure, but no heed has been paid to his suggestion. He had also suggested that admissions should also be allowed through lateral entry in the courses like MCA, M.Sc. (IT), etc. Though more than three years have passed, no action has been taken by the University. He had also suggested that the website of the University should be updated and making of portal of NRI, but that has also not been done. Though the suggestions are sought, action is not taken on them. For the last three years, the same Budget is continuing and the deficit is increasing every year. What are their achievements and how they are going to meet the deficit? Which of their self-financing courses are running in profit, and if they want to increase the fee, the fee of those self-financing courses should be increased. The persons who could pay Rs.50,000/-, could also pay Rs.60,000/- to Rs.70,000/-, and the revenue would come from them and not by increasing the fees by Rs. 500/- or so. He has been unable to understand during the last three years as to what is their fiscal roadmap even though the top-most brains are available in the University. He has gone through the NAAC report, wherein it has been pointed out that some of their properties are damaged. The NAAC has specifically said that their Holiday Homes are dead properties, but still they are investing a sum of Rs.10 crore. During the last five years, they were in slumber and when the NAAC pointed out these as dead properties, they spontaneously decided to allocate a sum of Rs.10 crore on all these, i.e., Students' Holiday Home, Dalhousie, Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla and Amritsar, whereas only a sum of Rs.1.5 crore had been allocated for P.U. Regional Centre, but still the work has not been started. Where do they raise these issues? When they try to raise these issues in the meeting of the Board of Finance, it is said that there is not mandate for the purpose, and if these are raised in the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor is saying that they could raise the same in the meeting of the Senate. He promises not to speak even a single word in the meeting of the Senate, but reply should be given to his queries.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he agreed with Shri Raghbir Dyal and his anguish is right as to why the money is not being spent on P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. He had pointed out on a couple of occasions that persons have been appointed in P.U. Regional Centres and P.U. Constituent Colleges through Walk-in-Interview, and appointees are continuing as such for the last more than 5 years. The meritorious persons did not appear in those Walk-in-Interviews, and resultantly, either less meritorious or ineligible persons got selected. Citing an example, he said that in the Walk-in-Interview for Regional Centre only one person appeared and he got selected and he is teaching there for the last five years and is also guiding M.Phil. students. He is astonished to see how a simple NET qualified person is guiding M.Phil. students. There are several Ph.D. candidates in the waiting. He fully agreed with Shri Raghbir Dyal and they needed to pay attention to all those Regional Centres to which he is referring to. He suggested that the temporary appointments should not be made for long period. The person who is teaching at the Regional Centre for the last about five years, tomorrow he would claim for appointment on regular basis. They knew that the students' organization do not allow them to increase the fees, but they could increase the fees of self-

financing courses, where the people have the paying capacity. As such, they could increase the fees of self-financing courses. He also agreed with Shri Raghbir Dyal that the vacant faculty positions of P.U. Regional Centres should immediately be filled up.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that Shri Raghbir Dyal has said that a revenue of about Rs.7 crore is being generated by the University Teaching Department from the traditional courses and Rs.48 crore from the partially self-financed courses. There are very few courses from where much funds are coming. In the last meeting also, he had suggested that more and more number of NRI students should be invited to get enrolled in various University courses, by using the office of the Dean International Students, and if need be, the office of the Dean International Students should be activated for the purpose. So far as making increase in traditional courses is concerned, they could not make enhancement more than this. So far as self-financing courses are concerned, they are only for the students, who had sound financial background. Therefore, they should increase the existing fees of the self-financing courses, and secondly, introduce more self-financing courses.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that both Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa have suggested that the fees of the self-financing Institutes should be increased. But it is not that all the students, who took admissions in self-financing Institutes, belonged to well to do families. Since the people do not have other option, the other students, whose parents are not even financially sound, also sometimes took admission in self-financing Institutes. Citing an example, he said that even the students belong to poor families took admissions to Five-Year Integrated Course being offered at University Institute of Legal Studies as they do not have any other option. As such, even the students belonging to below poverty line also have to pay the same fee as is being paid by the students, whose parents have income in crore of rupees. Therefore, he is of the opinion that the students, who have reached here after getting various types of concessions, they should be given concession/s here also. He also suggested that the NRI seats should always be demanded from the Governing Body in addition to the sanctioned seats and the fee structure for the same should be separate/different. The students irrespective of whether they are NRIs or have the paying capacity, they should be admitted with extra fees. He, therefore, suggested that the number of seats in such Institutes should be increased instead of increasing the fees. He knew very well that some of the students really belonged to poor families and are unable to pay their fees and gave representations for fee concessions, which they recommended to the University authorities. Sometimes, the teachers pay the fees of such students from their own pockets. If they increased the fees of such students, they would be deprived of higher education.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that so far as NRI seats are concerned, as pointed out by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, it is correct that they do not have that many NRI students, but there were different reason/s and one such reason was that the kind of rules and the way the definition of NRI was interpreted, according to which, only very few people could take admissions. Now, those rules have been changed and are part of this agenda itself. Citing an example, he said that the definition of ward is that anybody who is dependent and not just the sons and daughters are wards. As such, the rules have now been revised in consultation with the legal persons. Hopefully, this

year more number of NRIs would be admitted to various courses being offered by the University. So far as allocation of Rs.10 crore for renovation of Students' Holiday Home, Dalhousie is concerned, it is being done because they are charging students specifically for Students' Holiday Home and the funds so collected could only be used on the Students' Holiday Home only. Therefore, it was thought that if the funds are available, the same should be used properly, and that is why, this allocation has been made in the planned Budget of this year.

On a point of order, Shri Ragbir Dyal said that the amount in the Budget Head-Students' Holiday Home was already available. His point is why they have suddenly woken up after five years.

Professor Anil Monga said that there are certain courses in the University where the fee is very low in comparison to other Universities. Citing an example, he pointed out that the fee for the MBA Course being offered at the University Business School is just about Rs.18,000/-. He was astonished to see that the MBA Degree is being awarded on a fee of just Rs.18,000/- in these days. The increase of minimum of Rs.500/- and maximum of Rs.1200/- is right, but in certain courses, which have a lot of demand in the market, they have to rationalize the fees by raising the same at least to Rs.40,000/- to Rs.50,000/-.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky stated that fiscal management has two main points – (i) how could they increase the revenue; and (ii) how could they reduce the expenditure. As was suggested in last couple of meetings, the University has three main Guest Houses, and besides, there is a College Bhavan, Alumni House, etc. where the room rent is only Rs.300/-. He suggested that firstly this rent should be hiked to at least Rs.500/- per day. This alone would increase their income up to Rs.2-3 crore. When it was pointed out that there is more than 80% occupancy, he said that sometimes the occupancy is 100% as when they make a call for the purpose, they were told that the accommodation is not available. He added that in none of the hotel they could get accommodation below Rs.2,000/- per day and even in the villages the room rent is more than Rs.700/- to Rs.800/- per day. Since there is air conditioner/s, attached bathrooms and so many other facilities in the rooms which are available in different University Guest Houses, the expenditure incurred on the facilities provided is more than the room rent paid by them. Secondly, they make provision for maintenance purposes, but he does not know whether it is possible or not to give the maintenance to big companies by just putting a small hoarding of the company concerned. With this they would be able to maintain and also able to curtail the expenditure up to some extent. Such types of small steps, including e-tendering, could be taken by them. They have also discussed in the last meeting of the Syndicate about the shortcomings on the part of their Engineering Department. He pointed out that it is not their own Engineering Department, but in every Engineering Department, the inflated estimates are quoted as at every step the commission is fixed, which results into inferior quality. If they introduced e-tendering, there would be transparency and it would also lead to cutting of cost. As suggested by the Vice-Chancellor himself, there must be a Committee to monitor the construction activities. With these small steps, they could increase their income and would also be able to curtail their expenditure.

It was informed that e-tendering process has already been implemented by the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything is being followed up, and would see what could be done.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the suggestions are very good, but he does not think that it is not very substantial gain which they would make. He had suggested that a team headed by Dean International Students should go to Poona University wherein about 5000 foreign students had taken admission and he was told that they earn about Rs.100 crore from the foreign students. So they are looking for some kind of substantial income.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not Pune University alone. Certain private Universities also get a number of foreign students enrolled.

Continuing, Professor Shelley Walia said that he is talking about some Iranian students, who take admissions in Social Sciences, Ph.D., etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, the students of Iran and other South Asian countries are sponsored by their Embassies and are also given certain other concessions. They would seek several other kinds of concessions.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they should not lower the standard, but the procedures of admission should be simplified, which is being done by several other Universities. He, therefore, suggested that it is not a bad idea to study the Pune model.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the NRIs have option to send the student to Bangalore, Manipur, and several other Universities. They have to compete in all sorts of things to attract the NRIs. First, it is the branding of the University and second is what they would give to the NRIs, in that the boys would come as also the girls. As such, there are a lot of factors which would make the NRIs way.

Professor Shelley Walia pointed out that last time, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and he himself have suggested formation of the Committee for giving some relaxations to the NRI students, but the meeting of the Committee has not been convened so far.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Syndicate has taken about 158 pages. He has formed the Committees, but it would take some time. Since the agenda were so heavy, it takes time and it also becomes even difficult to translate the discussions into the minutes. It is very non-trivial job to prepare the minutes of 150 odd pages, which is not so easy.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that, if they see practically, since there is infrastructure, including labs., they could increase number of seats at one or two places. For example, if there are 30 seats, the same could be increased to 50, which would also lead to generation of a lot of income. Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU) has also done this for increasing its income. GNDU has increased seats of Architecture course from 40 to 80.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they would come under the regulatory body.

Principal S.S. Sangha clarified that he is just giving an example. He is saying that the seats of B.Sc., M.Sc., etc. courses could be increased.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already appointed 11 Sub-Committees, which are doing the manpower auditing of both teaching and non-teaching. Everybody knows that the University system has to be understood before summer. They could not go to the next Board of Finance meeting with having all these things in order. The real progress/acceleration to all this process would happen as to what MHRD does before 31st March 2016 on the basis of whatever they would put to them. Everything, including their survival, depended as to what the response of the Centre is on that. That is the reason that he is after the Minister of State for Human Resource & Development, Government of India, that he comes for the Convocation of the University. He met the Secretary, MHRD, after the meeting of the Board of Finance. In fact, they had a very long meeting with him. The Minister of State has not refused till yesterday, and has also not accepted their invitation, but he (Vice-Chancellor) has not given up. He is trying his level best to get the Minister of State for the Convocation, so that they are able to find by 31st March as to where they stand. They have no option but to carry out manpower audit. The question is what proposal they should make – 15% increase or 20% increase or 25% increase or whatever they like because they might say that 20% or 25% is unacceptable to them. The recommendations of 7th Pay Commission are coming, and they might come up with 30% increase. So let them put a proposal. Once they put their condition/s, they would know as to what is their commitment to the University. They need a long term commitment from the MHRD also because they could not drag their feet every year. Their difficulty is that they (MHRD) say that they would meet their deficit (deficit of the University), but at the same time are also saying that they (the University) are not increasing their revenue, but question is how much revenue should they increase. Are they also going to freeze the grant, the way the Punjab Government is doing?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, “Yes”, this is what his perception is. After attending the meeting of the Board of Finance, he was going to share his perception. The Punjab Government has fixed their grant at Rs.20 crore. Earlier, they were saying that they are getting the manpower audit done and they spent months together on this. In fact, they were showing that they are getting the manpower audit done. Now, they have changed its name to that of “Think-Tank”. In fact, they are neither interested in increase in fees nor manpower audit or in the ‘Think-Tank’ as they did not see the recommendations of the ‘Think-Tank’ even for a second. They are interested in fixing the grant to the University as is being done by the Punjab Government. According to him, they would give the due share this year, i.e., Rs.196 crore and next year, they would give Rs.205 crore by increasing it by 8%.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Keshav Malhotra that, “how does he know this?”

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is his perception after attending the meeting of the Board of Finance.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the suggestion of Principal S.S. Sangha appeared very nice to him, and for the time being they could increase the number of seats. He suggested that where the number of seats per unit is 60 presently, could be increased to 70 per unit.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they should understand the figure. He is a man of figures, but even if they double the figure of Rs.55 crore, it would be Rs.110 crore only. In fact, they are not understanding the crisis, which they are facing. They should understand that the crisis is very serious. When the Centre is giving them Rs.200 crore, it is not given for a given Department; rather it is given to the University. It is a taxpayers' money. If they are paying salaries for self-sustaining Institutions which are part/s of the University, the Centre wants those self-sustaining Institutions to be inclusive. So they have to have a policy of cross-subsidizing. This is what Shri Ashok Thakur and Dr. Ajay Ranga have said. Until they did not keep the Institutions run on behalf of the University inclusive, money from the Centre is not going to come. Centre is run by the people, who have to go to their electorate after every five years. As such, they have different conditions. There is a political as well as bureaucratic control at the Centre. Since it is a very complex problem, tinkering is no solution. It is in that context, he said that the crisis they faced is the same crisis which was faced by Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. As such, the crisis is not different. They have a little bit additional commitment from the Centre and commitment of Punjab Government is a little bit less for them. He said that he wants a clear statement from the Centre. They might say that their contribution is also frozen to some level, but they have not said this so far.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the inclusiveness could not be one sided. In fact, they do not think for thousands of students, who are not getting main-stream education. It is happening because both the Centre and State Government are curtailing their spendings on higher education. They should emphasize that theirs is a premier Institution for the smooth functioning of which funds are required and they should seek more funds from them. If they increase their revenue to the tune of Rs.1-2 crore on small accounts, they would not be able to solve problem, but deteriorate it. In fact, the problem has arisen because they (Governments) are running away from their responsibilities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is because of that objective in mind that the stake in this University is being given to the national intellectual leadership. It is with that objective in mind that Professor R.P. Bambah advised him that get to the very best from India and he readily accepted his advice. It is with that thought only, he said that the 8-10 Chairs in the University should be given to the very best in India and make them come to the University. They should understand this University and talk on behalf of this University at invisible fora, which are not obvious to them. In that context only, the agenda of Social Science Congress and Science Congress are being pursued, so that people get invited to the national events on behalf of this University. Let the Vice-Chancellor and other intellectuals review so that they find out as to what crisis the Institutions of Higher Education are facing. He is very happy that all the Syndicate members are very passionate of their responsibilities, they are understanding all issues and giving suggestions. They have to work together and move forward.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that he attended the meetings of the Manpower Audit Committee. Though the spirit of manpower audit is very good, they should not keep in mind the figure to be brought down. They are saying that 304 posts should be abolished. What is the purpose of abolition of 304 posts, when they are not claiming grant for the same. They should not show to the people that they have abolished 304 posts, and instead they should focus on the expenditure side. They should see where they are incurring the expenditure and where they could control it. According to him, controlling the expenditure is more important than the manpower audit. He suggested that orientation of the teams, which have been formed for the purpose of manpower audit, should be got done, so that they should ask the concerned quarters to cooperate for meeting the deficit of about Rs.100 crore. In fact, manpower audit is a serious exercise and they could gain something out of it. Referring to **Sub-Item 26(D)**, he stated that whatever he had said in the meeting of the Board of Finance, the same was said by Shri A. Karthik, which is in their interest. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to look into the same. In fact, Shri A. Karthik has said for the year 2015-16 only, and 2015-16 means the expenditure of Rs.10,15,00,000/-, which they have got sanctioned, should be incurred, but the proposed expenditure of Rs.2,54,000/- to be incurred during the year 2016-17 should not be incurred, and for that they should approach the CAG, and the words which are to be deleted are "Provident Fund (GPF/CPF) and Non-Plan Account for the last three financial years". But he is unable to understand it because the Vice-Chancellor might have already done this. It should be clarified whether these words have been deleted. He urged him to check up Shri A. Karthik, if need be.

On this the office record was checked and found that the response given by Shri A. Karthik with regard to minutes of Board of Finance did not contain the words 'be deleted'. Hence it was informed that no change was required.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that they had discussed the issue of capping there and decided that an undertaking should be obtained. In fact, they (UT Administration) should have argued that they themselves have not obtained undertaking from their own persons, which they have promoted, whereas they are asking them (University) to obtain an undertaking.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he does not want to get into it.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that after the meeting of the Board of Finance, several persons have met him and told him as to why they should give the undertaking because they had the requisite scores even with capping. He, therefore, suggested that they should review all such cases and those, who have not the requisite scores with capping, undertaking should be obtained from them only and not from others.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could write to the people that their increment is being released on the premise that if the UGC asked them, they would be forced to review it. They would send a letter to every individual on behalf of the Establishment. When Professor Keshav Malhotra insisted, the Vice-Chancellor said that he is not going to review their cases. He is not doing re-screening voluntarily. A process which has been gone through and approved by

the Syndicate and Senate, he is not going to reopen that, unless he is forced to do it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is sitting here as a representative of the teachers and, thus, has no opinion of himself; rather, whatever opinion is being expressed by him, is the opinion of his fellow colleagues. He is the most misunderstood person. In fact, he is a social worker, and he is doing it from many-many years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since he (Dr. Keshav Malhotra) is a Professor, first he has to do Professorship and then later on social service.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is doing Professorship, and at the same time tell that it is not the issue of increment alone, and instead it had psychological and sociological implications. He suggested that option should be given to the affected persons whether they wanted to get it review or not, and thereafter, action should be taken accordingly. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to take over his suggestion.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, right now, he is implementing the decision of the Governing Bodies of the University namely Syndicate and Senate, which have allowed these promotions by using their jurisdiction and implemented the directive of the University. He has done whatever he was authorized to do, on behalf of the Syndicate and Senate. Alright, there was some difficulty which was placed before the Board of Finance because of some apprehensions, which the RAO had, and they have been addressed at the Board of Finance level and come here. He is, personally, not in favour of reopening the decision taken on behalf of the Syndicate and Senate, until the Syndicate and Senate decided to reverse it at its own or modify on its own. If somebody wants to modify it or get the whole thing reviewed, then an agenda item would have to be prepared, put before the Syndicate and then processed. Though he understands what Professor Keshav Malhotra is saying, at the moment, as a Vice-Chancellor, he is not in a position to follow up what he is saying.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that already the kind of undertaking they are talking about that has been made. So far as review is concerned, it is for the capping which is to be given now. What they are saying is that if something adverse is received from the UGC, then they would review it, and are not saying that the whole process would be completed again. At that time it could be checked that they are also eligible as per the capping. As such, today it is not necessitated now. The kind of undertaking which is being proposed by PUTA and others, it is right that their promotion is not being affected. As such, there is no such problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the promotion is without any condition, unless it is ordered to be reopened by the UGC.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the guidelines pertaining to capping have been implemented with effect from June 2013. Since the capping was implemented spontaneously, perhaps, a condition or two was/were relaxed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no condition was relaxed. In fact, the UGC asked them to adopt and the matter was placed before

the Syndicate and Senate, which took some time to adopt. He clarified that until the Senate does it, nothing could be adopted. The Government of the University has not done anything, which is violative of the UGC.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that he has used the words that 'perhaps, a condition has been relaxed'. If the Panjab University is abiding by the Regulations/Rules of Punjab Government, then why the Punjab Government has not extended the date to 31st October 2014.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not answer this.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he (Vice-Chancellor) has already told the House that this has not been relaxed, whereas he has said that the condition has been relaxed. If he (Vice-Chancellor) thinks that he (Shri Dua) is saying something wrong, then he could apologize. At that time, he was not aware that the condition is being relaxed. He is observing for the last about 12 years that when the issue related to the University, the intention is different, and the issue related to Colleges came, the intention is different. Either they should take up the matter with the Punjab Government or in the case of unaided Colleges, where the regulations/rules are implemented, at least those teachers are given this relief, especially when this relief is given to the University teachers. He added that presently four types of cadres are existing in the Colleges, i.e., aided teachers, unaided teachers, teachers on contract, guest faculty. Those who are governed by the regulations/rules/ norms of Panjab University, why they are deprived of such benefits? Though he had given reminders during the last four meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, no action has been taken as yet. If they could deliberate it here, why did not they deliberate it in the meeting of the Board of Finance, wherein the capping issue was on the agenda? Why do they keep quiet about them? Either they are unable to project the issues relating to College teachers properly or do not argue them forcefully. Continuing further, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have brought an item on the agenda regarding construction of Holiday Homes at Amritsar, Dalhousie and Shimla for which a sum of Rs.3 crore, Rs.3 crore and Rs.4 crore, respectively have been allocated. Had these allocations been made on the basis the recommendations of the Committee, which made the survey at these places?

The Vice-Chancellor said that Committees had gone and some estimates were made by them, but at the moment he does not have the data. He would get them the data in the next meeting of the Syndicate, the basis on which this money has been asked and allocated.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the last meeting, when he had referred to the construction work being carried out by Panjab University Construction Office, the Vice-Chancellor had said that they would get the work checked/reviewed by appointing a Committee. If this data or figure is given by the said Construction Office, then they have to think at least 10 times before starting the work.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Fine".

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his is the dissent on the allocation of funds for starting construction on these Holidays Homes.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that on that day also a detailed discussion had taken place on the working of Panjab University Construction Office, and Dr. Ajay Ranga had said that they did not reply to the queries even made by him.

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that these are the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate, which have been circulated to the members only the previous day. It took a long time to prepare these minutes. They should not expect him to read these minutes overnight as it takes time to read 149 odd pages. Whatever has happened in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, the same has been recorded in these minutes. It related to XEN Office, this that and so on. He has formed the Committees, but they have not yet been conveyed to the concerned quarters. He has also to go through these minutes, which takes time, and it is not an easy job.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they also understand this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all this work has been done and he has made all the notings. Everything is being followed up. The Deputy Registrar (General) could vouch for it that he has asked him (DRG) to notify all his notings to the concerned quarters immediately and as quickly as possible. Since they are running on public money, there is no question of wastage. The Governing Body of the University is the guardian of the public money. So they are doing their duty as the persons holding their office. He would also do his duty and would have the follow up of the decisions, which they are taking. He would not be seen wanted to be not following the directives given by this House. He urged the members to have a little bit patience and allow this thing to reach and stage, and then come back to the Syndicate meeting, if they think that the directive given by this House, he has not followed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he was just saying that the estimates, which have been given by the Construction Office, have been got verified from any Committee. A Committee might have gone, which could have given the estimates also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that XEN alone is not doing all this; rather, there as Estimates Committee, Building Committee. As such, these are not being done by any individual. In fact, these are done by the Committees. One could have an issue whether the Committees were giving enough time of theirs that the proposal, which are put to them, they are evaluating them with that degree of comprehension or seriousness or inquisitiveness. There is somebody who prepares this. The job of the members of the Committee is that the job, which is given to them, they do it with that degree of passion, with which they are raising now. Members have also certain apprehensions, but those apprehensions they have to exercise their rights as members of those Committees at that stage. Once the recommendations come from the Building Committee, which are duly constituted, anybody sitting in his position, would penetrate into it only if great doubts are there, but these things happened rarely. The Vice-Chancellor could not be seen to doubting the things presented to him on behalf of the Committees,

a majority of which are made up of his own colleagues. He could not disregard the recommendation, which has come to him, in which 50% members are teaching colleagues. He was a teacher only till he took over the office of the Vice-Chancellor, and would be teacher only at the end of his term. As such, he could not be doubting everything which is presented to him. But yes, it is a public money and they are elected representatives, they have to have a higher responsibility while sitting here as the members of this House and he respects that responsibility. Whatever they say, the same would be followed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that in the Budget – Head Income, the revenue from the examination is shown Rs.80 crore, which also include income from private students, majority of which appeared through the affiliated Colleges. Perhaps, the strength of the private students is more than the regular students. The Colleges have to incur expenditure for creating infrastructure, creation of examination centre, and perhaps, earlier some funds were given to the Colleges for the purpose. He suggested that some part of the income (per student) should be given to the affiliated Colleges for the purpose. The number of private students given to a College for appearing in the examination, proportionately funds should be given to the College concerned, so that it could incur expenses on parking, maintenance, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a revenue sharing arrangement. It is fine, the point is well taken.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested since the Holiday Home, Dalhousie is in dilapidated condition for the last so many years, first the same should be renovated and thereafter, the work on other two should be started. He also suggested that two should be made Students' Holiday Home and one should be made Teachers' Holiday Home.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that this is what he has suggested in the beginning.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the work on Students'/Teachers' Holiday Homes, should be prioritized.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Alright".

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that once a similar Holiday Home was approved for Manali in H.P.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that all the placements made by the Placement Cell should be uploaded on the University Website of the University so that they could motivate all over India.

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

Principal B.C. Josan said that he only wanted to say that everything is right, and the Budget should be approved.

Referring to Sub-Item 20, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had sought the list of sports coaches along with the salaries being paid to them, and the Dean of Student Welfare had promised to provide, but he has not given him the same so far.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that only one coach is being paid out of the Amalgamated Fund and he had told it on that day also.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor has promised in the meeting of the Board of Finance that he would provide him (Shri Raghbir Dyal) the list.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever he had promised, he would not go back.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 15.02.2016 (Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 & 15, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34 and 35, be endorsed to the Senate for approval, with the modification that the word “Directress” mentioned in Sub-Item 12(3) be replaced with “Director”.

Issue regarding nomination of two University Readers on the Academic Council

4. Item 4 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

4. To nominate two University Readers on the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2016 to 31.01.2018, under Regulation 1.1(m) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 1.1(m) *ibid* provides that not more than two University Readers are to be nominated by the Syndicate on the Academic Council. These members shall hold office for two years beginning from February 1.

2. The following Readers were nominated for the term 01.02.2014 to 31.01.2016:

1. Dr. (Ms.) Sheena Pall
Reader (Associate Professor)
University School of Open Learning
P.U., Chandigarh

2. Dr. Latika Sharma
Reader (Associate Professor)
Department of Education
P.U., Chandigarh

3. An office note along with the list of Associate Professors (Department wise) enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that though in the pay-scales of 2006, the designation of Lecturer and Reader have been changed to that of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor respectively, these are still being mentioned as Lecturer and Reader. He suggested that the relevant Regulations should be amended immediately.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to nominate, on behalf of the Syndicate, two University Readers (Associate Professor) on the Academic Council, for the term 01.02.2016 to 31.01.2018, under Regulation 1.1(m) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That steps be taken to amend the Regulations/Rules wherever the designations have been mentioned as Lecturer and Reader instead of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor.

Issue regarding 5. nomination of two University Lecturers on the Academic Council

Item 5 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

5. To nominate two University Lecturers (one from the Science Faculty and one from other Faculties) by rotation, on the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2016 to 31.01.2018, under Regulation 1.1(k) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

- NOTE:**
1. Regulation 1.1(k) *ibid* provides that two University Lecturers (one from the Science Faculty and one from other Faculties) shall be nominated by the Syndicate, by rotation, every alternate year, for two years term, beginning from February 1.
 2. The following Lecturers were nominated for the term 01.02.2014 to 31.01.2016:
 1. Dr. Gurmeet Kaur
Lecturer
Department of Geology
P.U., Chandigarh
 2. Mrs. Shruti Bedi
Lecturer
University Institute of Legal Studies
P.U., Chandigarh
 3. An office note along with the list of confirmed Lecturers (Department wise) enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor, be authorized to nominate, on behalf of the Syndicate, two University Lecturers (one from the Science Faculty and one from other Faculties) by rotation, on the Academic Council for the term 01.02.2016 to 31.01.2018, under Regulation 1.1(k) at page 42 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

Appointment of Dr. Ruchi Sharma as Assistant Professor on temporary basis

6. Considered, if Dr. Ruchi Sharma W/o Late Dr. Rahul Sharma (who worked as Reader in Oral/Maxillofacial Surgery on contract basis and his lien was as Senior Lecturer at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital), be appointed on

compassionate grounds as Assistant Professor at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University.

- NOTE:**
1. Dean Faculty of Medical Sciences vide letter dated 23.12.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) has written that Dr. Rahul Sharma, Assistant Professor in the specialty of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery at Dr. HSJ Dental College & Hospital, Sector-25, Chandigarh has expired. He has requested that Dr. Ruchi Vashisht W/o Late Dr. Rahul Sharma may kindly be accommodated for the job of Assistant Professor at the same ground as Dr. Madhurima was accommodated in the University School of Open Learning on compassionate grounds.
 2. A committee dated 31.12.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) of Senior Faculty members considered the proposal of Dr. K. Gauba and has observed that:
 - (i) Dr. Ruchi Sharma is eligible for the post of Assistant Professor as per the Dental Council of India.
 - (ii) Presently, she is working as Associate Professor in the Department of Conservative Dentistry at National Dental College, Dera Bassi.
 - (iii) The Institute has vacant positions for Assistant Professor.
 3. Earlier too, Syndicate dated 22.11.1992 (Para 3 (iii)) and Senate dated 30.12.1992 (Para IV) (**Appendix-VII**) has approved the appointment of Mrs. Madhurima Mahajan as Lecturer in Sociology in the Department of Correspondence now USOL on compassionate grounds after passing away of her father Late Professor Amarjit Mahajan, Department of Sociology (**Appendix-VII**).

In addition to above, the Syndicate dated 21.11.1997 (Para 9) and Senate dated 21.12.1997 (Para XI) (**Appendix-VII**) has also approved the appointment of Mr. J.S. Rathore in the Department of Evening Studies on compassionate grounds after passing away of his father Dr. B.S. Rathore, Reader, Department of Commerce & Business Management.

4. A detailed office note enclosed
(Appendix-VII).

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item is related with appointment on compassionate grounds of Dr. Ruchi Sharma wife of late Dr. Rahul Sharma who passed away at a young age. After a request was received, he consulted Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction, who made him aware that such appointments had been made in the University in the past. He gave the example of someone who is now a Professor in one of the departments of the University, under similar circumstances whose father had passed away and his daughter was given the job. He would like that the recommendations of the Committee be accepted respecting the practice in the University. His only concern is that while offering the job to her, they should give the benefit of last pay drawn from wherever she is coming. If she has graded salary, then at least they should be seen to give consideration to it. If the members authorize him, he would like to make the appointment not at the minimum of the salary because she has lost her husband.

Some of the members said that they authorize the Vice-Chancellor to take the decision.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he wanted to draw the attention towards the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India cited by Shri Randeep Singh Surjewala which says that on the compassionate appointments, the Supreme Court has ruled that Class-I employees could not be appointed. If they are citing the two precedences, he would like to say that there is a Supreme Court ruling which goes against the appointment though he has no objection. If they look at the precedence and he has tried to find it out that in the case of Professor Madhurima Mahajan, she was actually interviewed and put on the waiting list. The appointment was not on compassionate grounds, it was through an interview. It meant that the precedent is wrong. If they look at the case of Shri J.S. Rathor, he was appointed temporarily but within a year had an interview. They could not appoint anyone on compassionate grounds on class-I posts. Therefore, he has objection to it on the grounds of the ruling of the Supreme Court and the precedents given not in reality which those seem to be.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get back to Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the legal opinion could be sought in the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said the legal opinion could be sought only if there was a need.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the Vice-Chancellor at that time had clarified that the appointments were on temporary basis and nowhere he has seen any appointment on Class-I post of Assistant Professor without interview. Therefore, the two precedents are absolutely faulty and against the Supreme Court judgment.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that actually the compassionate appointment is a welfare policy started by the Central Government just to bring out the family from the financial crisis and grief. He did

not know Dr. Ruchi. But his opinion is that as Professor Shelley Walia said and raised objection that they could have their own policy as presently, they did not have any such policy in existence. The compassionate appointments are made by the Central and State Governments on the basis of a policy. In the University, they could also frame a policy for compassionate appointments and accordingly they could make the appointments.

Professor Shelley Walia said how could they make the appointments without seeing the capability of the candidates?

The Vice-Chancellor read para 3(iii) of Syndicate meeting held on 22.11.1992 which says "the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Ms. Madhurima Mahajan as Lecturer in Sociology on compassionate grounds on 8.10.1992 on one year's probation in the Department of Correspondence Studies in the pay scale of Rs.2200-4000 against one of the vacant posts of Lecturers, at the initial pay of Rs.2200/- p.m.".

Professor Shelley Walia said that he wanted to draw the attention to page 70 that Ms. Madhurima Mahajan was not appointed on compassionate grounds but was interviewed and put on the waiting list. Since the person selected was sent to the Department and it was thought that since she is on the waiting list, she should be sent to the Department of Correspondence Studies. The interview could be conducted in this case also.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it could be possible that the interview must have been conducted for appointment on compassionate grounds.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the legal opinion could be sought in the matter.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that first temporary appointment could be offered and later on the appointment on regular basis could be made through interview.

The Vice-Chancellor said that somebody appeared for the interview and put on the waiting list and the waiting list does not entitle, as of norms today, that on the basis of waiting list, one could be appointed somewhere else or against a vacant position. It is not a panel. It is a matter of precedent.

Professor Shelley Walia said he is drawing the attention because the precedents are wrong and putting some doubt. It should be clarified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Ms. Madhurima Mahajan appeared in the interview for the post in the Department of Sociology and put on the waiting list. If the first candidate does not join, then she gets the appointment automatically. Now the issue is whether she got the appointment automatically or the Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate used some extraordinary power to give the appointment. If she was on the waiting list and the first person did not join, then the Vice-Chancellor is not in the light. It is to be checked whether the Vice-Chancellor exercised this right to give appointment on compassionate grounds.

Professor Shelley Walia said that on page 72, the then Vice-Chancellor said that it is a temporary appointment. Both the cases are doubtful.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he talked to Professor A.K. Bhandari. However, he would go back and confirm the facts.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that Dr. Ruchi is not a fresh candidate as she is working somewhere else.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the directive of the Supreme Court could not be overruled and overruling the directive could cause a problem. As the Governing Body of the University, the members seem to be doing things over which the House should not be questioned.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he wanted to point out that there are 2 other Professors who passed away earlier out of which one is Dr. Shishu. Her husband remained out of business for 2-3 years to look after her. He is about to complete the Ph.D. from IIT, Ropar. On the same lines of compassionate appointment, his case be also considered for absorption in the University. The other case is of Professor Naresh Tuli, which may also be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into those cases also but it is not proper to club those cases with this item.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that presently they are not having any policy on compassionate appointments. First, the policy should be framed and all such cases could be considered.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the husband of Dr. Shishu was jobless to take care of his wife.

The Vice-Chancellor said the case of Dr. Ruchi Sharma would not be clubbed with other cases as this case is a different one and he would not like that this case be kept pending for other cases.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could consider this case for appointment under Regulation 5(b) since the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate have the authority to make, till all the cases are considered for regular appointment.

The Vice-Chancellor said the advertisement could be given for making the selection.

Some of the members said that the appointment could be made under Regulation 5.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the power of the Syndicate to make appointment under Regulation 5 is for a fixed term only. Therefore, the members could fix a term of 3 years or 5 years.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the appointment on compassionate grounds could be made only if Dr. Ruchi is not working elsewhere. But she is already working. Therefore, they could frame some guidelines and approve the appointment in the next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the recommendation of the Dean of University Instruction is that the appointment be made as per the past practice. The recommendations are before the members for consideration.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said since the Dental Institute is having the vacant positions, the offer of appointment could be given to her.

When Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said the appointment could be made but they should see the page 71, the Vice-Chancellor said that the appointment could be offered for a fixed term.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said in the first instance, the appointment could be made for 5 years and later on a an item could be brought.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the matter of the item is regarding offering of appointment on permanent basis else whereas Professor Navdeep Goyal is saying something else.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that Shri Harpreet Singh Dua is right.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the items are brought many times and the same are changed in the meeting.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that all the items are prepared and signed by Professor Navdeep Goyal. He does not talk otherwise. He knows everything.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he objects to cross accusations.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that these words should be used towards Professor Navdeep Goyal. Every Committee has Professor Navdeep Goyal and not Shri Harpreet Singh Dua.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he objects to it.

When heated arguments were taking place amongst the members, the Vice-Chancellor adjourned the meeting for 10 minutes.

After 10 minutes, when the meeting restarted, the Vice-Chancellor said that the issue for consideration was the appointment of Dr. Ruchi Sharma. The recommendations of the Dental Institute happened on 31st December 2015 and the noting of the Dean of University Instruction on page 68 asking for the precedents and two precedents of Dr. Madhurima Mahajan and Shri J.S. Rathor and Professor Shelley Walia was correct to point out about the decision of the Supreme Court and in that background, all these things, they should take a decision on behalf of the Governing Body which is sound and which is not questioned later on. Keeping all this in view, the Syndicate has the jurisdiction to make appointment beyond one year for a fixed period of time. It could not be a appointment on the precedents given . It has to be on fixed term basis and there were suggestion for 5 years. But his personal recommendation is for 3 years as his term is up to the year 2018 and would not like to bind his successor. The Syndicate could make the recommendations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the term of the Vice-Chancellor is up to 2018 but the Syndicate is a continuing one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the term of a given Syndicate is one year and the term of the Senate is also for a period of 4 years.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that on the same lines, other cases may also be considered for appointment on compassionate grounds.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members could authorize him to process the case but the decision is taken by the Syndicate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the appointment could be made on temporary basis and later a decision could be taken. The Vice-Chancellor could do take the decision about the term on his own.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get a salary slip from her and the pay could be fixed accordingly.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the salary be fixed as per University rules.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that sometimes, the Colleges do not pay proper salary. Therefore, the salary be paid as per University norms.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would consult Professor Keshav Malhotra in this matter.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ruchi Sharma W/o Late Dr. Rahul Sharma (who worked as Reader in Oral/Maxillofacial Surgery on contract basis and his lien was as Senior Lecturer at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital), be appointed Assistant Professor in Conservative and Endodontics on temporary basis at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University for a period of 3 years, under Regulation 5(b) at page 111-112 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007. The Vice-Chancellor is authorized to determine the starting salary in Pay-Band-3 to be offered to her.

Recommendation/s of the Committee dated 23.01.2016 regarding continuation on administrative positions

7. Considered the minutes dated 23.01.2016 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in pursuance of the decision of the Syndicate dated 20.9.2015 (Para 32), to examine the issue and make recommendations regarding continuance/non continuance of service of the University administrative positions, who have crossed the age of 60 years. Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.9.2015 vide Para 32 (**Appendix-VIII**), considered this issue and resolved that the matter be referred to a committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for examining the issue and make recommendations.

Initiating the discussion, Professor Shelley Walia said that he had great apprehension about it. Whatever decisions they take in the Syndicate and Senate, are taken for the benefit of students and the teachers and they should not ignore them. The teaching community of the University at the moment and people are talking about, it think about the inconsistency in the system. He felt that they need to take foolproof policy decision in this particular House. This would be seen from the cases that he is going to point out. The follow-up of this inconsistency is that suppose if now they were to look back at what they decided 8 months ago that no administrative position would be given to anybody after the age of 60 and now they take a decision that reverses it. If they examine the cases of Professor R.K. Gupta from University School of Open Learning, Professor Vijay Lakshmi and 3 others, it is clear that they were asked to go which caused them hurt and now they would be asked to come back. The ones occupying their place would have to go. They could understand the conundrum. This kind of adhoc decisions and going against the previous decision was wrong. What made them to revise it now because when that particular decision was taken, they all had said that let the teachers who have a stake carry on with their administrative position. That was not followed and they said no administrative posts because the Calendar says that they should not be given administrative posts at all. He would give a small example of this particular nature. Supposing if they were to introduce this in the departments, supposing the administrative positions go to the retired people, superannuating people, they did not know when the judgment is about to come. What they are doing is that in the University when a person is going to superannuate, he/she stops signing the cheques. He would not name the departments. For the last month and a half, no cheque has been signed, journals are not being published, seminars could not take place because the Chairperson is retiring. If they are following this policy, people are going to be appointed as Chairpersons on absolute adhoc basis. Therefore, in all departments if this takes place, no cheques would be signed because the people know they would be retiring in 10-15 days. Therefore, he would say that they should stick to the actual decision that they took then and they took that decision according to the Calendar. He would also like to know why they have moved on now to revise it again. Therefore, the House should take a decision keeping in mind these examples.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the case of teachers' retirement is going on. It is not getting decided as quickly as it ought to be, it is dragging on. The teachers want extension till the age of 65 years and the Court has said to continue the teachers services. So, the Judge wanted to know what is the University's call on. They have not retired the teachers and paying the salary. He was asked about the University's position on it through the Counsel. He personally thinks that when the Court has said and the salary is being paid, duty, including administrative duty, is to be performed. He is in a dilemma as to what to do in the matter. They did not want to weaken the case of the University teachers that they are not being given extension. If he sends a negative signal that they are not being given duty, then he is weakening the case of the colleagues. On the one side they are saying that re-employment should be given for 5 years and get all the duties performed by the re-employed teachers. All are in favour of granting re-employment to the teachers not only in the University but also in all the affiliated Colleges. He did not wanted to weaken the case of the teachers by coming in the way. If the Court thinks that the

teachers should perform all the duties, they should do so. This is all the background of the case.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired what about if somebody is going to be a Chairperson.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if someone has been appointed as Chairperson for a period of 3 years by the Syndicate, he/she would not be removed.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if a decision taken today is ratified by the Senate but in the meantime if somebody becomes the Chairperson, in that case what would they do.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Syndicate passes it today and says that the appointment be implemented in anticipation of the approval of Senate, then if one is retiring a day after or 10 days, they have to hold a meeting of the Senate or if one is retiring on 29th February and he/she has got the stay from the Court, then he/she would continue.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that those persons have also taken their retirement benefits.

The Vice-Chancellor said that those who have taken their retirement, those could not come back. If someone has taken stay as in the case of Professor Vijay Lakshmi, definitely they would have to prematurely retire as the Chairperson and in that place a new Chairperson would join, he/she would continue for 3 years because that appointment has been approved by the Syndicate. He is not saying that they are doing reversal if once a decision has been taken by the Syndicate consciously. He would explain the reasons the circumstances if someone has anxiety. He hoped that those persons would understand as the matter is concerned to all the teachers. It should go up to 65 years. It is not that some individual is being targeted. The system is evolving.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired whether the departments would be able to run under such circumstances and adhocism?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even when there was stay on the retirement of teachers from 60 years to 62 years, then the teachers were being allowed to continue as Chairpersons.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is talking about a general thing that if something is going on in the system that should be strengthened instead of breaking the system by seeing the individuals. As is said generally and going on for the past so many years that "You show me the man and then the rule would be shown". As Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the teachers in the case of stay from the court in case of retirement related with enhancement from 60 years to 62 years that they were continuing, it was thought from 60 to 65 all would be Chairpersons, at that the rule of "show me the man, the rule would be shown" was done and it was a wrong decision at that time. The lesson to be learnt is that no interference be there and the Regulations should not be manipulated. The Regulations and the traditions are pure which should not be manipulated and there would be no problems. If someone had got the stay, the system has to go on.

It is easy to say that someone could go to the Court. Lot of complications would come.

Professor Shelley Walia said that there would be lots of court cases in such cases because there would be heart burning and humiliation because those persons already working as Chairpersons would now be removed for the retired ones to become the Chairperson.

Shri Raghbir Dyal read the statement made by Professor Navdeep Goyal that whatever decision has already been taken, that should be final.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it does not mean that he is not in favour of it.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that now a new definition is being given that the administrative position, Chairpersonship, whether it is to block or to help somebody.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have two options, either to accept the recommendations or continue with the status quo.

Professor Shelley Walia suggested that they should continue with the earlier decision.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired what is the status of employment beyond 60 years whether it is re-employment or extension.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they all understand the details of the case. It is not something that they are learning it. It is a matter which is discussed for the teaching community. At the end of the day, they have two options either to continue with the status quo or accept the recommendations. The members could take the decision later.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they should take a decision.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not getting it voted but wanted to see whether they are sharply divided or have a consensus.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would send a wrong signal if they do not accept these recommendations. It is better to accept these recommendations in the welfare of the teachers.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that one person says something in a meeting and something in the next meeting. He changes the position. There is no consistency.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired about the decision taken earlier. The Syndicate had not decided it. If it was so, then the decision should be shown to him.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua wanted to know what is the spirit of the Court and what the Court has asked for.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said what decision had earlier been taken, should be taken now also.

Shri Raghbir Dyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they authorize the Vice-Chancellor to take a decision in the interest of the University. Most of the members also said that they authorize the Vice-Chancellor.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the matter on behalf of the Syndicate.

Qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security

8. Reconsidered the qualifications for the post of Chief of University Security as recommended by the Committee dated 18.2.2016 (**Appendix-IX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of the decision of the Syndicate dated 23.1.2016/6.2.2016 (Para 37). Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting held on 23.1.2016/6.2.2016 (Para 37) (**Appendix-IX**) has resolved that 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.

The Vice-Chancellor while giving the inputs said that there were certain observations on page 85 and 86 of the agenda which have been clarified in Bold in the papers provided to the members. The first observation regarding age be read as Not exceeding 56 years including relaxation permissible to SC/ST candidates and ex-servicemen. The second observation regarding basic knowledge of computer be read as the candidate should be well versed with basic use of computer in MS word, MS Excel and internet applications such as E-mail etc. The third one be read as Police Officers of the rank of DSP and above having minimum of 05 years of experience instead of Police Officer with Grade Pay of Rs.5000 or higher with suitable experience. The fourth one is that the candidate should be able to read and understand Punjabi, Hindi and English.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that with the candidate's ability to read and understanding and making Punjabi compulsory, are they not limiting the scope of selection only to a particular State.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the candidate should be able to understand Punjabi language.

Professor Keshav Malhotra cited an example that sometimes at the time of interview when a candidate is good at English and it seems that the candidate could be selected on merit, the managements of the Colleges ask such candidates whether they would be able to teach in Punjabi as most of the students understand Punjabi, those candidates regret their inability. This is what Dr. Ajay Ranga meant to say.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they need a Chief of University Security who could converse with the University community. Another

addition is that the candidates who are working on the pensionable post in the Govt. Departments/Organizations, if selected in the University, then their case for considering their service as pensionable under the Old Pension Scheme (prior to 1.1.2004) will be decided only after the receipt of approval of the Govt. of India in the amendment of the Pension Regulations of the Panjab University, otherwise they shall be covered under the New Pension Scheme. The Points No. 6 and 7 of the Detailed Instructions to Candidates be treated as deleted.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that under Point No. 16 of the detailed instructions, a written test is to be conducted. Is it appropriate to conduct a test for the persons of the level of DSP.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the decision to conduct the test could be taken only if there are about 100 candidates for the post.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the members always give good suggestions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have a good system.

RESOLVED: That the qualifications and detailed instructions (both revised) for the post of Chief of University Security, as per **Appendix-IX**, be approved.

Issue regarding grant of benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension

9. Considered, if the following retired Professors be granted the benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension under Regulation 3.9 at pages 184-85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 on the basis of other advertisements of the contemporary period as the advertisement vide which they were appointed are not available in the office:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1	Prof. Vidya Bhushan Bhanot	Department of Physics
2	Dr. Inder Sain Mittra	Department of Physics
3	Dr. S.L. Sharma	Department of Sociology

NOTE: 1. Regulation 3.9 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I at pages 184-185 reads as under:

“An employee appointed to a service or post shall be eligible to add to his service, qualifying for Superannuation Pension (but not for any other pension), the actual period, not exceeding one fourth of the length of his service or the actual period by which his age at the time of retirement exceeded twenty five years, or a period of five years, whichever is less if the service or post to which he is appointed is one-

(a) For which postgraduate research of specified qualifications or experience in Scientific, technological or “Professional field” is essential, and

(b) To which candidate of more than twenty five years of age are normally recruited.

2. Requests of Prof. Vidya Bhushan Bhanot (Retd.), Department of Physics, Dr. Inder Sain Mittra (Retd.), Department of Physics and Dr. S.L. Sharma (Retd.), Department of Sociology duly recommended by their Chairpersons of the respective department are enclosed (**Appendix-X**).
3. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

RESOLVED: That the following retired Professors be granted the benefit of addition in qualifying service for pension, under Regulation 3.9 at pages 184-85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 on the basis of other advertisements of the contemporary period as the advertisement vide which they were appointed are not available in the office:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1	Prof. Vidya Bhushan Bhanot	Department of Physics
2	Dr. Inder Sain Mittra	Department of Physics
3	Dr. S.L. Sharma	Department of Sociology

Issue regarding conversion of appointment from contract basis to purely on temporary basis

10. Considered, if the status of appointment of Ms. Simranjeet Kaur, Assistant Professor in Computer Science (contract basis), P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, be converted from contract basis (Rs.30400/- fixed) to purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules w.e.f the date of declaration of the result of UGC-NET i.e. 28.12.2015, in accordance with the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.01.2013 (Para 32).

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.01.2013 vide Para 32 (**Appendix-XI**) while considering the extension in the temporary appointment of certain Faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U. has resolved that all the teachers appointed on contract basis in the University be treated appointed on temporary basis and the benefit of allowances like HRA, etc. be given to them with retrospective effect.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.03.2013 (Para 4) (**Appendix-XI**) has resolved that the status of appointment Ms. Gaganpreet Walia, Assistant Professor, Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, Distt. Nawanshehar, be converted from contract basis (Rs.30400/- fixed) to purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- w.e.f the date of declaration of the result of UGC-NET i.e. 12.11.2012.

3. Request of Ms. Simranjeet Kaur, Assistant Professor in Computer Science (contract basis), P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).
4. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

RESOLVED: That the status of appointment of Ms. Simranjeet Kaur, Assistant Professor in Computer Science (contract basis), P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, be converted from contract basis (Rs.30400/- fixed) to purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules w.e.f the date of declaration of the result of UGC-NET i.e. 28.12.2015, in accordance with the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.01.2013 (Para 32).

Recommendations of the Committee dated 27.01.2016 assignment of Chair names to re-employed Professors

11. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 27.01.2016 (**Appendix-XII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the feasibility of extending the proposal of assignment of Chair names to re-employed Professors of the Panjab University.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.09.2015 (Para 25) (**Appendix-XII**) has approved the recommendation of the Committee dated 25.08.2015 with regard to modalities/means to fill various Chairs and Chair Professorships in the University.

Professor Shelley Walia said that with regard to offering the chairs to everyone, he is of the opinion that when they look at the Chairs and define the Chairs especially keeping in view that when they have appointed Shri Kailash Satyarthi and Dr. Manmohan Singh on the Chairs, that there should be renowned people occupying all Chairs who could bring more fame and name to the University. When he saw that everyone who would be reaching the age of 60 and into retirement, on the one side, they are saying whether those persons could be given the Chairmanship or not and on the other side offering Chairs to anyone who reaches the age of 60. Therefore, he felt that if the Chair is to bring about a change of environment, is going to bring international reputation, then they ought to select the right people. What he wanted to say is that the practice of people who are right here go to other Universities to get the Chair. But in the Panjab University, this is rather disturbing. He is not casting aspersions on anyone. The Chair is supposed to deliver 5 lectures during his term to the whole University. He/she has to deliver the normal lecture. It is not just giving some kind of honour to everyone. Let them not make a mockery of the Chairs as they hear in the country that Panjab University is giving Chairs from every XYZ, as they have almost 19 Chairs to give. He would seriously give it a thought that why they could offer these Chairs, for instance to Shri Girish Karnad. It would be a pride that Shri Girish Karnad is holding a Chair in Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University has had these Chairs for long. The Chairs could not be filled up for a long time. They attempted to fill the Chairs and encountered the difficulty as they tried to induct a Professor with a given name and the UGC

prescribed qualifications. It happened in the case of named Professorship in the Department of Laws. They had a person who qualified to be a Professor. But if they had given him Gurdial Singh Chair, there are existing more eminent Professors in the Department of Laws, who do not carry such a label. So the Committee decided that anyone who has to be inducted on Gurdial Singh Chair, he/she has to be equivalent to or better than half of the existing Professors. They raised the bar and could not get a suitable person. The same problem is occurring with other Chairs also and the Chairs remain vacant, and when the NAAC team visited the University and said that why the University did not fill up the Chairs, is the University not able to find suitable persons or the University does not have such people. They could not give the Chairs to the Professors of the University, without an algorithm. The existing Professors typically would not apply for Gurdial Singh Chair. To overcome this situation, Professor R.P. Bambah said that a practical way ought to be found out and he gave the practical way enunciated in the Appendix. Professor R.P. Bambah gave this idea that the Chairs be given to the existing Professors by way of seniority. They have a re-employment scheme and the extensions are also being given. They are expecting every reemployed Professor in the University, to perform all the academic duties. It is in that background that the Committee met and suggested that the Chairs be assigned to Professors by seniority. A given Professor is assigned to a Chair up to the age of 65 years. This is what the proposal is. If the members agree to this proposal, the Chairs could be filled up. As suggested by Professor Shelley Walia that whoever is assigned the Chair, he/she would be requested to deliver a lecture of the level of Panjab University Colloquium in the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a Committee could be constituted to frame the rules and terms and conditions.

Professor Shelley Walia said that first of all, he did not agree with the idea of demarcating that one Chair is important while the other one is not. He did not understand how Shiv Kumar Batalvi Chair is not as important a Chair while Rajiv Gandhi Chair is an important one. Secondly, for filling these Chairs, they are actually showing a deep-seeded inadequacy of not being able to fill up these Chairs. Have they invited the people and sent the invitation and call the renowned people? The idea is that when they fill up these Chairs, the people who are automatically going to be 60 years of age, everyone would occupy a Chair. He has serious apprehension about the workability of such a scheme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as the Governing Body, they could not say such things as all the Professors are supposed to be persons of eminence.

Professor Shelley Walia said that they are thinking of making everyone a Chair Professor. But what about the 4 Professors who actually are in the superannuated age of 60 to 65 years. Who amongst those persons would be given the Chair Professorship, are they going to circulate this information amongst those persons, or would they give each Professor a Chair if there are 4 persons in a Department who are between 60 years to 65 years and retiring within a period of 2-3 months of each other's retirement. When they give Chair Professorship to one person, they actually ruin the chances of others. The rules have to be framed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal cited the example of Shiv Kumar Batalvi. He is not doubting the ability of the University Professors. It might be that the person who has been assigned this Chair, must not have done the work on Shiv Kumar Batalvi but have done some work on Baba Farid. A person assigned the Chair at the age of 60 years, would occupy the Chair for 5 years and the Chair is booked up to the age of 65 years and a person who is of the age of 62 years, he/she would get the Chair only for 3 years. It should be completely scrutinized and terms and conditions should be framed. His concern is that the quality of the Chairs should not be diluted. The Chairs could be offered to the Professor, but through a proper mechanism as there are some lacuna. A small Committee could be formed and asked to submit the terms and conditions for the Chairs in a time bound manner.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that with the designation of Chair Professor, whether the person would be provided the office and staff.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the financial burden should also be seen.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would form a Committee of Syndics to be chaired by the Dean of University Instruction to give the algorithm.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested the name of Professor Karamjeet Singh for the Committee.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky suggested the name of Professor Shelley Walia.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that every member is suggesting the names. He suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should form the Committee on his own.

Shri Raghbir Dyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said they authorize the Vice-Chancellor to form the Committee on his own.

RESOLVED: That a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to frame the guidelines for the Chair Professorship's to be given to the existing Professors/Reemployed Professors.

**Recommendation of the
Committee dated
08.02.2016 regarding
Academic Calendar**

12. Considered the minutes dated 08.02.2016 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to finalize the Academic Calendar to be observed by the Teaching Departments/ Regional Centres of the Panjab University and its affiliated Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce) for the session 2016-17.

Initiating the discussion, Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that on page 143, late fee of Rs.525/- has been mentioned for late admission to be allowed by the Principal whereas on page 158 of item for revision of fees structure, the late fee has been revised to Rs.560/-. Therefore, it should be corrected. Similarly, the late fee with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor has been mentioned as Rs.1940/- (page 143) which is being revised to Rs.2040/- (page 157).

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that wherever fee has been mentioned under item 12 be replaced with the revised fee proposed under item 13.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that earlier half day holidays declared to take out the processions on the eve of religious functions were being mentioned in the calendar. In the government institutions, these half day restricted holidays are declared but it is not so in the case of private institutions. A separate note regarding this could be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this could create problems because it would reduce the number of working days.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that in the areas around Muktsar, holiday on account of Maghi is declared. Similarly, the holidays in other areas be also declared. Some of the affiliated Colleges remain open while others remained closed due to holidays on such occasions.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that on the pattern of the Punjab Government, the Principals or the Heads of the Institutions be allowed to declare 4-5 local holidays.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the holidays declared by the Punjabi University and Guru Nank Dev University to their affiliated Colleges, the Panjab University could also allow the same holidays to its affiliated Colleges.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 08.02.2016, as per **Appendix-XIII**, be approved with the stipulation that the late admission fee/s with the permission of the Principal/Head of Department/Vice-Chancellor be corrected as per the revised rates.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 09.02.2016 regarding revised fee structure for the degree affiliated Colleges

13. Considered the minutes dated 09.02.2016 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for revision of fee structure for the Degree Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce) affiliated to Panjab University for the session 2016-17.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the quality of education in the Colleges is very low. There is no monitoring of these Colleges. Some of the Colleges are very good. Some of the Colleges do not fulfill the conditions put by the Inspection Committees and it is also said that a suitable person from the panel was not available. The quality of education is very low especially in the rural areas. They are increasing the fees but the University has no system of monitoring of these Colleges. The periodical inspection of the Colleges has become a dream. The intake capacity of the Colleges should be put on the website of the Dean College Development Council so that the workload could be ascertained. He cited the example that where M.Sc. course in Mathematics is going on, 4 teachers are required. This issue would also come up later. Are they increasing the quality of education in the Colleges with the increase in fees? Do they have a citizens' charter of the University for the students of the Colleges? As earlier said, he opened the website of the Himachal Pradesh University and found that a citizens charter is there. The Panjab University has a grievance redressal cell which is non-functional. The Controller of Examination is a very visionary person and is working very hard. There is no

mechanism for the students who have to get reevaluation done because they have to submit the Detailed Marks Card (DMC) to the University on their own and only then the result is declared. The fees being increased looks like a luxury. If they see page 158, the PU Alumni House and Scholarship Fund has been raised from Rs.20 to Rs.30 which is flat 50% increase and College Development Council fee from Rs.60 to Rs.80, which means that an amount of Rs.1.6 lacs income which the University could spend on maintenance, seminars, etc. The total University charges have been increased from Rs.425/- to Rs.500/-, meaning thereby a 15% increase.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier the University charges used to be Rs.925/- and the same has been gradually reduced to Rs.500/- which resulted into a loss of 50% income to the University.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that with a fee of Rs.425/-, they have earned an income of Rs. 9 crore if they take the strength of the students at 2000 and the amount comes to Rs.10 crores with a fee of Rs.500/-. The increase in income is only of Rs.1 crore. As he had earlier said, that there should be some monitoring system as these funds have so many securities. The securities could be utilized for infrastructure development as there is a provision in the Panjab University Calendar that the Vice-Chancellor has the power to incur the expenditure from one budget head to the other.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that these funds should have been increased.

Principal B.C. Josan said that in the Government Colleges, the number of teachers is less than the required numbers, whereas on the private Colleges, the conditions of fulfilling the required number of teachers are imposed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his dissent be recorded in the matter of increase in fees.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is a need to strengthen the monitoring mechanism.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he agreed with what Shri Raghbir Dyal has said. The self-financing Colleges do not pay the full salary to the teachers. He was a member of the Restructuring Committee in the year 2009. A fee of Rs.350/- was fixed as retiral benefits. Now the pay-scales have been revised. The Colleges had said that they could not pay the full salary in the absence of increase in the fees. A new budget head of Retiral Benefits was started with charging of a fee of Rs.350/- per student. Earlier, a note used to be given that only those Colleges could charge the retiral benefits fee which would give the revised pay scale to the teachers and the retiral benefits would be given out of that budget head. Now that note has been removed. Some of the affiliated Colleges must have been charging this fund because they are paying the retirement benefits and new pay scales have been implemented. But about 80% of the Colleges in spite of charging the fund are not paying the full scales and the retirement benefits. As he has pointed out earlier also, there should be a check on such Colleges and it be ensured that the Colleges did not charge the fee which do not pay the full scales and the retiral benefits.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is mentioned that the amount collected under retirement benefits be maintained separately. He had got the fee structured prepared. A budget head would be created for this purpose and the management of the Colleges would invest the amount.

On a point of order, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that a note should be given that only those Colleges could charge the retiral benefits fund which would pay the full pay scales and the retirement benefits.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that yesterday a meeting of the Research Board in Commerce was held where it was said that they had got B.Com on such number of teachers and the other said that they got M.Com. for having such number of teachers. They should call a meeting where standardization could be done that if a College wanted to get the B.Com./B.Com. Honours/M.Com. course, so many teachers are required. There should be an orientation towards this so that the Colleges could know about the requirement of teachers because the periodical inspection is not being done. The periodical inspection Committee could be formed and a standardized format be prepared and the Inspection Committee should check whether the retirement benefits are being given or not.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that on the back side of the guidelines for the fees structure, it has been mentioned that for a unit of such number of students, such number of teachers are required and such fees is to be charged. Though the College branch is working properly. But what is being done that the things are being diluted. For example, one College had asked for 6 courses and temporary extension has been granted, in the next year, the Colleges apply for 4 courses only and do not apply for the 2 courses for which the conditions could not be fulfilled. The Colleges ask for extension of the 4 courses only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in order to be seen to be maintaining quality, whatever could be done, should be done following the instructions.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that a fine of Rs.50,000/- could be imposed on the Colleges which ask for temporary affiliation extension. He pointed out that a fee of Rs.440/- is being charged for the inter-university migration/duplicate migration certificate which should be checked.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Periodical Inspection Committee be constituted which could see all such things.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the compliance could sought for which a letter could be sent to the Colleges that the Syndicate has taken a serious view of this matter.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the procedure of seeking the compliance is that the extension and affiliation Committees are visiting the Colleges in time and the reports of the Committees are submitted in the month of March. It is checked whether the teachers are given the DA or not. Before the year 2013, they had no data about the courses granted to a College. Then a data was prepared with the help of Dr. I.S. Sandhu. After that the Colleges thought that the University has become somewhat strict. They could see that 4 units of

Commerce have been given to a College but the College is not deducting the PF.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it should be checked whether the migration fee is Rs. 300 or Rs.400.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the University charges should be got checked from the concerned branch.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is necessary to get these checked.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his dissent be recorded on the issue of increase in fees.

RESOLVED: That recommendations of the Committee dated 09.02.2016, as per **Appendix-XIV**, be approved with the stipulation that it be checked that the revised inter University migration or Duplicate Migration Certificate fee is in consonance with the revised fees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Item 14 is related with the qualifications for the post of Assistant Registrar as was suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal to get it ratified. Along with this item, Item 58 is related to the corrigendum issued with regard to the qualifications for the post of Deputy Registrar which were on the basis of the recommendations made by the same Committee and the Counsel for the University has opined that the matter could be placed before the Syndicate of the University for ratification without touching the process of selection of Deputy Registrars, therefore, these be taken up for consideration together.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since the case pertaining to Item 58 is sub-judice, they could not consider this item. If still this item is taken up for consideration, his dissent should be recorded.

Some of the members said that they should disperse for lunch as it is already 2.15 p.m. and we would take this item post lunch.

After lunch, Items 14 and 58 were taken up together.

Qualifications for the post of Assistant Registrar

14. Considered if, the modified qualifications, for post of Assistant Registrar as per the Corrigendum issued in response to Advertisement No.1/2013, be approved:

Qualifications as per corrigendum

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
- (b) Five years as Assistant Professor in the AGP of Rs. 6000/- and above in Educational/ Research Institution having experience in Educational Administration.

OR

Five years of administrative experience as Superintendent or in an equivalent post or above in an Educational/Research Institution.

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).

NOTE: 1. An Item in this regard was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 (Para 38) (**Appendix-XV**). During discussion Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the item should again be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting after properly reframing the same. This was agreed to.

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

RESOLVED: That the following qualifications be prescribed for the post/s of Assistant Registrar:

Qualifications

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
- (b) Five years as Assistant Professor in the AGP of Rs. 6000/- and above in Educational/Research Institution having experience in Educational Administration.

OR

Five years of administrative experience as Superintendent or in an equivalent post or above in an Educational/Research Institution.

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).

Qualifications for the post of Deputy Registrar

58. Considered proposal given by the University Counsel/Advocate dealing with “CWP No.15771 of 2015 – Panjab University Staff Vs Panjab University and another” to ratify the qualifications of Deputy Registrars as per corrigendum, reproduced as under:

- 1(a) Master’s Degree with at least 55% marks (50% marks in case of SC/ST candidates or equivalent grade thereof from a recognized University; and
- 1(b) Nine years as Assistant Professor in the AGP of Rs.6000/- and above in Educational/Research Institution having experience in Educational Administration.

OR

Five years of administrative experience as Assistant Registrar or in an equivalent post or above in an Educational/Research Institution.

2. A candidate with not less than 25 years of service in Panjab University out of which he/she must have worked in the capacity of Superintendent/Personal Assistant or higher position for a period of not less than 4 years, shall be eligible irrespective of qualification prescribed above at 1(a) & (b).

- NOTE:**
1. The court order dated 24.02.2016 in respect of CWP No. 15771 of 2015 was received in this office on 25.02.2016 after the dispatch of Supplementary Agenda. Hence, due to urgency of the case the item is being placed as Table Agenda for syndicate meeting dated 27.2.2016.
 2. The Court order and the legal opinion along with detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).
 3. The date of hearing of the case has now been adjourned to 09.03.2016.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that on the last date of hearing, the Hon^{ble} Judge has passed the following order:

“Learned senior counsel for the respondent-Panjab University relies upon a judgment of the Supreme Court in Maharashtra State Mining Corporation vs. Sunil (2007)(1) SLR 525, to submit that even at this stage the qualifications prescribed by the Committee appointed by the Vice-Chancellor can be put up before the Syndicate and if approved by the Syndicate, then it would amount to ratification of the qualifications, in tune with Rule 2 of the Rules of Service and Conduct Rules for Non-Teaching Employees, by which the age, educational and other qualifications for appointment to a post and the methods of recruitment, are to be prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time.

Since none is present on behalf of the petitioners, the matter is adjourned to 26.02.2016.

If none appears on behalf of the petitioner on the next date of hearing, it will be presumed that the petitioners have nothing to say in the matter.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the other connected matter too”.

He said that the qualifications for the posts of Assistant Registrar and Deputy Registrar were approved by the Committee constituted on the suggestion made by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since the item has been placed before the Syndicate as table agenda, they could not apply their mind. Secondly, a case has been filed in the Court by the non-teaching employees, and he does not want to become a party to it. Thirdly, the issue is sub-judice, they could not take a call on it.

When the Vice-Chancellor sought opinion of the members one by one, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Anil Monga, Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky, Principal B.C. Josan, Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi opined that they should ratify the qualifications which were given in the corrigendum.

The Vice-Chancellor giving the background of the case stated that an advertisement was given. Thereafter, Shri Ashok Goyal had, while pointing out some lacuna, said that these qualifications should be looked into by a Committee to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor was authorized to constitute the Committee. The Committee under the chairmanship of Professor A.K. Bhandari, comprising Professor Keshav Malhotra and Professor Naval Kishore was constituted and on their recommendation, a corrigendum was issued. After receiving the applications, the process was started and when the interview was to be called, a case was filed in the Court and the Judge ordered that the process of interview should continue but the result should not be declared. The main question before the Court is whether the qualifications given in the corrigendum were ratified by the Syndicate or not. Then it came out that the qualifications have not been ratified by the Syndicate since the Vice-Chancellor was authorized. The selections had been made on the basis advertisement plus the corrigendum, which has not been ratified. Item 14 also relates to qualifications for the post of Assistant Registrar, which are part of the same Committee's recommendations. Today they have the agenda item relating to qualifications for the post of Assistant Registrar that the recommendations of the Committee should be ratified by the Syndicate so that the advertisement could be given. In that way, the corrigendum for the posts of Deputy Registrar had been given. The court had ordered that they could go ahead with the selection process but the result should not be declared. In between when the Court asked whether these qualifications have been ratified, the counsel for the University said that there is a judgement that the ratification can be done at any stage. His plea to the Governing Body of the University, i.e., Syndicate is that since these are the recommendations of the same Committee, the same should be considered and ratified.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the item should have been for consideration.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that there is a demand of the non-teaching employees for promotion to the post of Deputy Registrar in the ratio of 50:50. Whether that has been acceded to or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is a separate matter. That has nothing to do with the case. The Judge had allowed the University to proceed with the interviews and asked not to declare the results. The final judgment could be keeping all things in mind. The matter is being put up to Syndicate members whether they ratify the qualifications.

Principal S.S. Sangha enquired whether those serving in the University for the last about 30-35 years, would be given the benefit of the ratio of 50:50.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not answer it at this stage.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that some of the non-teaching employees had challenged those qualifications because some of the employees could not apply. Now it is being said that those qualifications which were advertised be ratified now. He enquired when the advertisement was given and after how many months after they are ratifying?

Principal S.S. Sangha if the Syndicate approves the ratio of 50:50 for Deputy Registrar, then he is for ratification otherwise, he is against the ratification.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired whether the decision which they are going to take would not affect the court case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to put up it to the Court and it is for the Court to take the decision. If the Court permits, then they could open the envelopes of the selections and place before the Syndicate and if the Court does not permit, they would not place the matter before the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, that is about the result. But now they are becoming a party against the employees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that alright. This is the opinion of Professor Keshav Malhotra.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that if the ratio of 50:50 is approved, then he is for ratification otherwise against ratification.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item of 50:50 has not yet come. It should not be conditional.

Professor Shelley Walia wanted to know the background of the item.

The Vice-Chancellor while giving the background said that Item 14 is ratifying a revision in the qualification of Assistant Registrar which was done many years ago in response to an issue articulated by Shri Ashok Goyal saying that the qualifications as approved many years ago for the Assistant Registrar and Deputy Registrar had certain lacuna. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) wanted a Committee to look into it and gave him (Vice-Chancellor) authorization to implement those recommendations. The Committee gave the recommendations which were implemented. The corrigendum was given. The applications were received and remained for years in the office. When there came a stage that the interviews were to be held, then the issue was raised that the qualifications were not ratified by the Syndicate and should have been placed before the Syndicate. After the Vice-Chancellor approved the qualifications, the matter was not reported back to the Syndicate and the matter went to the Court. The Court said that go ahead with the interviews but the result should not be declared till the

Court permits. The matter got shuffled from one Judge to the other. The University counsel pointed out that the ratification could be done by the competent body at any stage. The Item 14 related with qualifications of Assistant Registrar and Item 58 related with qualifications of Deputy Registrar is of the same meeting. The qualifications of Assistant Registrar and Deputy Registrar which were done in the same meeting, the matter is before the members and his plea to the members is to consider to ratify. Whatever decision the members take, the same would be communicated to the Court. The Court could give its judgment as and when taking everything into consideration. If the Court allows to declare the result, the result would be placed before the Syndicate and then the members have to take a decision whether to approve the same or not. While they are ratifying the qualifications of Assistant Registrar under Item 14, his plea is to consider to ratify the qualifications of Deputy Registrar also. He counted the number in favor and against the ratification of the qualifications of Deputy Registrar which came out to be 8 members in favour, 2 against, 1 has said conditional yes and then Vice-Chancellor sought the opinion of Professor Shelley Walia.

Professor Shelley Walia said that at the level of Deputy Registrar, let this also be considered as a separate item and do not take it together.

The Vice-Chancellor said that given all these things, whether Professor Shelley Walia would like to ratify it or not.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he would like to take the Deputy Registrar as a separate entity for ratification and said he is against the ratification.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter is separate but he is clubbing the same. After counting the numbers, it came out as 9 in favor of ratification and 4 against the ratification.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when a decision in this manner is taken and seems that the Syndicate is divided, it does not give a good signal. Otherwise, as the Vice-Chancellor may think proper.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the final decision has to be taken by the Court and let the Court discuss the University cases.

After detailed discussion and counting of heads, it was found that the majority (9 in favor and 4 against) was in favor of ratification of the qualifications of Deputy Registrar, it was –

RESOLVED: That the following qualifications for the post of Deputy Registrar, which were given in corrigendum issued in response to Advt. No.1/13, be ratified:

- 1(a) Master's Degree with at least 55% marks (50% marks in case of SC/ST candidates or equivalent grade thereof from a recognized University; and
- 1(b) Nine years as Assistant Professor in the AGP of Rs.6000/- and above in Educational/ Research Institution having experience in Educational Administration.

OR

Five years of administrative experience as Assistant Registrar or in an equivalent post or above in an Educational/Research Institution.

2. A candidate with not less than 25 years of service in Panjab University out of which he/she must have worked in the capacity of Superintendent/Personal Assistant or higher position for a period of not less than 4 years, shall be eligible irrespective of qualification prescribed above at 1(a) & (b).

Introduction of M.A. in Sri Guru Granth Sahib & Indian Religions

15. Considered the recommendation dated 19.12.2015 (**Appendix-XVII**) of Faculty of Arts (Item 16) that M.A. in Sri Guru Granth Sahib & Indian Religions be introduced from the academic session 2016-17.

- NOTE:**
1. Dr Jaspal Kaur Kaang, Fellow, has sent the resolution (**Appendix-XVII**) i.e. "M.A. in Sri Guru Granth Sahib & Indian Religions should be introduced in the Department of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies from the session 2015-16" to place before the meeting of the Syndicate/ Senate.
 2. The Vice-Chancellor has referred the said resolution to the Faculty of Arts. Since, the Faculty considered the recommendations of the Board of Studies, the Chairperson, Department of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies was requested to convene the meeting of the Advisory Committee to consider the resolution and make recommendations.
 3. The Advisory Committee in its meeting dated 15.10.2015 (**Appendix-XVII**) has decided that the Syllabus will be prepared immediately to start the above said course from the session 2016-17.

RESOLVED: That the Resolution proposed by Dr. Jaspal Kaur Kaang along with explanatory note, if any, be forwarded to the Senate with the remarks that the recommendation of the Faculty of Arts that M.A. in Sri Guru Granth Sahib & Indian Religions, be introduced, from the academic session 2016-17.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 25.01.2016 regarding creation of additional seats for students of rural and border areas

16. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 25.01.2016 (**Appendix-XVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding creation of additional seats for students of Rural areas and Border areas in PG/UG courses in Departments of Panjab University, Constituent Colleges, Regional Centres and affiliated Colleges.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.04.2015 (Para 14) (**Appendix-XVIII**) had resolved that a legal opinion be sought from more than one person on the issues

of two additional seats for rural area students and one additional seat for border area students, over and above the sanctioned seats in all the Under-graduate and Postgraduate courses offered by teaching Departments of Panjab University, Constituent Colleges, Regional Centres and affiliated Colleges, subject to the conditions laid down by the Committee in its recommendations and thereafter the item be placed before the Syndicate for approval.

2. Legal opinion dated 07.11.2015 of Shri Anmol Rattan Sidhu enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 25.01.2016, as per **Appendix-XVIII**, be approved.

**Resolution proposed by
Dr. Ronki Ram and Dr.
Yog Raj Angrish, Fellows**

17. Considered the following resolution proposed by Dr. Ronki Ram and Dr. Yog Raj Angrish, Fellow:

“difficulties faced by the constituent Colleges and unaided Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh on appointing the regular Principals on account of non-availability of the eligible and suitable candidates”.

EXPLANATION:

At present affiliated Colleges are also facing the similar difficulties in getting regular and suitable Principals in their Colleges. Keeping in view the above stated facts it is submitted that similar provisions may also be provided in the aided Colleges i.e. re-employment for a period of 2 years.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of resolution dated 1.12.2015 proposed by Dr. Ronki Ram and Dr. Yog Raj Angrish, Fellow enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).
 2. The minutes of the Syndicate dated 18.10.2015 (Para 21) along with the recommendation of the Committee dated 06.10.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).
 3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.11.2015 (Para 4) (**Appendix-XIX**) while considering the resolution proposed by Dr. Gurdip Sharma and Dr. Sanjeev K. Arora with regard to difficulties faced by the unaided Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh on appointing the regular Principals on account of non-availability of the eligible and suitable candidates has resolved that the Sub-Committee of the Syndics be constituted to prepare the model of advertisement and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take

decision on the recommendations of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Accordingly the Vice-Chancellor has approved the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee dated 12.12.2015 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor and copy of circular issued to the Presidents/General Secretaries of the Governing Bodies of all the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh vide No.74977-75177 dated 15.01.2016 enclosed **(Appendix-XIX)**.

Initiating the discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be done as they have already approved this for unaided Colleges and Constituent Colleges where 2 years was allowed to the Principals. All the related papers are there. When it was being discussed for the other cases, at that time it was also said that it should be brought as consideration next time. The resolution has been given by two of the Fellows. Already, they have deliberated on this issue for quite some time and what had been decided is that for the Constituent Colleges if they did not get a Principal, then one of the approved Principals could be appointed for 2 years. Similarly, for unaided Colleges also, same decision had been taken that the appointment could be made and the duration should be enhanced for 2 years to have uniformity.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the decision was taken for 1 years and whether the members wanted to revise it to 2 years.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the duration of the re-employment should be enhanced to 2 years.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that for the selection of Principals, in the process of giving advertisement, getting the selection panel approved, a lot of time is spent. Therefore, the re-employment could be for 2 years.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since it is a resolution, let it go a Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the decision for re-employment for 1 year was taken on the basis of the discussion held in the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said the Committee had already done its job.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the Principals give their opinion.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that an amount of Rs.60,000/- is spent on giving the advertisement. It takes time to get the panel approved and the advertisement is to be given again after 3-4 months. The appointment has to be made at least one month in advance so that the incumbent could continue. A decision could be taken that the case for approval be sent and the interview may not be held again. Otherwise, the duration should be 2 years.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the case is otherwise and not for 2 years re-employment. It is a resolution for the Constituent Colleges and not for unaided Colleges. He requested that a Committee could be constituted to consider it.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are going to do for the Constituent Colleges. There are so many candidates available.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee including Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi, Principal S.S. Sangha, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky could be formed to consider the resolution. He requested Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi to convene the meeting after taking time from Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he was talking about the Constituent Colleges.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that what they are going to do is that if for the Constituent Colleges, no person is available, then the re-employment could be given. If an advertisement is given then there would be so many candidates available. Have they faced the non-availability? The decision taken earlier is a right decision. Even the regular Principals of the Colleges are ready to go there. It is not the case of non-availability. It is being said that there might be non-availability and the report of the same be given within a month.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is asking the members to get the matter resolved.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that there is no Principal in the Constituent College, Sikhwala also there is shortage of some teachers for the last 4 years. How do they manage those Colleges?

Principal B.C. Josan said that in the year 2014, it was decided to give re-employment to Principals for 2 years in all the Colleges. In the year 2015, someone moved a resolution. Some of the Principals had got the re-employment of 2 years. Thereafter, someone gave a resolution, on the basis of which the re-employment was done for 1 year.

It was informed that a resolution was passed that in case of non-availability, the Principals could continue. This decision was in respect of grant-in-aid Colleges. It was discussed by another Committee and in the Syndicate, the decision was taken for 1 year. After that, for unaided Colleges also, the matter came to the Syndicate and the decision was taken for 2 years in respect of unaided Colleges. On the same pattern, the decision in respect of Education Colleges has been taken. In respect of Constituent Colleges also, same could be done.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have approved the re-employment of Principals for 2 years. But the Punjab Government does not give/stop the grant to those Colleges. If they take a decision for the Constituent Colleges, the Punjab Government would not give the grant to the University for these Colleges.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the issue is related with the affiliated aided Colleges.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the issue is of Constituent Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the item come a consideration item. There would be a 5-member Committee including the Dean College Development Council, to be chaired by Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi. The matter be sorted out properly in a single meeting.

Principal S.S. Sangha enquired whether the Constituent Colleges are under the Dean College Development Council or the University because there could be problems if the Constituent Colleges are not under the Dean College Development Council and with the University at the time voting of the teachers for the Senate Elections. The Constituent Colleges should be under the control of the Dean College Development Council.

Some of the members said that the Constituent Colleges should be under the control of the Dean College Development Council.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if the Constituent Colleges are under the control of Dean College Development Council, then what is the role of the Coordinator.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there would arise issues related with it also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Principals would be appointed there. When the interview for the post of Principals have been conducted, the role of the Coordinator is over.

RESOLVED: That a Committee to be chaired by Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi including Principal S.S. Sangha, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky and Dean College Development Council (Convener) be formed to consider the resolution.

Recommendation/s of the Committee dated 15.12.2015 regarding establishing Directorate of Hindi

18. Considered minutes dated 15.12.2015 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding establishing Directorate of Hindi, its objectives and subsequent monitoring mechanism, pursuant to UGC letter No.16-1/2008 Rajbhasha dated 03.08.2015 (**Appendix-XX**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that neither the working of the University is in Hindi nor in Punjabi. The entire administration could not be in Hindi or Punjabi. However, whatever could be done respecting the national sentiments, would be done. Since majority of the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University belonged to the State of Punjab and their working is in Punjabi, whatever they decide to do in Hindi, currently they have to translate the same in Punjabi. Meaning thereby, if they made Directorate of Hindi, whatever would be done in Hindi by it, it would be the sole responsibility of the said Directorate to concurrently translate the same into Punjabi. This is the minimum, which they have to do.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that that why, he is saying that he (Vice-Chancellor) should apply his mind and take decision on the matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that so far as making of Directorate is concerned, they should accept the same, and the remaining should be examined.

To this, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it would send a wrong signal. Therefore, they authorize the Vice-Chancellor to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it would require manpower and other resources, therefore, in the matter the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor, be authorized to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Enquiry Report

19. Considered the enquiry report (**Appendix-XXI**) in respect of a faculty member of the University.

Giving the background, the Vice-Chancellor stated that there was some misdemeanour, which happened on behalf a faculty member. They asked for an explanation from the faculty member concerned, and the response was not found to be satisfactory. Then a one man enquiry Committee of Justice Anand was appointed, and the report of that enquiry has been provided to them in a sealed envelope.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that to discuss this, a lot of time is required, therefore, another item should be taken up for consideration.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua also said that this item would take a lot of time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could discuss the report.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have to go by the contents of the report as the pagination is not there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not an enquiry at the moment. Right now, it is consideration of an enquiry report.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it seems that Justice Anand has proved the charges by becoming biased. If they discussed the enquiry report, it would take at least two hours.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could spend two hours. He added that the appointing authority in this case is the Senate and, if any punishment is to be awarded, it is to be awarded by the Senate. The enquiry report is before them. The first decision which they have to take is that the report is to be forwarded to the Senate with or without their recommendation/s.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that since some of the members are not aware of the entire issue, let one of the members, who has read the report thoroughly, should give the background to them, so that they could deliberate on the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this would go to the Senate. If they do not want to comment on it, it should be forwarded to the Senate, and if they want to comment on it, they could also do so.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if it has to go to the Senate, then they could deliberate on it in the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua jointly said that they want to discuss the report in the Syndicate itself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even if they decide that it should not be forwarded to the Senate, he has to take it to the Senate as an information item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to explain the charges and then they could have discussion on it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are four charges. In fact, he expected them at least to go through the entire enquiry report. He is going to tell them about the four charges, but not in the order, which is given in the enquiry report. One charge is, giving a legal notice to the Chancellor. Another charge is falsifying the information. She attended only one seminar, but she claimed attendance in five seminars and she claimed API score for attending five seminars. She was asked to give proof of her five publications, which were required, but she did not respond despite asking repeatedly. So, one of the charges is disobedience. Actually, first charge is repeatedly refusal to comply with the orders of the Vice-Chancellor and Panjab University authorities to provide evidence of having publications, which is mentioned at page 182.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to of which date this charge is.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Harpreet Singh Dua to go to page 182, where everything is given.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that what they understand is that charges were on the lady that she claimed publication of five papers for promotion, but when she was asked to give proof, she gave proof for publication of only one paper.

The Vice-Chancellor said that publication is separate and participation is separate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it means that she has given wrong information. He added that nowadays papers could even be presented on-line.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she has claimed participation in five seminars, but has actually attended only one of them. On asking, the Vice-Chancellor said that the second charge is disobedience as when she was asked to give proof of five publications repeatedly, but she did not give proof/s. She wrote representation/s to the Chancellor without routing the same through the office of the Vice-Chancellor. This is the third charge, and the fourth is that she served a legal notice on the Chancellor. When Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired as to what were the contents of the legal notice, the Vice-Chancellor said that everything is before them. The Vice-Chancellor said that they

could go through all the documents and say whatever they want in the Senate, and he is okay with it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the legal notice is at page 13.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that the page 13 to which they are referring to is dated 4th March 2015. They could also see page 167, which is of dated 10th October 2013. It is a letter by Assistant Registrar, which states, "After looking into the representations of students and teachers, Department of Music, Post Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector 11, Chandigarh, regarding the result of (Post Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector 11, Chandigarh) M.A. Music (Vocal), Paper-I: Theoretical Survey Principles of Aesthetics and Critical Survey of Ragas examinations held in April/May 2012, subsequently on the recommendation of Syndicate Member and with the approval of the Vice-Chancellor the re-evaluation was undertaken of all the complainants. The previous page is a letter from Dr. Neelam Paul dated 11.10.2013, in which she has made 6-7 points. In that letter, she had sought a copy of the complaint/charges. These issues seems to be interlinked. They are talking about the show cause notice, which is of 2015, whereas the documents attached are of 2013.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Judge has looked into everything. The Judge after considering so many things has given an enquiry report, which is before them. If they have an issue that the enquiry report/judgement is wrong, they could come and tell the same in the meeting of the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they do not approve this enquiry report because the type of charges which are levelled here, these could be levelled against all the teachers. The person could claim the points/score, but it is for the pre-screening or the screening Committee to award correct score.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that she has claimed that she has attended five seminars, out of which she did not attend four. Even if one presents a paper on-line, the same is considered.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified she has herself admitted before the Judge that she had not gone to attend the seminar/s.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out in these documents, it has been mentioned that the Screening Committee has seen her documents, and after seeing the documents, her promotion as Professor has been recommended.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that the record could not be washed. If she has presented paper/s anywhere, record is there. If somebody has mistakenly or intentionally done something which they are saying, he/she should come again and reproduce the evidence/s.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that generally whenever one filled up the per forma, he/she does so according to his/her understanding, but if later on the University authorities sought certain documents or ask to revise the claim, then it is his/her duty to do so. At that time, he/she would not challenge that whatever he/she has done is final.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that it has been mentioned at page 8 of the enquiry report that "I had attended the Conference at Allahabad, while I had sent papers to other Conferences, which were published in Souvenir/s. I never claimed that I had attended five seminars. I claimed points on the basis of participation".

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him interject. The findings, thus, under charge one is that Dr. Neelam Paul wrongly claimed marks while being in the know of the fact that the UGC Regulations did not validate her claim in that behalf. The finding under charge No. 2 is that the University has been able to prove that Dr. Neelam Paul defied the competent authority by refraining from complying with the directions given to her from time to time to provide proofs of publications. The charge is, thus, held to be proved. The finding under charge 3 is that Dr. Neelam Paul forwarded an advance copy of the relevant complaint to the Chancellor at her own level in a clandestine manner and did not get the despatch of advance copy recorded in the despatch register, just in order to be able to conceal the factum thereof. That the endeavour proved to be abortive is an altogether different facet. The receipt (by the Vice-Chancellor) of the original letter from the office of the Chancellor says it all, even otherwise. This item of charge too stands proved against Dr. Neelam Paul. The fourth charge related to legal notice served upon the Chancellor, and the finding, thus, is that the charge of indiscipline and violation of the relevant provision of the University Calendar (for having served a legal notice upon the Chancellor, instead of the Registrar) stands proved against Dr. Neelam Paul. These are the findings given by Justice Anand, Enquiry Officer, who has spent lot of time. The report is with them and they could take a call on it.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky enquired has the Enquiry Officer recommended any punishment.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the Enquiry Officer could not recommend punishment. He is duty bound to place the enquiry report before the Syndicate, which could forward it to the Senate with or without comments. The Vice-Chancellor said that let him ask a specific question to each one of them that do they recommend that it (Enquiry Report) be forwarded to the Senate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the Appointing Authority is the Senate, let the Senate decide as to what is to be done, but all the relevant papers, including the Enquiry Report be provided to the Senate members well in advance so that they could go through the same and come prepared.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no problem, he could send the Enquiry Report to the members of the Senate even tomorrow.

Professor Emanuel Nahar, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Anil Monga, Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky, and Principal B.C. Josan said that the Enquiry Report should be forwarded to the Senate.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is unable to understand the person who has been promoted as Professor, in that what is the role of the Screening Committee. Whether the Screening Committee did not check the papers, etc.? It is true that the Senate is the appointing authority, but the Syndicate also has a role to check. The Syndicate

could not run away from its responsibility; otherwise, there would be several cases in future.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that since all Syndics are also members of the Senate, they could discuss the issue in the meeting of the Senate as well.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that since all the members of the Syndicate are the members of the Senate, that meant, no issue should come to the Syndicate, and everything should be placed before the Senate for consideration. So far as the query posed by the Vice-Chancellor, he would not like to make any comment.

Principal S.S. Sangha enquired whether Dr. Neelam Paul was given an opportunity to put forth her side.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the report has it all, and he is not going to answer this. He is just asking them whether the report should be forwarded to the Senate.

To this, Principal S.S. Sangha said that the report should be rejected.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that Dr. Neelam Paul has written a letter to the Dean of University Instruction on 29.8.2013 (page 35), wherein she has written that Publication dates of all publications from 2006-2009 as well as from 2010 to present and updated C.V. are being enclosed. It related to five papers to which they are talking. If somebody has done this type of work, they are not to defend him/her. There are 3-4 queries from her. The first is that the charge was framed/complaint against her in the year 2013 that she has not checked/evaluated the papers of the students of Post Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector 11, Chandigarh, properly. Those answerbooks were got re-evaluated after a period of one year. Dr. Neelam Paul had demanded that a copy of the complaint should be given to her, but the same is not provided to her till date. It is not known as to who raised the issue, how many marks increased, what change was effected in the result is also not known. She has demanded again and again, but copy of the complaint was not supplied to her. At least she should have been told that this is the complaint against her and let her respond.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, the issue is that everything is there.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua intervened to say, "No Sir", this report is not right.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, the question posed to them is whether the Enquiry Report be forwarded to the Senate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that if they want to dismiss the person from the University service, they could do so, but the question is that Dr. Neelam Paul has sought certain documents from the University Authorities, whether the same has been supplied to her.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, in fact, the members do not know as to how the system is working in the University.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that then he should speak out everything.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is telling them. She has demanded two documents from the Registrar, whether the same have been supplied to her or not.

It was clarified that she has not demanded any document from Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha, Registrar as he was not the Registrar in the year 2013.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Dr. Neelam Paul had demanded the documents from the Registrar. Secondly, these papers have been sent to them by Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha, Registrar.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that Professor A.K. Bhandari was the Registrar of the University in the year 2013 and Professor A.K. Bhandari being the Dean of University Instruction was involved in the conduct of this case. Professor Bhandari was also called as a witness to the case. So there is nothing, which Dr. Neelam Paul wanted to raise and which did not get submitted to him. So right now he does not think that he should be asked to give microscopic responses to the queries which are being raised.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that the Vice-Chancellor might not give the responses to their queries. But, he would like to draw the attention of the House to the letter (page 47) written by Dr. Neelam Paul which reads "With reference to my earlier representation dated 08.02.2013 vide which I have explained my CAS promotion case and interview, in which I appeared on 10.10.2011. The report to which they are talking about is of the year 2015, whereas the issue started in the year 2013, which is not being disclosed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Justice Anand has looked into each and everything.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that they have to start looking at the case from the year 2013. He read out the letter written by Dr. Neelam Paul which reads as under:

"With reference to my earlier representation dated 08.02.2013 vide which I have explained my CAS promotion case and interview, in which I appeared on 10.10.2011. This is to submit that after going through my letter, Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor (Shri R.L. Kapoor) has discussed with me and insisted that I have to appear for my CAS interview once again.

As you know, that when I last appeared for the CAS interview, the whole process and screening as well as interview was completed thoroughly and properly. However, my promotion could not be given due to some discrepancies on part of the Administration and I had to suffer without the fault of mine.

As per the discussion the Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor (Shri R.L. Kapoor), I am ready for appearing interview once again with request that this time the process may kindly be fair and in justified way, so that my long pending genuine due is given to me. ...”

Whereas he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying that she does not want to appear. In fact, the person is saying that her interview has been conducted and her papers are attached. She must have the name of the Committee before which she had appeared. In fact, Brar Committee had screened her application.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor B.S. Brar was also a witness before the Judge.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that papers are here and Professor Brar has himself said that the Research Papers are there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it has been clearly mentioned that the papers have been published in the souvenir.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that Professor B.S. Brar was also a witness and whatever Professor Brar has to say is there. Professor B.S. Brar, the date on which he has been examined is 19.12.2015.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that the input is the same which is with him (Vice-Chancellor). He is asking again and again that they do not wish to become a party in such a case. She (Dr. Neelam Paul) has requested time and again that her case should be examined and her request is with them. Secondly, she is also seeking certain documents from them. Even then, if they think that they would not give her any chance/hearing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that she appeared in the interview in the year 2011, and after 2011 the Interview Committee could take only two decisions, i.e., either accept or reject. If the Interview Committee rejected her, is there any rule that one could be promoted without any interview. According to him, there is no such rule. In the year 2011, when Professor R.C. Sobti was the Vice-Chancellor, the interview was held, and the Interview Committee might have rejected her that is why the case was not processed. Obviously, once a Committee says that the candidate is not selected, the Vice-Chancellor, Syndicate or the Senate could not promote/select him/her without the conducting the interview again. Rather in that letter she is saying that her interview could not be conducted again, and she should be promoted without the interview. Obviously, the kind of claims she was making were not appropriate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is mentioned here that she has five major publications, and she is not lying.

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not a stage to have this kind of cross-talk. Right now, only thing is that he (Vice-Chancellor) seeks from them “should he forward the report to the Senate”.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, "No". His remarks should be written that the report should be rejected *in toto*.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the majority opinion is that it should be forwarded to the Senate. Three persons are saying that it should be rejected and not be forwarded to the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that let they discuss the enquiry report.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that Shri Raghbir Dyal is saying that he has not read the enquiry report.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that they could also discuss the enquiry report in the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could send the copy of the enquiry report to the members of the Senate tomorrow itself. He added that he would make photocopies of this and make available to the members of the Senate as an advance information tomorrow itself, so that they have adequate time to go through it. The Senate meeting could not be held on 20th March 2016 because that day is a car free day from 7.00 a.m. to 2.00 p.m. Shri Vijay Dev came yesterday and he (Vice-Chancellor) has told him that in view of the Convocation on 13th March 2016, which would be attended by thousands of people, and presided over by the Governor, Punjab & Haryana. Shri Vijay Dev has accepted the University's plea that there would not be car free day on 13th March 2016, and the same would be on 20th March 2016.

After some discussion, on behalf of the majority of the members present, it was –

RESOLVED: That the enquiry report in respect of a faculty member of the University submitted by Justice Anand, be forwarded to the Senate. However, three members do not want that the enquiry report to be forwarded to the Senate.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the meeting of the Senate be held on Sunday, the 27th March 2016, and the meetings of the Faculties on 28th & 29th March 2016.

Issues contained in the letter received from Chancellor's office

20. Considered issues contained in the letter received from Chancellor's office.

NOTE: The item was placed before the Syndicate at its adjourned meeting dated 6.2.2016 (papers related to Item 15) as an Information Item. It was desired by one of the members that the item be placed for consideration in the next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Chancellor's view is not on a particular issue. The Chancellor's direction is that PUCASH is a Committee that has been constituted by the Senate. The Senate has the entire superintendence of the governance of the University. So, the matter considered by the Statutory Committees of the University duly constituted on behalf of the Senate which has the entire superintendence of the University that whosoever is involved, everyone including the Vice-Chancellor, those reports would go directly to the

Senate. The Senate had said that the reports should go to the Chancellor directly and the Chancellor's opinion is that the Senate has the superintendence of the University. Therefore, the PUCASH whatever it would consider the issue where the Vice-Chancellor, or the Senators or any other persons are involved, the reports would go to the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to who is the appointing authority of the Vice-Chancellor.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that he is not answering these things. He had put the matter to the members what the Chancellor had asked. He had not sent anything to the Chancellor using his authority. He was asked to submit everything to the Chancellor and accordingly he had submitted everything to the Chancellor and the Chancellor's response has come and he has put the same before the members. He was asked to send it back by the Senate and the Chancellor's response has come and put to the Syndicate. The members could again choose not to react to it and send back to the Senate and the Senate had said that it should go to the Chancellor and the Chancellor has said that the matter should go to the Senate. Whatever response has come from the Chancellor's office, he has first put it to the Syndicate in a sealed cover. If again the members had no time to think over it and debate over it, let the matter as such go to the Senate.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that, last time, they had taken a responsibility to try to find a solution involving Professor Shelley Walia and other members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not an individual case. It is no more a case between an individual and another individual.

Professor Shelley Walia said that if they discuss such a delicate matter at a juncture when they are going to both the parties and in the process of reconciliation, then they are discussing the matter as this might retard the process. If they touch the matter, the things could become hardened. Let them not discuss the matter at this moment and try to resolve the issue in a week or two and then come back to the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is duty bound to place the matter before the members.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that but the Vice-Chancellor is not time bound.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the members need time, they could discuss the matter again in the adjourned meeting on 8th March.

Some of the members said that they could discuss the issue in the adjourned meeting to be held on 8th March.

After some further discussion, the date for holding the adjourned meeting was fixed on 14th March, 2016 in which the items of urgent nature could also be included.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred till the adjourned meeting to be held on 14th March, 2016.

Report of the Standing Committee and CVO

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

The Vice-Chancellor stated that Item 21 is an important issue which they could not defer. Giving the background, he said that the item pertains to a series of letters being written by a re-employed teacher of the University and he is making accusations against the senior officers of the University including the Vice-Chancellor and is sending these letters everywhere not only to the Senate members but also to the Prime Minister's Office, Ministry of Human Resource Development, anywhere and everywhere. He is sending these, in spite of the pleas to him to let the University Committees look into the matter. The Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO) and the Standing Committee have looked into the matter. The reports of the CVO and the Standing Committee are before the members. The teacher knows all these things and everything has been told to him. In spite of all these things, he is now expanding the issues and making references to all and circulating documents relating to all kinds of enquiry committees that were set up against the University, including the Fact-Finding Committee on P.U. Budget. Collating all those things, he in some sense is saying that the University is guilty of so many things. What were the complaints against the University, which led to the Fact Finding by MHRD, as if for the last 20-30 years, the University had been misappropriating the budget, funds and so on, and the fraudulent claims were made by so many Vice-Chancellors and the budget estimates were inflated? So, very serious charges have been levelled not against the Vice-Chancellor personally, but, against the entire functioning of the University. The entire functioning of the University means, the entire governance of the University. Now, the issue is, could a re-employed Professor indulge in such things. If one has complaints and wants to become a RTI activist, there are people, who are out to criticize the University and they saw an example of the same during the NAAC review of the University, the kind of difficulties the University had to face for 3 months because there were all kinds of accusations against the University. There is a re-employed Professor of the University, who is out to be a party to all these things. He (Vice-Chancellor) sees no reason for this, as to why a re-employed Professor of the University should lodge complaints against the University and do such things in circulation to the Prime Minister and everybody. So, very serious misdemeanours are being committed by a re-employed Professor of the University. So, it puts a question why they are giving extension(s) to such a re-employed Professor. They are giving extension without any conditions (to the re-employed Professors). It is putting a question on the process of re-employment. Somebody asked the Vice-Chancellor as to why they are employing such people after retirement.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that why they are giving extension when they are having thousands of applicants for any post.

The Vice-Chancellor said that very serious issues stand raised by a kind of campaign which is going on for so many years. The papers related to the misconduct of the re-employed Professors were sought earlier also. But somehow the office staff could not put up the papers. The office is afraid in sending all these things to the members. So this is the level of the fear psychosis amongst the staff

of the University because the people, who are former Chairpersons of the University and had been part of the University for so long, level such serious allegations against the entire functioning of the University. When he (Vice-Chancellor) had a look at the files, he found that this colleague has been in the habit of doing such things for a long time. He (re-employed Professor) troubled a colleague of the Department that an Enquiry Committee had to be instituted against him and the pensionary/terminal benefits were of that colleague were delayed until the Enquiry Committee validated that all the accusations against that colleague were wrong. There are so many things which he could find in the files that there were complaints against the person that while on leave at one time, he was running a company which had raised several crores of rupees. There are letters against the company which he found in the files. There were serious allegations, and when asked for reply, no reply came from him. But the University did not pursue all these things. The University has done nothing to provoke this person to indulge in such things. In fact, the file had horrifying things. He (Vice-Chancellor) could not believe what has been going in the University for the last so many years. He just did not know where to stop this. All this could become a source of a campaign to stop the scheme of re-employment for faculty members at P.U. The members could see how it is affecting the competitiveness of the University. Already they have competitors in the State of Punjab who are upset, and say that the Panjab University gives re-employment to the teachers 5 years at a go without putting any conditions. There is only one minimal condition that one has to give an yearly report. A normal Professor has to submit an annual report as well. But in the case of a re-employed Professor, the submission of yearly report becomes a compulsion because the re-employed Professors are given a one day break after every year. These people have to file a report and it is the job of the Dean of University Instruction and the Chairperson to see while making a recommendation that whether the report has arrived or not.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa enquired what they are paying to the re-employed Professors.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are paying the last pay drawn minus pension plus 10% HRA, which comes to around Rs.60000-70000 and after 3 years, even the DA is restored, as for 3 years the re-employed teachers do not get enhancement(s) in the DA announced by the Government. At the end of 3 years, they re-compute the DA on the last basic drawn. If the DA is increased @ 10% year, at the end of 3 years, they add 30% to it. They are doing as much as they could do and the Syndicate has been generous to accept the recommendation that in order to retain the competitiveness, they should be seen to be retaining the talent.

Professor Shelley Walia said that one case could not blemish the whole re-employment scheme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is his concern that if they do this, then a directive could come from some agency in Delhi that and ask for a report that the University has given re-employment to how many teachers and under which conditions the re-employment has been given. Are the compliances being made? Whether every re-employed teacher is giving a report? Is there a procedure in place to evaluate those reports? There are very serious issues relating to such misdemeanours. That is why, he thinks that they need to take a

cognizance of what is going on in the University on behalf of the colleagues.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is just a beginning that the Vice-Chancellor has seen. He has deliberated many a times that re-employment should not be given and they are stopping the avenues of the younger generation at least for a period of 5 years. If they do not stop the re-employment, it could be seen from the re-employed teachers whether they really want to teach for the sake of teaching or just for the sake of salary.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he is also not in favor of re-employment. In the first instance, they should make appointments against the vacant faculty positions and the re-employment could be thought of later on.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that one on the side they are saying that the re-employment should not be given and on the other side, they are allowing the retired teachers to retain the administrative positions, a decision which they have taken a little while ago.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not mix up so many things.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa intervened to say that if they did not make eligible their own students, where would they go?

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the re-employment is given to the teachers to pursue the academic agenda of the University. Right now, the issue is that with the misdemeanour of a single person, the whole system has suffered a lot. He just wanted to draw the attention of the members towards this. He should be guided as to what he should do. At the moment, what could be done is that, as per rules, a show cause notice could be served upon him as he is a contractual employee of the University. If the reply is not found to be satisfactory, an enquiry could be ordered. However, in the meanwhile, they could not continue giving him re-employment. He is posing a question to the Hon'ble member as to what they should do. He is just telling them a possible thing that could be done. He is not the governing body of the University, and he is just chairing the meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that this issue is of a kind where the concerned person could be called to sort out the problem *ab initio*; otherwise, the problems deteriorate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a letter came to him on 30th November, 2015. What did he do that he put it before the Statutory Standing Committee that serious allegations have been made against a senior officer of the University. He gave it to the CVO and the Standing Committee and asked to give a reply, one cannot force to get the reply immediately. If there is no reply for about a month, the person starts threatening that the Vice-Chancellor should do the things within next 2-3 days. He (Vice-Chancellor) wanted the members to study all these things before coming to the meeting. The members should read all these things. It could not be expected of a person that if something is not done within 2-3 days, he would do such and such thing, and write to the Prime Minister, etc. The day before yesterday, he has informed that he sent the copies of his letters

to the Prime Minister, while the University Committees are looking into the matter. There is no question of asking such a person to come and hold negotiation with the Governing Body. He could not do any negotiation with such a person.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that what the Vice-Chancellor is saying, what type of negotiation could be done?

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no personal grievance that the person has. What is the grievance that he has? He wanted to ask each one of the members whether they could go back and read up everything, and discuss the matter on 14th March, 2016 again.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred till the adjourned meeting to be held on 14th March, 2016.

Letter from Deputy Secretary (Vigilance), UGC/MHRD regarding allegations against Principal of affiliated College

22. Considered (i) the letter No. F.30-48/2012 (CVO) dated 1.02.2016 received from Secretary and CVO, and (ii) letter No. F.30-48/2012 (CVO) dated 1.02.2016 received from Deputy Secretary (Vigilance) University Grants Commission, MHRD, Govt. of India, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi, regarding Enquiry Report on the allegations against Principal of affiliated College of the Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item is a matter which he has been compelled to present before the House the way he has presented in a sealed cover because it pertains to a member of the Governing Body who has been a member of the Syndicate in the past.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the person now ceases to be a Principal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has been given certain directive to place the matter before the House and the circumstances under which the directions have been issued, all the documents are before the members and if time is needed to go through the papers, they could go back and discuss the matter on 14th March, 2016.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it would be better to go through the papers and then discuss the matter on 14th March, 2016.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred till the adjourned meeting to be held on 14th March, 2016.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 19.02.2016 regarding Policy against Sexual Harassment (Rules and Procedures) of Panjab University

23. Considered minutes dated 19.2.2016 (**Appendix-XXII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, as per decision of the Syndicate dated 18.10.2015(Para 9) and 23.1.2016 (Para 14), to recommend changes to be incorporated in the existing Policy Against Sexual Harassment (Rules and Procedures) of the Panjab University ensuring that it is in consonance with The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

NOTE: The decisions of the Syndicate dated 18.10.2015 (Para 9) and 23.1.2016 (Para 14) enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

RESOLVED: That the Panjab University Policy Against Sexual Harassment (Rules and Procedures), as per **Appendix-XXII**, framed as per the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, be approved.

Proposal of DCDC regarding grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation

24. Considered the proposal of DCDC (**Appendix-XXIII**) with regard to grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation by the Inspection Committees/Affiliation Committee to Colleges affiliated to Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal drew the attention of the House towards last paragraph at page 220 of the appendix, which states that “the office observed that not even a single College fully complies with the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committees/Affiliation Committees. It is, therefore, requested that the orders may kindly be passed that, in future, the Inspection Committees may not recommend the affiliation/extension of affiliation in the case of Colleges which have not fully complied with the conditions imposed by the earlier Inspection Committees/Affiliation Committees”. He suggested that it should not be kept so rigid.

It was clarified that it has been wrongly mentioned that not even a single College fully complies with the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committees/ Affiliation Committees. In fact, it should have been mentioned that certain Colleges do not fully comply with the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committees/Affiliation Committees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the way it has come, it would have far reaching effects on the University Teaching Departments as well.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that they should appoint an Affiliation Committee of Syndicate members every year to recommend grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation to the Colleges.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that every year such a Committee is appointed by the Syndicate, 8-10 meetings of which take place, and by the time, the Committee makes recommendations, the month of December comes. Since by that time the students have already appeared in the examinations, they could not do anything even if the College/s did not comply with the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committees. Previous year also, a Committee of Syndics was constituted for the purpose and the recommendations of the same were placed before the Senate for information only. It is the fact that not even a single College fully complies with the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committees/Affiliation Committees. He added that the Inspection Committees have never imposed all the conditions on the Colleges; rather, they imposed the conditions keeping in view the position, including financial, of the College concerned, but even then the Colleges did not comply with the conditions.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, in fact, their Inspection Committees have become Advisory Committees. He suggested that standardization should be done.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the Colleges must know that compliance is absolutely necessary.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to evolve a mechanism because the different Inspection Committees work in different manner. A Committee is appointed to make the recommendations of the Inspection Committees in a uniform manner. The Colleges must know the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee; rather, they should have an opportunity to challenge any of the condition.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that his concern is that they have to find a practical way in the contemporary time. When such a note is coming that not even a single College fully complies with the conditions as imposed by the Inspection Committees/Affiliation Committees, it meant that the University is going to close the Colleges. In fact, the University does not want to close the Colleges, but only wants to regulate them, so that the interests of the teachers and the students are protected because without satisfaction of the teachers, the Colleges could not be run. The University wants that the teachers should be paid properly and they should be given satisfactory service conditions. Until this is done, the teachers would not be able to teach the students. Therefore, they need to find a practical solution as hundred per cent compliance cannot be done. In fact, minimum compliance limits should be determined.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that some kind of penalty could also be imposed on the Colleges which do not comply with the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this body (Syndicate) comprised Principals, teachers who are representatives of College Teachers, persons from Registered Graduate Constituency, and they could reach at a consensus and suggest as to what minimum is required to be done.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, first of all, they should go into the genesis as to what it is. Referring to the formation of the Inspection Committees, he said that he does not understand as to how the Inspection Committees are formed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he trusts the Dean of University Instruction and the office of the Dean, College Development Council and by and large he relies on them. When enquired by Professor Keshav Malhotra, the Vice-Chancellor said that very rarely he forms or changes some of the members suggested by the Dean of University Instruction or the Dean, College Development Council.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he sees the Committee and somewhere the Associate Professor is made Chairman of the Committee, wherein the Professors are made just ordinary members.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that if the Associate Professor is Fellow, he respects him/her and makes him/her the Chairman of the Committee.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether they accepted the tag of the UGC or the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in their University, the Fellows have been given higher status.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he could not understand, a Fellow, who is Assistant or Associate Professor, is made the Chairman of the Committee and under him/her Associate Professors and Professors, as the case may be, and the Syndicate members, are asked to work. He pointed out that if they dig out the record, they would find that the same persons are appointed on the Committees again and again. He remarked that somebody has stake in the Principals' Constituency and somebody else in the Teachers' Constituency, and this is the reason due to which they are facing the problems. How the Professor could be asked to work under the Assistant or Associate Professor?

The Vice-Chancellor urged Shri Raghbir Dyal to focus on the agenda. Are the problems arising owing to the wrong composition of the Committees?

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that it is one of the reasons, to which the House might also agree.

Professor Navdeep Goyal remarked that the composition might be wrong, but the different Committees had different viewpoints. However, according to him, only the subject expert could be the Chairman of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that his appeal to all of them is to remain focused on the agenda item. When Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to what is his (Vice-Chancellor's) opinion on it, the Vice-Chancellor said that he gave them his comprehension on the issue and a possible solution. They all know that hundred per cent compliance could not be there. In the background that 100% compliance would not be there, what is the minimum compliance which could be insisted upon. If even that is not complied, the University would take a very strict action, which might lead to disaffiliation. Second is, what are the possible non-compliances, which could be figured out by a Committee. If there are non-compliances, what the University could do to induce those compliances. Somebody has said that for certain kinds of non-compliances, one could consider financial penalty, and for some other kinds of non-compliances, they could have the Committees revisited the College/s after giving them some time. The Committee would go and verify and then it would go to the same category, i.e., the minimum compliance and if that is not done, action would be taken accordingly. There might be certain Colleges, which would definitely comply with the conditions and the others won't. The Colleges which complied with the conditions, they could quote their examples and ask others to follow, and if they did not do so, the University Calendar would be strictly followed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he could give the names of very famous Colleges, which had been asked to appoint teachers by the Inspection Committees, but those Colleges did not advertise the positions in spite of that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal remarked that maybe the College/s concerned had advertised the positions, but they did not find eligible candidates.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that if eligible and suitable candidates are not found for the first time, does it mean that they should not re-advertise the positions during the whole year.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that every candidate for a position in the affiliated Colleges should apply to the University directly.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that what has been suggested by Dr. Ajay Ranga, is in fact, being already done.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that a 5-Member Committee of the Syndicate comprising teachers of affiliated Colleges should be constituted.

Principal S.S. Sangha stated that the major condition imposed on the Colleges is appointment of requisite number of teachers, and the same depends on College to College. Suppose a College appoints 10 teachers, but pay them only Rs.15,600/-, whereas the teachers of his College are being paid minimum of 72% Dearness Allowance, which amounts to minimum of Rs.40,000/-. If they appoint 10 teachers, they have to shell out minimum of Rs.4 lac, whereas the Colleges which pay only Rs.15,600/- would shell out only Rs.1.56 lac. As such, the College which is paying Rs.15,600/- is better to them. He, therefore, suggested that a point system should be evolved giving weightage to the Colleges which pay D.A., Provident Fund, etc. A few years ago, he visited a College where one of his students was the Principal, and he recommended disaffiliation of that College because it did not fulfil any of the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee. There were 4-5 more such cases. Thereafter, another Committee of the University visited the said College and recommended extension of affiliation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he agrees and thanks him for the suggestion. Since he (Principal S.S. Sangha) has also remained Dean, Faculty of Education, and knew everything, he should accept the responsibility to chair the 5-Member Committee to be constituted and give him an algorithm, e.g., that this is the minimum (75%) compliance and if the same is complied with, only then the affiliation/extension of affiliation would be recommended/granted.

On a query made by Principal B.C. Josan, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the teachers would definitely be appointed in the Government Colleges, but would be on contract basis and they would be paid Rs.15,600/- p.m.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to what is to be done for this year.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the revised pay-scales were implemented, the Committee had been formed. In that teachers for each and every course have been specified, and the teachers were specified on the basis of fee structure of the self-financing courses. Citing an example, he said that if a College wishes to take Commerce courses, this much teachers are required and the salary has to be paid in accordance with the new pay-scales.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are discussing the details, whereas the item is something else. He wants an algorithm that if the compliance is not there, what is to be done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that if the Colleges failed to do the compliance, they should not be given affiliation/extension of affiliation and they should be asked to apply afresh next year.

It was clarified that so far as compliance is concerned, it is true that certain Colleges did not fulfil compliance and due to their lengthy process, sometimes it takes a year. It is said that the teachers are not available. The teachers are not available because certain Colleges do not pay full salaries, which everybody knows. When they see the balance sheets, they found that the Colleges have no shortage of funds. At least the Inspection Committees which are supposed to visit the Colleges, they should be provided the report/s of the last year. If the College did not comply with the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee/s, it should not be given any new course.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that according to him, it has already been decided by the Syndicate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the entire information, including staff, students teacher ratio, relating to the College, should be provided to the Inspection Committee, which is supposed to visit the concerned College.

Shri Raghbir Dyal remarked that if the compliance of a College is good, they could not stop it from the new course/s.

It was clarified that the Colleges, which had complied with the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committees, should be given affiliation/extension of affiliation, but those which did not comply with the conditions, at least should not be given extension of affiliation for new course/s.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that the University Professors are not aware of the exact position of the affiliated Colleges.

On an information sought by a couple of members, it was clarified that the Periodical Inspections could not be got done, because a Committee of Syndics was appointed to constitute the Periodical Inspection Committees, which they did not constitute. One of the reasons for non-compliance is that they have approved that if the course is of three-year duration, the Committee goes to visit that College. Now, the Colleges have found a new way out that big Colleges where 20 or more courses are being offered, even though compliance is not there, they apply for a new course and sent 100% compliance, the University has no alternative, but to grant extension of affiliation for the same.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that suppose a College sought a postgraduate course and showed compliance, whereas it did not appoint requisite staff for the undergraduate courses. He suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to constitute Periodical Inspection Committees.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the following Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal S.S. Sangha be constituted to recommend minimum algorithm for grant of affiliation/ extension of affiliation to the Colleges:
 1. Principal S.S. Sangha (Chairman)

2. Principal B.C. Josan
3. Principal Charanjeet Kaur Sohi
4. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
5. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
6. Shri Raghbir Dyal
7. Dean, College Development Council

The Committee should make its recommendations before Professor Naval Kishore's term as Dean, College Development Council, comes to an end.

- (2) the Colleges, which do not comply with the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committees, be not granted new course/s; and
- (3) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute Periodical Inspection Committees.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 11.01.2016 regarding seniority of Store-keepers vis-à-vis newly appointed Clerks

25. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 11.01.2016 constituted by the Syndicate dated 18.10.2015 (Para 12), with regard to the seniority of the store-keepers, be fixed after last confirmed clerk or last appointed clerk.

It was informed that in the Senate a decision to merge the Store Keepers in the Clerical cadre was taken and it was written that the Store Keepers would be placed under the last confirmed Clerk. However, during the Syndicate meeting, it was said that a Committee must reconsider this whether it is effective in that manner or an amendment is needed. The Committee decided that the words should be last appointed Clerk instead of last confirmed Clerk.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is a merger. If the merger is with the same basic qualifications and same pay scale, only then this formula could be applied.

It was informed that such a decision could have been taken at that time itself.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the first instance the Store Keepers wanted that they be merged in the Clerical cadre and then asked for giving the seniority. Those 5 Store Keepers were helped and now they wanted promotion. They were appointed as Store Keepers. How they could be promoted as Superintendent? They would have to work in the Stores.

It was informed that the Committee has made the recommendation that the Store Keepers should be placed below the last appointed Clerk.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if they go by the advertisement of 2012 and see the qualifications of Clerk-cum-Data Entry Operator and Store Keeper, the basic qualification of Clerk is 10+2 or equivalent and the qualification of the Store Keeper is Graduate with Graduate Diploma in Material Management/Diploma in Store Keeping or any other equivalent qualification. There is a difference at the time of appointment. Besides this, in the case of Calligraphist, office orders issued in the year 1995 part 3 says that the Calligraphists are already confirmed and they be given the seniority in

the Clerical cadre after the last confirmed Clerk. It was principally decided and the Punjab Government is also giving the same benefit. He suggested that it needs reconsideration. In the minutes of the meeting it has been recorded that Ms. Anu Chatrath was not present in the meeting. In fact, she was not called for the meeting. She had no intimation regarding the meeting. She has told that she was not intimated about the meeting.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this case is pending for a long time.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that the decision in the matter has already been taken by the Syndicate and the Senate.

It was informed that the notice for the meeting was sent well in advance.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the matter could be again discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate to be held on 14th March, 2016.

It was informed that there is a technical problem. It was also discussed in the earlier meeting that after keeping aside the 5 posts, the other persons be promoted because the entire process of promotion is stuck.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that the decision in the matter has already been taken by the Syndicate and the Senate. Even Rule 15.1 of Panjab University Calendar says that “an employee shall rank for seniority in the grade according to the date of his confirmation” and also the Punjab Government rules are in favour of the Store Keepers. Since there are so many proofs and witnesses, how could they do it.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired if there is a similar case of merger in Punjab.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he had dealt with a case of non-teaching staff of Engineering College. In the year 1995, when the Institute was set up through a Society for the technical education. In those colleges, following a uniform policy, all the posts like Store Keepers, Date Entry Operators, Cashiers, Clerks, Accountants, etc. were merged in a single cadre. The uniform policy came in the year 2007 and was implemented in the year 2011 or so. They should also keep that in mind.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Store Keepers were merged in the Clerical cadre and in the meantime about 300 Clerks were appointed. How the Store Keepers could be given the seniority to those Clerks.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the uniformity policy of Punjab Government should be followed up.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that even in the teaching departments also there have been mergers and new seniority is given in all such cases.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that earlier also the merger had been done and the seniority had been given from the confirmation date.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if the members agree on the Punjab Civil Service Rules, they must discuss the matter in the light of the uniformity policy which has been framed by the Punjab Government.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the President, PUSA was in the meeting and Sh. Naresh Gaur and Professor Navdeep Goyal also said that double benefit, i.e., merger in higher scale and seniority, could not be given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right. But Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is also citing some rule.

It was informed that earlier the pay scales of the Store Keepers and the Clerks were the same. The difference in the pay scale arose in the year 2011 when the Punjab Government re-revised the pay scales of certain categories due to which various anomalies cropped up. In this background, the Store Keepers said that they are loosing as their qualifications are higher and earlier were in the same pay scale as that of Clerk. They requested for merger in the Clerks. In their support, a policy of Punjab Government was also provided rather the Punjab Government has merged the Store Keepers with the Clerks in the year 1990 itself. Somehow, the University could not do so.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they should see all the record.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all the factual position has to be seen before a final decision. The same Committee could re-look on the issue after verification of the factual position.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he was a member of the Board of Finance when the decision was taken. The Store Keepers were given the Grade Pay of Rs.3200/- from Rs.1900/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have a meeting of the Syndicate on 14th March 2016 and the meeting of the Committee be reconvened and it be ensured that Ms. Anu Chatrath is there. Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa be also added as special invitees to the said Committee. The input of the Committee be given. On the request of Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, the Vice-Chancellor said that if Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is not able to attend the meeting, then Professor Emanuel Nahar would attend the meeting.

It was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa be added as members of the Committee and a meeting of the Committee be reconvened ensuring that Ms. Anu Chatrath is there. If Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is not able to attend the meeting, then Professor Emanuel Nahar would attend the meeting on his behalf. The inputs of the Committee be given to be considered in the Syndicate meeting to be held on 14th March, 2016.

Regulations/Rules for Masters of Dental Surgery (MDS)

26. Considered the recommendation (Item 6) of the Faculty of Medical Sciences dated 18.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXIV**), that the Rules/Regulations of Masters of Dental Surgery (MDS) (**Appendix-XXIV**), to be effective from the session 2015-16, be approved.

RESOLVED: That the Regulations/Rules for Masters of Dental Surgery (MDS) effective from the session 2015-2016, as per **Appendix-XXIV**, be approved.

Guidelines for utilization of interest earned on Pran Nath Vohra Trust Fund

27. Considered the following recommendation (1) of the Joint meeting dated 27.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXV**) of the Administrative and Academic Committee of the Department of Chemistry with regard to frame guidelines for the utilization of interest of Pran Nath Vohra Trust Fund, which would be available on annual basis from the fixed deposit:

(a) **Guidelines and division of annually accrued interest.**

Percent of interest accrued annually	Purpose of Utilization
10%	Amount can be deposited back to the Principal amount to overcome the inflation and gradual growth of the fund.
15%	Amount can be utilized to initiate and conduct a special "Pran Nath Vohra oration in Chemistry" every year along with: "Pran Nath Vohra Lectures in thrust areas in Chemistry" by inviting expert(s) in special areas of Chemistry. The thrust area and speaker will be selected by the Academic Committee of the Department. The money can be utilized in terms of honorarium, TA/DA, accommodation charges and miscellaneous expenditure.
75%	Amount can be used for the maintenance and upgradation of the existing instrumentation laboratory and all the departmental instruments.

- (b) The unspent amount (if any) can be utilized for the purchase of small equipments/spare parts required for the instrumentation Lab of the Department.
- (c) The above mentioned guidelines can be reviewed and amended by the Academic and Administrative Committee as and when required.
- (d) To express gratitude and appreciation towards the benevolent contribution of Mr. Pran Nath Vohra, the existing instrumentation lab will be renamed as 'Pran Nath Vohra Instrumentation Laboratory of the Chemistry Department'. This renaming would be performed through a ceremonial function at appropriate time.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate vide Para 5 dated 22.11.1992 (**Appendix-XXV**) had accepted the donation of US \$7700/- (Rs.2,19,024) from Professor Pran Vohra,313, University

Avenue, Davis CA95616, USA for creation of an Endowment 'Durga Devi Ram Dass merit Scholarship' to disburse the Scholarships as per proposed terms and conditions. Further, University received US \$1.28 lac from Pran Vohra Trust, USA and the amount deposited in the Special Endowment Trust Fund Account subhead Pran Vohra Trust in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh on 28.03.2005. Consequently, with the concurrence of the investment committee the same amount was invested by the office in the RBI 8% Saving (Taxable) bonds 2003 for 6 years. Since there was no proper guidelines for the utilization of funds, hence the amount continuously getting accumulated.

2. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Administrative and Academic Committees of the Department of Chemistry in their joint meeting dated 27.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXV**), the following guidelines for the utilization of interest of Pran Nath Vohra Trust Fund, which would be available on annual basis from the fixed deposit, be approved:

(a) **Guidelines and division of annually accrued interest.**

Percent of interest accrued annually	Purpose of Utilization
10%	Amount can be deposited back to the Principal amount to overcome the inflation and gradual growth of the fund.
15%	Amount can be utilized to initiate and conduct a special "Pran Nath Vohra oration in Chemistry" every year along with: "Pran Nath Vohra Lectures in thrust areas in Chemistry" by inviting expert(s) in special areas of Chemistry. The thrust area and speaker will be selected by the Academic Committee of the Department. The money can be utilized in terms of honorarium, TA/DA, accommodation charges and miscellaneous expenditure.
75%	Amount can be used for the maintenance and upgradation of the existing instrumentation laboratory and all the departmental instruments.

- (b) The unspent amount (if any) can be utilized for the purchase of small equipments/spare parts required for the instrumentation Lab of the Department.
- (c) The above mentioned guidelines can be reviewed and amended by the Academic and Administrative Committee as and when required.

- (d) To express gratitude and appreciation towards the benevolent contribution of Mr. Pran Nath Vohra, the existing instrumentation lab will be renamed as 'Pran Nath Vohra Instrumentation Laboratory of the Chemistry Department'. This renaming would be performed through a ceremonial function at appropriate time.

Donation for institution of Endowment

28. Considered, if an endowment of Rs.4,00,000/- made by Mrs. Vibha Sharma, B-404, NPSC CGHS Ltd., Plot-5, Sector-2, New Delhi-110075, be accepted for institution of Endowment named as "Shri D.P. Sharma and Smt. Nirmal Sharma Memorial Scholarship". The Investment of Rs.4,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment and the interest of the amount be utilized for Girl Student in the School of Communication Studies with the following terms and conditions:

- a) Endowment will be named as 'Shri D.P. Sharma and Smt. Nirmal Sharma Memorial Scholarship.'
- b) Scholarship will be awarded on the basis of merit-cum-financial needs on the recommendations of the Academic Committee & the Chairperson of School of Communication Studies, Panjab University.
- c) The beneficiary should preferably be given to one Girl Student.
- d) In case a girl student does not fulfill the conditions then a male student may be considered.
- e) The amount of Scholarship would be Rs.2500/- p.m. for 10 months in view of the interest to be accrued on the endowment sum of Rs.4 lacs.

NOTE: An office note along with the request dated 27.01.2016 of Mrs. Vibha Sharma enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

RESOLVED: That the donation of Rs.4,00,000/- made by Mrs. Vibha Sharma for institution of Endowment in the name "Shri D.P. Sharma and Smt. Nirmal Sharma Memorial Scholarship", be accepted, and the Investment of Rs.4,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR, and the interest of the amount be utilized for award of scholarship to the Girl Student in the School of Communication Studies with the following terms and conditions:

- a) Endowment will be named as 'Shri D.P. Sharma and Smt. Nirmal Sharma Memorial Scholarship.'
- b) Scholarship will be awarded on the basis of merit-cum-financial needs on the recommendations of the Academic Committee & the Chairperson of School of Communication Studies, Panjab University.
- c) The beneficiary should preferably be given to one Girl Student.

- d) In case a girl student does not fulfill the conditions then a male student may be considered.
- e) The amount of Scholarship would be Rs.2500/- p.m. for 10 months in view of the interest to be accrued on the endowment sum of Rs.4 lacs.

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

Recommendation of the Committee dated 11.01.2016 regarding exemption to teachers from UGC-NET/SLET

29. Considered minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 11.01.2016 (**Appendix-XXVII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, on the basis of discussion held in Syndicate meeting dated 30.08.2015 (Para 20), to review the exemption granted to the teachers of the University as well as its affiliated Colleges from UGC-NET/SLET and the Entrance Test for registration to Ph.D. programme.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 (Para 20) (**Appendix-XXVII**) while considering the case of Ms. Richa Sood, Assistant Professor, Biophysics, Dr. R.P. Government Medical College at Tanda, District. Kangra, Himachal Pradesh, for exemption from Ph.D. Entrance Test for enrolment to Ph.D. programme, under the Faculty of Science in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University has also resolved that a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the exemption granted to the teachers of the University as well as its affiliated Colleges from UGC-NET/SLET and the Entrance Test for registration to Ph.D. programme.
 2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).

Professor Shelley Walia enquired whether it is proper to exempt the teachers from the entrance examination for admission to Ph.D. programme as this would dilute the standards.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the exemption has been granted only to the permanent teachers. If the teachers are not allowed to do research, then they are locked in a position that they would be left behind others.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the point of Professor Shelley Walia is that those who have NET, they need not take the entrance test.

Professor Shelley Walia said even some persons have become teachers after having passing the M.A. degree.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the exemption granted by the UGC is for those teachers who hold the teacher fellowships. But the problem is that the teacher fellowship could be granted only if one could enroll for Ph.D. It was also earlier recommended by the Committee and he thought that it is alright.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that if some non-teaching employees are also interested for doing Ph.D., they should also be allowed the exemption.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it could not be done as the exemption is only for teacher fellowship holders.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 11.01.2016, as per **Appendix-XXVII**, be approved.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 06.01.2016 regarding minimum span period within which a student should qualify the degree

30. Considered the minutes dated 06.01.2016 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the letter No.F.12-1/2015 (CPP-II) dated 15.10.2015 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) received from the Secretary, UGC, New Delhi vide which the guidelines on determination of a Uniform Span period within which a student may be allowed to qualify for a degree have to be adopted.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 06.01.2016, as per **Appendix-XXVIII**, be approved.

Recommendation of JRB regarding Pre-Ph.D. Course Work in Swami Vivekananda Studies

31. Considered the recommendation (Item 74) dated 07.05.2015 (**Appendix-XXIX**) of Joint Research Board, and

RESOLVED: That Ph.D. programme be opened to the students from various disciplines who have cleared UGC-NET in their own discipline or Ph.D. Entrance Examination in Swami Vivekananda Studies conducted by Panjab University. These candidates will have to do Course work in Swami Vivekananda Studies or if they want to do it in their own discipline then they will have to also pass the certificate course in Vivekananda Studies over and above Master's Degree. Panel of Supervisors need to be prepared immediately.

Amendment in the Senate decision dated 28.9.2014 (Para LI)

32. Considered, if the following amendment be made in the Senate decision dated 28.9.2014 (Para LI (R-43)) (**Appendix-XXX**) regarding change of name cases received from male/female candidates registered with Panjab University, and the Gazette of India, be considered valid, for change in name without having to change the name in the Board/University by submitting the following documents along with application form:

1. Required Fee; and
2. An affidavit to his/her present and proposed names duly sworn in the presence of Magistrate by his/her parent or guardian in case he/she is a minor or by himself/herself in case he/she is major; and
3. Copy of the Gazette of India (full).

NOTE: 1. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).

2. The amendment already approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 28.9.2014 in Regulation 10 at page 149 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007 have been approved by the Regulation Committee in its meeting dated 29.10.15/

3.11.2015 and yet to be sent to Govt. of India for approval.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following amendment be made in the Senate decision dated 28.9.2014 (Para LI (R-43)) (**Appendix-XXX**) regarding change of name cases received from male/female candidates registered with Panjab University, and the Gazette of India, be considered valid, for change in name without having to change the name in the Board/University by submitting the following documents along with application form:

1. Required Fee; and
2. An affidavit to his/her present and proposed names duly sworn in the presence of Magistrate by his/her parent or guardian in case he/she is a minor or by himself/herself in case he/she is major; and
3. Copy of the Gazette of India (full).

Correction in Syndicate decision dated 15.3.2014 (Para 14)

33. Considered if a correction be made in the resolved part of the Syndicate decision dated 15.03.2014 (Para 14) (**Appendix-XXXI**) in Rule 10.1 that out of the total share of the University, 40% will be paid to **'the Development Fund'** instead of **Corpus Fund 'Foundation for Higher Education & Research'** as under:

Decision of the Syndicate dated 15.03.2014 (Para 14)	Proposed provision
As per Rule 9: The distribution of consultancy amount received will be as under:	Same
9.1. In case of Advisory Consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 (cost of consultants' time, including intellectual fee) will be paid to the consultant(s) and 30% will accrue to the University.	Same
9.2 Similarly, in case of service consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 above will be paid to the consultant(s) involved and 30% will accrue to the University.	Same
As per rule 10.1 Out of the total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be paid to the Corpus Fund 'Foundation for Higher Education & Research' and 50% will be available to the concerned Department for the purchase of equipment/material/repair of the existing equipment/maintenance of laboratory infrastructure or for any academic activity/industry participation activity, upon request by the Department.	As per rule 10.1 Out of the total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be paid to the Development Fund and 50% will be available to the concerned department for the purchase of equipment/material/repair of the existing equipment/maintenance of laboratory infrastructure or for any academic activity/industry participation activity, upon request by the department.

- NOTE:** 1. Letter Ref. No.CIIPP/44 dated 29.01.2016 of Director (Hony), Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP), Panjab University, Chandigarh is enclosed **(Appendix-XXXI)**.
2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 29.02.2012 vide Para 33 has already amended **'Foundation for Higher Education & Research'** to **'the Development Fund'**

RESOLVED: That a correction be made in the resolved part of the Syndicate decision dated 15.03.2014 (Para 14) **(Appendix-XXXI)** in Rule 10.1 that out of the total share of the University, 40% will be paid to **'the Development Fund'** instead of **Corpus Fund 'Foundation for Higher Education & Research'** as under:

Decision of the Syndicate dated 15.03.2014 (Para 14)	Proposed provision
<p>As per Rule 9: The distribution of consultancy amount received will be as under:</p> <p>9.1. In case of Advisory Consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 (cost of consultants' time, including intellectual fee) will be paid to the consultant(s) and 30% will accrue to the University.</p> <p>9.2 Similarly, in case of service consultancy, 70% of the amount received for item 5.1 above will be paid to the consultant(s) involved and 30% will accrue to the University.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Same</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Same</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Same</p>
<p>As per rule 10.1</p> <p>Out of the total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be paid to the Corpus Fund 'Foundation for Higher Education & Research' and 50% will be available to the concerned Department for the purchase of equipment/material/repair of the existing equipment/maintenance of laboratory infrastructure or for any academic activity/industry participation activity, upon request by the Department.</p>	<p>As per rule 10.1</p> <p>Out of the total share of the University, 10% will be paid to the University as administrative charges, 40% will be paid to the Development Fund and 50% will be available to the concerned department for the purchase of equipment/material/repair of the existing equipment/maintenance of laboratory infrastructure or for any academic activity/industry participation activity, upon request by the department.</p>

Addition in the Syndicate decision dated 30.8.2015 (Para 14)

34. Considered the following addition in the Syndicate decision dated 30.08.2015 (Para 14) as recommended by the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) (No.3) dated 04.06.2015 (**Appendix-XXXII**):

“the amended ratio be implemented after the promotion of Steno-typist who had already qualified the promotional test for the post of Stenographer in response to circular No.23907-24107/Estt. dated 05.11.2013 i.e. after the already approved panel is exhausted.”

NOTE: 1. Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) at its meeting held on 4.6.2015 considered the demand of PUSTA that the promotion to the post of Stenographers may be allowed in the ratio of 50:50 instead of 25:75 and unanimously recommended as under:

1. The existing ratio of 25:75 be changed to 50:50.
2. The eligibility condition shall remain the same.
3. The demand of ratio be implemented after the promotion of Steno-typist who had already qualified the promotional test for the post of Stenographer in response to circular No. 23907-24107/Estt. dated 05.11.2013 i.e. after the already approved panel is exhausted.

The above recommendations of JCM were placed before the Syndicate at its meeting held on 30.8.2015 vide Para 14 (**Appendix-XXXII**) and it was resolved that Rule 4(ii) (a) & (b) at pages 76-77 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, with regard to promotion of Steno-typist to the post of Stenographer be amended.

As per minutes of the Syndicate dated 30.08.2015 the recommendations of the JCM mentioned at Sr. No.3 above contained in the office note were also taken into consideration but have not become the part of decision.

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

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) (No.3) dated 04.06.2015 (**Appendix-XXXII**), the following addition be made in the Syndicate decision dated 30.08.2015 (Para 14):

“the amended ratio be implemented after the promotion of Steno-typist who had already qualified the promotional test for the post of Stenographer in response to circular No.23907-24107/Estt. dated 05.11.2013 i.e. after the already approved panel is exhausted.”

Recommendations of the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) dated 29.12.2015

35. Considered the recommendations of the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) dated 29.12.2015 for Ministerial, Secretarial, Laboratory & Technical Staff and Class ‘C’ staff of the University

Initiating the discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what has happened that the minutes of the JCM are annexed with the item. But sometimes, it gives an impression that the minutes are there, but the matter has not been resolved. There are few things which they should resolve today that as earlier said by Principal S.S. Sangha that proposal for filling up 50% posts of Deputy Registrars on the basis of selection after advertising the post and filling up 50% posts of Deputy Registrars by promotion on the basis of seniority-cum-merit amongst in-service Assistant Registrars may be accepted after receiving inputs from other Universities and may be got approved by the competent Statutory Bodies of the University. This is resolved part.

The Vice-Chancellor stated whether the inputs from other Universities have been sought or not. The inputs should have been given, where are the inputs because the meeting was held on 29th December, 2015 and so much time has passed since then. They could discuss the matter on 14th March, 2016.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred till the adjourned meeting to be held on 14th March 2016.

Issue regarding appointment of Secretary for various Faculties

36. Considered the recommendations of the Faculty of Science (Item 15), Faculty of Arts (Item 17) and Faculty of Languages (Item 8) dated 19.12.2015 with regard to the appointment of Secretary for the various Faculties.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.10.2015 (Para 17) has resolved that in order to have input from the Faculties, the matter be placed before the Faculties concerned. In the meanwhile, the item be treated as withdrawn.

2. An office note enclosed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that on the one hand, they are saying that the Deans of various Faculties should not be appointed through election, and on the other hand, they are saying that the Secretaries of the Faculty of Arts, Science, Languages, should be appointed by way of election. He, therefore, suggested that this issue should be referred to Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for making reforms.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the recommendation of the Faculties should be referred to the Regulations Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired from the members whether it should be referred to the Regulations Committee or Senate Reforms Committee as suggested by Professor Keshav Malhotra.

Professor Navdeep Goyal again suggested that it should be referred to the Regulations Committee.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Professor Keshav Malhotra jointly said that it would go to the Regulations Committee only if they approve it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would send it to the Regulations Committee as the reforms would take a lot of time.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred till 14th March 2016.

Addition in Regulation 14.4 in respect of temporary/daily-wage/contractual employees

37. Considered if following addition, be made as clause (v) in para C of the Regulation 14.4 appearing at page 129 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, in respect of temporary/daily-wage/Contractual employees of P.U. subscriber towards provident fund:

Existing	Proposed
<p>a) In case of any appointment other than on regular posts, the following procedure shall be followed:</p> <p>I Temporary appointment against the substantive posts:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">No appointment shall be made except by following proper procedure and rules by giving wide publicity through advertisement. Such appointments shall be made for a period of at least one year or till the posts are filled on regular basis whichever is earlier. However, the term of such appointments may provide for extension of the term also.</p> <p>II Appointment for the purpose of seasonal work against contingency/temporary establishment, projects etc.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">No appointment shall be made without following proper procedure and rules. Any person appointed for</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>seasonal work or on a project whether construction or otherwise shall not be allowed to continue after the conclusion of the purpose for which such appointment was made. In no case, such employee/s shall be posted against a substantive post. The tenure of their appointment shall be fixed according to the tenure of the seasonal work, construction work or research project as the case may be. On the expiry of such period, no extension shall be granted. However, they shall be eligible for fresh appointment as per rules for different work for which a fresh appointment letter shall be issued by the concerned authority.</p>	
<p>(b) On the appointment of a person on whole time basis for period not less than one year other than on regular basis whether on temporary basis or contractual or daily wage basis, the provident fund account number shall be allotted to the employees by the Establishment Section. For separate identification, the provident fund account numbers of such employees shall be prefixed by a word "T"</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>(c) The employee's contribution towards provident fund shall be deducted from the monthly wages/remuneration for credit to provident fund w.e.f. the date of appointment. However the University contribution shall be credited to the provident fund only after the expiry of one year continuous service of the employee in the University w.e.f. date of appointment. While calculating the continuous service of one year, the breaks on account of following shall not be deemed as interruptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Any authorized leave; (ii) Sundays and other authorized holidays; (iii) Period of absence due to inability of the employees caused by accident in the course of employment; (iv) Any break due to maternity leave in case of women employees provided the total break is not more than 12 weeks. 	<p>(c) The employee's contribution towards provident fund shall be deducted from the monthly wages/remuneration for credit to provident fund w.e.f. the date of appointment. However the University contribution shall be credited to the provident fund only after the expiry of one year continuous service of the employee in the University w.e.f. date of appointment. While calculating the continuous service of one year, the breaks on account of following shall not be deemed as interruptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Any authorized leave; (ii) Sundays and other authorized holidays; (iii) Period of absence due to inability of the employees caused by accident in the course of employment; (iv) Any break due to maternity leave in case of women employees provided the total break is not more than 12 weeks. (v) Compulsory break given by

<p>Provided that with respect to employees already in service the CPF deduction and University contribution shall start w.e.f. the date of approval of these rules by Syndicate/Senate.</p> <p>a. The benefit of contributory fund scheme i.e. employee’s contribution shall be available to only those employees who has completed one year of continuous service. The amount of University contribution towards the provident fund of employee shall be 10% of the salary. The expression salary here includes Basic Pay, Grade Pay and DA or the consolidated emolument as the case may be.</p> <p>b. In case an employee put in less than five years of service then only half of the amount of the University contribution shall be paid.</p> <p>c. An affidavit must be obtained from the temporary employees that “if the University give this benefit to the temporary employees they may not claim for regularization of their service on this ground”.</p>	<p>the University while extending the term of appointment.</p> <p>No change</p>
--	---

NOTE: 1. The Senate in its meeting held on 31.03.2012 vide Para XXXIV (**Appendix-XXXIII**) had approved the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 31.01.2012 (Para 37) (**Appendix-XXXIII**) with regard to deduction of the P.F. of temporary/daily-wage/ contractual employees of P.U.

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

RESOLVED: That the following addition in respect of temporary/daily-wage/Contractual employees of P.U. subscriber towards provident fund, be made in Clause (v) in Para C of the Regulation 14.4 appearing at page 129 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Existing	Proposed
<p>a) In case of any appointment other than on regular posts, the following procedure shall be followed:</p> <p>I Temporary appointment against the substantive posts:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">No appointment shall be made</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>except by following proper procedure and rules by giving wide publicity through advertisement. Such appointments shall be made for a period of at least one year or till the posts are filled on regular basis whichever is earlier. However, the term of such appointments may provide for extension of the term also.</p> <p>II Appointment for the purpose of seasonal work against contingency/ temporary establishment, projects etc.</p> <p>No appointment shall be made without following proper procedure and rules. Any person appointed for seasonal work or on a project whether construction or otherwise shall not be allowed to continue after the conclusion of the purpose for which such appointment was made. In no case, such employee/s shall be posted against a substantive post. The tenure of their appointment shall be fixed according to the tenure of the seasonal work, construction work or research project as the case may be. On the expiry of such period, no extension shall be granted. However, they shall be eligible for fresh appointment as per rules for different work for which a fresh appointment letter shall be issued by the concerned authority.</p>	
<p>b) On the appointment of a person on whole time basis for period not less than one year other than on regular basis whether on temporary basis or contractual or daily wage basis, the provident fund account number shall be allotted to the employees by the Establishment Section. For separate identification, the provident fund account numbers of such employees shall be prefixed by a word "T"</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>c) The employee's contribution towards provident fund shall be deducted from the monthly wages/remuneration for credit to provident fund w.e.f. the date of appointment. However the University contribution shall be credited to the provident fund only after the expiry of one year continuous service of the employee in the University w.e.f. date of appointment. While calculating the</p>	<p>(c) The employee's contribution towards provident fund shall be deducted from the monthly wages/ remuneration for credit to provident fund w.e.f. the date of appointment. However the University contribution shall be credited to the provident fund only after the expiry of one year continuous service of the employee in the University</p>

<p>continuous service of one year, the breaks on account of following shall not be deemed as interruptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Any authorized leave; (ii) Sundays and other authorized holidays; (iii) Period of absence due to inability of the employees caused by accident in the course of employment; (iv) Any break due to maternity leave in case of women employees provided the total break is not more than 12 weeks. <p>Provided that with respect to employees already in service the CPF deduction and University contribution shall start w.e.f. the date of approval of these rules by Syndicate/Senate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The benefit of contributory fund scheme i.e. employee's contribution shall be available to only those employees who has completed one year of continuous service. The amount of University contribution towards the provident fund of employee shall be 10% of the salary. The expression salary here includes Basic Pay, Grade Pay and DA or the consolidated emolument as the case may be. b. In case an employee put in less than five years of service then only half of the amount of the University contribution shall be paid. c. An affidavit must be obtained from the temporary employees that "if the University give this benefit to the temporary employees they may not claim for regularization of their service on this ground". 	<p>w.e.f. date of appointment. While calculating the continuous service of one year, the breaks on account of following shall not be deemed as interruptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Any authorized leave; (ii) Sundays and other authorized holidays; (iii) Period of absence due to inability of the employees caused by accident in the course of employment; (iv) Any break due to maternity leave in case of women employees provided the total break is not more than 12 weeks. <p>(v) Compulsory break given by the University while extending the term of appointment.</p> <p>No change</p>
--	--

At this stage, some of the members said that they are feeling exhausted and the consideration of the remaining items on the agenda, be deferred till 14th March 2016.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Items 45, 46, 47, 48, 56 and 59 on the agenda, which related to re-employment of Dr. Nahar Singh, Leave cases of teaching staff, number of students to be admitted in Law courses being offered in the University, should be taken up for consideration.

This was agreed to.

Request of Dr. Nahar Singh for re-employment

45. Considered the request (**Appendix-XXXIV**) of Dr. Nahar Singh, Professor (Retd.), School of Punjabi Studies, that:

- (i) he be granted re-employment for another two years i.e. up to attaining the age of 65 years on 05.10.2017, as per decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI).
- (ii) he be sanctioned Extraordinary Leave (without pay) already applied by him up to 31.03.2016 in term of decision of the Syndicate dated 20.04.2015 (Para 20) vide which Devi Sirohi was granted EOL without pay for two years more i.e. beyond admissible EOL without pay of one year for re-employed faculty.

NOTE: 1. The Senate at its meeting dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) that the present scheme of re-employment of teachers including teachers of affiliated Colleges after superannuation be extended for 5 years i.e., up to 65 years of age instead of existing 3 years, i.e. up to 63 years of age. Other Rules governing re-employment of teachers after superannuation, namely Rules (3)-(10) at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 would remain same. The decision be made effective w.e.f. 8.9.2012. However, the re-employment shall be after one day break following the date of superannuation and the usual one day break will be there at the completion of every year during the re-employment.

2. The meeting of academic Committee dated 23.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) has unanimously resolved that the case of Professor Nahar Singh be strongly recommended for re-employment up to 65 years i.e. from 06.10.2015 to 05.10.2017.
3. Dr. Nahar Singh, Professor was re-employed for three years i.e. up to the age of 63 years, which will come to an end of 5.10.2015 vide Syndicate

decision dated 04.11.2012 vide Para 58 (i).

4. Dr. Nahar Singh, Professor (Re-employed), was granted Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 01.09.2014 to 13.03.2015 (in term of decision of Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.10.2013 vide Para 5) vide office order 8024-25/Estt. dated 22.08.2014.
5. Earlier, the request of Dr. Nahar for extension in Extra Ordinary Leave w.e.f. 14.03.2015 to 31.03.2016 was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 (Para 6) (**Appendix-XXXIV**) and it was resolved that Dr. Nahar Singh, Professor (re-employed), School of Punjabi Studies, be granted extension in Extra-Ordinary Leave without pay up to 05.10.2015, i.e., attaining the age of 63 years.
6. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.10.2013 (Para 5) (**Appendix-XXXIV**) has resolved that the teacher re-employed after superannuation, be entitled to 20 days Casual Leave (any time), Special Casual Leave for 10 days and Special Academic Leave for 30 days and Duty Leave as per University Rules and Regulation except Half Pay Leave and Commuted Leave. In addition, Extra Ordinary Leave without pay not exceeding one year be also allowed to the incumbent.
7. Earlier, the Syndicate in its meeting held on 20.04.2015 (Para 20) (**Appendix-XXXIV**) has resolved that the request dated 28.01.2015 of Dr. Devi Sirohi nee Devi Verma, Professor (Re-employed), be granted Extra-Ordinary Leave without pay for two years more w.e.f. 07.02.2015 up to 07.02.2017, (till as her term Chairperson, Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights).
8. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) Dr. Nahar Singh, Professor (Retd.), School of Punjabi Studies, be granted re-employment for another two years, i.e., up to attaining the age of 65 years on 05.10.2017, as per decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI).

- (ii) he be sanctioned Extraordinary Leave (without pay) already applied by him up to 31.03.2016 in term of decision of the Syndicate dated 20.04.2015 (Para 20) vide which Dr. Devi Sirohi was granted EOL without pay for two years more, i.e., beyond admissible EOL without pay of one year for re-employed faculty.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 15.01.2016 regarding sanction of leave to the teaching staff

46. Considered the minutes dated 15.01.2016 (Item Nos. I, II, III, VII, VIII and IX) (**Appendix-XXXV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18) to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

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

Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that at page 388 of the Appendix, the leave case of Dr. Gaurav Verma, Assistant Professor (Polymers), Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, is there. In fact, it is not the case of Dr. Gaurav Verma, but of the many teachers of the University, those who are getting leave on the basis of Fellowship, and in such cases the University did not pay the salary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whosoever is getting Fellowship, his salary is not to be stopped because with the salaries, people feed their families.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there is a letter of the UGC, which has been adopted by the Syndicate and the Senate, still the salary of the people is being stopped. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to get all such cases cleared so that the persons should get salary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that salaries of such people would not be stopped. He added in no National Institute, salary is stopped on the Fellowship. The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Ajay Ranga to bring all such cases to him, so that he could get them cleared.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 15.01.2016, as per **Appendix-XXXV**, be approved.

Recommendations of Revising Committee dated 17.12.2015

47. Considered the minutes dated 17.12.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) of the Revising Committee to consider the lists of Paper-setters/Examiners recommended by the various Boards of Studies for the examinations of 2015-16.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Revising Committee dated 17.12.2015, as per **Appendix-XXXVI**, be approved.

Leave case of Professor P.S. Jaswal

48. Considered minutes of the Leave Cases Committee (by circulation) dated 05.02.2016 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) regarding leave case

of Professor P.S. Jaswal for EOL without pay w.e.f. 08.02.2016 to 28.02.2017.

NOTE: Request dated 05.01.2016 of Professor Jaswal along with office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVII**)

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 05.02.2016, as per **Appendix-XXXVII**, be approved.

Representation of Dr. Gurdip Sharma, Fellow

56. Consider representation (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) of Dr. Gurdip Sharma, Fellow, regarding opening of new Degree College/s requiring 5 acres land in 3 parts within the radius of 2 kms. in hilly areas, which fall within the jurisdiction of Panjab University.

NOTE: An office note mentioning relevant Regulations enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVIII**).

RESOLVED: That opening of new Degree College/s having 5 acres land even if it is scattered at 3 places within a radius of 2 kms. in hilly areas, which fall within the jurisdiction of Panjab University, be allowed.

Issue regarding maximum intake of students for B.A.LL.B. (Hons.)/ B.Com.LL.B.

59. Considered the minutes of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor held on 25.02.2016 to clarify intake of students for LL.B./B.A.LL.B. (Hons.)/B.Com.LL.B., as per the norms of Bar Council of India and the recommendation of Mrs. Anu Chatrath thereon (**Appendix-XXXIX**).

- NOTE:**
1. A communication had been received from the Bar Council of India stating that each section should have only 60 students, and any additional student admitted is against the rule.
 2. The above-said Committee met on 25.02.2016 and after detailed discussion, authorized Mrs. Anu Chatrath to take-up the matter with the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the Government of India has issued directive/s that additional seats be created to accommodate certain categories, including Kashmiri Migrants, Cancer/Aids patients, Single Girl Child, etc. Now, the Bar Council of India (BCI) is saying that the total number of seats should not increase from 60 per section. But the BCI has only said that reply to this should be given. Therefore, the University has to reply that they are following the Government of India guidelines and only owing to that the number of seats has increased. Therefore, they should not reduce the seats.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a letter has to go on behalf of the Governing Body of the University to the BCI that their 60 seats per section could not be reduced. Meaning, no seat should be reduced out of those 60 seats per section.

This was agreed to.

At this stage, some of the members collectively said that since now they have exhausted, the meeting should be adjourned till 14th March 2016. However, they should be allowed to raise a couple of important issues.

- (1) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that about 4-5 days, a report appeared in the newspapers that the recruitment test for the posts of Patwari in Punjab was not conducted by the Panjab University properly.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they had not received any complaint in this regard from any quarters and this has been done unilaterally. He had an occasion to speak to the Deputy Chief Minister, Punjab, who was also not aware of any complaints. He (Deputy CM) told him that he had also come to know about it from the newspapers. Panjab University is a premier University of Punjab and this type of report affects the brand name and the efficiency of Panjab University, including its affiliated Colleges. He had got prepared the list of examinations conducted by Panjab University. He is not only sending the list to the Deputy CM but also to the Chief Secretary and the Director, Higher Education, and he is going to pursue it vigorously. He added that the Panjab University has conducted only the written test so far. The job was neither given to Guru Nanak Dev University nor to Punjabi University, but was given to Thapar University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the University had put in a lot of efforts and worked hard to conduct this test, and it was one of the best tests conducted by the University so far. They should categorically say that they have full faith in the system and they stand by it. He suggested that appreciation of the Syndicate be conveyed to the Coordinator who conducted the test.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that the anguish of the Syndicate on the news item should be shown and appreciation by the Syndicate should be conveyed to the Coordinator.

This was agreed to.

- (2) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that certain add-on courses and honours courses remained pending for want of signatures by the Principals as sometimes the Principals changed in mid session.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Dua to provide him the list of all such pending cases so that he could take appropriate action.

After some further discussion on the issue, it was –

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate, on the cases to be provided by Shri Dua.

- (3) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired about the status of the case, the documents relating to which (deduction of Provident Fund by the Colleges) were supplied by him to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, he had forgotten as to where the said documents had been forwarded. He requested Shri Dua to supply the same to him again.

- (4) Principal S.S. Sangha pointed out that one of the persons (namely Shri Shashi) is working in the University for the last more than 30 years on a single post. He requested that he (Shri Shashi) should be promoted under the Assured Career Progression Scheme, viz., 10/20/30 years.

- (5) Principal S.S. Sangha said that certain cases of approval are still pending in the University. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to grant approval to those cases on the pattern of which they had granted approval recently.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the following Committee be constituted to consider the pending approval cases of teachers of affiliated Colleges:

1. Principal S.S. Sangha
2. Principal B.C. Josan
3. Professor Navdeep Goyal
4. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
5. Dean, College Development Council

- (6) Principal B.C. Josan requested that the last date for enrolment of Registered Graduates should be extended as certain persons could not get themselves enrolled due to recent disturbance in Haryana. He added that due to the aforesaid disturbance, certain persons from Punjab could also not get themselves enrolled.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the plea which appeared compelling to him is that some people of Haryana could not get themselves enrolled due to the recent disturbance in the State.

Principal B.C. Josan pointed out that the election schedule and date of election are to be decided by the Syndicate as per the Regulations, but not the last date of enrolment. Therefore, they could extend the last date of enrolment.

Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that when the last date for enrolment as Registered Graduates was approved, it was not an item on the agenda.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, it was a conscious decision taken by all the members of the Syndicate and the plea taken by Dr. Ajay Ranga is a mere technicality.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that legally, once the election process has been started, they could not change or make any amendment.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, may be, several people have submitted the forms for enrolment along with photographs and residence proof. However, all the forms which do not contain photograph and residence proof would not be rejected as they have enough time to contact the persons concerned. They would definitely contact those persons and ask them to supply their photograph and proof of residence even through e-mail which is not difficult nowadays. He added that in view of whatever happened in Haryana, if they wish to extend the date a little bit, it is okay with him.

One of the members said that if the date is extended, it would send a wrong signal.

To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that it is a mere technicality. In fact, they are moving progressively.

Dr. Ajay Ranga remarked that there is a general feeling that those who are in the House have taken the benefit of this decision and on the other hand, others could not as they were not aware of this decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is for the individuals to get themselves enrolled as Registered Graduates.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that, in fact, this issue arose in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 23rd January 2016 and at that time he had said that the issue should be debated in the House, which they could verify from the DVD.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the time-table was to be approved. On the basis of some argument, the date was changed and put for consideration.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that ultimately, the decision was taken unanimously and Professor Navdeep Goyal had said that two things needed to be taken care of – (1) on the spot attestation should be stopped; and (2) the Panjab University Calendar should not be violated anymore. How could they verify residential address of the Graduate who submits more than one form for enrolment giving different addresses? So far as Haryana is concerned, he fully agreed that the situation in Haryana was disturbed. A representation has been received, now it is up to the Vice-Chancellor that in the case of emergency and for the reasons to be recorded, he could extend the date for enrolment. However, he does not see any emergency except the State of Haryana and he also does not see any reasons for extending the date as the decision taken by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23rd January 2016 was notified.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Raghbir Dyal is right that he had said at that time they would not allow the Calendar to be violated. He thinks on that day, Shri Ashok Goyal had said that this was the schedule earlier and earlier

also the Calendar was violated and they believed in him. When they checked, they found that the last date for enrolment as Registered Graduate in the year 2012 was 31st May 2012. They also found that it was not a violation of the Calendar as the Vice-Chancellor has the authority to change the date for reasons to be recorded. According to him, even today the date could be extended as per Regulation 12.2 which says, "The Vice-Chancellor may, in case of any emergency and for reasons to be recorded, postpone at any stage the date of election or elections or the dates for transaction of any business connected with the election, and the matter shall be reported to the Syndicate". Secondly, there is a full Chapter (Chapter II(B)) about the election of Ordinary Fellows where everything has been mentioned in detail as to how they would make votes and what types of documents have to be sought for the purpose. If they wanted to make any change/s, they have to first amend the Regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the change suggested was that the photograph should be attached.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that they are violating the Calendar in the name of reforms by asking the candidates to send their photograph and residential proof.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, in fact, they should appreciate that some reforms have been affected.

The Vice-Chancellor reiterated that it is a matter between the University and the individuals and the University would plead to the candidates to send their photographs and residential proofs. However, no form would be rejected.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that according to him, seeking photograph and residential proof is not violation of Calendar in any manner. Secondly, what would they do about the candidates who have already sent their photographs and residential proofs?

The Vice-Chancellor said everything is recorded and put up. They could not send a message to the society, that too, in the 21st Century, especially to the new voters, who have completed Graduation before the last 5 years. If this had happened 50 years ago, then they could have said that they are less concerned voters. Since the people who have Graduated from this University in the year 2011 or before, are quite technology savvy and almost all of them have e-mail IDs, they could plead to them to send the photographs, which is not impossible. As they could not give adequate notice to the people, especially people of Haryana, he proposed that the last date for enrolment as Registered Graduate should be extended up to 31st March 2016, which would be fair to everyone. He further said that, in fact, they do not want to follow a wrong practice but they do not want impersonation. They want to enable the Graduates to cast their votes. He added that when the last election happened, the issue had come up that when the polling staff asked the voters to show the identity proof, the voters did not have the same. In view of this, they decided to ask for the photograph and identity proof.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that, the practicality is that 90% or more forms for registration are filled up by the candidates, who are seeking elections themselves. This is the practice which is being followed.

Shri Raghbir Dyal reiterated that in the last Syndicate meeting also, his question was that if they receive multiple forms from candidates with different addresses, how would they ensure as to which one is the genuine.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in case of multiple forms, they have to establish the genuineness of the voters through the signature. When they are extending the last date by one month, there is no harm seeking the photograph.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that earlier the last date for enrolment was 31st May. Sometimes, they impose different conditions. In fact, there should be a level playground for all the contestants. According to him, there should definitely be a change with the change of time. Therefore, after election, in January 2017, they should start the process for reforms including seeking the photographs, residential proof, etc. from the voters, so that these reforms could be implemented from the next elections. Since the fee (Rs.15/- life membership fee plus Re.1/- cost of the form) is very meagre, if extra expenditure is incurred while implementing the reforms, they could enhance the life membership fee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now an expenditure of Rs.1.5 crore is to be incurred, which might go up to Rs.2 crore.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that even if the date is to be extended, the provision of photograph and residential proof should not be diluted; otherwise, they would not be able to check bogus voting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they go into the technicalities, they would not be able to reach at any decision. He did not see the previous record to find out as to what were the reasons for extending the dates earlier.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the last date for enrolment as Registered Graduate be extended up to 31st March 2016 keeping in view the recent disturbance in Haryana. If more than one form is received from a candidate, identity proof be sought from him/her; however, no forms would be rejected for want of photograph.

Shri Raghbir Dyal recorded his dissent.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

**Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR**

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE, which was adjourned on 27th February 2016, held on 14th March 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 said that the items which could not be taken up for consideration in the adjourned meeting (27.2.2016) should be first taken up for consideration, and thereafter, the deferred items. As such, they would start from item 38.

Recommendations of Administrative Committee of BGJ Institute of Health

38. Considered minutes of the Administrative Committee of BGJ Institute of Health dated 11.12.2015 (**Appendix-XL**).

Initiating the discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there were two issues involved in the item under consideration. The first issue is regarding OPD prescription slips and the second one is regarding medical entitlement booklets of students, mess workers and contractual staff of Panjab University. Regarding the students, the number of students is very large and issuing them these kinds of booklets after paying a certain fees, that would lead to many administrative problems. There are about 15,000 students in the campus and they are having the identity cards on the basis of which they are being provided the medical facilities. The recommendation regarding entitlement booklet for mess workers and contractual staff could be accepted and not for students because it could create problems for the students.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that to implement these things, a lot of money would be involved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the expenditure could be recovered from the students. There is no harm. Typically, the stay of a student in the University except Certificate courses is between 3-5 years. The students of Honours School leave the University after 3 years, students of professional courses after a period of 4 years and postgraduate students stay ranges from 5 to 9 years. The way they are moving towards computerisation, in that sense, it is not a bad idea to have a medical data of the students. They could consult the representatives of the students.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that presently the system is that the students show their identity cards on the basis of which the Health Centre issues them a slip. If the slip is lost, it is not known to the doctors which ailment the student was suffering and what type of treatment he/she had previously undergone.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could see how the technology is being used in such a way that the doctor checks the patient and prescribes the medicines, the whole data is recorded. Even if a person has visited the Dispensary once, the whole data of that patient is recorded. They could develop a software and using the technology is not a big thing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for the time being, the issuance of entitlement booklets for the students should not be made mandatory and could be issued only to the willing students.

Professor Anil Monga said that normally the students have an identity card on the basis of which they are provided the medical facilities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what Professor Keshav Malhotra is saying is a different issue. The entitlement booklet would have a record of the service that a patient has taken from the doctor.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the students have the equal rights. They should be issued the entitlement cards and could be charged for that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the students are already paying the medical fee. If they charge extra for the booklet, they could give an option to the students.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that could they deny the medical facility to the students when they are carrying the identity card?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is talking about maintaining the medical record of the students. They could not make it compulsory but could explore the possibility of maintaining record of the students availing the services of the Health Centre.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said it should not be made compulsory but should be encouraged that the students who are interested and conscious about their health, could be issued the entitlement booklets so that a record of the ailments and tests undergone could be kept.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nowadays all the dispensaries are getting computerised in such a way that when one visits the doctor, the doctor prescribes the medicine and the medicines are already prepared by the dispenser along with the details and the patient has no doubts about which medicine and at what time he/she has to take it.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they could provide the students with an identity card having a validity.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the doctor checks up the patients but the idea is to keep a medical record of the students as he also uses his entitlement card whenever he visits the Health Centre.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first of all, the issue is not what they are discussing. The issue is that the students go to the Health Centre with identity card, nobody is denied any kind of medical facility. The Health Centre has pointed out the difficulty that sometimes the students do not come with the identity card or medical entitlement card which creates difficulty for them and they have made a proposal in this regard that if somebody comes without identity card or entitlement card, they be allowed to charge a fee of Rs.10/- as charges for coming without identity card or entitlement card. The second proposal is that against the payment of Rs. 50/-, the Health Centre be allowed to issue the entitlement card to everybody. Basically, they say that if entitlement card is issued, then it would do away with the practice of having identity card. It is not clear whether the students would bring the entitlement card. Secondly, the Health Centre has only explained the added advantage of issuing the entitlement card that a record would be there. Even if, as the Vice-Chancellor has rightly pointed out, unless and until the record is computerised, one could say that he/she has lost the card, the duplicate card be issued. Then where is the record. Basically, it is to take care of those students or non-students who go to the Health Centre without identity card or entitlement card or they have said that they should be allowed to charge Rs.10/- and they would not be denied the medical facilities. The second part says that they be allowed to issue entitlement card @ Rs.50/- since they are already charging medical fee of Rs.50/-, it would give another issue to the students to protest.

Professor Anil Monga said that the students could say that if they have the identity card, they could not take another card with them. There should be only one card.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that only one identity-cum-medical card could be prepared.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a booklet also has to have having the medical history of a patient.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said it should not be made mandatory and an option could be given to the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no harm in issuing a card.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the students should not be charged for the booklet and it should be made clear to them that it is not mandatory so that it might not create problems at a later stage.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could be said that the students would be entitled to the facilities of Health Centre if carrying either of the two cards.

The Vice-Chancellor said in the first instance, the entitlement card could be issued to the students free of cost and Rs.50/- could be charged for a duplicate card.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that for example if a student was suffering from diabetes, there should be a column about the disease and the record could be sent to the Health Centre.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should move towards computerisation so that at least the basic information which is entered into the card is also recorded electronically.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the staff would also be required for this purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could move towards computerisation on the pattern of CGHS and other Central Government schemes.

Professor Shelley Walia said that even if it is not computerised, as he is using the services of the Health Centre for the last about 25 years with a medical entitlement card, it becomes very essential that when a patient visits the doctor, the doctor knows the medical history of the patients as to what kind of treatment was already going on.

The Vice-Chancellor said they should realise the value of the card.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it is very important. At one point of time, the entitlement card of one of the teachers was misplaced and he tried his level best to trace out the same as it was having the whole medical history but could not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not charge the students and issue the booklet and if someone needs a duplicate, only then the fees could be charged. A duplicate could be issued only if they are having a record for which they have to computerise the records.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that only those students interested in having the entitlement card could be issued as there might not be more than 2000 students interested in having the card.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could find volunteer students who, on a small honorarium, could do all these things in the interest of the students. There could also be some research scholars who have to stay for 5-6 years, they would be the first persons to do all these things.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that this kind of booklet could be issued to the students at the time of their admission.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that a circular could be issued to all the Departments so that those interested could avail the facility.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that in the College, at the time of the admission, they provide the medical form especially to the hostellers.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is the best option.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the medical examination of all the students of the Departments should be made compulsory in a year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would issue the booklets starting with the Research Scholars, the modalities of which would be worked out by the Health Centre and they should move towards computerisation.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if they are approving it, it should be mandatory otherwise the resources would be wasted and the entitlement card should be issued at the time of admission.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the card could be issued at the time of the issuing of the departmental identity card.

Professor Anil Monga said that it is a good idea to start with Research Scholars.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are charging an annual medical fee from the students and not from the employees. If they are charging the fee, to give service against that fee instead of making it mandatory for the students to get the entitlement card, rather it should be mandatory for the University to provide the entitlement card as they are issuing the identity card. So, now the question comes of computerisation. Even in the PGI, the computerisation could not be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that about 10,000 patients visit the PGI daily.

Continuing Shri Ashok Goyal said that the reason is not that as he had asked about it. The reason is that when sometimes the patients visit the PGI at odd hours and needing the treatment or some procedure to be performed, it is not possible at that time to feed the whole data in the computer. The data is written on the card so that whenever that patients the OPD, at least everything is mentioned in the card. If they start computerising, half of the history of the patient would be missing and could not tell the patient to come only when the computer is operational. So, they could take care of this issue separately, but the medical cards could be issued. He just wanted to know because there was another apprehension that the medical fee is being charged but even 5% of the students would not be availing the medical facilities including the hostellers. He did not know whether the office of the Dean Student Welfare has the data of such students including how much money they are charging annually from the students. Could he know it because accordingly they could take a

decision and he is sure that even now it could not be more than Rs.7.5 lacs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are providing the medicines worth much more than that. There are two kinds of schemes of the Central Government, i.e., Central Government Health Scheme (CGHS) and the other is Contributory Health Scheme (CHS). The charges of CGHS are decided by the Central Government. The CHS, which is on the lines of CGHS, the respective departments charge the fee. He knew that the Department of Atomic Energy had a separate scheme and in such schemes, the Government recovers some of the cost from the employees and the charges are revised as per the recommendations of the Pay Commissions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the University, the employees are entitled for reimbursement.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the reimbursement is at par with the rates in the referred cases.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a Committee including the Doctors could be formed to take a decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would provide the entitlement card to every student and explore the possibility that the data of the booklet is computerised so that at the time of issue of duplicate booklet, it is not lost.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the first proposal regarding charging of Rs.10/- for those coming without card be accepted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should give everybody a booklet. He read the annual report of Panjab University brought out by Professor A.C. Joshi, telling about the state of the University. He further went into the past and found the objectives for which the Panjab University started its medical scheme and why Panjab University is very generous in its medical scheme as compared to Punjab Government because the University is self governed from time immemorial. So, the people who were running the University like Dewan Anand Kumar and others, built in these things and not did not wait for the Government to come out with these things. They took proactive steps that it should be on behalf of the University.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that at that time there was no problem of funding.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that they are seeking funds from the Central Government only towards salaries and pension and for other facilities, the University has its own funds. Initially, there was a confidence level that the University would generate its own funds because the University conducted the examination of Prep and Intermediate classes. So, the University never felt that they would have to look for funds even for small things. The problems of funds arose only when some of the examinations being conducted by the University went to the School Education Boards. The income of the University did not increase in the ratio the University is expanding. This is where the problem has occurred. The Governing Body of the University has been taking care of the students' right from its inception. He had not seen the history of universities except TIFR and

Panjab University. Dr. Homi Bhaba was there in the TIFR. Though TIFR is a part of Department of Atomic Energy but having more facilities than the Department of Atomic Energy because Dr. Bhaba wanted the best people to come to TIFR and focus on the work and not worry for such small things. So, in that legacy, the students could be given the benefits.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the doctors of the Health Centre know the difficulties being faced. Therefore, they should also be consulted in this matter.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired whether they have such a infrastructure to keep such records. He cited the example of the Colleges where bus pass forms are attached with the admission form, which are not required by the local students. Similarly, if there are about 15,000 students in the University, hardly 1500-2000 students would take the entitlement cards and rest of the card would be wastage. He further said that the registration could be done at the Health Centre itself.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should always have posing thinking in order to start a new thing. They would work out the modalities.

RESOLVED: That recommendation of the Administrative Committee of BGJ Institute of Health dated 11.12.2015, that Rs.10/- be charged from those who do not bring the identity/entitlement card, be approved. So far as issuance of booklet is concerned, the students be issued the entitlement card (booklet) free of cost at the time of issuance of identity card by the department concerned.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That steps be initiated for keeping computerised medical record of the patients visiting the Health Centre.

**Issue regarding
condonation of delay in
the submission of Ph.D.
thesis**

39. Considered, if delay of 4 years 10 months and 29 days as on 14.01.2016 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Rajiv Chugh, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, be condoned w.e.f. 16.02.2011 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to following reasons:

“I was supposed to carry out a study on super heavy systems, for which I was developing a code. It was nearing completion when we faced a problem with server, which crashed and all the files and data related to my work were lost. So I had my work all over again.

In the meantime, the sudden revelation of my mother’s ailment (last stage Gall Bladder cancer), her long treatment and then finally her demise had its toll on my mental being.”

NOTE: 1. Request of Shri Rajiv Chugh enclosed **(Appendix-XLI)**.

2. Mr. Rajiv Chugh was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Science on 16.02.2005. He

was granted first extension for one year i.e. upto 15.02.2009 after normal period of 3 years. He was further granted second extension up to 15.02.2010 and third extension up to 15.02.2011.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has nothing against giving the extension. But since the Syndicate has to take the decision, he wondered whether this kind of application could be considered where nothing is written about when the server was down, when the cancer was detected that lead to the unfortunate demise because they are going to condone the delay of almost 5 years, i.e., 4 years, 10 months and 29 days and the office note says that however, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond 8 years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded. It is pertinent to mention here that the Syndicate at its meeting held on 18.10.2015 has resolved that the power to condone the delay up to six months beyond the period of 8 years exceptional circumstances, on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded, be delegated to the Dean of University Instruction. If need be, the relevant Regulations/Rule/Guidelines be amended accordingly. Now, at the cost of repetition, he said again that he is not against giving the extension, but should the Syndicate not know what are the exceptional circumstances. At the same time, it could not be delayed as the candidate has said that he would submit the thesis within a period of 15 days. In case such an item is deferred again as it was deferred earlier because of adjourned meeting, he is not in favour of adjourning it any further. At least, they could tell the departments and the candidates that there should be complete data. Secondly, they are taking a particular decision in October 2015 and without going into the merits of the case just in the beginning of 2016, they are giving the extension of almost 5 years. At least, they should be in a position to justify why they did it so that the same could not be taken as a precedence that it is unending and anytime the delay could be condoned. This is what he wanted to say as others including Professor Navdeep Goyal must be knowing better about this matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he knows the circumstances and the condonation could be granted.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they should be more elaborate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the new guidelines, the maximum period has been defined by the UGC and they could not go beyond that. This is one of the old cases in which they are condoning the delays. He personally knows that the candidate had to face these problems.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not opposing it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the candidate was enrolled in the year 2005 and the title of the thesis was approved in the year 2007 and the due date for submission of thesis was 2011. There is no explanation regarding such a long period.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has all sympathy and positive attitude to the candidate who has put so much efforts in doing research, it is not his fault. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) is sharing with them what is happening in the University that it is said that you give just a two line application and we would get it cleared from the Syndicate. If that is to be done, he is against that. Simply on the basis of an application, giving the extension, is not appropriate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what Shri Ashok Goyal is saying is correct.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the candidate belongs to the Department of Physics, Professor Navdeep Goyal must be knowing very well the whole matter.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that today's meeting is third meeting of this year and in every meeting, cases regarding condonation of delay are coming. A data could be collected of all the pending cases so that all the cases could be considered together in a single meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he agreed with it.

Professor Shelley Walia said that in order to give extension to a Ph.D. student, a report from the Supervisor could be sought saying how much work the student has done. It is a sympathetic case and there is no report from the Supervisor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that so callous is the approach of the Department that the application is undated which meant that it would be dated as and when taken up.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that there are so many issues related with it. They had taken a decision to conduct the course work within 2 and half years as the course work could not be organised during that period in certain subjects. The students who were enrolled at that time were asked to submit 15-20 copies of their synopsis for consideration by the pre-RDC. This information does not reach the concerned quarters, due to which the students have to pay the late fee. Whichever decision is taken by the University for the students/Colleges should be conveyed. The students had to submit the synopsis within one year.

The Vice-Chancellor said the case was approved on 19.01.2016 and a letter from the Deputy Registrar has been written to the candidate on 21.01.2016.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the candidate was given extension up to 15.02.2011. From the correspondence, It looks as if the candidate has applied for extension almost after 5 years that another extension be given and that too vide his application dated nil. The concerned branch responded on 21.01.2016 that the extension is not admissible. Now the letter of the candidate is after he has received the communication from the branch or it is the same which was submitted before the branch. If this application is the same to which the branch has responded that the extension could not be given and on the basis of the same application, they say that it is done which means that they are taking a contradictory stand. The candidate

should have mentioned that he has received a letter from the branch and under the circumstances, his request be reconsidered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the data in this regard is incomplete.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not against giving the extension and did not want that he is against the research. The letter to the candidate had been issued on 21.01.2016 on the basis of the approval of the Vice-Chancellor on 19.01.2016. In the note from the branch, the office had given the option the Dean of University Instruction would like to take the appropriate action in the matter or the matter needs to be taken to the Syndicate and the final decision was 'no' and accordingly, the branch advised the candidate that the extension could not be given.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dean of University Instruction had approved the portion marked 'x' in the office note and the matter be taken to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that point (i) in the office note is to be approved by the Dean of University Instruction and (ii) by the Syndicate and the Vice-Chancellor has approved both the points. It could be that point (ii) be approved and the matter be placed before the Syndicate. Now, if that is the case, then how after the Vice-Chancellor has signed the matter be placed before the Syndicate, how subsequently the branch advised the candidate that the condonation could not be delayed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the letter from the General Branch says that the Dean of University Instruction has granted extension up to 15.2.2011 and the extension beyond 15.2.2011 is not admissible under the regulation and it has not been written that the Syndicate could not condone the delay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the office note had explained the whole matter that the candidate has asked for condonation of delay of 4 years, 10 months and 29 days and it is to be decided whether it could be done by the Dean of University Instruction or Syndicate or the condonation is not to be given. It was approved as such and the Vice-Chancellor meant that it be taken to the Syndicate. But the office said that the extension could not be given as per regulation. Subsequent to that, the item has been placed before the Syndicate. He just wanted to imagine for a minute that what impression the candidate would carry, as if, this letter of the office has no meaning and the decision is going to come contrary to that. This, in fact, is going to compromise the credibility of the University. That is why he had said that he did not want to discuss and said that he is not against condonation of delay.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there were so many cases who have requested for condonation of delay and the students have to pay the late fee. Since a supervisor has a fixed number of seats to guide Ph.D. students, if the students did not complete the degree within the stipulated period and they keep on granting extension, it blocks the way of prospective candidates. The whole procedure should be streamlined and those seeking extension could be penalised.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is true that the documentation is not proper. But they could not take a decision due to which there could be delays. They could authorise the Dean of University Instruction or the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what they could do is that in principle, the Syndicate agrees that the Vice-Chancellor be authorised that on the basis of proper documentation, if the Vice-Chancellor is satisfied, on behalf of the Syndicate, he could condone the delay. Let they not give a message that such kind of thing is purchasable.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that as said by Dr. I.S. Sandhu, a time be fixed for holding the meeting of the RDC irrespective of the students. The meeting of the RDC in the subject of Education has not been held for the last about 9 months. He suggested that a timeframe could be fixed so that at least 3 meetings of RDC are held in a year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would take up the matter with the Director, Research and Dean College Development Council. In the beginning of the year, the dates for holding the meeting of the RDC could be fixed and minimum 3 meetings per year should be held.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that holding the meeting of the RDC varies from one department to the other. There are some departments which organise the meetings of RDC regularly even if 1-2 students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are a research University and in the Convocation held on 13.03.2016, they had awarded about 300 Ph.D. degrees and there are not so many universities which are awarding so many Ph.D. degrees. So, they should have a discipline as a research University in which the time schedule and other things are mentioned. He would make it sure that it should be given publicity as to how many meetings have been held and the minutes of the meetings of RDC are publicised. There are very serious issues. It is not a responsibility on behalf of the campus but also on behalf of the affiliated Colleges also as they are encouraging the Ph.D. in the affiliated Colleges because otherwise the College teachers would not have a bright career. Let they start with at least 3 meetings of RDC in a year and if need be, they could think of holding 4 meetings later on. They would compile a data of how many meetings of RDC have been held during the last one year as this data would also be required by the IQAC Cell. They would try to get a time schedule and hold at least 3 meetings in a year.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it should be seen as to during which months of the year, there is less pressure of work in the Departments. He suggested that the meeting could be held during the admission and examination days.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would do it, no issue at all.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that as said by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua that the cases of the teachers should be considered.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that a Committee could be formed to discuss all the cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that that he would do it separately. They have a 6-member Research Promotion Cell which could consider all these things.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the two of the meetings could be held during the months of May and December and one could be held in between.

Professor Shelley Walia said that just holding the meeting of the RDC is not enough. He wanted to bring one thing to their notice. For instance, there was no RDC in English. Lot of students waited and accumulated with the result that there were 23-24 students who wanted to appear before the RDC. He wanted to know whether it is possible to interview 23-24 candidates in a single meeting of RDC and the office says that it could not be done. Then he asked that why not spread the meeting over 2 days so that the candidates could be interviewed properly to which the office said that they have to call the members of the RDC from other places also.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that sometimes the competent bodies of the Departments/referees approve the synopsis of the candidates. A Department holds the meetings of RDC twice in a year. If the request of a candidate is not put up before the RDC in a meeting, then both the supervisor and the candidate suffer for a whole year.

Professor Shelley Walia said that those students who have to go abroad, have to suffer.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to condone the delay of 4 years 10 months and 29 days (beyond 8 years) in the submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Rajiv Chugh after looking into all the records/documents, on behalf of the Syndicate;
- (ii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to clear the pending cases of teachers, irrespective of whether it is for carrying out research leading to Ph.D. degree or supervising the Ph.D. candidates in consultation with the Director, Research and Dean College Development Council, on behalf of the Syndicate; and
- (iii) Director, Research be instructed to take steps to hold at least 3 meetings of Research Degree Committee in a year.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 05.1.2016 and 15.1.2016 regarding amendment of rule/s

40. Considered minutes of the Committees dated 05.01.2016 and 15.01.2016 (**Appendix-XLII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, (i) to update the rules in the Handbook of Hostel Rules and revision/changes in the fee structure of the hostels and (ii) to frame rules for condonation of lectures for the students of Panjab University Teaching Departments for the session 2016-17.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two Rules 4.1 and 4.2. Under Rule 4.1, the students would be given the benefit of having participated in some activities. Under Rule 4.2, for some activities, the

maximum condonation would be 10%. But there was a problem for the students who were participating in NCC or NSS camps. There is no problem as far as NSS camps are concerned as the same are organised during vacation. The students of NCC sometimes even have to go to Delhi to participate in Republic Day Function or other activities. Similarly, the students who are playing in the inter-college and inter-university and zonal games, the attendance given for these purpose is restricted to 10%, which is not fair. On the other hand, there were students who were just going for some educational tour, participating in the University functions conducted by the Student Council and were also getting 10%. For those activities, 10% is okay. There are other students who were actually going on the duty of the University for which they should be given the credit for the actual days of absence and on the other hand, for those students who were participating in functions like Jhankar, the percentage had been reduced to 10% for some specific activity for which the students were actually going to represent the campus or the College, those students should get the actual benefit. That is the reason why that it has been done separately as otherwise Rule 4.2 was barring such students from getting the actual benefit. The minimum requirement of 33% attendance had been kept as per the earlier decision of the Syndicate and Senate. This clause had been kept so that such students who do not attend the classes did not take the benefit.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that giving the credit for attending the NCC camps is justified but the other activities like tournaments would open a backdoor entry for the students. There is a limit for inter-college competitions whether it is cultural or sports.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if a College has a very good Bhangra team and the students are devoting more time in these activities than the advantage be given.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is right for the students participating in NCC activities. But there is an impression that the teams of Bhangra devote less time in activities as compared to other events. With this Rule, they are giving a provision to such students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the provision was already there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thought that the reply which he wanted to be given that probably is not given. Earlier, the limit of 10% in the earlier rules was there. Now, what they have done is that 10% for Rule under 4.2 and earlier it was Rule 4.1 only which was covered for the purpose of condonation of lectures up to 10% and there was nothing different as far as the functions held by the Dean Student Welfare or the Departments or educational excursions. Now what they have done is that under Rule 4.1, it has to be actual, equal to the number of days and under 4.2, the whole 10% which was existing as one rule, they have brought forward in Rule 4.3 where they have kept the minimum attendance at 33%. What is the definition of giving credit up to 10% for the activities which are being done in the campus? First of all, as an individual, he is not in favour of 75% or 60% attendance whatever be the motive of the UGC? But if they have made a rule, then probably they should not make a mockery also. The Chairpersons of the Department and even up to the Vice-Chancellor say 'no' that the condonation could not be done and the matter goes to the Syndicate. The Syndicate has also the limited power. But as if the

cricket tickets are being sold, the students have been rushing towards the office of the Dean Student Welfare for getting a certificate of having participated in activities who keeps on signing the certificates. Then they have another rule which is not found mentioned here that if somebody falls sick, and probably, they had passed a rule that if somebody is hospitalised, the condonation of shortage of lectures is given equal to the days of hospitalization, that 25% leverage has been given to take care of these things because it is not possible for human being to attend 100% classes because sometimes there could be social functions or cultural activities, etc. But slowly, they have started considering those activities as part of academic activities. The student should be part of the team, unless and until that is defined, he is afraid that Rule 4.2 would be misused because simply saying that for cultural activities of the University, educational excursions conducted by the Department/Dean Student Welfare or any other activity, credit for attendance shall be given by the Board of Control of the concerned Department/Dean Student Welfare and in no such case a credit for attendance/participation shall exceed 10%, meaning thereby that 10% condonation which includes any other activity also. He said that they as custodians of the University have the responsibility to maintain the sanctity of the Rules and Regulations of the University which they themselves frame. A decision be taken that minimum 33% attendance is required and why should they have the condonation. What could not be done directly, they are trying to do it indirectly that minimum condition of 75% attendance, they have brought down to 33% which is the case with the Department of Laws. At least they could take a conscious decision, if not on paper, that anybody having 33% attendance would be given the roll number.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that when they have made a Committee to frame the condonation of lectures, it should have been comprehensive keeping in view the semester system of examinations. They are giving the benefit of 15 days for medical problems whereas the total classes in a semester are held for 60 days.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could be said that if a student has not been able to attend the classes because of the circumstances beyond his control, the shortage of lectures would be condoned by the Board of Control. 33% attendance is compulsory. The power to condone the shortage 10% of lecture each is with the Chairperson/Board of Control, Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate. It might be only in double digit that someone who could not be covered, it could be said that using extraordinary power, the same be also condoned which could be less than 10%. He has no hesitation in accepting that they have been doing it in the Syndicate and getting it done from the Vice-Chancellor wherein the student has not attended even one lecture. Where the power even does not lie with the Syndicate or Senate or the Vice-Chancellor, what is happening that when the power does not lie with anybody, then the power lies with everybody. He has the knowledge of hundreds of such cases. He said, that is why, we should not open it and say that a student, who has 33% attendance, should be allowed to appear in the examination, at least the instructions could be issued. There are different kinds of instructions for the Colleges not only in Chandigarh but outside, why outside, but in Chandigarh also that whosoever is falling short of lectures, he should be given the relaxation just like income tax slab that below a fixed percentage, certain fine be imposed and the lectures be condoned. Who has even less than 10%, so much fine be imposed. It could be said since a student has not attended even a class, that

could be imposed a heavy fine. That is being done by the Colleges despite the UGC Regulations and the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate. They would start doing such thing instead of getting the certificates which are not genuine certificate from different sources including burdening the office of the Dean Student Welfare where he says that the student could get the shortage condoned. Similarly about the medical certificates, if a particular Doctor does not issue the medical certificate, the student could be get the same from other doctors. In the same manner, the Syndicate says that if they do not condone the shortage, the students would fill up a fee for appearing in a particular paper and appear in the examination. He said that if they could not take care of their own rules, nobody stops them from being liberal at least informally.

The Vice-Chancellor said that with the minimum requirement of attendance being 33% and 30% (10+10+10) being condoned, the bone of contention is only 12% and even then if a student says that he/she was admitted in the hospital, that could also be added.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as said by Shri Ashok Goyal, there are so many departments which do not bother even about 33%. But the real problem is that the genuine players or who genuinely participated in NCC camps and as per the provisions, the departments say that they could not condone beyond 10%. Some departments have given the attendance for actual days while other departments have not given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for the *Jhankar* function, when Professor Naval Kishore was the Dean Student Welfare, a decision was taken that within 3 days of the conclusion of the function, Dean Student Welfare office would send to the respective departments all the details of the students who participated in the programme so that nobody is able to misuse the facility after 3 months. But it was never implemented for the obvious reasons. He simply wanted to say that those students who are genuine, they never faced the rule. The rules are proposed and modified only for those who want to take the undue benefit of the lacunae in the system. They are not against them also. All of them want to help the students. Why should not they accept that what they are doing? Otherwise if a genuine problem is concerned, as they are thinking in possible terms to create a computerised record in the Health Centre, could it not be done in the office of Dean Student Welfare or in the Departments by which they would be able to know automatically about who are the genuine participants.

Professor Anil Monga said that whatever is issued afterwards, whatever is done, they plan it in advance and involve the members of the various Committees, the Dean Student Welfare office should decide and then accordingly give signature and only those students should be given. This process should be done in advance and not post-function because otherwise the Dean Student Welfare and the Departments also face problems and are under pressure.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that what they see in the University Institute of Legal Studies, being a very big department that sometimes the students who had genuine problems could not get the roll numbers and are not able to appear in the examination because they could not get the fake certificates prepared. Sometimes, the students ask the department about the level of the certificate whether of the

Medical College or private practitioner the department needs to issue the roll number and produce the certificate within 2 hours. Sometimes, they have seen such incidents that a male student submits the certificate issued by a gynaecologist. He thinks that their system is wrong and they themselves compel the students that if they submit the fake certificates, they could be allowed to appear in the examination and those with genuine reasons could not do so. They should try to find a way out. There are examples that a student who does not even attend a class in the whole semester but gets the roll number to appear in the examination.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the problems arise only when they prepare the attendance chart which is shown to the students and only then the student comes to know about it and tries to make good the shortage.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is the bone of contention at the moment. The practical situation is that a student who has 1/3 attendance, he/she must have gone up to 75% by manoeuvring in one way or the other. So this proposal is that the restriction could be fixed at 1/3rd.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when all the channels are exhausted, the students go to the High Court and the High Court says that the student be allowed to appear in the examination and since the examination has been held, the result be also declared.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said the benefit could be given as per earlier rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said if they see the previous rule, by quoting the same rule, the students take the certificates from the office of Dean Student Welfare and the practice is going on for decades together and the departments used to consider the same. It meant that they were not following the rules. If they talk about the previous Rule 4.1 and the present, guidelines are exactly the same. But in Rule 4.1, the activities were not mentioned which now have been mentioned in Rule 4.2 and these activities were being recommended. But now these activities have been specifically mentioned and restricted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is 10% over and above for the activities which were mentioned in Rule 4.1 with the additional qualification that 33% attendance is must. Why this 33%, would they be able to ensure this 33%? Then the condonation as is within the power of the Chairman or Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate, then by condoning that also, they have to ensure that 33% attendance is there.

Professor Shelley Walia enquired why they have this condition of compulsion for the students to attend classes to take higher education?

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are not a private University. They are governed by the UGC Regulations.

Professor Shelley Walia said that then the UGC Regulations should be followed as it is.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if there is a requirement of 75% attendance in the UGC Regulations, that has to be followed. It is to be seen that they have to facilitate that 75% attendance, while the students are there to do all kinds of activities for all round development by encouraging all kinds of activities. There should be an algorithm and to have that algorithm in place, it is compulsory to keep the minimum attendance at 1/3rd.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in professional courses including science courses, requirement of 75% attendance is compulsory. In professional courses like LL.B., the students have to get a certificate of the attendance from the departments and only then the license to practise is issued.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that it is right to give the credit for taking part in inter-college youth festivals and tournaments and not for others as the same is just like a backdoor entry.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he agreed with Principal Surinder Singh Sangha because sometimes the students could say that they have organised a blood donation camp.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the power to condone a specified percentage of lectures given to the Board of Control, Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate is meant only for these kinds of activities such as blood donation camps, motivators for some programmes. It is not the case that all the shortage of attendance should be condoned for all the students.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in the meeting of the Committee held on 05.01.2016, no representative of the students was involved. If the students have an elected body, their representative should be invited in such meetings so that their concerns are attended to.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the decision had been taken in consultation with the students' representatives.

Referring to the protest being organised by the students outside the Administrative office, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the students are agitating and the situation is worsening. He wanted to go to the Main Guest House but the gate is not being opened for the fear that the students would enter inside the building. He requested that if thought proper, they should try to control the situation with the help of Dean Student Welfare.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a discussion had taken place with the students who were earlier sitting near the Vice-Chancellor's office. They could not roll back the fee hike. He had requested the students not to sit near the Vice-Chancellor office to which the students agreed. The students also know that if any decision regarding reversal of fee hike is to be taken, that has to be taken by the Governing Body only. It could be possible that the students decided to protest at the time of the meeting of Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is a party to the decision taken regarding hike in fee.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he had got his dissent recorded on the issue of fees hike.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to resolve the issue of attendance.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in the Department of Evening Studies, they did not issue the roll numbers to the students not having 33% attendance. For the other activities like sports or inter-college competition, they get a certificate from the Directorate of Sports. For participation in youth festival, they procure a certificate from the Youth Welfare Department. Regarding the blood donation camps, they have their own records. They did not give any benefit to the students who submit the medical certificate and ask the students to get it countersigned by the Chief Medical Officer of Panjab University. The students should be encouraged to participate in sports and activities. But the problem is that the students submit the fake medical certificates. The benefit being given for 15 days medical is going on of the annual system whereas now there is a semester system of examination in place which meant that the duration of medical certificate should be reduced to half. If the total duration of the classes is 50 days and the students submit the medical certificate of illness for 15 days and take the benefit. He had already pointed out in the meeting of the Chairpersons and also in the Syndicate that but it was not considered that the medical certificates submitted by the students should be seen by the Chief Medical Officer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him take a cue from what Shri Ashok Goyal said. The requirement of UGC is 75% attendance. They have the condonation formula of 10% by the Board of Control, 10% by the Vice-Chancellor and 10% by the Syndicate in practice so far meaning thereby total condonation of 30%. 25% is already relaxed by the UGC which actually goes to 55%. They should raise the minimum limit from 33% to 45% and those students who do not get 45% attendance, they would not be issued the roll numbers to appear in the examination. All kinds of condonations have to be adjusted within 55%.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the minimum requirement of attendance could be the same as is already prevalent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the proposal is to take it beyond 33%. What the Vice-Chancellor has said is right that it should be written that provided further that no condonation of whatever kind whether on medical grounds or within the power of the Board of Control or Vice-Chancellor or Syndicate would be allowed beyond 33%.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that in the College, they inform the students about the attendance every month but not at the end of the session and the students have the chances to improve the shortage of attendance. The Coordinators of Cultural Affairs and Sports provide the list containing the name and number of days that a student taken part in the activities. They reduce the number of lectures delivered during that period and count the shortage. Regarding submission of medical certificate, as per Panjab University Calendar, any medical certificate of the duration of more than one week has to be from the Government hospital. The genuineness of the medical certificate is also got checked.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that normally in the Colleges the procedure is that if a student does not come to the College for 10 days and the College has got no information about the participation in any activities, the name is struck off. He wanted to know whether such kind of practice is prevailing in the University or not. Secondly, as they are talking about the medical certificate, whether the medical certificate is submitted by the students soon after getting well and joining the department or at the time of taking the examination?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had pointed out that they could ask for a data that how many students from the Colleges have been detained annually and then a round of the Colleges not outside Chandigarh but within Chandigarh and see how many students are attending the classes. He has told what is actually happening and that there is a specific fee which is being charged. As far as genuine medical certificate is concerned, he could produce thousands of such certificates which are on the record of the University relating to even those days during which the students have attended the classes and they are giving the certificate for that particular certificate also without checking the record because practically it is not possible to cross check all the records and initiate action. Secondly, gone are the days when they could enforce that the certificate issued only from the Government hospital would be acceptable. If somebody is not going to government hospital, how could they pressurise someone to go government hospital when one could have the choice to go to well established private hospitals like Fortis, Escorts, etc. So, that is not possible. In the University, there is no such provision that if some student does not report for 7 days, his/her name be struck off. That is only for the first 10 days of the start of the session so that if a student has vacated the seat, the seat is not get wasted and some other student be admitted in that place. That is the only issue. As far as the medical certificate is concerned, if the certificate is not genuine, it is to be submitted at the time of getting the shortage of lectures condoned. He thought that it is good to keep the minimum at 33%. Even if they are able to carry 33%, that would be a great achievement.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the academic standards should not be diluted and the minimum requirement of attendance should be at least 45-50%.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that just because the classes are not taken by the teachers, there are brilliant students who do not want to go the classes who are sitting in the Library and not attending the classes on the assurance that the minimum attendance could be given. There are such students also who have qualified the competitive examination of IAS and did not attend even a class. As said by Professor Shelley Walia that if a teacher is good, the student would be automatically attracted to attend the classes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as a regulatory body, they have to have an algorithm in place that they are seen to be encouraging people and not seen to be diluting what is the minimum requirement. If the minimum requirement for qualifying in the examination is 33%, the attendance could be at least 40%.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that since it is not being followed practically, some via media could be taken to keep at 33%.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the earlier rule, they could not give more than 10% for all such activities. Most of the departments are not following. He has got incorporated that if the students had actually participated in activities representing the University, that could be accounted for according to the rules. For the other 10%, he did not insist for that. In the earlier rule, there were words 'or similar other activities', the students used to take the advantage of that. The condonation could go up to 60% as the Students Council used to conduct the programmes and on the basis of that Dean Student Welfare used to issue the certificates. So, to curtail that, it has been kept at 10% so that the students who had represented the University that should be allowed as per rules.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything put together at the moment, could not exceed 67%.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if in actual a student went for an international event and spent 2 months, he/she could not attend 33% lectures. For such events, the credit could be given for the lectures delivered during those days and should be deemed to have been attended by the student because the idea is not to discourage the genuine students who have excelled in sports and other activities. The idea is only to curtail the designs of those students who in the name of these activities and in the name of medical certificate are able to exploit the authorities including the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate. He thought some of the departments are giving the benefit for international and nation events.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that though the departments are giving the benefit but it is not in the rules and he wanted that these could be incorporated in the rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that should not be the condonation. The lectures delivered during those days, the credit could be given meaning thereby duty leave and in fact duty leave was sanctioned as far as Colleges are concerned for going to inter-college competitions, youth festival and that was never deducted from the lectures delivered and the practice would be going on at present. For the purpose of condonation, they could fix some limit that under any circumstances, it could not be more than 10% for various activities. They should streamline the procedure that the President, Panjab University Campus Students Council is supposed to submit a list of the various activities held and the students who actually attended those activities. Could there be any supplementary list after a period of the function being held because Dean Student Welfare is probably the Chairman of that Council and also heading the Organising Committee. So, how could it be told that the certificates were issued wrongly? Within a few days of the conclusion of any function, a list of the participants could be sent to the Departments which could not be revised thereafter.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said it could be done to stop the misuse by the Dean Student Welfare

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are so many practical difficulties. People think that the members of the Syndicate and Senate could get any decision done and come for minor favours. They should try to stop the misuse. Let them give it a trial for at least one year.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if a student is on medical leave and the teacher has not signed the proforma, then that certificate could be considered as fraud.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the purpose of the University is to deliver lectures. The system has to be simple and not so complicated.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the minimum attendance should not be below 33% and the students participating in international events could be considered for giving the benefit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no consideration. If a student has not attended the classes due to medical problems, how could that student study? He is recommending that there would be no condonation below 45% attendance. If the members approve, a mid-way could be thought of between 33% and 45%, the minimum attendance could be kept at 40%. So, there would be no condonation beyond 60%. Only exceptional cases could be considered. If they bring the cases of condonation of delay in Ph.D. cases, similarly those exceptional cases could be placed before the Syndicate. It is not a case that a student has gone abroad that he/she would return only on the day when the roll number for appearing in the examination is to be issued.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it could be re-drafted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item be re-drafted and be placed before the Syndicate and the minimum requirement could not be less than 40%.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that 40% actual attendance is must and for medical or any other unforeseen circumstances, the Vice-Chancellor could take decision and place those cases before the Syndicate.

Some of the members agreed to.

The Vice Chancellor requested Dean Student Welfare to redraft the item and the same would be placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested that a representative of the students should be associated in this process.

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'alright, well taken'.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would have a student representative, Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra as members to help in redrafting the item.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that the students should be informed every month about the status of attendance.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they are enhancing some of the charges related with hostels. He pointed out that there are so many reports in the newspapers about the problems prevalent in the hostel regarding unhygienic food, shortage of water. They should try to find a solution to such problems. He wanted to know as to how much approximate fine they are collecting annually.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be answered at this time. He requested Shri Raghbir Dyal should give it in writing and the details could be provided in the next meeting.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that if he has to give in writing and only then he could be given the answer, then what is the use of sitting in the meeting of Syndicate?

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Shri Raghbir Dyal is asking the question because it is an item on the agenda and if while framing the item, the inputs regarding hike in various kinds of fees are not provided, how could they discuss. Shri Raghbir Dyal was just asking about approximate amount.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said he was just asking an approximate amount. He had also asked for the list of sports coaches in the meeting of the Board of Finance and the Vice-Chancellor had promised to provide the same in the next meeting of the Syndicate. But that list has not been provided. Should he give it in writing right now? Then is there no action taken report on what they say in the meetings.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whenever there is any proposal for enhancing any charge, it has to be based on some documentary evidence. Probably, Shri Raghbir Dyal was asking such a thing. They have increased the fine from Rs.500/- to Rs.1000/-. Shri Raghbir Dyal was asking that if the number of students who are fined every year is just nil, why unnecessarily they are going for criticism that the fine has been increased. Now, the question is that there has to be some ground that is why they are doubling the fine where the number of persons who are using the unauthorised equipments have increased manifold. If the number is negligible, then what is the idea of enhancing because basically these things are to generate revenue and also see the logic of day-to-day increase in hostel expenses.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the enhancement in fine is more. If they see the page 320, they have allowed the use of certain equipments which the students are generally using by paying a nominal amount. For example, for use of electric kettle, charges of Rs.75/- p.m. (optional), use of electrical iron Rs.75/- p.m. (optional) and use of hair ironing/hair dryer device Rs.25/- p.m. (optional). Actually, what is happening that generally these things on nominal charges and reasonable fine, the students are using these equipments and if checked, they would pay for these. If they have fixed whatever nominal charges, the student would pay for that. They want the students to use such equipments legally and not illegally. They have also reduced some charges.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that it is appreciated that the option to use electric kettle has been given on nominal charges because there are so many students who study up to 2.00 a.m. and if they need tea, they could avail the facility. The item should be passed as the charges are nominal.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that when the issue is related with the students and the Dean Student Welfare is part of the Students Council, why there is no participation of the students in the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could involve the students in such matters.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a representative of the students has been made a part of the Committee for future meetings.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a problem that they have seen that if they have made the students' representative a member of the Committee because then it could be said that the representative could not attend the meeting and he could publically say that he is not a part of such decisions and could say that he was made a member of the Committee and he boycotted the meeting. He principally agrees that the decision which is to be imposed on the stakeholders, must be taken into confidence so that they do not have to face such kind of protest that is going on outside the Administrative office and would reduce the pressure. There are car parking charges Rs.300/- p.m. subject to availability. He had been going through the newspapers. There was a proposal to ban the four-wheelers on the campus and a referendum had also been done. On the other hand, they are saying that the car parking charges be increased.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a provision that all fresh students in the hostel will not be allowed to keep four wheelers in the Hostel and the residents, who has not obtained permission till session 2015-16, will also not be allowed to keep four wheelers in the hostel.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they could say that only the handicapped persons could be allowed the four wheelers and all others would not be allowed to keep the four wheelers. If they see the model of foreign countries, they would find that the parking charges are so costly for 2-3 hours than the shopping done. That is why those people use the public transport. They could make a rule for the new comers and for existing students, the charges should be doubled.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that imposing a total ban on four wheelers would create problems because there are students who have already been granted the permission.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there is a problem of hostel accommodation as they are providing the accommodation on concessional basis. He suggested that the students who could afford the cars, the hostel accommodation should not be provided to them. Such students who have the capacity to afford cars could stay outside in P.G. accommodation and those who could not afford accommodation outside, could be provided the hostel accommodation.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he agreed with what Dr. Ajay Ranga said about providing hostel accommodation to the needy students. If they allow the existing students to keep the cars and not the newcomers, it would create a problem. If they want to ban the four wheelers, it should be totally banned including all those who have already got the permission.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to be practical and a general parking space could be created in the University. The hostellers could have the cars but those should be parked away in the general parking area.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first of all if there is not enough space in the hostels and the students are not parking their vehicles in the hostels but on the road and there is no mechanism to control them. If about 50 cars are being parked in the hostel, those would also be not allowed to be parked in the hostel the same would also come on the roads and what they could expect the conditions of the roads which are already choked. As far as making rules for the hostellers and having car on the campus of hostellers are concerned, that is a different issue. If they allow hostellers of any category to keep the cars in the hostels, then there is no way out to deny the same facility to the day scholars unless and until as per the referendum, the four wheelers are banned on the campus.

The Vice-Chancellor said that firstly they have to have a paid parking only. Secondly, the parking could be allowed only on one side of the road. There could be no distinction between a day scholar and a hosteller. The hostel residents are not permitted to have the vehicle. But if the residents want to have vehicles, then parking areas could be created which are in remote areas where the parking could be done on payment basis. If they could create a parking space, that could be rent out for parking.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in fact, at one time when Professor A.S. Ahluwalia was the Dean Student Welfare, a decision was taken that the hostellers would not be allowed to park the car in the hostels due to which the roads near Boys Hostel No. 4 and 5 were totally blocked. Then, they had to take a decision that the space available in the hostels would be allotted to the students on seniority basis depending upon the availability. Whatever parking space is available in the hostels is being allotted to the students. Gradually, they have to minimise the four-wheelers. There are so many students who are having the cars but do not take the paid car parking space in the hostels to save the money and park their cars on the roads because they have deputed the guards in the parking areas of the hostels. For outside areas, the decision taken by the University is that from now onwards the vehicle would not be allowed inside the parking without the stickers. It would put a ban on those who were using the parking areas without paying for the same. The parking space also needed to be increased and only one side parking on the road could be allowed. For the time being, they could take a decision that outsiders' vehicles be not allowed in the campus which could be parked in designated areas. The idea is that the students should not be allowed to take the vehicles in the academic area.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have a large number of faculty and the employees who are forced to drive from their residence to the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would face a great difficulty if they ban the four wheelers because then the students could go towards the residential area.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are under compulsion to allow private vehicles for the faculty and staff as they are not having public transport in the campus. Till the time a comprehensive plan is made, they have to do with it. They need parking places for faculty and regular employees. There has to be a very efficient free shuttle

service from the parking to the departments with minimum time and at no cost.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that at the entrance gate near the PGI, sufficient parking space has been created. It is a good space and nobody parks the vehicles there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they move on with a resolution that before the next academic session starts, they would have some practical way to control the situation and not that a referendum should be done again.

Professor Keshav Malhotra requested that the barricades on the roads are creating a big problem as in that space the cars could be parked. He suggested that the concerned quarters be directed to remove these barricades.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the space taken by the barricades, the parking could be easily done. He said that till a comprehensive plan is not made, the parking problem could not be solved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they would have to face the problem from those students who have been allotted the car parking for the last about 2-3 years and if they are asked to take away their vehicles. They have increased the parking fee for those who have already been allotted the parking and not asking them to vacate the parking.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that from today onwards, no fresh permission for car parking be given in the hostels on the basis of the referendum conducted.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the new students would also raise the demand for allowing the car parking.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that on the basis of the decision taken by the Syndicate, an undertaking would be taken from the new students for not bringing the vehicles to the hostels.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the recommendations of the Committees dated 05.01.2016 and 15.01.2016 relating to the changes in the Handbook of Hostel Rules and revision/changes in the fee structure of the hostels, **as per Appendix-XLII**, be approved; and
- (ii) so far as rules recommended by the Committee dated 05.01.2016 (Appendix) for condonation of lectures for the students of Panjab University Teaching Departments for the session 2016-17 are concerned, the same be deferred. In the meanwhile, the rules be redrafted in accordance with the discussion held and the item be placed before the Syndicate.

Deletion of a line mentioned under point No.4 at page 144 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I

41. Considered, if the following line under point No.4 appearing at page 144 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, Chapter (xvii) of Pensionary benefit, be deleted:

“Note:- There is no Pensionary scheme for University employees at present”.

NOTE: 1. The Panjab University Employees (Pension) 1991 effective from 24.10.2005 was published in the Govt. of India Gazette dated 02.10.1993 & 23.02.2006 respectively and stands incorporated under P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

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

After some discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the above said note be deleted.

Recommendation of Board of Control in Mathematics dated 29.01.2016 regarding B.Sc. (Hons. School) in Mathematics

42. Considered the following recommendations dated 29.01.2016 (**Appendix-XLIV**) of Board of Control in the Department of Mathematics that:

- (i) B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics and computing be discontinued from the session 2016-17 and the seats of B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics and computing be merged with seats of B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics, and;
- (ii) From the academic session 2016-17, admission to B.Sc. (Hons. School) in Mathematics only be made with total number of seats 40 (25 seats of B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics and 15 seats of B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics & Computing).

NOTE: The Academic & Administrative Committee in its Joint meeting dated 07.01.2016 (**Appendix-XLIV**) has observed that the Students of B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics will have the option to study computer related courses along with computer based practicals as either Generic Elective or as Discipline Specific Elective. So, therefore, there is no need to continue with B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics and Computing as a separate course from the academic session 2016-17. The seats of B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics and Computing be merged with seats of B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the course proposed to be discontinued is a self-financed one.

The Vice-Chancellor said the University is not like a commercial shop but running for academic considerations and the prime purpose is to provide quality education, training human resources to provide career options.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they look at the data, the seats in B.Sc. (Hons School) Mathematics and Computing are filled up prior to B.Sc. (Hons. School) Mathematics.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it means that the course is in demand.

The Vice-Chancellor said it was discussed in the Academic and Administrative Committee of the Department and recommended for merger with B.Sc. (H.S.) Mathematics. If a course is to be merged, it could not go to the higher level of fee. Therefore, the fee argument is over. Now, the argument is whether the decision of merger is academically sound or not. He cited an example that many years ago, School of Mathematics of TIFR was reviewed along with other Schools. There is a person named David Mofet, who was a pure Mathematician in one of the top Universities and when he moved to a small University to commence what he felt was holistic Mathematics education which is not being given with a purpose of only promoting Mathematics. A small fraction of them apply Mathematics to promote other subjects. So, he advocated that TIFR should assume that responsibility.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Department has given the logic, but not in detail that with the introduction of Choice Based Credit System, the students of B.Sc. (Hons. School) in Mathematics would have the option to study the Computer related course along with Computer based practical as either generic elective or discipline specific elective.

The Vice-Chancellor said that earlier only 15 students were studying the subject of Computer and with this merger, all the 40 students would study that subject.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are merging the self-financed course meaning thereby that the revenue being generated by the Department from various courses, that would remain the same. If any such merger is made in some other departments also, they could adopt the same formula. It could be done because nobody would have any grievance because it is only those lower in the merit who would have to pay more fee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Department has recommended that the students who opt for Computer related course may be charged lab fees as decided from time to time. As said by Shri Ashok Goyal, the students opting for Computer could pay the lesser fee as there is no additional fees for lab. He suggested that the item needed to be redrafted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could be done in consultation of Dean of University Instruction.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that what Shri Ashok Goyal has said is right. But the students could challenge this in the Court on the plea that they are studying the same course in the same Department, how could there be two different fee structures.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that a Committee was formed to discuss the fees structure for various departments of the University and got the fee structure of Himachal Pradesh University (HPU), Shimla. They could adopt the formula of HPU. Suppose there are 50 seats in a course out of which 40 are under general fee structure and 10 seats under subsidised fee structure. There are different fee structure in a single course. The issue should be deliberated and there could be further inputs so that they could implement the same and it could increase the revenue of the University without increasing the workload of the departments and the infrastructure. As far as this course of Mathematics and Computing is concerned, he is of the view that this course is actually popular among the students. It is his personal opinion as he has been associated with the subject of Mathematics. The people from the area to which he belongs, also come to take admission in the University and their first preference is always Mathematics not Mathematics & Computing. If they are offering some Computing subject in the Honours School itself in basic course, it is always welcome. If they have to take further inputs from the Department, that is welcome. If the Department wants to close the course, they should not hesitate to close it. The revenue would not be affected. The hostel seats that they are offering to the students of Computing should be clubbed with the basic course. If they need to take some clarification, they could consult the Department of Mathematics and the Dean of University Instruction, but they should respect the spirit of the Department.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the first instance, a clarification could be sought from the Department.

Professor Shelley Walia said that since the course in Mathematics and Computing is having a better demand nowadays, then why one would go for Mathematics instead of Mathematics and Computing.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that a decision in this regard should be taken at the earliest as the prospectus of CET for admission to this course is about to be brought out and they could face difficulties. Either they could postpone it for another year or authorise the Vice-Chancellor to take a decision in consultation with Dean of University Instruction within a day or two.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the CET prospectus, against this course, a star (*) could be put that a final decision is to be taken about this course.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that since a student is applying for the course in Mathematics and Computing and if they close the course later on, it would not be a good thing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that about 2 years ago, he had observed that the seats in Mathematics and Computing are filled up on the basis of merit earlier than Mathematics.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they could take the feedback from the Chairperson of the Department and the Dean of University Instruction.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to take the feedback from the Department.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Department must have submitted this proposal after taking into account all the issues.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if need be, they could take the help of Shri Raghbir Dyal.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Vice-Chancellor could take the feedback from the department and could take decision.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate. after getting feedback from the Department of Mathematics.

Guidelines for admission to MBA programmes, MBA for Executive (MBAfEX) M.Com. (Hons.)

43. Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 09.11.2015 (**Appendix-XLV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the proposed Guidelines after making correction in existing Guidelines (**as per Annexure-I**) 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.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting held on 23.1.2016/6.2.2016 (Para 22) considered the recommendations of the committee dated 9.11.2015 and during the discussion, the Vice-Chancellor said that if needed further discussion, the item would be taken up for consideration in the next meeting of the Syndicate which is scheduled for 27th February 2016.

This was agreed to.

Initiating the discussion, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that under point no. 7 at page 335 of the agenda, it has been mentioned that the admission of the student under category A, B, C and D which meant that A is international, B is national and so on. Sometimes, there has been confusion as category B is one who gets a medal at national level. In that category, there are two categories – one is senior national and the other is junior national. It should be made clear that if a student gets Bronze medal in senior national and the other gets Gold in junior national, the preference should be given to the Bronze medallist of senior national.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be checked and clarified.

Continuing, Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that at Sr. No. 9, it is mentioned that the case of persons with achievements in games/disciplines not included in Annexure-I but excelling at international level and the cases of sports persons excelling at international level who are otherwise not eligible as per AIU rules. As regards to these, there are some games which are not recognised by the AIU, but it is a very difficult task for the students to represent Panjab University or Punjab in Hockey. It is just like a backdoor entry as there are some games in which not even 7 States participate and the number of participants is very less.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier the game of only 10 meter shooting was included and not the track due to which as per AIU rules, the students could not be granted admission.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the track game is a very costly game.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the suggestions forwarded by Principal Surinder Singh Sangha would be taken care of.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal Surinder Singh Sangha to help in the matter.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha while referring to point 5 at page 336 that where there is an entrance test, tie shall be resolved by considering marks obtained in entrance test only, enquired whether the tie is related with the grade or something else.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that this related with the tie of grade. He requested Principal Surinder Singh Sangha to suggest the changes required, if any, in consultation with the Director Sports.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 09.11.2015 (**Appendix-XLV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, be approved with the stipulation that the suggestions to be put forth by Principal Surinder Singh Sangha in consultation with Director, Sports be incorporated.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 14.12.2015 with regard to counting of past service

44. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 14.12.2015 (**Appendix-XLVI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of Syndicate decision dated 30.08.2015 (Para 11), to re-examine the whole case of Shri Arvind Kumar, Assistant Professor, UIET, with regard to counting of past service, for placement/promotion from Lecturer to Lecturer (Sr. Scale) under CAS as per UGC old guidelines.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.08.2015 (Para 11) has resolved that the matter be referred to a Committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to re-examine the whole case (**Appendix-XLVI**).

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that an item came up for consideration by the Syndicate in its meeting held in January, 2016 related with Dr. Latika Sharma. They had said that the case of Dr. Latika Sharma would go to the UGC. The present incumbent is asking for the benefit on the basis of the judgment in the case of Dr. Latika Sharma. He read out the minutes that “the Vice-Chancellor said that it means that they would have to get it done from the UGC”. Then, it is written that “the Vice-Chancellor said that a Sub-Committee would be formed to give the draft. This was agreed to”. He said that whenever a clarification from the UGC is received, Sh. Arvind Kumar could be given the benefit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the case under reference is that the person was working somewhere.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the candidate has not submitted the Form-16 and also there are so many loopholes. They

have already taken a decision that wherever the case of Dr. Latika Sharma would be quoted, the same would be got clarified from the UGC. Since they have already taken a decision in the month of January, the case should not have been brought for consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the decision of 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 wherein it was said that "the Vice-Chancellor said that it means that they would have to get it done from the UGC. The Vice-Chancellor said that a Sub-Committee would be formed to give the draft. This was agreed to". It meant that in all related cases, clarification from the UGC would be sought.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have not sent any letter to the UGC in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested that the letter could be sent immediately.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that a letter should be sent to UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a discussion had taken place in which it is written that they would write a letter to the UGC saying that these are the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana which have been passed in one of the cases and in view of this they propose that after getting a nod from the UGC, they would consider all such cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that any letter in this regard has not been sent to the UGC. They could not take a decision on the basis of the noting. It appears that they should follow the past and it would be better to pursue it with the UGC.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the case could not be sent to the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the case would not be sent to the UGC. In view of the orders of the Court, they have decided in January that they would frame a policy and after that let they seek confirmation from the UGC that these are the rules otherwise it was discussed that just on the basis of one order passed by the Court, they could not take a decision which is in contradiction of the UGC policy.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred until clarification from the UGC is received as decided by the Syndicate dated 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 (Para 34).

Items 45, 46, 47 and 48 on the agenda have been taken up for consideration on 27.02.2016.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the leave cases of Item No. 48 were approved but a particular case was not considered. It is a good thing that they discuss that the maximum benefit be given to the teachers. There are teachers who have been granted the leave up to 12 years. The same rule of the Calendar applies to the Colleges also. In a particular case, it was said that they could not grant the leave for more than 2 years. He had a document wherein 185 teachers had not been confirmed since the year 2006.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment he would not answer the question arising out of and the same could be taken up in the next meeting. He requested Principal Surinder Singh Sangha to give it in writing and the same could be discussed in the next meeting as an agenda item or during zero hour. As a governing body, they have the right to discuss all the matters.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they had discussed and approved the Item No.48. Was that item not for consideration?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would take up the issue whatever Principal Surinder Singh Sangha wanted to give in the next meeting.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the issue raised by Principal Surinder Singh Sangha is an important one which could be taken up now because till the time the item would be brought, the loss would have already occurred and then it would be of no use to discuss the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal Surinder Singh Sangha to give in writing which would be considered.

Recommendation of the Standing Committee dated 18.01.2016 regarding refixation of date of placement in Lecturer Selection Grade/Associate of Dr. Dharma Bir Rishi

49. Considered minutes of the Standing Committee dated 18.01.2016 (**Appendix-XLVII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of Rule 3 at page 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, regarding "Guidelines for Processing of Serious Charges of Allegations against the University, its Officers and Others" (in pursuance of decision taken by the Syndicate at its meeting held on 14.09.2002 (Para 38) and the Senate on 22.09.2002 (Para XL-66), to consider the matter regarding fixation of date for placement in Lecturer Selection Grade/Associate Professor of Dr. Dharma Bir Rishi, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics. The information contained in office note (**Appendix-XLVII**) was also taken into consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Dr. D.B. Rishi was not given the Selection Grade Lecturer from the date, he became eligible. It is related with that now the same has been recommended.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are teachers whose promotions were pending for very long time.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked how the item has been prepared. He was wondering whether it is some disciplinary case involving some serious charges as the item is to consider minutes of the Standing Committee regarding Guidelines for Processing of Serious Charges of Allegations against the University, its Officers and Others. The issue is regarding placement in the Selection Grade. Why it is happening? He had pointed out earlier also that the Standing Committee was constituted only for looking into serious charges of allegations against University officers. But they have started using that Committee as Grievance Committee as somebody represents any kind of high-handedness or any kind of benefit that was due to some person but was not given, the case is handed over to that Committee. The title is processing of serious charges of allegations and the item is for consideration to give some which was due to that person. He was thinking that there was mixture of two items. While bringing the item, this should be kept in mind. The Chapter in the Panjab University

Calendar is relating to serious charges against University officers. That Committee is to process the serious charges. Now they have started using that Committee as a Grievance Committee for all purposes. The purpose of the Standing Committee is something and they are using the Committee for some other purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there should be a separate Grievance Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in fact they did not have any Grievance Committee. When the NAAC team visited the Panjab University and asked if the University had any Grievance Committee, they told that they have a Standing Committee and the purpose of NAAC was served. Thereafter, they started using that Committee as Grievance Committee instead of making a Grievance Committee. They should have formed a separate Grievance Committee to take care of all such things. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to form a Grievance Committee arising out of the discussion being held keeping in view the fact, kind of problems being faced by the University staff in the same format as that of Standing Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Grievance Committee could be formed on the similar lines.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the formation of a Grievance Redressal Committee has been a long pending demand of the PUTA.

RESOLVED: That Dr. D.B. Rishi be placed in the Lecturer (Selection Grade) w.e.f. 27.07.1998 instead of 31.12.2008 {i.e., the date he was placed in the Lecturer (Selection Grade) as per UGC guidelines 1998} and be granted the pay-scale of Rs.12,000-420-18300 (revised to Rs.15600-39100 + 8000 AGP) and, thus, consequent upon his placement as such, he may also be re-designated as Associate Professor w.e.f. 01.01.2006, on completion of 3 years service as Lecturer (Selection Grade) in accordance with UGC Regulations, 2010, as re-designation of Associate Professor was given to all Readers/Lecturers (Selection Grade), who have completed three years in the current pay-scale Rs.12000-18300, instead of 30.12.2011.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Grievances Redressal Committee on the pattern of Standing Committee, to consider the grievances of University employees, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Deferred Item

50. Consider minutes of the Committee dated 16.02.2016 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to review the criteria of eligibility for NRI quota in admissions and preparation of common merit list, under Foreign National/NRI category

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLVIII**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, earlier, there was some confusion about the definition of ward. Now, some relaxation has been given and children, grand-children, siblings, sons-in-law, daughters-in-law, have been included, whereas earlier only sons and daughters were there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whether it is legally sound.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this issue was very hotly debated about 4-5 years ago. It was only because of this interpretation that the University stopped getting NRIs admitted in Panjab University. Earlier, the wards of NRI and before that anybody sponsored by NRIs were being admitted in various courses being offered by the University, and no NRI seat ever remained vacant in P.U. Resultantly, the University was earning good money.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then the same were a kind of management seats.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Yes" these were like management seats, but the only difference was that the fees were taken in dollars.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if they could not convert the NRI seats and the same remained vacant, they should try to find out some solution so that they could fill up the seats.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, the definition of ward is sons and daughters only.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that NRI seats comprised of three types – (i) NRIs, Foreign Nationals; (ii) their children and wards; (iii) NRIs sponsored. Later on, the NRIs sponsored category was excluded with the direction of the Court. So far as children and wards are concerned, any person, who is adopted by the NRI, is included in the Children and wards.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that this issue had earlier cropped up at the time of admission at University Institute of Legal Studies, and a legal opinion had come from none other than Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath and he defined the wards – sons, daughters and dependents. He said that anybody who is dependent on NRIs/Foreign Nationals would be included in the category of wards, and on the basis of several candidates, who fathers were working in foreign countries, but they are not NRIs, their children were given this benefit and were granted admission. He suggested that the said legal opinion should be seen.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that perhaps, earlier, one had to be an NRI and wards were not there.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that, in fact, an affidavit is given by the NRI that he is the NRI and he/she is his dependent, he/she be given admission from my quota, and the person concerned pays the fees in dollars.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if by including grand children, the admission against NRI seats is increased, then there should not be any problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that everything is in the file. They had already got the issue legally examined, wherein everything has been defined, including the wards, NRIs and what should be status of wards while seeking the admissions. Because this issue was also discussed that somebody, who is his class fellow and has much lesser merit than him, but his father happens to be an NRI, though they were studying in the same school in Chandigarh, at the time of

admission in the University, he/she says that he/she is the ward of an NRI, he/she get admitted, whereas his ward did not get admission. All these things were discussed in the Court also while quashing that NRIs sponsored candidates. Then there is 8-10 pages legal opinion, which was duly endorsed by the Syndicate and Senate, though at that time also there was a lot of hue and cry that they should not accept it because the University is going to suffer a lot so far as finances were concerned. But ultimately it was said, "No", because at that time some admissions made by Guru Nanak Dev University were quashed and they did not want to face the wrath of the Court. Thereafter, they are admitting only those wards of NRIs, who are covered under the definition already accepted by the Syndicate and Senate and has been made a part of the rules. It was also discussed at that time and it was said that it is the candidate, who is seeking admission, should be NRI because he/she should have passed his/her qualifying examination from a foreign University so that a level playing field is there.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that it is the foreign nationals to which Shri Ashok Goyal is talking about.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No, No", foreign nationals are different and NRIs are different. A detailed legal opinion has been given by Shri Anupam Gupta. They do not have any objection because ultimately they say that the candidate has to give an affidavit that he/she is the ward of NRI. What is the definition of ward? Even he could also give an affidavit that he is the ward of NRI. Dr. Ajay Ranga is right that people used to say that anybody could be called the ward of NRI. He suggested that they should check the file and for the time being, consideration of this item should be deferred and they should take a decision whereby they do not have to face any problem from any quarter.

This was agreed to.

**Donation of Rs.10,00,000
for institution for
endowment**

51. Considered the request (**Appendix-XLIX**) of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge, and

RESOLVED: That an endowment of Rs.10,00,000/- (Rs.8 lac for Founder's Day Colloquium function and Rs.2 lac for Award of Medals) be accepted for institution of Endowment in the name of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge for Founder's Day Colloquium and Award of Medals, with the following terms and conditions:

A Founder's Day Colloquium (Rs.8 lac)

- (i) only 50% of the interest earned on the above said amount be used for this purpose and the rest be left for growth of the fund.
- (ii) A colloquium Function at the Dental Institute be organized every year in the month of November to all students of all courses.
- (iii) If any payment is to be made, all rules and regulations of Panjab University be observed.

Guest Speaker at the Colloquium, who come from far away places/foreign be provided accommodation

at P.U. Guest House for one week duration, if required/needed.

- (iv) The function be not clubbed with any other function of the Institute.
- (v) Announcement of the function be made in the University news as well as in the newspapers via a University Press release.

B Award of Medals

- (i) only 50% of the interest earned on the above said amount be used for this purpose and the rest be left for growth of the fund.
- (ii) The name of the awards be “Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital Awards.”
- (iii) The Awards/Certificate could be named- Vice Chancellor’s Medal/Certificate Principal’s Medal/Certificate Dental Surgeons of the Year.

Or similar acceptable/suitable titles (but three different names of the three awards to the three different individual candidates)

- (iv) These be consolation awards for the next three final year’s students on graduation, who could not get the Gold Medal with the following conditions:
 - (a) Performance and behavior is certified to be satisfactory by the Principal of the Institute
 - (b) The candidate is among the top ten percent (10%) in the final year results.
 - (c) The candidate must have minimum ninety percent (90%) attendance in each of the four year of BDS Course.
 - (d) The candidate must have passed all the examinations during the four years of the BDS course in Dentistry in first attempts.
 - (e) The candidates have to attend the Institute Founder’s Day Function to receive the Award/Certificate.

Revised Regulations/Rules for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences

52. Consider if, the revised Regulations/Rules (**Appendix-L**) for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences, be approved w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.10.2015 (Para 22 (R-xv)) (**Appendix-L**) had resolved that the Regulations/Rules and course structure (Appendix) for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences w.e.f. academic session 2015-16, be approved with the stipulation that the system of examination prevalent in Honours School courses be followed, and the relevant provision/s of Regulation/s be amended accordingly and the same was ratified by the Senate in its meeting dated 05.12.2015 (Para XLI (R-13)).
 2. The Coordinator, PU-ISSER vide No.741/GM dated 12.01.2016 (**Appendix-L**) was requested to amend the Regulation/s of the said course as per decision of the Syndicate. Now, the Coordinator has sent the revised Regulations/Rules with amendments.
 3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-L**).

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed that it has been mentioned under Note 1 that "The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.10.2015 (Para 22 (R-xv)) (**Appendix-L**) had resolved that the Regulations/Rules and course structure (Appendix) for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences w.e.f. academic session 2015-16, be approved with the stipulation that the system of examination prevalent in Honours School courses be followed, and the relevant provision/s of Regulation/s be amended accordingly.....". Meaning thereby, the Regulations, which have been shown as amended, have not been approved by the Syndicate. He, therefore, suggested that the 'revised' word should be deleted.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the Regulations/Rules for Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences w.e.f. the academic session 2015-16, as per **Appendix-L**, be approved.

Inspection Report

53. Consider if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital, Sector-26, Chandigarh for B.H.M.S. course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 50 (fifty students per year) for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the CCH and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

- NOTE:**
1. The Inspection Committee dated 16.02.2016 (**Appendix-LI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, had recommended

that proposed extension of affiliation be granted for the B.H.M.S. course with the maximum number of students the College is allowed to admit 50 (fifty students per year).

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

RESOLVED: That temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital, Sector-26, Chandigarh for B.H.M.S. course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 50 (fifty students per year) for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the CCH and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

Inspection Report

54. Consider if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32-B, Chandigarh, for –

- (i) M.D. (Obst. And Gynaecology) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 06 (six students per year) for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

NOTE: 1. The Inspection Committee dated 15.02.2016 (**Appendix-LII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, had recommended that proposed extension of affiliation be granted for the M.D. (Obst. And Gynaecology) course with the maximum number of students the College is allowed to admit 06 (six students per year).

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

- (ii) M.D. (Radiodiagnosis) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 06 (six students per year) for the session 2017-18, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

NOTE: 1. The Inspection Committee dated 03.02.2016 (**Appendix-LII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, had recommended that proposed extension of affiliation be granted for the M.D. (Radiodiagnosis) with the maximum number of students the College is allowed to admit 06 (six students per year) for the session 2017-18.

2. An office note enclosed
(Appendix-LII).
- (iii) M.S. (ENT) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 03 (three students per year) course for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

NOTE: 1. The Inspection Committee dated 13.11.2015 **(Appendix-LII)** constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, had recommended that proposed extension of affiliation be granted for the M.S. (ENT) with the maximum number of students the College is allowed to admit 03 (three students per year).

2. An office note enclosed
(Appendix-LII).
- (iv) M.D. (Ophthalmology) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 05 (five students per year) for the session 2017-18, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

NOTE: 1. The Inspection Committee dated 14.12.2015 **(Appendix-LII)** constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, had recommended that proposed extension of affiliation be granted for the M.D. (Ophthalmology) with the maximum number of students the College is allowed to admit 05 (five students per year).

2. An office note enclosed
(Appendix-LII).
- (v) M.D. (Community Medicine) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 05 (five students per year) for the session 2017-18, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

NOTE: 1. The Inspection Committee dated 30.12.2015 **(Appendix-LII)** constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, had recommended that proposed extension of affiliation be granted for the M.D. (Community Medicine) with the maximum number of

students the College is allowed to admit 05 (five students per year).

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

RESOLVED: That temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32-B, Chandigarh, for –

- (i) M.D. (Obst. And Gynaecology) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 06 (six students per year) for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.
- (ii) M.D. (Radiodiagnosis) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 06 (six students per year) for the session 2017-18, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.
- (iii) M.S. (ENT) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 03 (three students per year) course for the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.
- (iv) M.D. (Ophthalmology) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 05 (five students per year) for the session 2017-18, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.
- (v) M.D. (Community Medicine) course with the maximum number of students. The College is allowed to admit 05 (five students per year) for the session 2017-18, subject to the condition that the College will obtain mandatory approval from the MCI and will make admission in the courses/subjects thereafter.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 28.1.2016 regarding inclusion of Professors of Government Medical College in the Faculty of Medical Sciences

55. Consider minutes of the Committee dated 28.01.2016 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider request of the Director-Principal, Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh, for inclusion of the Professors of Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32 in the Faculty of Medical Sciences. Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

Initiating discussion, Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that he has carefully gone through the recommendations of the Committee, the Convener of which is the Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor. He pointed out that only four members have attended the meeting of the Committee held on 28th January 2016 and five namely Professor Raj Bahadur, Professor S.S. Johl, Professor D.V.S. Jain, Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal, have not attended the meeting. It has also been mentioned that the comments received from Professor Raj Bahadur, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Ashok Goyal were also perused. What their comments were, have not been mentioned. It has also been mentioned that the Chairperson telephonically checked up with Professor S.S. Johl and Professor D.V.S. Jain and discussed the matter with them at length. What were their deliberations/comments have not been recorded. Without prejudice/bias to anyone, he is surprised that they are trying to take not 1, 2 or 3, but 10 Professors in the Faculty of Medical Sciences. So far as he remembers, during the last few years, the Punjab Government has promoted certain Associate Professors as Professors, but the PUTA did not even allow them to become members of Board of Studies, what to talk about Added Members. Here, the reason is given that only one Medical College is affiliated with Panjab University, whereas tomorrow one or more Law Colleges could also be affiliated with Panjab University, and then the Professors of those Colleges would also demand that they should be made member of the Faculty concerned. Similarly, the Professors of Homoeopathic College might also make similar demand. He added that since they are teachers of affiliated Colleges, they could co-opt them. He does not agree that one would get high respect after getting the voting right. He has already said that without being bias, but to him it seems to be a hidden agenda. It is just an agenda to keep some persons away from the Senate, who are legends and have contribute a lot. There might be several persons in the Syndicate and the Senate, who might not agree with the opinion of the Vice-Chancellor on several matters, but it is his (Vice-Chancellor) duty as a statesman to take everybody along. Not one or two, but 10 Professors of one College are being made members of the Faculty of Medical Sciences alone. Earlier too, the majority in Syndicate members got approved the changes in the assignment of Faculties by blatantly violating the Regulations and got insulted in the High Court. In my opinion, in this Syndicate, majority of the issues placed are of those, which do not agree with the views of Chairman of the Senate – whether it is the case of Dr. Neelam Paul or Professor Rajesh Gill or Professor V.K. Chopra or Medical Faculty the case under consideration. In every Syndicate meeting such cases are placed again and again, to which he does not agree. He does not agree that if they have the majority, they should start following wrong practices. Meaning thereby, there is no rationality. Professor K.K. Talwar is an honour of our country and he salutes him even in his absence, but he does not think that had Professor K.K. Talwar attended any of the meetings of the Faculty of Medical Sciences and given certain suggestions and the Faculty would not have accepted those suggestions. If this is the way they are to continue with the affairs of

the University by deliberately targeting certain individuals, then God saves this University.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, according to him, they should not spend long time in discussion of this, and instead should send it to the Regulations Committee as it is related to amendment of Regulations. Whatever would be the recommendations of the Regulations Committee, the same be placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if they need intellectuals and knowledgeable persons in the Medical Faculty, why they have limited themselves to Medical College alone. Why not, they have sought of intellectuals from the Homoeopathy, Ayurvedic, Unani. All these are the need of the hour. He added that now the people had started towards Yoga. As such, there are many things which they need to corroborate. If it is being done to take political mileage or to give advantage or disadvantage to someone, then it is a sad part. But if it is being done from education or enhancement of knowledge, then it is right.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it would not just be limited to Faculty of Medical Sciences alone, but would open a Pandora's box and since the Principals of Colleges of Education are Professors, they have to make them members of the Faculty of Education. Similarly, in Government Colleges, every Principal is a Professor and all of them would demand membership in their respective Faculty. As such, this issue which has been brought to the Syndicate spontaneously, should not be considered.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that ten Professors seem to be a large number to immediately put into the Faculty of Medical Sciences. He thinks that it has to be spread out to various other disciplines in the Medical Sciences and they could not take only one Institution. Therefore, he thinks that number 10 is very exorbitant kind of a number, which arouses some kind of suspicion. Why 10 and why not 1 or 2. He would have understood had it been 1 or 2 from an Institution. Therefore, he thinks that Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is right that why not spread it across to Yoga, Homoeopathy, Ayurvedic and Unani also.

Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that in every Faculty, all the Senators who are members of the Faculty concerned, they add members. Nowhere the Doctors/faculty members of Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, have been debarred. Earlier, someone had proposed the name of Professor Ravi Gupta, who is a Doctor at Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, for Added Membership of Faculty of Medical Education and he was elected. The main discussion about the framing of syllabi, etc. took place in the meetings of the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Board of Studies. There is election for constitution of Undergraduate Board of Studies and so far as Postgraduate Board of Studies is concerned, the same is nominated by the Vice-Chancellor. He would like to point that 46 nominations were made by the Vice-Chancellor, which are very high, for two years and only 6 were from Sector 32, Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh. Where the specialization of Doctors is required, there they are nominating only 6 persons out of 46, and that too, on their recommendation, and on the other hand, they are saying that Professors of Medical College be made members of Faculty of Medical Sciences. As per the existing system,

the faculty members of each College has the opportunity to become member of the Faculty as an Added Member.

On a point of order, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the Director, PGIMER, Director-Principal, Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh and Principal, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, are the members of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, but they hardly attend the meetings.

Continuing, Professor Keshav Malhotra stated that there are co-opted members also. Who would make the nominations of members? The nominations are made by flouting the regulations. A Standing Committee was constituted, in which the PUTA did not agree that they should put their persons in the Faculty of Languages and also make them ex-officio members of Faculty of Medical Sciences, and that was rejected and no meeting was held again. Good sense prevailed on the members that who were representing the University that will not be for one Faculty, but will have to do so for all Faculties. On the one hand, where the expertise of Professors of Medical Hospital is required, they have nominated only six persons out of 43 nominations made, and on the other hand, they are doing Senate reforms. Instead of this, they should publicly say that they are doing this through the Senate reform on merely on the basis of suggestion of a Principal. When he wrote that their teachers should be given nomination, the matter was not brought to the Syndicate and the Senate. This all is being done on the request of a Principal or he was asked to do so. It seems that the person concerned had been asked to write and might have been assured that they would get it done. In fact, when the request had come, the same should have been placed before the Syndicate for consideration in the first instance, instead of forming a Committee. When something is written by a member of the Senate, the issue is placed before the Senate, but when something is written by a Principal of a College, a Committee is being formed. In the end, he remarked that if they accepted the recommendations of the Committee, it would spoil the whole structure of the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that opinion is coming to the Syndicate and it must be allowed. If any change is effected, it should come only through the regulations. There are members of the Syndicate and Senate in the Committee and their opinion might also be there. So far as Faculties are concerned, there are only 1-2 Faculties where nominations could be made and the procedure for nominations has also been laid down. He thinks that the recommendations of the Committee should not altogether be rejected, but referred to the Regulations Committee along with the viewpoints expressed by the members. Ultimately, they should nominate a few Professors of Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, in the Faculty of Medical Sciences, but definitely not 10, so that their representation is there in the Faculty. This should be done either through the Regulations Committee or through the Syndicate by discussing the issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra intervened to say that if a letter was received from the Principal, the issue should have been placed before the Syndicate for consideration in the first instance. As such, the procedure has not been followed in this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that first of all, as pointed out by Shri Raghbir Dyal, he wonders how the Committee has recorded that

the comments sent by Professor Raj Bahadur, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Ashok Goyal Goyal were also considered. In fact, he has not sent any comments so far as this issue is concerned. He had simply requested that the meeting fixed in the evening of an earlier day be fixed next day. He has no hesitation in saying that the meeting was fixed keeping in view the availability and suitability of the Chairman of the Committee. Probably, it has happened for the first time that the meeting was preponed. He had heard that the meetings are postponed, but not preponed. The meeting was preponed knowing fully well that he (Shri Goyal) is out of station and he has made this statement in the meeting of the Syndicate as well. Still the meeting was preponed and that was also a sudden development as the Chairman of the Committee had to come, as a last minute programme, to Chandigarh and the meeting was preponed. He had only sent the communication that it would not be possible for him to attend the meeting, but here it has been shown as if he had sent some comments on the issue. Secondly, this issue had been discussed threadbare in this very Syndicate in the year 2013. At that time also, Professor Raj Bahadur, the then Principal of Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, who has been made a member of the Committee now, has sent a request, which was considered by the Syndicate and the same was not acceded to by giving reasons. At that time also, it was pointed out that there is no procedure that one Principal of an affiliated College writes and the Vice-Chancellor brings the same to the Syndicate for consideration. He tried to explain at that time that if they do not consider the request, the author of the letter would feel bad that his request has not been considered, and if they consider such a request, it would be in sheer violation of the regulations, which they had not decided to do. So far as amendment of regulations or for that matter any requirement is concerned, a set procedure is given in the regulations itself. It is not that if some Principals or some teachers of affiliated College/s write a letter, and they bring the matter to the Syndicate for consideration. There is a system – either by way of a Resolution proposed by a member of the Senate or by way of a proposal moved in the meeting of the Senate itself, but there is no such system through which such a request could be placed and considered in the Syndicate meeting. It was resolved in 2013 that, in future, no such request be placed before the Syndicate, unnecessarily putting the Syndicate into embarrassment and that was not recorded. Now, when a letter written by the present Principal of the College was received, they overstepped a step further as earlier the request was placed before the Syndicate, which was not acceded to, a Committee has been formed by the Vice-Chancellor to consider the same and the Committee has given the logic for its recommendations and the Principal of the College has also given a logic. The logic is that most of the academic issues relates to Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, which is not a fact. There is another College namely Homoeopathic College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh, the issues of which are also discussed in the Faculty of Medical Sciences. There is also a half affiliated College namely Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46-B, Chandigarh. He is saying half affiliated College because he does not know whether it is an affiliated College or not an affiliated College. If it is not an affiliated College, how they are conducting the examination of that College. If it is an affiliated College, why they are not considering that College for this purpose. So it was in that light only that in the year 2013, the Syndicate decided that no such request could be considered. They should themselves see that the author of the letter is already a member of the Faculty of Medical Science. The author of the letter

without attending the meeting of the Faculty of Medical Sciences is writing a letter that most of the issues relate to the College, so the senior Professors should be made members of the Faculty and he has given the logic of academics. He himself does not attend the meeting of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, being the Principal of Government Medical College & Hospital. There is also a provision for co-opting the members. Unfortunately, they are left with only one affiliated Medical College. At one point of time, there were five Medical Colleges affiliated with Panjab University – starting from Amritsar, two in Ludhiana, one in Patiala and fifth in Rohtak. Even at that time, none of the Professors of the Medical Colleges were ever made the member/s of the Faculty of Medical Sciences. So much so, none of the Professors of PGIMER, which was the sixth Medical Institution affiliated with Panjab University at one point of time, was ever made a member of the Faculty of Medical Sciences. Only with a view that in case this is allowed, how could they ignore other affiliated Colleges irrespective of the fact whether they are degree Colleges, Colleges of Education or for that matter Colleges of Engineering. In fact, it is only the Professors of Panjab University Teaching Departments who are the ex-officio members of the Faculties. A difficulty was expressed though never ever any member of the Faculty of Medical Sciences has expressed any difficulty that in the absence of members from Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh. He knew it because he has also been attending the meetings of the Faculty of Medical Sciences. If at all, any such difficulty was faced by the Principal of the College, he wonders why the issue should not have been discussed at the initial stage in the Faculty itself. Had the Faculty expressed its opinion that they are facing practical problem, he could have understood it, and on the basis of that any number of Senators representing that Faculty or otherwise could have moved a Resolution, but the Faculty nowhere has expressed such a thing. It is within the regulations that for getting a particular kind of advice or expertise, there is a provision of co-opted members, and this is what the premise of whole proposal is. He wonders that they started with an academic exercise and in the name of giving honour, as if after getting the voting right, they would be honoured and without the voting right, they would be dishonoured, and as if the Professors of PGIMER and other Departments in the case of Combined Faculties, are the dishonoured members because they are co-opted members without any voting right. It is nothing academic so far as the recommendations of the Committee are concerned because the emphasis is on giving the voting powers to the Professors of the Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, to be nominated, and that too, numbering ten, whereas there is a particular provision for co-option of one or two members for taking the advice. Here not only at par with co-opted members, but at par with ex-officio members of a particular College, in which all other categories none of the College has ever been included for making the Professors as members of any of the Faculties, including Faculties of Arts, Science, Pharmaceutical Sciences, etc. Then why only the Faculty of Medical Sciences has been chosen. As has been said, he was sure there is nothing like bias and there is no intention of ousting a particular person and there is no strong disliking for a particular person, but if only one particular Faculty is being isolated in the name of argument that they do not have any Medical College within their University, so they do not have expertise with the University, as if the University had that expertise since the inception of the University, and only now they are facing this difficulty, especially when there was nobody from the Medical College in the University and now they have Dr. Harvansh

Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital and Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh. When all these years they did not have persons from Medical Faculty, there was no proposal for including the Professors of affiliated Colleges in the Faculty of Medical Sciences. He wonders that why anybody has not thought that there is something more than what is seen on the papers. He said it is nothing, but putting an effort after a gap of two and a half years or three years to do once again, what they could not do in the year 2013. He does not know that what could be the motive and background, but since it is in sheer violation of the Regulations and only with the particularly aim to get some people from medical faculty ignoring the legitimate claim of others, the recommendations of the Committee should not be accepted.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that since Shri Ashok Goyal has explained everything in detail, perhaps now, he is not required to readout the lines which he earlier wanted to. Whenever any member of the Senate proposed a Resolution, the same is always placed before the Syndicate for consideration in the first instance. However, he does not know how a Committee has been constituted to consider the Resolution in the first instance. If they go through the recommendations of the Committee, the emphasis is on the voting right, which he fails to understand. Whether the necessity, which has been felt by the Faculty of Medical Sciences, has not been felt by other Faculties, including Faculty of Law? If they allowed this in the Faculty of Medical Sciences they have to do this in other Faculties also. By going through the item, it could be easily gauged that there is nothing like academics. They already have proper opportunity for nomination and also procedure to become Added Members. In fact, he (Vice-Chancellor) should have tackled the letter in question in a better way, when it was received by him, and such a situation might not have arisen.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that one could try to see various things into an item, the reason of which *prima facie* is academic, and academic in the sense, that they have to look at the history of the University. How the Faculties were constituted and why the Faculty structure in the University existed, the way it is. The University did not have Professors, when it commenced. The idea of having Professors on behalf of the University Teaching Departments is only after the 1904 Act of Indian Universities. Professors of the order of 10 came into being slowly and only on the eve of commencement of Honours School System in the University in the year 1919. By the time India's independence happened, there were not many Departments, and the same were only of the order of 15-16 at Lahore and the number of Professors at Lahore was only 10. The University recommenced after independence of India and in the beginning there were no Teaching Departments. The Teaching Departments reassembled at Hoshiarpur in early 1950s when the University started its job in very earnest as early as sometime in April 1948. The University was created in October 1947, and S. Teja Singh took over as *ad hoc* Vice-Chancellor, but on a Regular basis it happened only in 1948. The first task of examinations was undertaken for the sake of the Colleges which were earlier affiliated to the University at Lahore and were now affiliated to the University in Punjab. There were new courses to be run and the whole academics of the University had to be organized, but the question was who would govern the academics of University and that is why this structure is there, which was also in existence when the University was at Lahore. The Fellows of the

University were given a very high stature from the beginning to administer the governance of the University and of all the Faculties on behalf of the University. This responsibility was entrusted to the Fellows. Now, all the Fellows could not be looking after all the Faculties. Number of them was only 93 and if they say everybody just look after the subject of his expertise, there are 10/11 Faculties and number of Fellows in any given Faculty is less than 10, which is a very small number, and from them also very few attend the meeting. As such, it is a too much of a burden. It is in that background that this algorithm has been envisaged that every Fellow must look after the interests of four Faculties (two major & two minor). As such, there are 360 or 372 votes which have been distributed amongst 11 Faculties, which depend upon the choice of the Fellow. So, some distribution occurs, but since a person can know one subject very well and another one a little less, but he may not know well of all four subjects of his choice. What would happen is that the Fellows would be distributed in the Faculties in a manner that they need subject expertise from the people who are practicing those subjects, although all are not practicing those subjects. Few could be teachers, few public men and few might have gone up in civil society, but all of them might not be practicing these subjects. In order to enable the Fellows to discharge the academic duties assigned to them, this wonderful formula has been given that any two Fellows could get together and get a member Added to the Faculty and that Added Member is expected to bring in expertise related to that. Typically, the Fellows picked up teachers teaching a given subject in a given College, and this is how, the teachers of the Colleges and the University who are not Professors become Added Members of the Faculties. The whole procedure/structure is given for election of Added Members in the Faculties. The idea is that the Faculties should be made up in a manner that the academic functioning of the Faculties could get discharged. The time has evolved and the University came into being. The Campus gets created and the University moved to Sector 14, Chandigarh. Professor R.P. Bambah told him that, initially, the number of Professors was lesser at Chandigarh campus, and it was even less than 15. The position of Professor was not even in all the University Teaching Departments. The structure was set in the University that there would be one Professor, two Readers and three Lecturers, etc. etc. Since there were not Career Advancement Schemes, promotions were not there. In fact, the Career Advancement Scheme came very late. It was also there that where the Reader is the Head of the Department, he/she was also made a member of the Faculty concerned. As such, they have evolved slowly. Thereafter, Career Advancement Schemes came and persons started becoming Professors. Now, the most important thing for a University Professor is that one must have a job and the person concerned must be confirmed in that position. Thereafter, he should not look left and right. If one would focus on his/her work, he/she could progress and become a Professor, and have enough opportunities in life to serve as a member of the Faculty by virtue of being a Professor. Earlier, there were no Professors in the Colleges and only a few Principals were given the pay-scale of Professor. This is how, they have evolved. The University has also been contracting and expanding. At one point of time, everything was with the Panjab University. Later on, out of this very University, Regional Centre, Shimla, became an independent University and similarly is the case with Rohtak. The Haryana also taken out its Colleges and established a University, namely Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra. Similarly, the Engineering and Medical Colleges did not remain with them. PGIMER also became a

deemed University, and the courses the examinations of which were conducted by the University, were taken away from them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra intervened to say that even Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, is also becoming a deemed University.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that now the structure has evolved that they do not have everything at the campus. Neither they have the structure nor the land, and that is why, they are unable to construct the Hospital. He remarked that Medical College could never be constructed in the University Campus. Given the stature of this University, Medical College pleaded to be a part of this University. In fact, they should have a Medical College attached to this University. Both Aligarh Muslim University and Banaras Hindu University have Medical Colleges attached with them. Similarly, they should also have a Medical College attached to this University. All the premier Universities of the Countries had Medical Colleges attached to them. Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, is *de facto* their Medical College. Neither have they their own Medical College, nor Homoeopathic, nor Ayurvedic, and they would never ever be. The Indian System recognizes the value of alternative to allopathic Medicines. They also recognize the value of Ayurvedic, Homoeopathy, Unani, etc. So the way the science has evolved and the western science has far more evolved. But the science of other developing Countries relating to experimental basis, qualitative basis, etc, has not developed at it would have been. It has not developed to the level of allopathic. That is why, the western science has that kind of dominance. So it in that background, he valued that the Professors of Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh should be the members of their Faculties and so should be the Professors of Homoeopathic and Ayurvedic Colleges. There is a merit, that it could not be on selective basis that only the Professors of Government Medical College and Hospital, Chandigarh should be members of the Faculty and the Professors of other Colleges not. There is a unique kind of situation as Ayurvedic College used to be a part of this University and when something happened they have not forced disaffiliation on it; rather, they themselves inflicted whatever is there. They have not turned them out and worked against them that they should not be there. There were issues of compliance, which all of them knew. However, they are still conducting some of the examinations for them (that College) because those students had enrolled under them (Panjab University). The UGC also says that once a student is admitted under them, they have to take him/her to the last stage. So this is the background. So the Committee has given the recommendations in that way, and the Committee was made of the people, who are highly respected. All of them know the stature of Professor K.K. Talwar. Yes, they have a point that he should not have preponed the meeting of the Committee without the concurrence of the members. If they have to prepone the meeting, and he could not do so with the concurrence of the members or the meeting should have been held at a later stage at the convenience of the members. So the points which they are raising valid ones, but some of the points, .e.g., that Professor K.K. Talwar or those members including Professor A.K. Bhandari, he has consulted Chancellor S.S. Johl and Professor D.V.S. Jain, he does not have any reason to disbelieve somebody of the stature of Professor K.K. Talwar, as his stature is of national standing and he would not distrust him.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying that he has not sent any comments, whereas it is written that his comments have been perused. That means, he (Vice-Chancellor) is disbelieving him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what he (Shri Goyal) said and whatever he is saying, is on record and it would be known to Professor K.K. Talwar. The minutes of this meeting could be sent to Professor Talwar. So it is not the end of everything. It is just an input and he is not recommending that they have to take a call and accept it today itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice-Chancellor) should just try to understand him.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "he is understanding".

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Professor K.K. Talwar has stated in the minutes and he understands his anxiety to ensure that the people from Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, which is the only Medical College affiliated to Panjab University, are there in the Faculty only with a view to have academic representation. That is how, it started duly supported by their own Dean of University Instruction, the senior-most Professor of the University. It is only Professor K. Gauba, who instead of giving credence to academics, he said unless and until they gave them voting power, it would not be properly honourable. He wonders whether they are talking about academics or honouring. Thereafter, they said unless and until they have the voting right, it would not be a proper honour. Then the Dean of University Instruction seems to have responded by saying, "Alright, on academic issues, they could vote" and at that time, again it was said, "No, No", they have the voting right at par with the ex-officio members. That meant, the exercise which started purely as an academic one, has ended into a political one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that they discussed so many things, but these are only the discussions because they want to speak their minds. So let the discussion, remain the discussion. Finally, they should see the spirit in which Professor Talwar has forwarded the resolved part.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that they are saying that they are doing this mainly for academics. Whichever syllabi is prepared or examiners are appointed or any other academic issue is discussed, that is done in the meetings of the Boards of Studies and about 10-12 meetings of each Boards are held, depending upon the working of the Board. So far as Faculties are concerned, they just met twice a year, in which 50 representations are already there. So far as academic discussions are concerned, it only took place in the meetings of the Board of Studies and not in the Faculties. If they really want to take their services, they should strengthen the Boards of Studies and, thus, should focus on Board of Studies alone.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, first of all, he is not against anything. As he (Vice-Chancellor) has rightly said that he is not recommending anything and they are also not justified. It is their opinion and they are giving their opinion. He started from that, if at all, it is to be considered strictly in terms of regulations and on merits, then it is a matter which falls first within the purview of the Faculty of

Medical Sciences. Therefore, let it be sent to the Faculty of Medical Sciences, where Professor Talwar would also be there.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to the Faculty of Medical Sciences for consideration.

Item 56 on the agenda has been taken up for consideration along with Item 48 on 27.02.2016

The Vice Chancellor said that had they seen the minutes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had seen whatever has been provided to them, but not the minutes as the same have not been supplied to them.

Professor Keshav Malhotra informed that the minutes have been supplied to them.

On asking by the Vice Chancellor, it was informed that the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate have been prepared and supplied to the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though Item 56 had been considered in the meeting dated 27.02.2016 and decision taken, he is sure that it must be covered in the decision, the way it was discussed in the Syndicate, tomorrow some kind of confusion do take place. It was specifically discussed that Semi-Hilly areas as in Punjab there is no hilly area, but in the letter, which has been written by Dr. Gurdip Sharma, he has mentioned hilly areas. So the item which has come is also of hilly areas. Last time, they had also explained the areas. So the words are "Semi-Hilly Areas". Perhaps, in the minutes the words might be Semi-Hilly Areas, and if not, the same should be incorporated.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the words semi hilly areas should be added.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, in fact, those are the 'Kandi Areas'.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that it should be mentioned "Semi-Hilly/Kandi Areas".

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Okay", but they have to give him three minutes' break.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu enquired from the Dean, College Development Council whether the UGC guidelines are relating to hilly areas or semi-hilly areas.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that they just having informal discussion and it is not being recorded. Professor Navdeep Goyal enquired that if a directive came from the UGC that such and such things should be there, could they modify that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said what.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that if any directive came from the UGC that such and such thing should be there.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired is it relating to regulation/s.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, "Yes".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could not make any modification.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that is it not a modification.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No", he has given the Gazette notification of Government of India.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the copy of the Gazette notification is there, then it is okay.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he (Dean, College Development Council) is saying yes, but he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is saying no.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired is the whole Himachal Pradesh hilly area.

Professor Navdeep Goyal replied that the entire Himachal Pradesh is not a hilly area.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired it is semi-hilly area.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, "Yes".

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, that means, Himachal as whole is covered, Una is covered, and Hoshiapur and the upper area nearby Una is not covered in it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that is logically wrong.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there is Punjab Land Preservation Act, 1900. If it is a notified area, then it is okay.

It was clarified that the purpose of the UGC was hilly terrain why it was to be given was because there is a restriction there are so many valleys and one could not get a chunk of land of five acres at one place. That is why, they have given that provision. But in this instance, there land availability is mere.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No, No". Which is the area which they are talking about.

It was said, "Hoshairpur".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not Hoshiarpur.

It was said, "the outskirts of Hoshiarpur".

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it at the same footing as the areas which fall.

It was informed that here the Government notification has been shown, it covers.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor returned, and it was being explained that in the Government's notification it has been shown and it covers those areas stating that it is semi-hilly areas, and they are giving certain relaxation for salary; and it is only for consideration that, and not for distribution of land in that connotation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is not there even for hilly areas.

It is told that for hilly areas, it is there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is also for the same purpose, what he is talking and there is nothing else. Government's notification is only for that purpose in hilly areas also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in Himachal it is not there for all. Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is separate issue – whether it is for hilly area allowance. Not necessary, somewhere the Government is giving, but public sector is not giving; and somewhere public sector is giving, but University is not giving, but the notification is only for this purpose.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that is right, but they could only do if the UGC says.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why he endorses this because the idea is to promote the educational institutions in those areas also. Here it is not expected that somebody could get a chunk of piece of 5 acres of land in those areas and they are not able to get; rather, the position is other way round. In Una it is very easy to get a chunk of land of even 10 acres, but beyond that it is not because thereafter the hills started.

RESOLVED: That the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.2.2016 (Para 56) be modified as under:

“Opening of new Degree College/s having 5 acres land even if it is scattered at 3 places within a radius of 2 kms. in semi-hilly areas/kandi areas, which fall within the jurisdiction of Panjab University, be allowed.”

Request of Shree Atam Vallabh Jain College for discontinuation of B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) course

57. Consider if, B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) course at Shree Atam Vallabh Jain College, Hussainpura, District Ludhiana, be discontinued from the session 2016-17.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 13.1 appearing at page 161 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2009, is reproduced below:

“If any college does not provide instruction, for three years continuously in a subject or subjects in which affiliation has been granted, the affiliation in such subject or subjects shall be cancelled”.

2. Letter No. SAVJC/PU/21.8/14 dated 12.01.2016 of the Officiating Principal of the college for discontinuation of the B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) enclosed (**Appendix-LIII**).

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

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that at the time of giving affiliation/extension of affiliation, the condition of appointment of teacher/s must have been imposed, and the teacher/s might have also been appointed. After the discontinuation of the course, what would be done to the teachers?

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that they have written that in the meeting of the Managing Committee of the College, which was held on 21st March 2014, the issue was discussed by members as no student is seeking admission to B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) course from 2011-12 onwards. And it is precisely two years back. That meant, the student did not come even in the year 2011-12. He enquired whether the affiliation was granted to the College in the year 2011-12.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if the College had appointed the teacher/s, they must protect his/her/their interest. However, if the College did not appoint any teacher, then it is okay.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That Shree Atam Vallabh Jain College, Hussainpura, District Ludhiana, be allowed to discontinue B.Sc. (Fashion Designing) course from the session 2016-17.

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

60(i). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LIV**) 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 Dr. Shankar Sehgal be promoted from Assistant Professor (Mech. Engg.) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Mech. Engg.) (**Stage-3**), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **07.11.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

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

60(ii). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LV**) 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 Dr. Amrinder Pal Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Mech. Engg.) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Mech. Engg.) (**Stage-3**), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **19.04.2010**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the CAS, at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur,

60(iii). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sukhvinder Singh Bamber be promoted from Assistant Professor (Computer Science & Engg.) (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (Computer Science & Engg) (**Stage-2**) at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **25.08.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- 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 the CAS, in Department of Biophysics

60(iv) Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LVII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Biophysics, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Tanzeer Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Biophysics, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **19.08.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under

the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and 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 the CAS, in the Department of Physics

60(v). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Physics, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Physics, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and they would perform duties as assigned to them.

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|------------|
| 1. Ms. Neeru Chaudhary | : | 30.07.2015 |
| 2. Dr. Rajesh Kumar | : | 29.09.2014 |

- 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 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 CAS, in the Department of Statistics

60(vi). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Statistics, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Manoj Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Statistics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **22.11.2009**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

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

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

60(vii). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Economics, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Nitin Arora be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Economics, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **26.08.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- 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-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under CAS, in the Department of Laws

60(viii). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Supinder Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **07.06.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under CAS, in the Department of Laws

60(ix). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP

Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and they would perform duties as assigned to them.

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|------------|
| 1. Dr. Babita Devi | : | 01.07.2015 |
| 2. Dr. Shipra Gupta | : | 18.07.2015 |

- 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 selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under CAS, at UILS

60(x). Considered minutes dated 03.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXIII**) 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 Legal Studies, P.U. Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Pushpinder Kaur Mann Nee Gill be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **01.08.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and 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-3) to Assistant Professor (Stage-4), under CAS, in the Department of Chemistry

60(xi). Considered minutes dated 04.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXIV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Chemistry, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gurjaspreet Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Chemistry, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **07.11.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400 +67000 + AGP Rs.9000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
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 CAS, in the Department of Chemistry

60(xii). Considered minutes dated 04.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Chemistry, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Aman Bhalla be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Chemistry, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **19.08.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600 -39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- 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 CAS, School of Communication Studies

60(xiii). Considered minutes dated 04.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXVI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at School of Communication Studies, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Mohanmeet Khosla be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) at School of Communication Studies, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **31.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the 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-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under CAS, at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib

60(xiv). Considered minutes dated 04.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXVII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor(Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sujit Lahiry be promoted from Assistant Professor (Political Science) (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (Political Science) (**Stage-4**) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **13.08.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000 + AGP Rs.9000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
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 CAS, at USOL

60(xv). Considered minutes dated 04.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXVIII**) 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. Kuldeep Puri be promoted from Associate Professor (Education) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (Education) (**Stage-5**) at University School of Open Learning, P.U. Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **01.04.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the 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 CAS, in the Department of Botany

60(xvi). Considered minutes dated 04.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXIX**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Botany, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kamaljit Singh be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department

of Botany, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **13.10.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000 + AGP Rs.10000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the 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-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under CAS, in the Department of Botany

60(xvii). Considered minutes dated 04.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXX**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Botany, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Botany, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **09.10.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400+67000 + AGP Rs.9000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
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, 2010t

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under CAS, in the Department of Botany

60(xviii). Considered minutes dated 04.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXXI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Botany, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Anand Narain Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Botany, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **23.12.2009**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under CAS, in the Department of Chemistry

60(xix). Considered minutes dated 04.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXXII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Chemistry, P.U., Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ramesh Kataria be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Chemistry, P.U., Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **14.06.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- 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

Appointment of Professor-1 (General) in Department of Environment Studies

60(xx). Considered minutes dated 08.03.2016 (**Appendix-LXXIII**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Harminder Pal Singh be appointed Professor-1 (General) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.10,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University.

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

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

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

compliance to second amendment of
UGC Regulations, 2010

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of promotion/appointment to the persons promoted/ appointed under Item **C-60(i) to C-60(xx)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**Recommendations of the
Committee dated
11.02.2016**

61. Consider recommendations of the Committee dated 11.02.2016 (**Appendix-LXXIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the roster for the teaching positions i.e. Professors and Associate Professors at all levels in all departments be approved, as per guidelines of DOPT, Government of India, as per decision of the Committee in its last meeting dated 01.02.2016 (**Appendix-LXXIV**).

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the earlier roster was different to the one which has been proposed now.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that there were several *lacunae* in the roster which was being followed by the University earlier. First observation in the previous roster was that the persons belonging to the reserved categories, who have been selected against the general category, have been earmarked against the reserved category posts, which was gross violation of the roster policy. Secondly, all the roster points mentioned therein were contrary to the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of R.K. Sabbarwal. Therefore, the entire roster policy has been reframed and the roster has been made cadre-wise and all the Departments have been kept in alphabetical order.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his only concern in this matter is because sometime the University might have to explain its position in the court of law. Though Dr. Ajay Ranga was a member of the Committee, unfortunately he could not attend the meeting of the Committee. He suggested that, in future, in such legal issues, the persons having legal backgrounds should be associated with the Committee/s.

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

Dr. Ajay Ranga clarified that he was not informed about the meeting of the Committee, and that was why he could not attend the same. However, he was made aware of the recommendations of the Committee by the other members and he fully endorsed the recommendations. When an information was sought by Professor Anil Monga, he said that it would have no effect on the positions and only the number of positions would change.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now no one could predict as to which post would get reserved as everything would be done scientifically.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it seems that everything has been taken care of, but it needed to be clarified that if there are five posts in a Department, which one would be kept at No.1 and which at No.5.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that was why, the positions of Professors would not be advertised with specialization.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are certain Departments/Institutes (Dental Institute, UIET, etc.), the post of which have to be advertised with specialization.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there are certain cases where the candidates belonging to reserved categories are not found despite repeated advertisements and the posts remained vacant for years together. He suggested that to come over this difficulty, the post/s should not be advertised specifically for reserved category candidates and if the selection of reserved candidates are made wherever they are found suitable, those posts should be earmarked for reserved category candidates. This could be done to give due representation to the candidates belonging to the reserved categories.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, this meant that the candidate belonging to the reserved categories would be given preference over the general category candidates even if they are more meritorious. Could they ignore the claim of more meritorious candidates of the general category?

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as per the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of R.K. Sabbarwal vs State of Punjab, no post could be advertised with specialization. That is why, he is saying that the post for reserved categories should be earmarked after making the appointment of candidates belonging to reserved categories.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they might face such a problem in multi-disciplinary Departments/Institutes, e.g., UIET, Dental Institute, etc. He would sit with Professor A.K. Bhnadari and Dr. Ashish Jain and would try to resolve it before they proceed further.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the roster recommended by the Committee prepared as per guidelines of DOPT, Government of India, for the teaching positions, i.e., Professors and Associate Professors at all levels in all departments, be approved.

E-mail by Professor Navdeep Goyal regarding agitation by non-teaching staff

62. Consider e-mail dated 20.02.2016 of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Syndic and Fellow, with regard to the ongoing agitation by the non-teaching staff of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that he had sent an e-mail and the reason for the same was that when they went for the agitation, the authorities had talked to them and some of their major demands were accepted, e.g., that the persons working on daily wage basis should not be shunted out and the officiating arrangement should not be discontinued. In fact, it was explicitly told to them that no person working on daily wage basis would be shunted out and the officiating arrangement would also be continued. So far as outsourcing is concerned, that would be only for the seasonal work and, in future, if there is any additional manpower requirement that would also be outsourced. The Manpower Audit Committee has also recommended that some of the cadres, e.g., Cleaners, Security, etc., be made as

diminishing cadre/s and, in future, they be also outsourced. As such, there was no specific reason for carrying out the rally and agitation by the non-teaching staff. Therefore, he thought it better that the issue should be considered by the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that his concern is that the protests are alright so long as these are made after the office hours. Having prolonged agitation during the office hours would put the University in a problem, if somebody reports the same in Delhi, that the University is paying people salary on a day when they are not working. A large number of employees are working in the University on daily wage basis. For the regular employees, they could force them take half or full day's casual leave, but what would they do in the case of daily wagers, who are already being paid so lowly. Since they are working with the people, they have no option but to join them in the agitation. If they join the agitation, they (University authorities) also have no option, but to cut their salaries. His only plea to the non-teaching staff is whatever protest they wanted to make, they could do so, because they are living in a democratic country, but only after or before the office hours. They have been given the liberty to voice their concerns, but his plea to them is that they should do it in a manner so that no penal action is forced on the daily wagers. This is the plea which he had tried to take with them. Which is the organization, the Governing Body of which meets every month? The Panjab University is the only Institution/Organization, the Governing Body of which meets every month. He is a member of Governing Bodies of so many Institutions and has seen the Governing Body of some meets after 3 months and certain others after 4 or six months. Majority of the members of those Institutions are mostly unavailable. Panjab University is the only Institution, the Governing Body of which is alive to everybody, which is a big advantage to them. Where they have such an excess, they should not do things in a manner due to which there is a problem on their own existence. This is the anguish and concern, which he had. He does not want a directive from Delhi under which he has to dismiss 50 odd employees. He knows that the members of the Governing Body are also anxious that the University should run in a smooth manner. If all of them impress upon their own employees that they should use the legitimate form to discuss the things/issues and find solution/s instead of having such confrontation/s.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that, that meant, if he sends an e-mail, would an item pertaining to that be also placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was an issue compelling enough, which he felt that needed the attention of the Governing Body of the University. As such, he has used his prerogative to place the matter before the Syndicate.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would try to send an e-mail to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he responds to him (Shri Raghbir Dyal) most of the time whenever he writes to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is his opinion and it should not be taken otherwise. In fact, Professor Navdeep Goyal should not have sent this e-mail. It looks as if it is on the asking of somebody that send an e-mail or on asking that since he was present there, what happened. The Registrar, who in fact, was holding the meeting with

the employees, was supposed to be fully competent to give the information to the Vice-Chancellor that in spite of the fact that most of the demands of the employees have been met, he did not know as to why they are still agitating. It was very well in the purview of the Vice-Chancellor, if he deems fit, to report the matter to the Syndicate either for information or for consideration; rather than involving a member of the Syndicate, as if neither the Registrar nor the Vice-Chancellor are bothered about the reputation of the members of the Syndicate. As told by Professor Keshav Malhotra, they did not know as to what has happened. Perhaps, few of the members who belonged to the campus might be aware. Under what circumstances, especially when the negotiations were taking place between the employees and the Registrar or his team, a member of the Syndicate was sitting there? Whether it was by chance or deliberately or he was called by the Registrar. All these things should have been explained that he was invited for negotiation and convincing the employees that they have no base for going to the agitation or may be deputed by the Vice-Chancellor. It is not just believable that he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) was sitting there by chance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that he was present there by chance.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is still more serious if he was there by chance, he has shown so much concern as a member of the Syndicate. He was sure that besides the Registrar, there must have been some other officers also and none of the officers shown their concerns as to why the agitation was going on despite the fact that their demands had been met. As such, the Vice-Chancellor should have brought the item on his own that agitation could not be accepted as a part of the work culture and why at the cost of public annoyance. They should not be allowed to agitate as after all they are being paid handsomely, but should not unnecessarily harm the persons working on daily wage basis, who are already getting much less salaries. Again he said that, had he been in his place, he would not have sent the e-mail, and instead he could have told otherwise that the matter should be placed before the Syndicate, so that a message could be given to the employees, but not by sending an e-mail. Because the item before the Syndicate is, as if he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is complainant.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that he has neither made the complaint and nor he is a complainant. He just wanted to bring the matter to the notice of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item is to consider the e-mail of Professor Navdeep Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Registrar has placed the e-mail before him, and he ordered that it should be placed before the Syndicate for information.

Issue regarding confirmation of Dr. Jagdish Rai, Assistant Professor, Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology

63. Consider the case regarding the confirmation of Dr. Jagdish Rai, who was appointed as Assistant Professor in the Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology w.e.f. 05.06.2014 (A.N.) on probation of one year and was due for confirmation w.e.f. 06.06.2015. His work and conduct report has not been recommended as satisfactory by the concerned Department as per the enclosures and letters from, the

Head of the Department dated 10.03.2016 and 30.11.2015. The Regulation 5 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“Every appointment whether by direct recruitment or by promotion or by any other method approved by the Senate shall be made on probation for a period of one year, which may be extended by the appointing authority for a period not exceeding one year. The appointing authority may, however, grant exemption in exceptional cases.”

The Vice-Chancellor stated that this item related to a faculty member who joined the University about a year ago. His probation is sought to be extended by one more year and in between there are a lot of complaints from the Department concerned about his functioning. The Department has sent a report that his probation period should be extended, and he has already extended his probation up to 6th June 2016.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to when the probation period of Dr. Jagdish Rai was extended, because from the papers they have not been able to find this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that his probation has been extended after 12 months. In fact, he (Dr. Rai) should have been told about the extension of his probation period, but it has not been done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, earlier, in a similar case, the services of J.S. Rathore was terminated and he got the relief from the Court as the University has not followed proper procedure in his case.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he did not receive complaint from the Department against him (Dr. Rai), and the complaint/s came to him after the period of 12 months was over. The complaint was serious and the person concerned has also applied for extraordinary leave during the probation period itself. The Registrar stopped the same saying that how extraordinary leave could be granted to an employee, who is not even confirmed. In the meanwhile, all this mess started coming, i.e., complaints from the Department concerned, his colleagues, etc., but everything was oral and not supported by the documents. Then he had a meeting with Professor A.K. Bhandari and certain other people, wherein it was said that it would not work as they have to document everything. So the documents arrived only today. Technically, 12 months are over and they have not given him the notice, but he has himself created a mess for himself by applying for leave during the probation. In the background all this, they should discuss the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired has he applied for extraordinary leave after completion of 12 months.

It was told that Dr. Jagdish Rai had applied for grant of extraordinary leave after 12 months.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though Dr. Rai is not confirmed, he is also not probation after a period of 12 months. Definitely, positive order qua confirmation has to be passed, but after completion of 12

months, they could not extend his probation. They could take a time of six months or more in conveying the order of his confirmation and could say that he is not confirmed, but could not say that his probation period is extended.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that in accordance with the service and conduct rule, if a person is appointed on a probation period of one year, and if they do not communicate to him/her well within the probation period that his/her probation is being extended due to such and such reason/s, his/her probation period could not be extended for another year; rather, he/she would deem to be confirmed from the due date, i.e., after the completion of the probation period. Since neither have they issued any order that he is confirmed nor issued any other communication stating that his probation period is being extended for another year, he deems to be confirmed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is very much possible that somebody behaves very well during the probation period of 12 months, but habitually he is not a well behaved person. If one starts misbehaving after 12 months, i.e., after the probation period is over, there is another method to deal with him/her, and not that they could extend his/her probation period on the basis of work and conduct not to be found satisfactory, and instead they have to deal with him/her as a confirmed employee of the University. In fact, then they have to proceed as per the service conditions. Why he is saying so because in one case they had done this as the person concerned was habitual offender and he is also appointed on compassionate grounds on the recommendation of a well known person. But after completion of probation period, he started creating problems, and they extended his probation and thereafter terminated his services. The person concerned remained jobless for 4-5 years and after seven years, the University had to pay him arrear in lacs of Rupees on the ground that they could not extend his probation period after the completion of the probation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, technically, before the end of 365th day, the person concerned has to be told that his/her probation period is being extended for another year.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that suppose the Chairperson concerned has reported to the Registrar maybe after 300th day, but if the person concerned is not communicated about the extension of his/her probation period, then also he/she deems to be confirmed. As such, the correspondence between the Department and the administrative office does not matter. Why the Department did not inform in the first year itself because nobody would like to have somebody whose work and conduct is not satisfactory, and nobody would like to at least confirm a person out of compulsion just because they could not extend his/her probation period. But still if they want to know as to why this situation has come, it is for the Department because he is sure that he might be behaving like this only and they must have been giving him leverage time and again. Ultimately, now they felt that nothing could be done, they wrote to the University authorities and the Vice-Chancellor asked them to provide the documents. If nothing is done, the University would have to bear him for another about 30 years as he must be a young boy, just because they did not take action well within the time. He submitted that, in future, such an item should be discussed threadbare before bringing the same to the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that now they should go back to the items, the consideration of which was deferred in the previous meeting. Let them go through those items and spend at least 5 minutes on each item, and if they want to defer them, it would be okay with him. When the members said that they would not be able to do anything in the allotted five minutes, the Vice-Chancellor said that at least they should see as to what those items were.

The Vice-Chancellor said that one of the items, i.e., Item 20, relates to series of letters written by one of their re-employed Professors.

Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that, in fact, the item to which the Vice-Chancellor is talking about is Item 21 and Item 20 is "To consider issues contained in the letter received from Chancellor's office".

The Vice-Chancellor said that Item 20 is 'Letter which came from the Chancellor's office'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it would take time to discuss Item 20, but he would like to make an observation. A note has been given under the item that "The item was placed before the Syndicate at its adjourned meeting dated 6.2.2016 (papers related to Item 15) as an Information Item. It was desired by one of the members that the item be placed for consideration in the next meeting". But it is not a fact as nobody desired that the item be placed for consideration; rather, the item was placed for information. He just wanted to seek one or two clarifications out of the contradictory positions, to which he (Vice-Chancellor) said that he would not allow any discussion on any item under information, but he could bring it for consideration in the next meeting. Not that he (Shri Goyal) requested that it should be placed for consideration. As such, the note should be deleted or it should be mentioned that the Vice-Chancellor said that it would be placed for consideration or whatever had been decided at that time because it looks as if only one member of the Syndicate wanted that the matter should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration and the rest of the members were interested in noting the information.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter actually needs to go back to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No", because that is why, he said that he (Vice-Chancellor) has brought the item for information and unless and until some is discussed on the information, if at all, it requires, and it requires very serious discussion as the letter is full of glaring contradictions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that that is his (Shri Goyal) opinion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No", he is sure that he (Vice-Chancellor) would also agree that it is not that simple as it has been made out. That is why, he wanted to say that the item under information contains so many contradictions, and he (Vice-Chancellor) said that alright, he would bring it for consideration; otherwise, he would not allow discussion. But here it has been written that it has

been brought for consideration on the request of one of the members, that he wanted to get deleted/changed. Secondly, he feels that it would take time, therefore, its consideration should be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Okay".

The Vice-Chancellor said that Item 21 also relates to series of letters written by a re-employed Professor and the same is also a very serious issue. Whatever happened in the previous meeting, the discussion has been recorded in the minutes, the members could go through the same.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that these deferred items should be listed in the agenda of the next meeting of the Syndicate in the beginning.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Fine", no issue at all.

The Vice-Chancellor said that next relates to Enquiry, which is also a directive from Delhi. The papers were supplied to the members in closed sealed cover.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why these were supplied to them in sealed cover, that too, sealed with sealing wax. He could understand if the issue relates to very-very sensitive matter, i.e., sexual harassment, but to send this kind of enquiry report in a cover sealed with sealing wax, he does not understand the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it relates to a member of this House. That is why, some precaution has been taken.

The Vice-Chancellor urged the members to read all these documents so that they could have fruitful discussion next time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no one knows the History of the University more than the Vice-Chancellor, but he has perhaps not noted that earlier the meeting of the Syndicate was held once in a month and now also held once in a month, whereas now so many new Departments have been established and so many more Colleges have been granted affiliation. That is why, such a huge agenda is being placed before the Syndicate every month. This has been discussed a number of times that the meeting of the Syndicate be held at least twice a month, and the only problem is that when the agenda would be sent and how the minutes would be prepared.

At this stage, after some discussion, it was decided that the next meeting of the Syndicate be held on Sunday, the 17th April 2016.

Routine and formal matters

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

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes dated 02.11.2015 of the Committee regarding framing policy for transfer of faculty within the Panjab University System vide which it has been recommended that when a person applies for a post advertised in Panjab University, he/she applies for a particular Institute located at a particular place as per advertisement, say for Chandigarh or Hoshiarpur or Muktsar or Ludhiana etc. and gets selected through open/competitive selections from amongst the persons who had specifically applied for that Institute at that place only. Therefore, it is not advisable to transfer him/her from one place to other. In case, a person appointed at an Institute/place in Panjab University wants to move to another Institute/place in Panjab University, he/she has to apply for that Institute/place in Panjab University and compete with other applicants in open selections and at the time of interview his/her application should be considered, strictly on merit, without any bias.

(ii) In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Pratibha Nagpal, Professor Department of English & Cultural Studies, on contract basis up to 28.02.2021 (i.e. attaining the age of 65 years), w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58) and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: 1. Rule 4.1 appearing at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:-

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

2. Senate decision dated 29.03.2015 (C-20) circulated vide Endst. No. 3947-4027/ Estt./I dated

11.05.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.

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

(iii) In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. I.B. Prasher, Professor, Department of Botany, on contract basis up to 17.02.2021 (i.e. attaining the age of 65 years), w.e.f. the date he joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/ regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58) and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: 1. Rule 4.1 appearing at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:-

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

2. Senate decision dated 29.03.2015 (C-20) circulated vide Endst. No. 3947-4027/Estt./I dated 11.05.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.
3. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus usual one day break will be there at the

completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009 will be applicable.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Dr. Aditi Sharma, Assistant Professor in Law to work as Student Welfare Incharge (Hostel) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, effective from the date she has actually joined as such i.e. 21.01.2016 (AN), on the same terms and conditions, according to which Dr. Shiv Kumar Dogra, Assistant Professor in Law has worked as Student Welfare Incharge (Hostel).

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, has re-employed Shri Jagan Nath Dhiman, Senior Scientific Officer (Cartographer) (G-I), University School of Open Learning, P.U. (who retired from the University service on 31.07.2014) on contract basis for six months (w.e.f. 23.12.2015 to 22.06.2016 with one day break on 22.12.2015) or till post is filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on fixed emoluments i.e. half of the salary last drawn (excluding HRA, CCA & Other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100 irrespective of the fact whether he has opted for pension or not. His salary be charged/paid against the post of Senior Scientific Assistant/ Scientific Officer (Cartographer) (G-I), USOL vacated by him on his retirement.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in terms of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) has approved the re-employment of Dr. Arvind K. Sharma, Professor (Retd.), Department of Music, on contract basis up to 05.01.2018 i.e. the date of attaining the age of 65 years, as per rules/ regulations of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF.

NOTE: 1. Senate decision dated 28.09.2014 (agenda item C-22) circulated vide Endst. No. 11622-11792/Estt./I dated 12.12.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.

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

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed afresh Dr. Sanjeev Verma,

Associate Professor in Orthodontics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital w.e.f. 17.02.2016 for 11 months i.e. upto 16.01.2017 (with one day break on 16.02.2016), purely on temporary basis or till the post is filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 (a) at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Vol-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he is working earlier.

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of Syndicate has nominated following three experts as members of the Research Board in Engineering & Technology for the term 1.1.2016 to 31.12.2017, under Regulation 3(d) at page 445 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007.

1. Professor Navdeep Goyal
Department of Physics,
P.U., Chandigarh.
2. Professor S.K.Mehta
Department of Chemistry,
P.U., Chandigarh.
3. Professor R.C. Katiyal
CGC, Gharun.

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has reappointed afresh the following faculty members at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U.:

- (i) Dr. Shally Gupta, Professor in Oral Pathology, on contract basis w.e.f. 09.03.2016 for 11 months i.e. upto 08.02.2017 with one day break on 08.03.2016 (break day) & 07.03.2016 (Holiday) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier.
- (ii) the following faculty members purely on temporary/ contract basis as mentioned against each w.e.f. 11.02.2016 for 11 months i.e. up to 10.01.2017 with one day break on 10.02.2016 (break day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation & Nature of Appointment
1.	Dr. Maninder Pal Singh Gill	Associate Professor in General Surgery (Temporary)
2.	Dr. Satya Narain	Associate Professor in Oral/ Maxillofacial Surgery (Temporary)
3.	Dr. Prabhjot Cheema	Sr. Lecturer in Anatomy (Contract)
4.	Dr. Rajdeep Brar	Assistant Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology (Contract)

- (iii) the following faculty members purely on temporary basis mentioned against each w.e.f. 09.03.2016 for 11 months i.e. upto 08.02.2017 with one day break on 08.03.2016 (break day) & 07.03.2016 (Holiday) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation with specialization
1.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma	Associate Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology
2.	Dr. Ikreet Singh Bal	Associate Professor in Public Health Dentistry
3.	Dr. Simranjit Singh	Senior Assistant Professor in Oral Pathology

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate/Senate has approved the minutes of Selection Committee dated 07.01.2016 for appointment of following as 'Programmers' purely on contract basis, on Basic Pay +GP+DA thereon (Rs.15600+5400+DA), initially for the period of 89 days (i.e. w.e.f. the date they join duty) & further extendable as per requirement (for working six days a week) or till the posts are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, with the stipulation that the appointments are being made purely on contract basis and for the period & salary as mentioned above or whenever the incumbents to regular posts join, whichever is earlier. It is understood that they will have no claim whatsoever for regular appointment after expiry of their term of contract appointment & their appointment shall be terminable without any notice. Their contract appointment shall come to an end automatically on the completion of term of contract appointment as stated above. However, they may apply for regular appointment, subject to their eligibility as & when the posts are advertised for regular appointment:

Sr. No.	Name of Programmers	Place of Posting
1	Mr. Subodh Bansal	Computer Unit
2	Ms. Jasmine Ahluwalia	College Branch
3	Mr. Harsimran Singh Dhanju	R&S Branch

NOTE: 1. Minutes of the Selection Committee dated 07.01.2016 are enclosed **(Appendix-LXXV)**.

2. The appointment letters have already been issued.

- (xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has promoted:

- Shri Naveen Kumar Pathak, Sr. Assistant, Estt. Branch-II, as Superintendent on temporary basis (personal to him) in the Pay-Band of Rs.15600-39100+Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- with initial pay

Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University Rules and posted him at Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahar w.e.f. the date he joins his duty.

2. Shri Sandeep Kumar, Sr. Assistant, P.U. Ext. Library, Ludhiana, as Superintendent on temporary basis (personal to him) in the Pay-Band of Rs.15600-39100+Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- with initial pay Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University Rules and posted him at University College Sikhwala, District Muktsar, w.e.f. the date he joins his duty.
3. Shri Narinder Kumar, Sr. Assistant, Estate Branch, as Superintendent on temporary basis (personal to him) in the Pay-Band of Rs.15600-39100+Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- with initial pay Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University Rules and posted him at Govt. College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur, w.e.f. the date he joins duty.

The above arrangement is subject to the submission of an undertaking by them to the effect that they will not seek benefit of this temporary promotion when they returns back to Chandigarh and Ludhiana and shall have no claim or right whatsoever for promotion as Superintendents at Chandigarh and Ludhiana before whatsoever for promotion as Superintendents at Chandigarh and Ludhiana before their regular turn in accordance with the gradation list and if they wants to be posted back at Chandigarh and Ludhiana, then they will be reverted back to their substantive post and their services as Superintendent at Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahar and University College Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and Govt. College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur will not be counted towards their seniority in the cadre of Superintendent.

NOTE: 1. Shri Naveen Kumar Pathak, at Sr. No.1 has joined as Superintendent at Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshahar. But Shri Sandeep Kumar, Sr. Assistant and Shri Narinder Kumar, Sr. Assistant (mentioned at Sr. No.2 and 3 above), have shown their reluctance to join their duty at University College Sikhwala, District Muktsar and Govt. College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur respectively.

2. The next person in the list i.e. Shri Rohit Sood, Sr. Assistant P.U.R.C. Ludhiana was promoted as Superintendent in place of Shri Narinder Kumar (Sr.No.3), at Govt. College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur but he has also shown his reluctance to join his duty.

(xii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Ramesh Kumar, Sr. Technician (G-II), Department of Microbiology as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400 with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Department of Microbiology. His pay be fixed as per University Rules.

NOTE: As before, all other terms and conditions of service and rules of the discipline and conduct as contained in the University's Calendar, Volume I & III and other rules and instructions framed there under from time to time shall be applicable.

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of the following persons, as Senior Technical Assistant / Technical Officer (G-1), in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 +GP 5400 with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules, w.e.f. the date they report for duty, against the following vacant post at Computer Centre and Department of Computer Science & Applications. Their pay will be fixed as per University Rules:

Sr. No.	Name of the Incumbent	Promoted as	Centre/ Department
1.	Ms. Anu Arora Senior Technician (G-II), DCSA (Presently working in AC Joshi Library)	Senior Technical Assistant/Technical Officer (G-1)	Computer Centre
2.	Shri Swapan Middy Senior Technician (G-II), DCSA	Senior Technical Assistant/ Technical Officer (G-1)	Department of Computer Science & Applications

NOTE: As before, all other terms and conditions of service and rules of the discipline and conduct as contained in the University's Calendar Vol.-I & III and other rules and instructions framed there under, from time to time shall be applicable.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Balbir Singh, Senior Technician (G-II), Central Instrumentation Laboratory (CIL) as Senior Scientific Assistant (G-I) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Central Instrumentation Laboratory.

NOTE: An office note enclosed
(**Appendix-LXXVI**).

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the word **Duplicate** be substituted with **Re-issue** in all duplicate certificates being issued to students whenever the Detail Marks Card/Degree is lost/misplaced by the candidate and the necessary amendment be made in the rule appearing at page 585 in the chapter XLVI of the Calendar Volume-III, 2009.

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the meeting of the Research Promotion Cell (RPC) dated 07.01.2016 (**Appendix-LXXVII**) in respect of the following:

- (i) MoU between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Sarbat Da Bhala Charitable Trust.
- (ii) Recognition of Centre of Innovative and Applied Bioprocessing (CIAB) as a centre for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (iii) MoU between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Dr. H.S. Gour Vishwavidyalaya Sagar (MP).
- (iv) Lecture by Professor V.N. Attri, Chairman, Indian Ocean Rim Association on **“Growing strength of IORA and future roadmap”**.

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of Syndicate, has approved the recommendation dated 25.01.2016 (**Appendix-LXXVIII**) of Board of Control, Department of Chemistry with regard to the modification in eligibility criteria for admission to the M.Sc. (Hons. School) course in Chemistry which is to be included in the Prospectus and Handbook of Information.

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the names of the candidates who have passed examinations for the various degrees of the University and have become qualified under the regulation for admission to such degrees for the award of degrees at the 65th Convocation to be held on 13th March 2016, under Regulation 1 at page 27 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, as under:

Sr. No.	Name of Examination	Degrees to be conferred in the Convocation to be held on 13 th March 2016
	Part-A	
1. 2. 3.	D.Sc. D. Litt. Ph.D.	To all the candidates whose viva-voce are conducted and cases submitted to the Vice-Chancellor from 13 th March, 2015 to 12.3.2016, on behalf of the Syndicate.
	Part-B	
1.	M. Phil.	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 8.3.2015 to 5.3.2016 (7 days before the Convocation).
	Part-C	
1. 2.	M.D. M.S.	To all the candidates whose results stand declared from 8.3.2015 to 5.3.2016 (7 days before the Convocation).
	Part-D	
1. 2. 3. 4.	LL.M. M.Tech. M.E. (Chem. Engg.) Masters Degree of Engg. (All Branches)	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 8.3.2015 to 5.3.2016 (7 days before the Convocation).
	Part-E	
1. 2.	Master's degree (M.A./M.Sc./M.Ed. Annual & Semester System) Examinations in various Faculties. Following Bachelor's degree examinations: (a) Bachelor's degree of Engineering of all disciplines (b) B. Pharmacy (c) B.Sc. (Hons. School) (d) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Year Integrated course (e) Bachelor of Arts (Hons. School Economics) (f) Bachelor of Dental Sciences (g) Any other newly instituted Examination.	First three first divisioners, whose results of April/May 2015 Examination stand declared from 8.3.2015 to 5.3.2016 (7 days before the Convocation).

NNOTE: All the candidates who have been placed in the first division and secured first three positions in the final Merit list, after taking into account the process of Re-evaluation, where-ever applicable, may be

allowed to be invited to the Convocation. This will, however, be subject to the condition that they have not earned Comptt./re-appear/P.R.E. in any subject/ paper/ Semester/yearly exam. Candidates who have applied for degree in Absentia and have collected or not collected the same from the University may be allowed to be invited to the convocation.

(xix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Dr. H.S. Gour Vishwavidyalaya SAGAR (MP) **(Appendix-LXXIX)**.

(xx) To ratify the following addition in the Syndicate decision dated 20.09.2015 (Para 3):

Decision of the Syndicate dated 20.09.2015 (Para 3)	Modification/Addition
That, as per LPC issued by her previous employer consequent upon her placement in Senior scale, the pay of Dr. Veena Puri, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bio-informatics, be re-fixed at Rs.29070/- (Basic Pay Rs.22070/- +Rs.7000/- AGP) with next date of annual increment on 01.07.2011 i.e. Rs.29950/- (Basic Pay Rs.22950/- + AGP Rs.7000/-) in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.7000/- AGP.	That, as per LPC issued by her previous employer consequent upon her placement in Senior scale, the pay of Dr. Veena Puri, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bio-informatics, be re-fixed at Rs.29070/- (Basic Pay Rs.22070/- +Rs.7000/- AGP) w.e.f. the date of joining i.e. 27.10.2011 with next date of annual increment on 01.07.2011 i.e. Rs.29950/- (Basic Pay Rs.22950/- + AGP Rs.7000/-) in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.7000/- AGP.

- NOTE:**
1. The audit has raised objection on the circular issued vide 16773/Estt.-I dated 07.11.2015 **(Appendix-LXXX)** that it has not been mentioned in the order that from which date the pay of Dr. Veena Puri be re-fixed at Rs.29070/-.
 2. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-LXXX)**.

(xxi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation approval of the Syndicate has granted Special chance/ Golden/Mercy chance, to the students of Undergraduate/Postgraduate courses including professional courses to clear their reappear/s/ compartment exams/Improvement of performance/ Deficient subject in the examination to be held in June 2016. The examination fee for the special chance would be Rs.10,000/- for Postgraduate students per class and Rs.5000/- for Undergraduate students per class.

NOTE: The syndicate in its meeting dated 23.01.2016 during general

discussion has requested Dr. Ajay Ranga to get an agenda item prepared, so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate.

(xxii) To ratify the decision of the Vice-Chancellor, regarding pay fixation of Dr. P.S. Sandhu, Colonel (Retired), Secretary to Vice-Chancellor, that:

(i) the last pay of Dr. P.S. Sandhu, be reckoned as Rs.77000 + DA as admissible to him at N.I.T. Durgapur and his pay be fixed as below:

Last Basic Pay drawn by him as Registrar, NIT, Durgapur : Rs.77000/-

Less: Pension (Rs.30505/- minus Ignorable part of Rs.4000/-) : Rs.26505/-

Net Basic Pay : Rs.50495/-(Rs.77000-.26505)

Dearness Allowance (119% of net Basic pay (DA on pension to be Drawn separately with pension) : Rs.60089/-

Sect. Allowance : Rs.2500/-

C.C.A. : Rs.120/-

H.R.A. : Rs.15400/-

Mobile Allowance : Rs.500/-

Total Pay : Rs.129104/-

(ii) In the meantime, Colonel Dr. P.S. Sandhu be paid *ad hoc* monthly payment as if his basic pay is Rs.46310+Rs.8700=Rs.55010/-.

NOTE: 1. As per regulation 18 appearing at page 134 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Syndicate is competent body to determine the appointment and conditions of service of persons re-employed after superannuation or those holding temporary or contractual appointment.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.11.2015 vide Para 30 (R-xiii) **(Appendix-LXXXI)** had approved the appointment of Dr. Col. P.S. Sandhu, (Retd.) and Ex-Registrar, National Institute of Technology, Durgapur, as Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor, with effect from the date he offers to join on or after, November 16, 2015, till further orders, in the office of the

Vice-Chancellor, on the last pay drawn minus pension, with facilities as provided to Shri R.L. Kapoor, Ex-Advisor & Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor as per rules/regulations of the University (except accommodation on the Panjab University Campus). His salary will be paid against the vacant post of Secretary to Vice-Chancellor.

3. The Vice-Chancellor has also observed that the factual position appears as follows:
 1. Col. Sandhu's basic pay was in PB-4 at level Rs.46310+GP of Rs.8700/- when he left Army in 2006.
 2. Thereafter he worked in three institutions for a period of nine years up to April 30, 2015. In the last institution, his basic pay (including Grade Pay) was Rs.77000.
 3. However, the decision at (i) needs ratification by the BOF/Syndicate/Senate.
 4. An office note containing brief facts of the case enclosed **(Appendix-LXXXI)**.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(i), Professor Keshav Malhotra said that those who have applied for transfer earlier, their requests for transfer should be considered.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that explanation is given at 404 of the Appendix, and the resolved part is that a Committee was constituted for framing the policy for transfer of Faculty Members in the University System. The recommendation of the Committee is that "it is not advisable to transfer him/her from one place to other. In case, a person appointed at an institute/place in Panjab University wants to move to other institute/place in Panjab University, he/she has to apply for that institute/place in Panjab University and compete with other applicants in open selection and at the time of the interview his/her application should be considered, strictly on merit, without any bias". He enquired whether a transfer policy has been framed?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that while considering the transfer of certain faculty members, it was decided in the Senate that these transfers be approved, but hereinafter no transfer be made until the transfer policy is framed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was he who had raised the issue of transfer of Ms. Savita Grover and it was argued only for the

sake of opposing him that such transfer/s should not be made. The Vice-Chancellor response was that if there is any such case which was not brought to his (Vice-Chancellor) notice, and he had said, "No".

The Vice-Chancellor said that a specific request came to him from English Teacher (Hoshiarpur). She was putting representation after representation. He called everybody and talked to Professor A.K. Bhandari and President, PUTA and transferred Ms. Savita Grover from P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni to Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, up to 30th April 2016.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that consideration of this transfer policy should be deferred and in the meanwhile the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to make transfer/s.

Shri Ashok Goyal urged the Vice-Chancellor to transfer Ms. Savita Grover permanently from P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni to Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "okay".

Referring to Sub Item R-(xv), Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a good idea and he was sure that the decision to substitute duplicate certificates/degrees with the word reissue must have been taken on the basis of the difficulties faced by the students.

On a point made by Professor Keshav Malhotra that a late fee of Rs.1000/- is being charged from the students who are appearing in their compartment/reappear examinations, it was clarified that on the request of the affiliated Colleges and Fellows, the last date for submission of examination forms by the regular students was extended up to 17th March 2016, but in the case of reappeared/compartments students it was not extended. If they insist the matter could be examined. However, the last date is approaching as the same is up to 17th March, i.e., three days later. Since the candidates have already purchased the forms, it would be difficult to make refunds. Secondly, there are no forms for regular students. 10th March 2016 was the last date and the fine is being imposed with effect from 11th March 2016.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that they should look into the matter.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xviii), Professor Anil Monga pointed out that certain corrections were made in the Convocation, the same should be carried out here.

This was agreed to.

Referring to Sub-Item R-(xxii), Professor Keshav Malhotra urged the Vice-Chancellor to enlighten them about this item.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they appointed Dr. P.S. Sandhu as Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor, on last salary drawn by him minus pension. He has retired from the Army about nine years ago. During nine years, he has changed jobs. He was Registrar at three places. At third place, he was drawing Rs.77,000/- (basic plus

grade pay). Therefore, he tried to preserve his last salary (basic plus grade pay).

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to what he was drawing during his last appointment, and whether his appointment was on regular or contract basis.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that his last drawn basic pay plus grade pay was Rs.77,000/- and his appointment was on contract basis as they appoint Registrar in this University. However, the term of contract might differ from University to University. When he changed job from one Institution to another, he got enhancement in salary.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, perhaps, he (Vice-Chancellor) has written that it is his premise that the last pay drawn by Dr. P.S. Sandhu be reckoned as Rs.77,000/-, which is well appreciated because the salary which he was drawing there, obviously here his salary could not be less than that, but at the same time they also could not ignore the rules for fixation of salary. In view of the objection/s raised by the Audit, he thinks that they should not have confrontation with the Audit. Suppose tomorrow if the rules say what he (Audit) has quoted, then probably they would be overstepping their authority. So better it would be that he (Vice-Chancellor) should get it considered from the legal point of view and also place the same before the Board of Finance for consideration so that they do not face any embarrassment. Though they are ready to face embarrassment, they do not want the man in question to face the embarrassment.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Okay". However, in the meanwhile, he should be allowed to continue to draw the minimum (existing) salary.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in **Item 64 – R-(ii) to (R-(xxi))** on the agenda, be ratified;
- (2) the ratification of **Item 64 – R(i)** on the agenda, be deferred;
- (3) Mrs. Savita Grover, who has been transferred from P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni to Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, up to 30th April 2016, be transferred permanently to Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur; and
- (4) so far as **Item 64 – R-(xxii)** is concerned, it be got legally examined and considered by the Board of Finance.

Routine and formal matters

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

- (i)** To note the contents of letters **(Appendix-LXXXII)** received from the certain Syndics/Fellows/Students with regard to the voters in the Registered Graduate Constituency of Panjab University Senate Election 2016.
- (ii)** The Vice-Chancellor, has appointed Dr. Sanjeev Gautam, UICET, P.U. as Programme Officer in National Service Scheme (N.S.S.) for smooth & effective functioning of NSS activities, in addition to his own duties.
- (iii)** The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Ramandeep Kaur Saluja as Associate Professor in Oral Pathology and Dr. Vandana Chhabra as Associate Professor in Oral Surgery at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for one year or till the regular posts are filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, against the vacant posts of the Institute, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600/-+NPA+ allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5(a) (i) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to her 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 departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

- (iv)** The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Gurpreet Kaur as Assistant Professor in Anesthesia at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for one year or till the regular post is filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, against the vacant posts of the Institute, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + GP of Rs.6000/- + NPA + allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5(a) (i) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to her 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 departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

- (v)** The Vice-Chancellor has accepted the resignation of Mrs. Poonam Goel, Associate Professor of Economics (Re-employed) w.e.f. 16.11.2015, on her request, due to her falling health.

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.11.2015 (Para 4), has approved the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee of the Syndics dated 12.12.2015, constituted by the Syndicate to prepare the model of advertisement for the post of Principal in the affiliated Colleges.

“The Committee recommended that in the first instance, the College has to advertise the post as per U.G.C./P.U. guidelines i.e. the first advertisement has to be as following:-

**For the post of Principal in the affiliated Colleges
(Name of the College)**

Applications on the prescribed proforma (available with the College), are invited for the post of Principal on regular basis, from the candidates who are eligible candidate in accordance with the qualifications/ conditions laid down by the U.G.C./State Govt./NCTE/Panjab University, through Registered post/speed post or in person so as to reach the College with a copy to the Dean College Development Council, Panjab University, Chandigarh within 30 days from the date of publication of the advertisement. The candidates are also required to submit 9 photocopies of the prescribed proforma to the College while sending their application.

President/General Secretary
Governing Body

The Committee further recommended that If any eligible or suitable candidate for the post of Principal could not be appointed after the first advertisement in the newspaper, the College can give a note, as specified below, in the subsequent advertisements:-

**For the post of Principal in the affiliated Colleges
(Name of the College)**

Applications on the prescribed proforma (available with the College) are invited for the post of Principal on regular basis, from the candidates who are eligible candidates in accordance with the qualifications/conditions laid down by the U.G.C./State Govt./NCTE/Panjab University, through Registered post/speed post or in person so as to reach the College with a copy to the Dean College Development Council, Panjab University, Chandigarh within 30 days from the date of publication of the advertisement. The candidates are also required to submit 9 photocopies of the prescribed proforma to the College while sending their application.

Note: In case of non-availability and non-suitability of any eligible candidate, a retired approved Principal from an affiliated College of

Panjab University can be appointed on contract basis for a fixed term of two years, or till the age of 65 years, whichever is earlier.

President/General Secretary
Governing Body

The Committee further recommended that the Colleges which have already given advertisement on or after 15.09.2015 and could not find the suitable/eligible candidate for the post of Principal, may be allowed to issue 2nd advertisement, as specified above, to fill up the post of Principal. ”

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.11.2015 (Para 4) has resolved that the sub-committee of the Syndics be constituted to prepare the model of advertisement and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendation of the Committee on behalf of the Syndicate.
2. A copy of circular issued to the Presidents/General Secretaries of the Governing Bodies of all the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh vide No.74977-75177 dated 15.01.2016 is enclosed **(Appendix-LXXXIII)**.

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. Pratibha Nagpal, Professor Department of English & Cultural Studies	20.04.1989	29.02.2016	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007
2.	Dr. (Mrs.) Neeta Sharma Professor Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology	22.11.1994	29.02.2016	(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/her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for
3.	Dr. Indu Bhushan Prasher Professor Department of Botany	01.10.1984	29.02.2016	

				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).

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Ms. Veena Sharma Assistant Registrar Examination Branch	15.11.1976	29.02.2016	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Kamlesh Gandhi Superintendent (Proof Reading) Publication Bureau, P.U.	12.08.1975	29.02.2016	
3.	Shri Avtar Singh Technical Associate Central Instrumentation Laboratory	14.05.1980	29.02.2016	
4.	Shri Mithai Lal Semi Professional Assistant Department of Geology	17.01.1979	29.02.2016	
5.	Shri Bhag Chand Record Lifter Department of Laws	09.01.1973	29.02.2016	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
6.	Shri Inder Bahadur Security Guard Construction Office	30.08.1971	29.02.2016	
7.	Shri Ram Chander Cleaner Boys Hostel No. 6	07.01.1972	29.02.2016	

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

- (ix) The Vice- Chancellor has sanctioned terminal benefits to the members of the family of the following employee who passed away while in service.

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
Late Shri Raj Pal Senior Assistant Accounts Branch	04.12.1989	09.11.2015	Smt. Vidya Devi (wife)	Gratuity and Ex-gratia grant as admissible under the University Regulations and Rules

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

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, has accepted the additional donation of Rs.1,00,000/- (One lac only) made by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram, H.No.362, Sector-9, Panchkula, for purchase of books/scholarship/tuition fee, to the needy/poor students, out of Student Aid Fund Account.

NOTE: 1. The said amount has been deposited in Student Aid Fund Account vide Receipt No.11328 dated 21.01.2016 and credit the same has also been received in the account no.10444984461 on 29.01.2016 and a copy of income tax Exemption Certificate duly signed by the Registrar, P.U., Chandigarh, has been provided to the donor to avail income tax benefits during the year 2015-16.

2. Earlier, the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 (Para 48 (xiii)) and Senate at its meeting dated 27.09.2015 vide Para LXII (I-33) has accepted the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Shri Radha Krishan.

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

- (xi) To note that the allegation of the complaints viz. Shri Baldev Singh and Shri S.S. Randhawa, Ex-Principal, SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur, made in their complaints **(Appendix-LXXXV)** respectively, addressed to the Regional Director, Northern Regional Committee, National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), Jaipur, are unfounded especially with regard to the University being a league with the College Management and it is prudent to append the following documents as a part of reply to the NCTE, New Delhi, pursuant to letter No.F.38-5(26)/ 2014-15/NCTE/TE/CDN8040 dated

26.06.2015 received from Under Secretary, NCTE, New Delhi
(**Appendix-LXXXV**).

1. Fee Transfer
2. Students Return
3. Inspection Reports

NOTE: An office note enclosed
(**Appendix-LXXXV**).

- (xii) To note the contents of the letter dated 04.03.2016
(**Appendix-LXXXVI**) of the Registrar, sent to President, PUNTEF, with regard to the certain issues raised by representative of the Panjab University Non-Teaching Employees Federation.

At this stage, the members started general discussion.

- (1) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that for B.A./B.Sc./B.Ed. Integrated Courses, though they had got letters of intent, the condition for appointment of teacher/s has been imposed, and it is well known to Dean, College Development Council. Since the Colleges are facing the problem, if the Dean, College Development Council agrees the panels should be given to them, and if not, a Committee should be appointed to examine the whole issue and panels given to the Colleges, so that affiliation is granted to them and they could start the courses.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the Colleges are already affiliated with the University, there is no harm in giving the panels to them.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that firstly, the issue should be got examined through a Committee and thereafter, if deem fit, the panels should be given.

It was informed that the NOC has been given to the Colleges and LOIs have also been given by the NCTE to the Colleges. Now, the issue is that the University has not given the affiliation. NCTE Regulations say that until affiliation is granted by the University, admissions could not be made by the Colleges. If affiliation is not given, could they give the panels? This is the real issue. For that, a Committee should be constituted.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that after the LOI, they have to give the list of teachers to the NCTE along with the recognition order, and simultaneously to the University and the Government.

It was clarified that there is difference between LOI and recognition. NCTE clearly says that without recognition, the University could not grant affiliation.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that all the guidelines should be circulated to all the Colleges and them (members) also so that they could give their input.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the Committee comprising following persons be constituted to look into the whole issue:

1. Principal S.S. Sangha (Chairman)
2. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
3. Principal B.C. Josan
4. Principal N.R. Sharma
5. Principal Tarlok Bandhu
6. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
7. Dean, College Development Council
8. Deputy Registrar (Colleges)

- (2) The Vice-Chancellor stated that he has received a request from Dev Samaj College, a College which has highest NAAC rating amongst the affiliated Colleges of the University, that it has to apply for autonomous College, for which the deadline is 17th March 2016. He requires an authorization from the Syndicate, and he has already requested his colleagues to visit the College at the earliest. If he received more application/s from the College/s, the NAAC rating of which is good, the request of those Colleges would also be processed through the Committee. He added that 4-5 Colleges (namely Dev Samaj College, GGDSD College, Sector 32, Chandigarh, DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh), which have obtained good NAAC rating should try to obtain the status of autonomous College.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the request of Dev Samaj College for processing its case for grant of autonomous status by the UGC.

- (3) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that eligibility for M.Sc./M.Com. is B.Sc./B.Com., whereas the eligibility for M.Sc. (IT) is BCA as they did not offer B.Sc. (IT) course. Resultantly, the candidates have done B.Sc. (IT) from other Universities are ineligible for M.Sc.(IT) because they send the syllabus of the course to the Board of Studies to examine whether the syllabus is equivalent to B.C.A. or not. Citing an example, he said that if they compare their syllabus for Elective Punjabi with Guru Nanak Dev University, they would find a lot of difference. Since the candidates have done B.Sc. (IT) from other Universities were made ineligible several Colleges have to refund the fees to the candidates. He pleaded that the students having done B.Sc. (IT) from other Universities should not be made ineligible for M.Sc. (IT), especially when they have already qualified M.Sc. (IT) Semester-I.

The Vice Chancellor said, “okay”.

- (4) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that a representation has also been received by the Controller of Examinations. Earlier, as per the guidelines the minimum pass marks for B.C.A. was 35%, whereas the result has been prepared by taking 40% minimum pass marks. Resultantly, the result is very bad. Now, the members should consider and decide as to what could be done.

It was clarified that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out certain disparities amongst the Semesters. The Standing Committee head by the Dean of University Instruction comprising Dean, College Development Council, Controller of Examinations, Dr. I.S. Sandhu as members would meet on 21st March 2016 and this issue is on the agenda. The recommendations of the Standing Committee would be placed before the Syndicate/Senate.

- (5) Shri Raghbir Dyal said that they are offering B.Sc. (Agriculture) 4-Year course for which a lot of infrastructure is there, i.e., Laboratories in Physics, Chemistry, Botany, Zoology, etc. This course is being offered at Hoshiarpur. For this subject, the field is also required. Therefore, he suggested that higher fee structure is needed for this course. They should take this course to either partially self-financed courses or self-financed course. The fee for this course is only Rs.12,000/- to Rs.13,000/-, which is very less. He would make a written request in this regard to the Dean, College Development Council.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Raghbir Dyal should give it in writing to the Dean, College Development Council.

- (6) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had given certain documents related to Provident Fund of College Teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Yes", that matter needed to be given attention.

- (7) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that nowadays, the Inspection Committees are visiting the Colleges for the purpose of grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation. He suggested that the Inspection Reports of these Committees should be placed before the Syndicate, so that the issues pertaining to Provident Fund, D.A., etc. are taken care of.

It was informed that the reports of the Inspection Committees are being placed before the Syndicate as and when these are received.

- (8) Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that it is being observed that usually the Chairman of the Committees informed the members on phone that the Committee would visit the College on such and such date, he/she should accompany the Committee, if wishes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is a matter amongst all of them and their colleagues.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Chairman should at least try to reach at a consensus for fixing the date after discussing the matter with the other members of the Committee.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that wherever such a problem is found, the date should be finalized in consultation with the Dean, College Development Council.

- (9) Professor Shelley Walia pointed out that in the last meeting of the Syndicate it was decided that the Clause 16 wherein it written “Rs.500/-as examination Fee will be charged from the candidates if the University decided later on to conduct the written Test/Written Objective Type Test/Practical Test, etc.” be deleted as no written examination was decided to be taken. But it has not been got deleted in the minutes. He, therefore, suggested that the above quoted clause 16 should now be deleted.

This was agreed to.

- (10) Principal S.S. Sangha pointed out that sometime some kind of violation is done, especially by the Committee or experts as they have their own interests, but they did not know about that. During the last two years, in 2-3 cases the panels for interview of Principals in degree Colleges were sent, but the Principals of Colleges of Education were not made eligible for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor request Principal S.S. Sangha to give this in writing to the Dean, College Development Council.

- (11) Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that the Punjab Government has appointed certain teachers on contract basis at a monthly pay of Rs.21,600/- on a probation of three years. The Colleges are treating all such teachers on temporary basis and are not treating them with the regular teachers for the purpose of grant of leave/s, whereas they have been appointed on regular basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a letter in this regard is to be written to Directors Higher Education.

- (12) Dr. Ajay Ranga pointed out that the persons have to submit written complaints in the XEN Office for getting the various types of work done, but they do not know as to where the complaint is to be submitted as transfers are made there very frequently. He, therefore, suggested that on-line system for submission of complaints in the XEN Office should be evolved.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that both the systems, i.e., submission of complaints personally as well as on-line, should be kept.

The Vice-Chancellor said, “OK”, and he instructed the Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor to take necessary steps in this regard.

- (13) Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Haryana Government has introduced a File Tracking System. Here in the University, they do not know as to where the concerned file is. Even in his own case, he does not know as to where his Service Book is. When he enquires about the same from his office, they told him that it has gone to Accounts Branch, and the person of Accounts Branch says that it has gone to Establishment Branch and they give somebody else’s name. Ultimately, he

fails to understand as to where the Service Book is. He, therefore, suggested that the File Tracking System should be introduced here also, so that one could know as to where and how many days it remained and where it is now.

It was informed that the File Tracking System is there, but is not working primarily because the persons are not competent enough to use it. There are certain Departments, which are using it. It is being used by the Establishment and Accounts Branches, but it is not being used across the University as all other Departments are not using it. Even the people are not opening the e-mails, which are sent by the Registrar seeking some information. As such, no response is received back. The Registrar has to issue a circular and for that a capacity building programme has been initiated and also the classes are being taken to educate them.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he has also been personally visiting various Departments and has not even a single person whether temporary/contract or on regular who is not familiar with the use of computers. It is a separate matter that they do not use the computers because they are giving them liberty that even if they did not use computer, there would be no problem from the University authorities. If they made it mandatory/compulsory, he was sure that it would be implemented in letter and spirit and would prove to be effective. He added that the File Tracking System, which they had introduced earlier worked effectively for few months, but he does not know as to why it was discontinued.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the File Tracking System is worth trying.

(14) Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired as to where the tender for P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar, is lying.

(15) Professor Emanuel Nahar said that the teachers of affiliated Colleges, including those who have been appointed on a monthly pay of Rs.21,600/- either they are not allotted accommodation in P.U. Guest House or Faculty House or Golden Jubilee Guest House, and if allotted they are charged full rent.

The Vice-Chancellor said that rent is to be taken in full.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that rent is not taken from other teachers.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the other teachers of the Colleges are given accommodation in Faculty House, etc., on concessional rate, whereas full rent which is taken from the private persons is taken from the teachers who have been appointed on a monthly pay of Rs.21,600/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, the teachers, who have recently been appointed on contract basis by the Punjab Government for a period of three years, should be treated as regular teachers, but only for three years because they could not be sure as to what would happen to them after a period of

three years. The Government might say that they would continue to work as such after the period of three years as well as the Government may keep on changing its policy and they could not vouch for that. As such, they could not give them approval and they could also not take their responsibility as a University because tomorrow if some other decision is taken, they should not become a party. But if they are considered teachers of affiliated Colleges for three years, at least for those three years, they should be considered at par with other teachers for the purpose of Guest House, Faculty House, etc. and other facilities.

This was agreed to.

Shri Raghbir Dyal pointed out that they are giving them the approvals and, according to that, they would also become part of the Teachers' Constituency.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No, No," it should not be done; otherwise, they would become a liability of the University. He suggested that they should not be made part of the Teachers' Constituency as they have been given approval on contract basis only, so that tomorrow the University is not at the receiving end. He added that wherever it seems that the University might be in trouble, there they have to take a conscious decision because they do not know which Government would be there and what decision would be taken by it.

Shri Raghbir Dyal enquired as to what is the status of tenders of P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Raghbir Dyal to send an e-mail, which would be replied to.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR