

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 21st January 2017** at **10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Principal B.C. Josan
3. Dr. Dalip Kumar
4. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
5. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal
6. Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu
7. Shri Jarnail Singh
8. Professor Mukesh Arora
9. Principal N.R. Sharma
10. Professor Navdeep Goyal
11. Professor Pam Rajput
12. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
13. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
14. Shri Varinder Singh
15. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
16. Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha Registrar ... (Secretary)

Dr. Subhash Sharma, Shri Jitender Yadav, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

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

Condolence Resolution

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

- (i) Mrs. Sawinder Kaur mother of Prof. Karamjeet Singh, Honorary Director, Academic Staff College and former Fellow, PU, on 14th January, 2017.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Mrs. Sawinder Kaur and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I warmly welcome all the distinguished members to this first meeting of the present Syndicate of the new Senate and am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that-

1. Hon'ble Shri M. Hamid Ansari, Vice-President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University, has very kindly consented to deliver 66th PU Annual Convocation address on March 25, 2017. On this occasion Hon'ble Chancellor will confer five Honoris Causa degrees on

eminent icons, viz., Dr. N. S. Kapany (D.Sc.), Prof. Murli Manohar Joshi (D.Litt.), Prof. G.S. Khush (D.Sc.), Mr. Justice J.S. Khehar (LL.D.), Dr. Nuruddin Farah (D.Litt.) as well as honour three awardees, viz., (i) Sahitya Rattan (Prof. Ms. Dalip Kaur Tiwana), (ii) Kala Rattan (Shri Anupam Kher) and (iii) Vigyan Rattan (Dr. P.D. Gupta).

2. Hon'ble Prime Minister of India, Shri Narendra Modi ji has sent best wishes to the Vice Chancellor, Panjab University for 2017 and has urged us to use as many digital means as possible for economic transactions and has asked us to urge others to do the same.
3. Hon'ble Mr. Justice J.S. Khehar, an illustrious alumnus of Panjab University, took over as Chief Justice, Supreme Court of India, on January 4, 2017. He is the first one from present PU Campus to attain this high position. He is to be honoured with Doctor of Law (*Honoris Causa*) by PU during the 66th Annual Convocation of Panjab University on March 25, 2017.
4. Professor Ajay K. Sood, an alumnus of our University, has taken over as President of Indian National Science Academy (INSA), New Delhi w.e.f. January 1, 2017. He also studied at the present PU Campus (1968-72). He was awarded Vigyan Rattan for the year 2011.
5. Professor I.B.S. Passi, former Dean University Instruction, PU, has been elected as Council Member of INSA, New Delhi w.e.f. January 1, 2017.
6. Professor S. K. Mehta, Department of Chemistry and Director, SAIF/CIL/UCIM, has been awarded with prestigious Fellowship of the Royal Society of Chemistry (FRSC), London.
7. Prof. B. S. Bhoop, University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, has been selected for 'Honorary Fellowship Award' by the Punjab Academy of Sciences, Patiala, for his contribution in Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research work on novel and nanostructured drug delivery systems using Quality by Design (QbD).
8. Dr. Jitendra Mohan, Professor Emeritus, Deptt. of Psychology, has been honoured with Life Time Achievement Award by the Indian Academy of Health Psychology.
9. Prof. Indu Pal Kaur, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), has been awarded with the prestigious Fulbright-Nehru Academic and Professional Excellence (FNAPE) Fellowship for the session 2017-18, by the United States-India Educational Foundation (USIEF). Under this Fellowship, Prof. Indu Pal Kaur will carry out teaching and research activities at Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy and Center for Dermal Research, Rutgers University at New Jersey.

10. Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Sr. Lecturer in the Department of Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopedics at Dr H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences has won the Famdent Excellency in Dentistry Awards (FEDA) for the third consecutive year on 17th December in Mumbai.

He has also been felicitated with 'Jury Recommended Award' under the category 'Excellence in Orthodontics' in 'Indian Health Professional Awards 2016 organized by Smile Nation (International Journal of Scientific Study) Group at Pune on 14th January, 2017.

11. A book entitled 'Industry-Academia R&D ecosystem in India in India' authored by Professor Rupinder Tewari, was released by Dr. R. Chidambram (Principal Science Advisor to Prime Minister of India), Dr. V. Saraswat (Member, Science, NITI Ayog) and Dr. Ashutosh Sharma (Secretary, DST), during the Indian Science Congress 2017 on January 3, at Tirupati.
12. Babe Ke College of Education, Mudki, Distt. Ferozepur (Pb.) has been awarded CGPA 3.63 with A⁺ Grade by the NAAC at its Standing Committee meeting for accreditation by NAAC 2nd cycle.
13. Babe Ke College of Education, Daudhar, Distt. Moga (Pb.), has been awarded CGPA 3.57 with A⁺ Grade by the NAAC at its Standing Committee meeting for accreditation by NAAC 2nd cycle.

With this Panjab University is having 5 affiliated Colleges which have got CGPA of 3.5.

14. Philatelic Advisory Committee at Ministry of Communications, Government of India, Department of Posts, has recommended for release of Commemorative Postage Stamp on 'Prof. Balwant Gargi' an illustrious alumnus of Panjab University along with four other writers viz. Shri Krishan Chander, Pt. Shrilal Shukla, Dr. Bhisham Sahni and Shri K.V. Puttappa under the theme "Eminent Writers" in due course to commemorate their birth centenary. Three of the above five luminaries, viz., Shri Krishan Chander, Dr Bhisham Sahni and Professor Balwant Gargi are alumni of Panjab University while Shri Krishan Chander and Professor Balwant Gargi studied at F.C. College, Lahore, and Dr. Bhisham Sahni studied at Govt. College, Lahore and later obtained his Ph.D. from PU in 1958.
15. Ambassador of Korea to India, Mr. Cho Hyun visited Panjab University along with a delegation and delivered a special address on the topic 'Korea, India's Strategic Partner' on 23 December 2016 at ICSSR Complex. He has invited a Road Show on behalf of Panjab University and CRIKC Institutions in South Korea.

Koreans have a big presence in India when it comes to consumer goods. In north-western India, their sale is the maximum amongst all the other regions of the country and there is no Korean manufacturing. Actually, there is no activity on behalf of the corporate sector of Korea in the north-west of India which could aid the economy and part of the reason is that the Koreans, who manage these things, are unaware of what north-west India is. Mr. Cho Hyun shared that a very large number of Koreans go out of Korea to study in U.S., China and several other countries. However, only a small number to India, even though medium of instruction in most higher education institutions is English, and Koreans are comfortable with English language. Chandigarh is a natural place which should attract the foreign students. The Ambassador wants awareness about the academic institutions in north-west to be spread in Korea so that the young people could come and study here and once they will study here, they will get familiar with the society, and the Korean companies will employ these young people here. He says that if the north-west region could have their presence, this could lead to manufacturing of Korean goods located here, as their senior managers will stay here. So, he desired that the University should take a road show to Korea, and rest of the arrangements will be done by them. The University should advertise every kind of education there at undergraduate, postgraduate, research, post doctoral level. The road show would be sponsored by the Korean Embassy. It is a challenge but it is worthwhile to try.

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Hon'ble Mr. Justice J.S. Khehar, an illustrious alumnus of Panjab University, on having taken over as Chief Justice, Supreme Court of India, on January 4, 2017;
 - (ii) Professor Ajay K. Sood, on having taken over as President of Indian National Science Academy (INSA), New Delhi w.e.f. January 1, 2017
 - (iii) Professor I.B.S. Passi, former Dean University Instruction, PU, on being elected as Council Member of INSA, New Delhi w.e.f. January 1, 2017;
 - (iv) Professor S.K. Mehta, Department of Chemistry and Director, SAIF/CIL/UCIM, on being awarded with prestigious Fellowship of the Royal Society of Chemistry (FRSC), London;

- (v) Prof. B. S. Bhoop, University Instt. of Pharmaceutical Sciences, PU, on being selected for 'Honorary Fellowship Award' by the Punjab Academy of Sciences, Patiala;
 - (vi) Dr. Jitendra Mohan, Professor Emeritus, Deptt. of Psychology, on being honoured with Life Time Achievement Award by the Indian Academy of Health Psychology;
 - (vii) Prof. Indu Pal Kaur, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), on being awarded with the prestigious Fulbright-Nehru Academic and Professional Excellence (FNAPE) Fellowship for the session 2017-18, by the United States-India Educational Foundation (USIEF);
 - (viii) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Sr. Lecturer in the Department of Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopedics at Dr H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences on having won the Famdent Excellency in Dentistry Awards (FEDA) for the third consecutive year on 17th December in Mumbai;
 - (ix) Professor Rupinder Tewari, on release of his book entitled 'Industry-Academia R&D ecosystem in India in India' by Dr. R. Chidambram (Principal Science Advisor to Prime Minister of India), Dr. V. Saraswat (Member, Science, NITI Ayog) and Dr. Ashutosh Sharma (Secretary, DST), during the Indian Science Congress 2017 on January 3, at Tirupati;
 - (x) Babe Ke College of Education, Mudki, Distt. Ferozepur (Pb.) on being awarded CGPA 3.63 with A⁺ Grade by the NAAC ;
 - (xi) Babe Ke College of Education, Daudhar, Distt. Moga (Pb.), on being awarded CGPA 3.57 with A⁺ Grade by the NAAC;
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (1), (2), (14), and (15), be noted and approved; and
 3. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 27.11.2016, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they are having many distinguished achievements by alumni and faculty members. He thought that they should have a practice of a link on the website a distinguished achievements portal so that they could have better spreading of this information to the society.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is already there on the alumni page and they could surely and greatly improve it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Colleges have got A+ grade. Now they are having 5 such Colleges – 3 from Education and 2 from Arts and Sciences. His submission is that they should have a practice of the presentations of these Colleges, at least in the Principals' Meeting, so that the Colleges could share their USPs, so that the other Colleges could have better awareness and other issues pertaining to the improvement in NAAC grading.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already done it and invited Mrs. Madhu Prashar and the Principal of H.M.V. Mrs. Anita Kaushal also gave a presentation in SHEC meeting. No doubt, they would do it.

Principal Gurdeep Kumar Sharma said that this seems to be the highest grade amongst the Colleges of Education. They need to send IQAC team to see as to what extra these Colleges have done and that would be beneficial for all.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would do it.

Professor Mukesh Arora congratulated for the digitalization mode as also said by the Prime Minister. One more thing needed to be added to it. He suggested that the TA/DA of the Ph.D. examiners should be deposited in their account on the same day otherwise sometimes there is delay due to payment by cheque. Earlier, if somebody came after spending the money on travel by car, the payment used to be made in cash. A system could be adopted so that the payment is credited to the account of the examiner before his reaching his residence otherwise sometimes, as he has come to know, the examiners do not come.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the invitation goes to a person and the details of bank account of the examiners should be obtained when the acceptance is taken.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a circular from the Finance and Development Officer could be issued regarding such requirements so that when the examiner comes, he could provide all the details.

The Vice-Chancellor said that asking such details should be an integral part of the letter which is sent to the examiners.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a format of the same be prepared.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is happy to share that Professor Khush is going to deliver two lectures in the city. He is going to deliver Dr. Shiv Ram Kashyap Memorial Lecture on March 24 and Dr. Hargobind Khurana Lecture to the school students of Punjab who got Hargobind Khurana Fellowship. Professor Kapany, who has over 100 patents to his credit, is going to interact at a programme being organized by the Centre for Policy Research. He is also going to visit IIT, Ropar. Professor Kapany is of the age of 90+ years and Professor Khush is 89+. He is happy that they have agreed to travel at an age when people are reluctant to travel. The University would

provide business class travel for which they have found the partners to share the expenses. They are also trying to arrange a lecture by Dr. Kapany. Dr. Nuruddin Farah has been perennially nominated for the Nobel Prize. He is one of the most well-known English writers from the African continent. He had studied at a College in the city. He has agreed to spend two weeks and would deliver 5 lectures, would also visit Anandpur Sahib, Golden Temple. Shri Anupam Kher and Dr. P.D. Gupta are also going to deliver the lectures. So, all these people would come and stay and interact with the society. He is trying to see whether they could have a civic reception for Dr. Kapany and Dr. Khush. Dr. Kapany is considered as the father of fiber optics. Dr. Khush is the one who has solved the world hunger problem with the invention of high yielding rice variety. The families of Khush and Kapany crossed over from Pakistan to India in 1947, one studied at Agriculture College, Ludhiana and the other at Kanpur. Dr. Kapany has established the historical Sikh Foundation in California. Professor Ronki Ram had gone to California and delivered a memorial lecture named after the mother of Dr. Kapany. Many persons are looking forward to the visit of Dr. Kapany.

They have a long agenda and to see as to how they could proceed with it in an efficient manner, he had requested four colleagues to go through all the items of the agenda submit an algorithm to handle it. Some of these items require minimal discussion, some require some discussion and some require detailed thinking and deliberation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that agenda Item No.2 pertains to the minutes of the Selection Committee for promotions which are from Stage-1 to 2, Stage-2 to 3, Stage-3 to 4 and Stage-4 to 5. They are well aware that from Stage-3 to 4, there is an interview and from Stage-4 to 5, there is also an interview. So, the deliberations of the interview were sent to the members in sealed envelope. Item No. 2 and 3 pertain to that.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the benefit of increment is given when an employee enters into higher scale. It would be better if the increment is given at the time of the grant of pay scale. Otherwise, it takes a time of 1-2 years to process the cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not so.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu is saying is correct to some extent. Actually what is happening is that when the promotion is given, the person has to apply for the grant of one increment. Some of the persons do not know about it and it takes a year or so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as per Government norms, it is an automatic procedure. If it is not automatic, then he would look into it, in that case it is a violation of the Government norms.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it should be given at the time of promotion, as Dr. Ajay Ranga had also pointed out it, so that there is no problem at a later stage and then the arrears have to be prepared.

The Vice-Chancellor said that normally, it is an automatic process and the promotion means that the increment is to be given

otherwise the promotion has no meaning. He would check up it. There should be no complaint from anybody in this regard.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-3 to Associate Professor Stage-4, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIET

2(i). Considered the minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), 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-3**) to Associate Professor (Mech. Engg.) (**Stage-4**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **08.07.2014**, 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, 2010.

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

2(ii). Considered the minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-III**) 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. Shuchi Gupta be promoted from Assistant Professor (Physics) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Physics) (**Stage-3**), at the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **17.07.2015**, 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 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 Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at UIET

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Monika Randhawa be promoted from Assistant Professor (Physics) (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (Physics) (**Stage-4**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **04.04.2015**, 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 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-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gurinder Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Physics) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Physics) (**Stage-3**), at P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **18.07.2015**, 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.

Placement of Lecturer in Senior Scale, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of Microbiology, Panjab University

2(v). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Selection Committee for Placement of Lecturer in Senior Scale, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of Microbiology, Panjab University.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Naveen Gupta be placed in Lecturer (Senior Scale), in the Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, Chandigarh under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (1996), w.e.f., **04.05.2006**, in the pay-scale of Rs.10000-325-15200) 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of Microbiology, Panjab University

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in Department of Microbiology, Panjab University.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Deepak Kumar Rahi be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**), in Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **14.10.2012**, 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-3 to Associate Professor Stage-4, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Education

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-VIII**) 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 Education.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kuldeep Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **02.01.2016**, 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 she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

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

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Puja Ahuja be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS),

w.e.f. **01.10.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and 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-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at USOL Panjab University, Chandigarh

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-X**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Mamta Rani be promoted from Assistant Professor (Education) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Education) (**Stage-3**) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **07.09.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-3 to Associate Professor Stage-4, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at School of Punjabi Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh

2(x). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at School of Punjabi Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sarabjit Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) at School of Punjabi Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **16.10.2014**, 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, 2010

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

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-XII**) 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 Public Administration, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

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

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

2(xii). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Mandeep Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (Information Technology) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Information Technology) (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **25.11.2015**, 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 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-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh

2(xiii). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

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

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|------------|
| 1. Dr. Arvind Kumar | : | 26.09.2013 |
| 2. Mr. Sumit Budhiraja | : | 23.09.2015 |
| 3. Mr. Jaget Singh | : | 22.12.2015 |

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

Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur.

2(xiv). Considered minutes dated 12.01.2017 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Aditya Angiras be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **03.11.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of promotions to the persons promoted under Item **C-2(i) to C-2(xiv)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Promotion cases of some Programmers/System Managers

3. Considered minutes of the Screening/Selection Committee dated 16.11.2016 (**Appendix-XVI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to finalize the promotion cases of some Programmers/System Managers.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Screening/Selection Committee dated 16.11.2016 regarding promotion cases of Programmers/System Managers (**as per Appendix-XVI**), be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of promotions to the persons be issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Adoption of Gazette Notification No. 67 dated 8.3.2013 of Central Council of Homoeopathy

5. Considered if letter No. F.12-15/2012-CCH/25910-26171 dated 13.3.2013 (**Appendix-XVII**) received from Secretary, Central Council of Homoeopathy, No.61-65, Institutional Area Opp. D Block, Janakpuri, New Delhi-110058, enclosing therewith Gazette Notification No. 67 dated 8.3.2013 regarding Homoeopathic Central Council (Minimum Standards Requirement of Homoeopathic Colleges and attached Hospitals) Regulations, 2013, be adopted, as requested by Dr. P.K. Mittal, Vice-President of Governing Body of Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, # M-671, Sector 26, Chandigarh vide letter dated 8.11.2016 (**Appendix-XVII**).

NOTE : The above letter No. F.12-15/2012-CCH/25910-26171 dated 13.3.2013 was placed before the Syndicate at its meeting held on 27th July/13th August 2013 (Para 26) (**Appendix-XVII**) and it was resolved that the item be withdrawn

RESOLVED: That Gazette Notification No. 67 dated 8.3.2013 of Homoeopathic Central Council (Minimum Standards Requirement of Homoeopathic Colleges and attached Hospitals) Regulations, 2013, received from Secretary, Central Council of Homoeopathy, No.61-65, Institutional Area Opp. D Block, Janakpuri, New Delhi-110058, vide letter No. F.12-15/2012-CCH/25910-26171 dated 13.3.2013 (**Appendix-XVII**) be adopted, as requested by Dr. P.K. Mittal, Vice-President of Governing Body of Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, # M-671, Sector 26, Chandigarh vide letter dated 8.11.2016 (**Appendix-XVII**).

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form a Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate, for implementation of promotion policy as per the adopted Gazette Notification.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 03.11.2016 regarding Chairs in Category-1

14. Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 03.11.2016 (**Appendix-XVIII**) constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.07.2016 (Para 6) to examine the

recommendation of the Committee dated 16.05.2016 regarding Chair in Category-1 that:

1. the senior-most Professor of the Department, designated as Professor of a Chair, be allowed to hold the title upto the age of superannuation, subject to the decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court with regard to the age of retirement.
2. the teachers designated as Professor of a Chair should give an inaugural lecture to the whole University; and

he/she should also given one lecture/presentation, every year, to the faculty to which he/she belongs.
3. the teachers already selected, through open selection, as Chair Professor would continue as such upto the age of superannuation and thereafter the title be given to the next senior-most person in the concerned department, as per decision in Para-1 and 2 above.

This will not apply to the existing Professors, already serving as Chaired Professors after due selection on their Chairs.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.07.2016 (Para 6) (**Appendix-XVIII**) while considering the recommendations of the Committee dated 16.05.2016 has constituted a Committee under Chairmanship of Professor Shelley Walia to examine the recommendation of the Committee dated 16.05.2016 for Chairs in Category-1 and also approved the recommendations dated 16.05.2016 for Chairs in Category-2

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is an observation. Whatever has been done is right that it would be till the age of superannuation. There are certain Chairs for which the senior most might not be an appropriate person and might not be having specialization for that Chair. It could be offered by seniority to an appropriate person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then it becomes a value judgment, this is a Chair which carries a name. So, if they start with value judgment, then there is a big problem.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if a person is having any specialization and a Chair is of entirely different field, if just for the sake of seniority the Chair is given to that person, what kind of work he/she could do, what justice he/she could do. According to him, it is just like a bureaucratic thing that a person is senior. It should be seen whether a person has specialization, relevance or field and accordingly the Chair could be given.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 21st January 2017

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could defer this item and they could give him an algorithm where this problem should not occur.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it should not be deferred. They could authorize the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this kind of problem could occur in a few Chairs while there would be no problem in others. For example, in the subject of Music if there is a Professor of Music, then there could be no problem.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that if a person has some work in a field, then the Chair could be given to that person. If they defer it, the Chairs would remain vacant. They could authorize the Vice-Chancellor and assign the Chair according to specialization. If they form a Committee, the assignment could be delayed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the assignment of Chairs would come to the Syndicate and he would place the first list to the next meeting of Syndicate so that they have collectively and consciously done something.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that what Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is saying is right. For example, if there is a senior most person in Baba Farid Chair and he has not worked much on Sufism, it has also to be kept in mind.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the list would be provided, they could examine such things.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there was a crisis on this issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would come with the list.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if a Chair is named after Baba Farid, one could do work on other scholars also and could be assigned the Chair.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could examine these things. There is a K.L. Sehgal Chair in Music. Shri K.L. Sehgal was a vocalist and it does not mean that they could not assign the Chair to an instrumentalist. They would come back with the list and would collectively do it.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 03.11.2016 (as per **Appendix-XVIII**) constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.07.2016 (Para 6) to examine the recommendation of the Committee dated 16.05.2016 regarding Chair in Category-1, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the list of persons to be appointed on these Chairs be placed before the Syndicate.

**Recommendations of
P.U.S.C.
29.11.2016**

dated

15. Considered the recommendation (Item No.21) of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 29.11.2016 (**Appendix-XIX**) that Administrative sanction and financial approval to give financial

assistance to the driver of Staff Car during any Inter-University Competition held outside Chandigarh per head per day, be given at par with the rates to the bus driver of the Directorate out of respective budget head.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation (Item No.21) of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 29.11.2016 (**as per Appendix-XIX**) that Administrative sanction and financial approval to give financial assistance to the driver of Staff Car during any Inter-University Competition held outside Chandigarh per head per day, be given at par with the rates to the bus driver of the Directorate out of respective budget head, be approved.

**Recommendations of
P.U.S.C. dated 19.12.2016**

16. Considered recommendations (Items No.17, 2 & 5) of General Body of P.U.S.C. dated 19.12.2016 (**Appendix-XX**).

RESOLVED: That the recommendations (Items No.17, 2 & 5) of General Body of P.U.S.C. dated 19.12.2016 (**as per Appendix-XX**), be approved.

**Advertisement for walk-in-
interview for DPR**

17. Considered if, draft of Advertisement along with detailed instructions (**Appendix-XXI**), be approved to conduct a Walk-in-Interview for appointment of Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News-01, in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100+Grade pay of Rs.6600/- plus allowances admissible under Panjab University rules against Leave vacancy of Shri Vineet Punia, Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, purely on temporary/contract/deputation basis for a period of six months or until the person holding lien joins back to the University, whichever is earlier and permission be also granted to advertise the said position in two leading newspapers i.e. The Tribune and Dainik Bhaskar:-

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.11.2016 (Para 46) (**Appendix-XXI**) has granted Extraordinary Leave (without pay) upto 30.06.2017 to Shri Vineet Punia, Director Public Relations-cum-Editor.
 2. Shri Vineet Punia has proceeded on Extraordinary Leave (without pay) w.e.f. 27.12.2016 (AF) and he has handed over the charge to Professor Archana Singh, Chairperson, School of Communication Studies, pursuant to letter No.18566/Estt. dated 20.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXI**) as the Vice-Chancellor has allowed Professor Archana Singh to work as Officiating DPR (Additional charge) with immediate effect till further order.

Shri Punia has also briefed the whole functioning of the office of DPR to Professor Archana Singh (Officiating DPR) and Shri Devashish Chakarabarty, Research Scholar, who will coordinate and conduct the day to day functioning of the office of DPR.

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

The Vice-Chancellor said that the DPR is on leave and they have to do something.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the DPR has been given six months' leave.

The Vice-Chancellor said that presently, the DPR has been granted a leave of six months and as a special case he has been allowed to retain the house for six months. At the moment, this is the situation.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if DPR is granted leave for three years, then the house should be got vacated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the DPR is interested for leave for three years, then he would have to vacate the house.

Shri Varinder Singh said that then they could also appoint someone in that position.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are pros and cons and on the kind of position the DPR has gone and the circumstances in which he has gone that could not be encouraged and made a norm in Panjab University. They struggled so much for appointing somebody and gave something to him out of turn. Everything was provided to make him comfortable. Even after that he wants to go to the private sector, he could go, but then he should resign and vacate the position so that they could have somebody. They could not create a kind of precedence which could create problems.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is fundamentally right what the Vice-Chancellor is saying. There have been incidences that the eminent Professors of the University go to private institutions and provide consultancy. Therefore, this should be discouraged.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they get a person on deputation and could stay here for three years, then it is an exceptional circumstance.

Professor Pam Rajput said that they should not encourage it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they are not in favor of it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even the DPR has not asked the University in this regard. If someone wanted to go to State Bank, it is not a Government organization, it is a public limited company. One should evaluate the things. In future, somebody could also say that Panjab University is not a Government institution and is a self sustaining University. The way they are providing for themselves, he is afraid, that after five years, someone could also talk about the private University status of Panjab University.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that if a person is working very good, the institution should not spare such a person and the person would not go to any other institution.

RESOLVED: That draft of Advertisement along with detailed instructions (**as per Appendix-XXI**), be approved to conduct a Walk-in-Interview for appointment of Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, P.U. News-01, in the pay band of Rs.15600-39100+Grade pay of Rs.6600/- plus allowances admissible under Panjab University rules against Leave vacancy of Shri Vineet Punia, Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, purely on temporary/contract/deputation basis for a period of six months or until the person holding lien joins back to the University, whichever is earlier and permission be also granted to advertise the said position in two leading newspapers i.e. The Tribune and Dainik Bhaskar.

**Minutes of Revising
Committee dated
26.12.2016 regarding
Paper-setter/examiners**

18. Considered minutes of the Revising Committee dated 26.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXII**) regarding Paper-Setters/Examiners recommended by the various Board of Studies for the session 2016-17.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is okay. However, he would like to add that as per Panjab University Calendar, a member of the Board of Studies could not be a paper-setter. Even after having taken the decision in various Boards of Studies, he would cite the example of Board of Studies in Punjabi, when the letters to the paper-setters are issued or the Secrecy branch does not attend to it, it happens that from the list of examiners, the paper-setters are appointed. It is in his knowledge and he has been pointing out it for the last 2-3 years that a member of the Board of Studies has been appointed as a paper-setter. It should be kept in mind and the instructions should be issued to the Secrecy Branch that since a member of the Board of Studies, as per Panjab University Calendar, could not be appointed a paper-setter, he/she should not be appointed as a paper-setter.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in the letter which is issued to the paper-setters, there is an undertaking from the paper-setter that he/she is not a member of the Board of Studies.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there are so many persons who are members of the Board of Studies and are also appointed as paper-setters. He said that every year, he gets the letter for paper-setting but he refuses it being a member of the Board of Studies.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are two situations. One is that there is a provision that in case of an emergency, a member of the Board of Studies could be appointed as paper-setter. Secondly, there are many subjects in which sufficient number of teachers are not available as far as permanent faculty is concerned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be given in writing.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in emergency certain situations could prevail.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be distinguishably written. It be made sure that when after the discussion, the resolved part is written, these things are recorded.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that about 2-3 days ago, he had sent e-mail to the Vice-Chancellor that a teacher who has never taught the M.A. classes is evaluating the answer sheets which was, by mistake, approved by the Board of Studies though he is also a member but could not attend the meeting. He made a complaint. If a teacher says that he has taught the classes, at least an undertaking should be taken from the concerned teacher that he has taught a particular subject otherwise it would be an injustice.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the Board of Studies in Punjabi (PG), they have taken a decision that the teacher should have at least 3 years teaching experience of teaching PG classes and should give an undertaking that during the current year, he/she is teaching that paper. If a teacher had taught a paper 15 years ago, one could not be specialized in that paper as syllabi is continuously changing. Professor Mukesh Arora is saying right. The Board of Studies could be issued the instructions in this regard. Earlier there was a condition of minimum 10 years teaching, now it is five years. However, the University could not get sufficient number of evaluators. The examiners evaluating the papers for the first time are doing a good job. If a teacher is teaching a particular specialization, then it is good. But what is happening is that the teacher has not taught a particular paper in PG classes even then he/she is evaluating it. Such teachers should refuse the evaluation. He suggested that the instructions be issued to the Board of Studies that the requirement of the teaching experience should be kept in mind. A teacher should be allowed to evaluate the paper which he/she has been teaching and not the other papers.

Professor Mukesh Arora pointed out that there are eight papers in two semesters and a teacher is evaluating all the eight papers which is not possible.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the specialization should be asked for from the teachers.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the teachers should be asked to submit in writing that he/she is teaching the paper he/she is going to evaluate.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that at least this should be done in the case of PG classes.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the procedure is that in the month of July, the University sends the forms to the Colleges. What would the Board of Studies do in this matter? There are so many columns in the forms like classes, year, paper and area of specialization. A teacher fills up the form which is forwarded by the Principal which does not go to the Board of Studies and the Board of Studies has to see all these things whatever they have received from the concerned Colleges. In that situation, it becomes very important for the Board of Studies and they have to follow whatever they have received. How could they check these things? A teacher mentions in the form that he/she wanted to evaluate a particular paper with a specialization.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that an undertaking should be taken which could be challenged later on.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the same is also happening the Board of Studies in Punjabi. The instructions are being sent that the teacher should have been teaching a paper for three years and undertaking is also taken. If the Board of Studies decides, then no teacher would give the undertaking whether he/she is teaching the paper. Then it could be checked.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he had given a complaint in writing.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that it could be added in the form that the teacher had taught for such and such session. If any complaint is received, the Principal could verify that

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is right. They would have recorded it and the draft minutes of this para before he confirms the minutes would be sent to all the College teacher colleagues who have participated in today's discussion so that it is properly worded and such problems did not occur after the confirmation of the minutes.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Principals should give their recommendations well in advance that such and such teacher is teaching such and such paper, especially in the case of PG classes and that teacher should be approved as paper setter only in that paper.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is good.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang suggested that there should be separate forms for UG and PG classes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything is well taken.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the form a column should be added asking for the information that a teacher is teaching a paper during the current session.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he was talking about the University teachers and who maintains all this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the University, the number of teachers is very less.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that even a teacher who is not teaching a paper since 1994, even then such a teacher evaluates the papers.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the period of three years could be mentioned as a teacher must have taught a paper in an earlier year but not in the current year.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that there should be a requirement of at least three years of teaching.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Revising Committee dated 26.12.2016, (as per **Appendix-XXII**), regarding Paper-Setters/Examiners recommended by various Board of Studies for the session 2016-17, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the members of Board of Studies be not appointed as paper-setters except in emergency situations.

**Payment
of
Honorarium
to
Technical Advisors**

19. Considered if, the following Technical Advisors/ Advisor at P.U. Construction Office, be paid honorarium up to November, 2016 for the services, which they have provided to the Panjab University:

1. Er. V.K. Bhardwaj, Technical Advisor
2. Er. Param Hans Singh, Technical Advisor
3. Ar. P.R. Luthra, Advisor

NOTE: 1. The term of appointment of Er. V.K. Bhardwaj as Technical Advisor, P.U. Construction Office was extended for one year w.e.f. 22.02.2015, on the same terms and conditions by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 (Para 11) (**Appendix-XXIII**).

However, he continued to provide technical services to the Panjab University on the request of Executive Engineer-I without any order. Hence, no payment was released after 21.02.2016.

2. The term of appointment of Er. Param Hans Singh and Ar. P.R. Luthra as Technical Advisor and Advisor, respectively, was till further orders. Accordingly, they have already been paid honorarium upto October, 2016.
3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

Shri Varinder Singh said that a Committee could be formed to suggest the name of Advisors to oversee the works being done by the XEN office as the XEN has been taking all the decision on his own.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the present cases are of the Technical Advisors who worked earlier and their honorarium is pending.

RESOLVED: That following Technical Advisors/ Advisor at P.U. Construction Office, be paid honorarium up to November, 2016 for the services, which they have provided to the Panjab University:

1. Er. V.K. Bhardwaj, Technical Advisor
2. Er. Param Hans Singh, Technical Advisor

3. Ar. P.R. Luthra, Advisor

Assignment of Fellow to Faculties

22. Considered that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name:

Professor Deepak Pental CGMCP, Biotech Centre University of Delhi South Campus New Delhi-110021	1. Science 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Pharmaceutical Sciences
--	---

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name:

Professor Deepak Pental CGMCP, Biotech Centre University of Delhi South Campus New Delhi-110021	1. Science 2. Medical Sciences 3. Education 4. Pharmaceutical Sciences
--	---

Letter dated 17.09.2016 of Joint Secretary, Bar Council of India regarding revival of age restriction for admission in LL.B 3 year Course and LL.B Five years Course, from the session 2017-18

23. Considered letter dated 01.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXIV**) of the Chairman, Department of Laws, P.U. with regard to revival of age restriction under Clause 28 of Legal Education Rules 2008 for admission in LL.B 3 year Course and LL.B Five years Course, from the session 2017-18, pursuant to letter dated 17.09.2016 (**Appendix-XXIV**) of Joint Secretary, Bar Council of India.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this letter is a new one from the Bar Council of India. The matter is in the High Court and a decision in the matter could come anytime. Before adopting this letter, they could form a Committee of Senate members having legal background to examine it and only they could adopt it.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that even persons after retirement pursue the LL.B. course.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Dr. Sahota had also done the LL.B. after her retirement.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a Committee comprising of Justice (Retd.) Harbans Lal, Mrs. Anu Chatrath and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa be formed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would add 1-2 such persons who have recently done the LL.B. after the age of 60 years. This age restriction looks very restrictive. They were not accepting it. The Committee would examine it and then it would be brought back to the Syndicate and they would have to decide quickly before the commencement of the next session.

RESOLVED: That a Committee comprising of Justice (Retd.) Harbans Lal, Mrs. Anu Chatrath, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and 1-2 persons who have recently done the LL.B. after the age of 60 years be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the issue and the report of the Committee be placed before the Syndicate.

Resolution passed by PUTA **24.** Considered the following resolution (**Appendix-XXV**) passed by Panjab University Teacher's Association (PUTA) in its General Body Meeting (GBM) dated 16.09.2016:

"That the subscription to Panjab University Teacher's Association Welfare Scheme, be enhanced from Rs.300/- to Rs.600/-"

NOTE: 1. Previously, the subscription to Panjab University Teacher's Association Welfare Scheme was enhanced from Rs.200/- to Rs.300/- vide Syndicate decision dated 23.02.2002 (Para 34) (**Appendix-XXV**).

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

RESOLVED: That following resolution (**Appendix-XXV**) passed by Panjab University Teacher's Association (PUTA) in its General Body Meeting (GBM) dated 16.09.2016, be approved:

"That the subscription to Panjab University Teacher's Association Welfare Scheme, be enhanced from Rs.300/- to Rs.600/-".

Recommendation of Committee dated 03.11.2016 **25.** Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 03.11.2016 (**Appendix-XXVI**) that the existing rates for evaluation of answer books of Under-graduate and Post-graduate exams be revised as under with effect from December, 2016 semester exams:

Courses	From (per answer book)	To (per answer book)
Under-graduate Courses	Rs.18/-	Rs.22/-
Post-graduate Courses	Rs.22/-	Rs.27/-

NOTE: 1. Earlier too, the rates of remuneration for evaluation of answer books of Under-graduate and Post-graduate exams were enhanced vide order No. 4160-64/Secy. dated 07.05.2014 (**Appendix-XXVI**) on the recommendations of the Committee.

2. The matter will be got noted by the BOF as and when the meeting is fixed

Professor Mukesh Arora said that even if they are approving it today, but it should be given from the back date when they evaluation was done in December. The same was also decided in the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that any matter related with expenditure, he would have to get it okayed from the current Board of Finance.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the students have paid the fees for the examinations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Board of Finance would not allow doing such things and if it is done, there could be complaints. The meeting of the Board of Finance is not very far as it is scheduled to be held in the month of February to which the members agreed.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that whenever they wanted, could approve it but the benefit should be given from December onwards.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with it and the only thing is that it would be got done from the Board of Finance.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that they could also think of issuing Detailed Marks Card under 'Tatkal Scheme' on payment basis.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these are the normal rates that they are paying to the teachers. He suggested that sometimes if a student has taken the examination and wanted the result within a week whether it is of re-evaluation or otherwise. At present, there is no such provision of providing the result. They were thinking of having such a provision that on the lines of Tatkal Passport, a Committee be formed to look into the possibility of Tatkal Result with some charges. They could authorize the Vice-Chancellor to form a Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is okay with him.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it might not be that there is lot of pressure on this 'Tatkal scheme'.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee would look into all such things.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they could charge higher fee for this purpose.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they are facing problems in the semesters because of late declaration of results due to re-evaluation or for some other reasons. What is happening is that if the dealing hand has prepared the result and till the time the result of second semester does not go to the person dealing with third semester and the result of third semester does not go to the dealing person of fourth semester, the result of the fourth semester is not declared. The result is held up as RLL. In 99% of the cases, until the student approaches through some sources and goes from a counter to the other, the result is not declared and the students have to themselves do all this work. The work of semester examinations is out of their control even if they are saying that the semester system is doing well. But they should see the ground level realities. Secondly, he is not doing the evaluation work since the time he became the Principal, he got a letter on 19th for evaluation of modern poetry paper but the answer sheets had not been sent to the evaluation centres. Even outstation teachers also come for evaluation. There are so many problems. These could also be due to shortage of manpower or other reasons. The answer sheets assignment is sent for a week. A teacher has got relieving from the College for marking of the papers and the evaluation was done within a day as the number of answer sheets was very less which were sent by the University. On the second day, it was said that the papers are available but the delivery has not reached and there would be no evaluation. The teacher waits for a day or two and then returns back

to the College. The Principal asks the teacher as to for how many days the evaluation was done. The teacher did the evaluation work for a day while he/she was relieved for 6 days. The teachers are facing problems due to this. There are so many problems in the examination and evaluation system. These should be kept in mind by way of forming a Committee.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is not the examination work is not doing well. It is also doing well in some spheres. As said by Principal I.S. Sandhu there might be some problems. They could have a look as to how many re-evaluation results of December 2015 examination have not been declared or how many results are pending. As has been pointed out that if the result of the lower semester is declared, the result should be sent to the person dealing with the next semester. It should be done automatically and it should be in a time bound manner.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would make the video recording available to the Controller of Examinations who could give the response in brief to the points raised by the members. Once he gets the response, he would look into the issue and if he gets satisfied, it is okay, otherwise he would arrange a meeting between the Controller of Examinations and those of the members who have contributed to the discussion so that they evolve some guidelines and if something is left that should be resolved so that next time when they meet, they take a call whether they have come out with some algorithm.

Shri Varinder Singh said that as said by Professor Navdeep Goyal, a separate Committee should be formed for examining the possibility of declaration of results under 'Tatkal Scheme' as some students who wanted to go abroad and were in need of the results and the University would also benefit.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as per rules, the re-evaluation process is started after 21 days of the declaration of the results.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he disagreed with Shri Varinder Singh. If they start the Tatkal scheme, the teachers would vie for getting the answer sheets for evaluation under this scheme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not that if higher fee is charged under this scheme, that would go to the teachers.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that they should speed up the delivery system.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the rates of evaluation should remain the same.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if the fee is not enhanced, then all the students would demand the declaration of the results within a week.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the Committee see all these things.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that when the answer sheets for evaluation are sent, these are delivered by hand. There is no doubt during the last three years, there have been extraordinary reforms in the examination system. As far as re-evaluation is concerned, supposing a teacher gets two answer sheets, the teacher would not personally go to the University to hand over the answer sheets after evaluation, but would wait for the person from the University to pick up the same. This part is very serious. The teachers are saying that the answer sheets remain lying with them for months. Sometimes, he personally made a telephonic call in the concerned branch to collect the answer sheets from the teachers so that the re-evaluation result of the students is declared. He suggested that it should be seen that if the teacher has promised to evaluate the answer sheets within a specified period, the University should make arrangement for the collection of the answer sheets within that period from the teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the answer sheets could be sent as scanned copy and securing the same at website. There are Universities which are doing the entire marking system in the online mode.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the State of Karnataka is doing the evaluation through this mode.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it is a very good suggestion. Since for the re-evaluation, the answer sheets are sent to 2-3 examiners, through the scanning process, the examiners would not be able to see as to how many marks have been awarded by the other examiners. In the present system, the second or third examiner comes to know as to how many marks have been awarded by the first examiner and accordingly they evaluate the answer sheets.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are universities in the country which have implemented this with the help of software companies. Right now, they continue to do whatever they are doing. Ultimately, they have to move on to the scanning process which the University of Karnataka is doing.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that a team related with the examination system could go and see.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would form a team on behalf of State Higher Education Council (SHEC) and send it to Karnataka because bringing the examination reforms is also one of the agenda of SHEC. It should not be delayed.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that there is some issue related with the communication. For example, in the meeting of the Syndicate held on 1.5.2016, a decision was taken that the practical examination would not be conducted this time in the odd semester. The letter was issued by the University to the College on 26.9.2016 after five months. During this period of five months, there was confusion amongst the teachers whether the practical examination has to be conducted or not. After 26.9.2016, there were some representations that there are some technical subjects which were being taught and the practical would be the same and how the students would undergo the practical examination in next May. Thereafter, it was revised. They could see and find that there is no date sheet of this session which has not been revised. Proper date

sheets are not being prepared. The date sheet of the practical examination was revised and the date sheet of theory examination was revised at least twice. There is also confusion as one student had got one date sheet while the other one got the second one. There is a need to examine it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is well taken.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said the question papers are also e-mailed and they could not know as to in which paper the students were appearing. Sometimes, it has also been observed that a particular identification number on the envelope is written while in the envelope there is some other question paper. Sometimes the question paper is sent at 11.00 a.m. and thereafter the students have to write the examination. He would also like to bring it to the attention that in the subjects of Physics and Chemistry, the examination was of 50 marks out of which 45 marks were for theory paper and 5 marks were for internal assessment. With the introduction of semester, the marks allotted to the paper are 25 out of 22 marks are for theory and 3 marks for internal assessment. In the subject of Physics, out of the three papers, A, B and C, papers A and B are 22 marks while paper C is of 44 marks. The paper of Physics is 44 and Chemistry 22. There is also very much confusion in it. It needs to be examined and corrected.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it came from the Faculty of Science. As far as the issue of practical in the odd and even semester is concerned, the Standing Committee took that decision. The issue raised by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu is a genuine one. There are two issues. The Standing Committee took a decision that, it is larger decision of the Faculty, that they should take the practical only one time. Secondly, there are many subjects which, later on, came to the knowledge of the Faculty and the examination branch also that there is no second part. It particularly happens in B.C.A., Biotechnology and Computer Science. There is no part B in these subjects. Under those circumstances, for the knowledge of the Standing Committee that was not the issue at that time, it was raised later on. Under those circumstances also, lot of revision in the examination pattern was there as far as this is concerned. According to him, for a larger deliberation, in the coming meeting of the Faculty which would take place in the month of March, these things should be got cleared from the Faculty. There was lot of controversy during the meeting of the Faculty of Science held in March 2016 regarding what should be the percentage of internal assessment and theory. That should be deliberated again by the Faculty to come up with complete plan and that could be finalized.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that as said by Dr. Dalip Kumar, it was passed in the Standing Committee that the practical would not be conducted in odd semester but would be conducted in even semester. When some complaints were received, it was brought to the knowledge of the Controller of Examinations. He had also requested the Controller of Examinations to convene a meeting of the Standing Committee to look into the problems. But the decision which was taken again, was taken at their own level and the meeting of the Standing Committee was not convened. If the Standing Committee had earlier taken a decision that should have again gone to the Standing Committee and only then the decision could have been revised.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the practical in the semester system are to be taken annually. It is three years since the semester system was introduced. They should review it and take a feedback whether it is successful.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no question of going back to the annual system. There are so many universities in the country which are doing practical external examination at the end of the year.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he feels that the semester system is the best one where the number of the students in the Departments is very less. The admissions go up to the end of the month of August and in the month of November, students hardly come to the Colleges. The same is the system that after the month of February, the students do not attend the Colleges. What is the harm in having an assessment of the semester system? They have to work for the welfare of the students and have to see that if a student passes out, he/she must have some knowledge and it is not the case that the students only get the degree. He said that the semester system in the Colleges is not successful.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a decision that they could not reverse it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is mandatory.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could do what they wanted. In State universities where 50% of the money is coming from the Centre, they have to adhere to the directives of the Centre. Let them be practical and have to find device/ways how to plug the loopholes of the semester system.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that a Standing Committee for semester system was formed. There is a need to revive the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when they introduced the semester system, they had said that they would review it and the time has come that they review it. Let them review it and it is good that they are taking up in the first meeting of the new Senate so that before his term ends, this problem is not handed over to the next Vice-Chancellor. So, they would review it certainly before the start of the next session.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the issue of Standing Committee be looked into.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he agreed with it. They review the semester system, try to improve it as much as they could. The members are willing to work and he would stand behind them.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that dates of the commencement of the practical examination should be a part of the academic calendar. This time it happened that the practical examination was scheduled on 21st and the date sheet was uploaded on 19th, just two days before the start of the practical examination. The teachers and the students were not aware of it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would take up it with the Controller of Examinations. The DVD of the matters related to the Colleges would be made available to Controller of Examinations. He directed the Registrar to brief the Controller of Examinations about these matters.

Principal I.S. Sandhu enquired about the decision on the item related with the revision of rates.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the proposal would go to the Board of Finance and would be got ratified so that there is no complaint.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the rates of the employees should also be revised.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that these are all connected issues.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that with it, that is also approved and have to be revised.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the rates of the staff of the Colleges should also be revised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the expenses involved are not very high.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the recommendations of the Committee dated 03.11.2016 (**as per Appendix-XXVI**) be approved and be referred to the Board of Finance;
2. the same Committee should look into the other matters related with the remuneration for conduct and evaluation of examination; and
3. the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form a Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate, to work out the modalities for preparation of 'Tatkal Scheme' for declaration of re-evaluation results.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 17.11.2016

26. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 17.11.2016 (**Appendix-XXVII**) that Inductively Coupled Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometer (ICP-AES Make Jobin Yvon Model JY70 Plus) with accessories lying in lab No. 143-144 at Centre of Advanced Study in Geology in Department of Geology, P.U., be written off as the instrument is 28 years old and its Electronic card's components are spoiled, PS damaged, troubleshooting not feasible and not economical to repair.

- NOTE:** 1. As per P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 at pages 450-51, the competent authority to write off losses is as under:

1.	Vice Chancellor	Up to Rs.1 lac per item
----	-----------------	-------------------------

2.	Syndicate	Up to Rs.5 lac per item
3.	Senate	Without any limit for any item

2. Letter dated 21.11.2016 of the Chairperson, Centre of Advanced Study in Geology, P.U. enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).
3. The cost of equipment is Rs.23,07,529 and date of purchase is 22.11.1988.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Inductively Coupled Plasma- Atomic Emission Spectrometer (ICP-AES Make Jobin Yvon Model JY70 Plus) with accessories lying in lab No. 143-144 at Centre of Advanced Study in Geology in Department of Geology, P.U., be written off as the instrument is 28 years old and its Electronic card's components are spoiled, PS damaged, troubleshooting not feasible and not economical to repair.

**Validity
Advertisement
7/2015**

**of
No.**

31. Considered if, the validity of Advertisement No. 7/2015 relating to 40 posts of Assistant Professors in various subject at P.U. Constituent Colleges, Punjab may be extended one year more from the lapse of the advertisement i.e. on 28.2.2017, so that the posts of Assistant Professors could be filled in.

NOTE: An office note along with copies of the Advertisement No.7/2015, enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they have already adopted the 3rd and 4th amendment issued on 4th May and 11th July respectively. Since the advertisement is lapsing and if they are extending it, there would be lot of litigation. A wrong was done to a Ph.D. student in 2009 and now Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) has corrected it. Many of the candidates now have become eligible as per the new regulations of the amendment 2016.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the new regulations, the candidates with Ph.D. as also those without NET were allowed. Subsequently, that was amended on 11th July 2016. In that background, they have to look into how to include those candidates because prior to that NET is eligible, now the Ph.D. without NET is also eligible for the post of Assistant Professor. This is as per the Regulation of 4th May.

The Vice-Chancellor said that could they cancel the advertisement.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should not be cancelled. Either a corrigendum could be given or those who have already applied and if they are eligible as per new regulations, they should be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then there would be problems.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there legal complications involved in it.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to what is the way out.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be re-advertised. These are mandatory.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they should take a decision only after hearing the viewpoints of all the members.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they could be in trouble as the MHRD is very strict in it. The GNDU has cancelled all the advertisements. There could be complications. Even there are so many students of Panjab University who have now become eligible.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the simple way is that they issue a corrigendum and what could happen is that some more candidates could also apply, let them apply. The applicants whose screening has been done and are eligible, they would remain. The issue is that if they give a corrigendum, some more people would become eligible. Those who are eligible till date, they would not be ousted. The new applicants could be added and it would be a burden on him as he would have to interview some more people and he is willing to do it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if a corrigendum is given, if some more candidates would come, there is no problem. They could have the same conditions but they could not do that the candidates might not be given the chance otherwise the candidates could go to the court and there would be litigation. There is a need to issue the corrigendum.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if an amendment has come due to which they have to issue a corrigendum. The eligibility is always on the last date of application and in this case also it would apply. Supposing another amendment comes in the month of February, could they issue another corrigendum. Since a lot of time has passed after giving the advertisement and the validity is up to 29th February. The item before the Syndicate is for giving extension for one more year and the discussion is on the issue whether validity should be extended or not. The Screening Committee has worked thrice on different dates and some of the applications had been scrutinized. Then the screening was stopped. Again the screening was done and now for the third time the screening is fixed on 29th January. He has no interest or objection if some more candidates could be added, but his only concern is that the teachers have been appointed for the last 5-6 years, a decision could have been taken after a year, there is a separate recurring grant of those Colleges and the teachers are to be appointed against that grant only. If they go in for corrigendum or re-advertisement, they would be left behind by another year. His concern is that the extension of one year, as requested, should be given and after screening, the interviews be conducted as early as possible so that if some of the teachers already working could not be selected, in the new session those candidates could go somewhere else as most of those teachers are above the age of 35 years. He could submit all such record and the same could also be sought from Principal Kuldeep Singh, Principal Khosla and Principal N.R. Sharma that the teachers are already working for the last 5-6 years. Those teachers are working in good institution. Many other Colleges are not

paying full salary. The University is paying better salary. That is the reason that those teachers are working in the University for the last 5-6 years. If they take a year or so to complete all the formalities, those teachers would become overage after a year or so and would not be able to get job anywhere. This process should have been completed till now. The eligibility is always on the last date of application and not different. If they are thinking of issuing a corrigendum and supposing another amendment comes after two months, then again a corrigendum is to be given. The meeting was held on 27th November wherein it was decided that within a month the interviews would be conducted. Now it is two months. It is official work and he is not objecting to it, the screening has been started after two months. If they go in for corrigendum, they would not be able to fill up the posts for another one year. It would be an injustice to the teachers who have already been appointed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue is what is legally sound. They go through the whole process. If it is going to be litigation and if they are going to come to a naught, this is the problem. This is the crux. Is there a need to get it legally examined?

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this is more appropriate.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is nothing legal in it. A corrigendum could be given and 15 days time could be given to apply.

Professor Mukesh Arora, Professor Pam Rajput and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it should be legally examined.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it could be brought in the next meeting.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if there is anything of going into litigation, the other candidates could also go for litigation.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the item should be passed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have failed to conduct the interview during the one year, then the validity is over. If the validity is over, then their work would increase. They did not want to enhance their work and also most of the candidates are already working.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that out of those, there are some candidates who are Ph.D. and as per new regulation, they would be eligible.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there are 262 applications and there is a competition, it is not that they did not have the applicants. Why it is being delayed?

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they examine legally and legal opinion is that by extending the date of the advertisement at this stage, they would not attract any legal issue means the screening which has been done, they just extend the date and go ahead, they did not come into any legal problem because they are not playing any favouritism. If this permission is granted, then all the doubts are finished. If not, that it would have legal problems, then they should issue the corrigendum. Would the corrigendum get challenged?

When they get it legally examined, then they also get this thing examined whether the corrigendum could be challenged. Then they have no option, they have to re-advertise and those who have already applied, they need not to apply but only to refresh their application.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the item be passed and if the Vice-Chancellor thinks it proper, he might get it legally examined.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they authorize the Vice-Chancellor to get it legally examined.

The Vice-Chancellor said that by that time, let them extend the validity and send it for legal examination for at least two opinions so that at least one opinion is received. If it is delayed by the second person, then it be sent to the third legal experts and do it quickly.

Some of the members said that the item is approved.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that since the screening has been done and the list of journals has also been prepared as per the guidelines of UGC. In the subject of Hindi and Punjabi, the list of the journals is not there. When they would be doing the screening in the subject of Hindi, whether it would be done on the basis of old list of journals or according to the new journals.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if they issue a corrigendum, all the old applicants would become ineligible as per the new guidelines of UGC related with journals. There is no journal in the subject of Punjabi in the list. The candidates already working have published their papers in the journals because they are working in the Colleges. In the list of journals, there is only one science journal which is of Punjabi University. If the corrigendum is given according to the new amendment, the new API score would be applicable and according to the new API score, almost all the earlier eligible candidates would become ineligible and the work they have done during the last 6 years, that would become nil. If they have to implement the new API score, as said by Professor Mukesh Arora, the candidates of the regional languages would become ineligible. The new guidelines which are beneficial for the teachers are not implemented. The UGC says that full salary be given to the teachers, but in most of the Colleges, the full salary is not being given. If a guideline for increasing the workload from 14 hours to 18 hours is received, they implement the same immediately. He said that if a corrigendum is issued, another year would go in completing the screening process. The API score could be implemented from the year 2018.

The Vice-Chancellor said that neither they could decide these things nor they have the freedom to decide these things as the enforcing agency is somebody else.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if a corrigendum is given and new API score would be applicable, most of the candidates would become ineligible.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they have to induct the best talent. According to the existing circumstances, now the qualifications have changed. Ethically, they must re-advertise the posts.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not agree with it. It is not ethically, but it is legally.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that persons have become eligible.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if the University wanted, the appointment could have been made up to the year 2016.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the legal opinion should be taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if otherwise they would have filled up the positions, then it would not have been the issue.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that legal opinion be taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they extend the validity by one year and have legal opinion as early as possible from at least two experts. If an opinion is received from one expert and from the other it is not received, then they would seek the opinion from the third expert after two week's time.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the conditions as earlier should remain the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the legal opinion is on this issue only. It is to be legally examined as to whether could they do it.

RESOLVED: That the validity of Advertisement No. 7/2015 be extended by one year from the lapse of the advertisement i.e. on 28.2.2017 and legal opinion be sought from two persons and if an early opinion is not received then the third person be approached for legal opinion in view of the UGC 3rd and 4th amendments on issuing of the corrigendum.

**Confirmation of Director
Public Relations-cum-
Editor, PU News**

32. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the following person working as Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, PU News, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned against his name:

Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
Shri Vineet Punia Director, Public Relations-cum-Editor, PU News P.U., Chandigarh	22.05.2013 (F.N.)	22.05.2014

NOTE: 1. Shri Vineet Punia was appointed as Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, PU News on 29.04.2013 by the Syndicate/Senate in its meetings dated 15.04.2013/ 25.04.2013 (Para 41) & 29.09.2013 (Para III) respectively (**Appendix-XXIX**).

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

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that following person working as Director Public Relations-cum-Editor, PU News, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned against his name:

Name of the person, Designation, Department	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
Shri Vineet Punia Director, Public Relations-cum-Editor, PU News, P.U., Chandigarh.	22.05.2013 (F.N.)	22.05.2014

No Dearness Allowance and Medical allowance to pensioners/family pensioners

37. Considered circular No. 3/21/16-3Finance/505 dated 16.09.2016 (**Appendix-XXX**) of Joint Secretary Finance, Department of Finance, Government of Punjab, regarding not to grant of Dearness Allowance and Medical allowance, to the pensioners/family pensioner, residing abroad after getting permanent citizenship.

RESOLVED: That circular No. 3/21/16-3-Finance/505 dated 16.09.2016 (**Appendix-XXX**) of Joint Secretary Finance, Department of Finance, Government of Punjab, regarding not granting of Dearness Allowance and Medical allowance, to the pensioners/family pensioner, residing abroad after getting permanent citizenship, be adopted.

Issue regarding evaluation system of B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 year integrated courses

38. Considered:

- (i) recommendation of workshop conducted under the Chairmanship of the Dean Faculty of Law dated 11.07.2016 (**Appendix-XXXI**) that the split up of each paper for the newly admitted students of B.A./B.Com. LL.B (Hons.) 5 years Integrated Course w.e.f. Academic Session 2016-17 will be as under:

External Examinations	:	60 Marks
Internal Assessment	:	40 Marks
Mid Semester Test	:	15 Marks
Project/Assignment	:	12 ½ Marks
Presentation	:	12 ½ Marks

- (ii) in case any reappear candidate/s appear/s in the 1st or 2nd semester, under old scheme, the 60 marks of external examination shall be converted into 80 marks for evaluation purpose.

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXI**).

RESOLVED: That the following recommendations (i) and (ii) of the workshop conducted under the Chairmanship of the Dean Faculty of Law dated 11.07.2016 (**Appendix-XXXI**), be approved:

- (i) that the split up of each paper for the newly admitted students of B.A./B.Com. LL.B (Hons.) 5 years Integrated Course w.e.f. Academic Session 2016-17 be as under:
- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------|
| External Examinations | : | 60 Marks |
| Internal Assessment | : | 40 Marks |
| Mid Semester Test | : | 15 Marks |
| Project/Assignment | : | 12 ½ Marks |
| Presentation | : | 12 ½ Marks |
- (ii) that in case any reappear candidate/s appear/s in the 1st or 2nd semester, under old scheme, the 60 marks of external examination be converted into 80 marks for evaluation purpose.

**Formation of J.C.M.,
appointment of Standing
Committee and
appointment of two
members of the Syndicate
on the Board of Finance**

Items 7, 8, and 9 on the agenda were read out, viz. –

7. To consider the formation of Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 1.1.2017 to 31.12.2017.

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

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

8. To appoint the following Committee for the period noted against each:

Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
Standing Committee/s to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations	Regulation 31 at page 14 of P.U. Calendar Volume-II, 2007	Calendar year 2017, i.e., 01.01.2017 to 31.12.2017

NOTE: Regulation 31 for composition of Standing Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f.

01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016 is enclosed
(**Appendix-XXXII**).

9. To appoint two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2017 to 31.01.2018 under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007

NOTE: The above matter was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 27.11.2016 as an Agenda Item-C-36, but the same was treated as withdrawn.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form/appoint, with suggestions from members (if any), on behalf of the Syndicate:

1. Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 1.1.2017 to 31.12.2017;
2. Standing Committee/s to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations under Regulation 31 at page 14 of P.U. Calendar Volume-II, 2007 for the Calendar year 2017, i.e., 01.01.2017 to 31.12.2017; and
3. two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2017 to 31.01.2018 under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form the following Committees, on behalf of the Syndicate –

1. Affiliation Committee, consisting of members of Syndicate, who are authorized to take decision regarding affiliation of Colleges on behalf of Syndicate;
2. Committee to decide the seniority list of faculty members of Panjab University campus; and
3. Committee to decide the promotion policy of the faculty of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital.

Nomination of 10 members of various Committees to discharge the functions of Board of Studies/Conveners

To nominate:

- (i) members of various Committees to discharge the functions of Board of Studies/Conveners, under Regulation 6 at page 57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, in the following subjects for the term 1.4.2017 to 31.3.2019:
 1. M. Tech. Energy Management
 2. M.Tech. (Instrumentation)
 3. M.Tech. (Microelectronics)
 4. Applied Sciences Engineering
 5. B.E./M.E. (Information Technology)

6. B.E. (Food Technology)
7. B.E. (Bio-Technology)
8. M.E. (Electronics & Communication Engineering)
9. B.E./M.E (Computer Science & Engineering)
10. M.E. (Construction Technology & Management)
11. M.E. (Instrumentation & Control)
12. M.E. (Manufacturing & Technology)
13. Police Administration
14. M.Tech. (Engineering & Education)
15. Human Genomics
16. Vivekananda Studies
17. Women's Gender Studies
18. P.G. Diploma in Health, Family Welfare & Population Education
19. Human Right and Duties
20. M.Sc. Solid Waste Management
21. M.Tech. Nano-Science & Nano-Technology
22. Nuclear Medicine & Medical Physics
23. Social Work
24. MBA CIT
25. Geology
26. Ayurveda
27. Biochemistry
28. Environmental Education
29. Social Sciences
30. Homoeopathy
31. Biotechnology
32. Bioinformatics
33. Microbiology
34. Gemology and Jewellery
35. Fashion Design
36. Public Health
37. M.Sc. Forensic Science & Criminology
38. M.Sc. Instrumentation
39. Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering
40. If any.

(ii) members of various Board of Studies/Conveners, under Regulation 4 at pages 56-57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, in the following subjects for the term 1.4.2017 to 31.3.2019:

1. Arabic
2. Architecture & Planning
3. Arts & Fine Arts
4. Bengali
5. Chemical Engineering
6. Chinese
7. Civil Engineering
8. Computer Science & Application (UG & PG)
9. Dental Surgery
10. Defence & Strategic Studies
11. Electrical Engineering
12. Electronics & Electrical Communication
13. French
14. Gandhian Studies
15. German

16. Home Science
17. Indian Theatre
18. Law
19. Library Science
20. Mechanical Engineering
21. P.G. Medical Education & Research
22. Music & Dance
23. Mass Communication
24. Postgraduate in Nursing
25. Nursing
26. Persian
27. Pharmacy
28. P.G. in Pharmaceutical Science
29. Physical Education (Undergraduate)
30. Physical Education (Post graduate)
31. Russian
32. University Institute of Legal Studies
33. Tibetan
34. Tamil
35. Telugu
36. Kannada
37. Malayalam
38. Assamese
39. Slovak
40. Urdu
41. Sindhi

NOTE: An office note enclosed
(**Appendix-XXXIII**).

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that during the year 2014, he and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal had submitted a resolution which was duly accepted by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 12.07.2014. On a query by the Vice-Chancellor as to what was that resolution, he said that there are 18 subjects in the Colleges which are being taught in more than 2 Colleges each. It is as per the Calendar. Again this item is before them. That resolution was duly accepted and approved by the Senate. Why those subjects are again considered for the nominations, as far as the current term which is to start from 01.04.2017 is concerned. His request is that those subjects which have been cleared by the Syndicate and Senate, after a due procedure, those should not be part of the nomination. Those subjects should be included in election category.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that some of the subjects are now expanded and are being taught in the Colleges. Earlier, in these subjects the nominations were being made but now there should be election in those subjects.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with elections.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are so many subjects like Physical Education, Computer Science, Music, Fine Arts, Biotechnology, Biochemistry.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he had also moved a resolution in the year 2014 but nothing happened and again the item is before them.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that otherwise they would have to wait for another two years. This matter is pending since the year 2015.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they could hold a meeting of the Regulations Committee and the matter could be placed before the Syndicate in the next meeting as they have time.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the time is very short.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Regulations have to be amended.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Regulations have to be amended and approved by the Government.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that this matter could be taken up in the next meeting.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the matter should be decided in this meeting itself otherwise it would get delayed.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they authorize the Vice-Chancellor to take a final decision in the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that supposing the Chairperson of the Regulations Committee is there, could they do it quickly could it come back to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Jarnail Singh also said that they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor that the election could be conducted for the subjects which are available in more than five Colleges and not for others.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as per the Panjab University Calendar, it is more than two Colleges and they have to follow it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if they want that the matter be expedited, the Vice-Chancellor be authorized.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the meeting of the Regulations Committee be held at the earliest and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take the decision in a speedy way.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then Dr. Dalip Kumar would have to follow it with him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that where the nomination has to be done by the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor should form a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate for this purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Dalip Kumar to help in this matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that some of the Committee which were formed in the last meeting of the Syndicate, like the Affiliation Committee and two more Committees, one of which was for the seniority list of teachers. These Committees are to be formed again.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Committee regarding promotion policy of the dental faculty is also to be formed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee which has to look after the seniority list of the University teachers is to be recast in which some of the members could be from the Syndicate. Similarly, the Committee to look after the promotion policy of dental faculty is also to be recast.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting of the Committee looking into the promotion policy for dental faculty be held at the earliest so that the same is put up before the Board of Finance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the meeting of this Committee would be held within a short period.

Professor Mukesh Arora requested that the Affiliation Committee should be formed at the earliest.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that Committee is to be constituted on behalf of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the Dean College Development Council to take up the issue and requested the members to suggest the names.

Professor Mukesh Arora and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that the College teachers should be involved.

Shri Varinder Singh said that since the University is passing through the phase of financial crunch, he suggested that the services of those members who are interested in providing their services without TA/DA could be availed. A separate list of such persons be prepared and they be asked to perform the maximum of such duties so that the TA/DA could be saved and they could also come to know as to which of the members are really interested in performing the University duties voluntarily. He volunteered himself that he would perform such duties without any TA/DA even from Abohar. Whenever there is some issue regarding income generation, they enhance the fee of the students. He suggested that they should take the initiative, including the Professors who are highly paid, in performing such duties without any TA/DA. However, he is not against the payment of TA/DA. But if any member who wishes to contribute in the welfare of the University, let such a person do this duty.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Shri Varinder Singh is good.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if a person attends even four-five meetings of various Committees in a month, a payment of about Rs.50,000/- is made on account of TA/DA.

RESOLVED: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form a Sub-Committee to suggest the names, on behalf of the Syndicate.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That to implement the resolution proposed by Dr. Dalip Kumar and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal regarding election of Board of Studies in certain subjects, the meeting of Regulation Committee be convened at the earliest.

Constitution of External Peer Review Committee

4. Considered letter dated 29.11.2016 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) of Professor (Dr.) Jaspal S. Sandhu, Secretary, University Grant Commission, New Delhi, regarding constitution of the External Peer Review Committee in term of clause 5.6.1(d) of UGC Regulation on (Minimum Qualification for appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) 2010.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is for re-appointment of Principals as something is wrongly written. This is something that they have to comply and could not override.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the Punjab Government has done it for 10 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the Punjab Government do whatever it wanted but first they have to follow the UGC directive.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there would be problems with it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whether the problems would there or not, they have to find a solution to escape it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a Committee could be formed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it should be reviewed.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to what is to be reviewed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there three options in the letter that three kinds of Principals could be the nominee of the Vice-Chancellor, that is, the Principals of the College with Potential for Excellence, Autonomous College and NAAC A+ accredited Colleges. Presently, the University is having two Colleges with Potential for Excellence which are S.D. College and Dev Samaj College, Ferozepur. They are having 5 Colleges which are A+ accredited and there is no autonomous College. It means that one College is common as it is having A+ and Potential for Excellence. It means that they have only 6 Principals for this very particular purpose. The question is could they make any addition to it as the last line of the letter clearly says that "you are requested to please take note of the above and ensure compliance of the same". They could not take the Principals of the A category Colleges because their number is large.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that to start with, they have to implement it. Then they have to pose a question to the UGC. Luckily, they are having 6 Principals but they could have been in a situation that they did not have any such Principals. Such a possibility is there that there are some Universities which did not have

even a single Principal in this category. They could see the number of A+ colleges and it is very small. So, first let them implement it and then pose a question to the UGC with statistics and a proposal has to be submitted that the University is having so many Principals in a particular category. Would the UGC permit the University to use such a category for this purpose? They should make a reasonable proposal and tell the UGC that the number is very small and the task is very large and whether the UGC agrees to it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Committee could be formed for this purpose.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that addition could be made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could take it up.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the University is having 27% of the Colleges which are in A category.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has to be categories as to how many of the Colleges are in the group of 3.01 to 3.25, 3.26 to 3.5 and this list could be given to the UGC and request whether they could permit the University to expand this list and take the services of the Principals.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the Vice-Chancellor is right that they have to follow the UGC guidelines. The UGC has enhanced the retirement age of the teachers to 65 years but the retirement age in the Punjab Colleges is 60 years. His viewpoint is that since there are problems of funds in the States, no Principal would be able to apply for this before the age of 55 years. Even presently also they are not getting the Principals and with this they would have difficulty in finding the Principals. The State Government has taken a decision after thinking over it in increasing it from five years to ten years. The PCCTU and other organizations had also requested the Government and only then the decision was taken. According to him, they should think over it again. If the State Government is giving ten years instead of five years, they should also do it for ten years from five years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, so long as they are seeking a large sum of money from the Centre, anything that they do not follow, the Centre would say that Panjab University is not following it. He has faced the music. The MHRD Secretary, even on a trivial issue, had said at one time, where the Registrar and the Finance and Development Officer were also present, that since the Panjab University is not following the UGC guidelines, the grant has been stopped. So, he could not afford to say anything which is prima facie as if they are diluting the directive of the UGC.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they would have to follow it and it is mandatory. It is a re-appointment and they are implementing the decision of re-appointment for five years from now onwards. That situation of re-appointment would arise only after a period of five years and till then they would have a large number of Principals.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the earlier appointments are not to be touched.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu enquired whether it would be applicable in the case of appointments to be made from now onwards.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be applicable only in the case of appointments to be made from now onwards. It is re-appointment of the Principals who are to be appointed for five years but those who have already got it they are not to be touched.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that again it could be said that those who were in position have got it done for them while others would not get it.

The Vice-Chancellor said he also could get it done. Those who have already been appointed they are not to be touched. We do not know why the UGC is doing this, but they could not question it at the moment.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that ultimately, this decision would also be reviewed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment they are at a critical stage.

RESOLVED: That letter dated 29.11.2016 (as per Appendix-XXXIV) of Professor (Dr.) Jaspal S. Sandhu, Secretary, University Grant Commission, New Delhi, regarding constitution of the External Peer Review Committee in term of clause 5.6.1(d) of UGC Regulation on (Minimum Qualification for appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) 2010, be adopted.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a letter be written to the UGC for inclusion of Principals of those Colleges which have been awarded 'A' grade in the NAAC accreditation for inclusion as member of the review Committee.

Dates for the meetings of the Faculties to be held in March 2017

11. Item 11 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

11. To fix the dates for the meetings of the Faculties to be held in March 2017 for the purpose of election of various Boards of Studies (i.e. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Boards of Studies) for the term 1.4.2017 to 31.3.2019, pursuant to Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“The election of teachers from the affiliated colleges of Under-graduate and Post-graduate Boards of Studies by the Faculties concerned shall be held

by March 31 every alternate year by Single Transferable Vote System.

The Syndicate shall fix a date or dates on which meetings of the various Faculties shall be held for the purpose of electing Board of Studies.

xxx xxx xxx”.

2. An office note along with a copy of the schedule approved last time for the term i.e. 01.04.2015 to 31.03.2017 enclosed **(Appendix-XXXV)**.

RESOLVED: That since the Convocation has been scheduled on 25th March, 2017, the meeting of the Senate be fixed on 26th March and the meetings of the Faculties to be held in March 2017 for the purpose of election of various Boards of Studies (i.e. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Boards of Studies) for the term 1.4.2017 to 31.3.2019, as provided under Regulation 2.8 at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, be fixed for 27th and 28th March, 2017.

Leave cases of teaching staff

13. Considered minutes of Committee (Item Nos. I & II) dated 29.11.2016 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) constituted, 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

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a case related with Dr. Deepti Laroia. She applied for two years leave from abroad. The leave sanctioned was for one year but she was informed after one year and nine months.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct. Her premise is wrong. The University file and the noting says that she was informed and the noting also says that the Chairperson was informed. So, the facts have been hidden from the Committee which has recommended it. The fact of the case in her case is that this faculty member applied for leave in January 2013 before her marriage. She was given the leave for a period of two semesters, eight months. She comes as the session opens, joins for one or two days and again applies for leave because she is getting married and wanted to go. She avails the leave for one year and again avails the leave for one more year. Now, it becomes two years and eight months leave except the joining for one or two days in between. She is on leave since January 2013 and came

for a day or two. Now the leave period is two years and the precursor of leave is also over. Now, after a period of one year, she applies for a leave of two years out of which only one year leave is sanctioned about which she was informed as also her Department. Everyone is sitting silently. She did not join the duty pretending as if she had not got the letter. The Department also pretends that the Department also did not get the letter. The applicant as also the Department are pretending that the reply has not been sent/received. After two years, now she is applying that since she is in the family way and not permitted to travel, she be granted the leave till the child is born plus three months after that. So, this is the factual position. In this factual position, now it is a matter of creating a precedence. Do they accept such arguments and create a precedence.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is a medical leave.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a medical leave now. When she has consciously not joined when leave has been over, what disciplinary action they are going to take against that person.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that under the present circumstances, she could not join at the moment as she has to deliver the baby.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could terminate her services from the date whatever her job was there and nobody could prevent them from doing it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that something is there. If she joins tomorrow, they would allow her to join.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not. They could just take a decision that they do not allow her to join. She has remained on unauthorized leave.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that she could have joined within a week, she should have been allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she has remained on unauthorized leave and telling a lie that she did not get the letter. First of all, people have to admit that they got the letters and they did not join. According to the records, it could not be said that they did not receive the letter.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that whether any information or notice was given to her after a year that her leave period is over.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she was informed. She could not say that she was not informed. Neither the Chairperson of the Department could say that she was also not informed. Why should the governing body accept these pleas for which they should be in trouble. He is okay with giving the leave if she has got married and is on the family way. He is ready to accept and condone all the things but with some transparency and admission by the person that it is a fault on her part.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the background of what the Vice-Chancellor has said, it could be reviewed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members have to review it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a letter should be written to her that this is the minimum that they could do.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be done only if the admissions are made. If the admission is not made, she could not manipulate the system. The Chairperson is not allowed to manipulate.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired as to how the information was sent whether it was through e-mail or registered letter.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the office has to deliver the information to the Department and the Department has to inform the concerned person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they wanted this thing, then they remain in technicality, go to the legal and fight out the whole damn thing. The record says that the letters have been sent.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that legal opinion could be obtained.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as said by Shri Jarnail Singh she has sent the medical certificate and done other things also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not disputing it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there is no second opinion on it that there is a lapse. It would be better if some warning or minor penalty is imposed instead of terminating her services.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not recommending it but only saying that she should admit that she had received the letters.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that what he has been conveyed is that she applied for leave for two years but she was informed after a period of nine months.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is wrong. It is not a correct thing that the parents of the candidates approach the Syndicate members. This is how the governing body of this University has been compromised where people approaching the Syndicate members, who are not supposed to be approached.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is natural for the parents to approach.

The Vice-Chancellor said, no. Someone is an employee and why should the parents of employees approach. She is married. He could understand her. It is not correct thing.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he had told her parents that she herself should have asked whether her leave had been sanctioned or not. It is a lapse on her part. They could issue a warning to her.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a warning should be issued and thereafter whatever action they deem fit be taken.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at least she should admit the lapse. Reconsideration is only if she admits and not that she says that she did not receive the letter. If she does not admit, then he would contest her.

Some of the members agreed to it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if she confesses then the leave could be extended.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that she went from here. She had no intention that she would marry after going abroad. After going abroad, she got married and it was a compulsion for her to stay with her husband. In the meantime, all these developments took place. As said by the Vice-Chancellor, there must be some manipulations that the letters were not received. They do agree with it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that when her application for extension of leave for one year came, he agreed to it because she said that she has some compulsion. He realized it that she has gone to a new society and there might be some adjustment problems. He did not want to come in her way of exploring adjustments. Knowing fully well that till that time, she had availed the leave for 1½ years, another one year leave was granted. She had joined only for 3-4 days. He ignored all these things and recommended one more year leave. He did not come in her way. Now, saying that she did not receive the letter and the Department also pretending that they also did not receive the letter, is not good.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if there is some lapse at her part, at least she should not blame the authorities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since the office is inefficient and it is being blamed more. But at this stage, it is not justified that the office did not work.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if she confesses, minor punishment could be given.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that they could trace through the online system whether the letter had been delivered or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is available in the record that the letter has been sent to her. But the Department says that they have no record when the letter was sent. The person is also consulting so many persons. Her date of joining the University is October 2011. Is this the level of the manipulation of the system? In any organization such a person would have been thrown straightaway. Even after giving so many concessions, the manipulations are being done.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he has also got a call from a person by the name of Kulwant Singh from Canada for leave.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is a defaulter. As members of the governing body, they should read through the files.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of Committee (Item Nos. I & II) dated 29.11.2016 (**as per Appendix-XXXVI**) constituted, in terms of

the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18), to look into the leave cases of teaching staff, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That if Dr. Deepti Laroia Sarkar gives proper justification, only then her case for grant of leave could be placed for consideration.

Minutes of Committee to re-look into Panjab University-CET(UG) in the subjects of Biotechnology and Computer Science

20. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 20.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) to re-look into (i) PU-CET (UG) to be conducted during 2017 in the subjects of Biotechnology and Computer Science (ii) Merit displayed while declaring the result of P.U.-CET (UG).

The Faculty of Sciences also formed a Committee. There were two issues and one of the issues was that in these subjects the test should be conducted. That proposal has come and is very good. That is to be approved. Besides that there was another discussion that there are four papers, namely Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics and Biology. Some of the courses are such that the students of Mathematics and Biology are eligible in Physics, Chemistry and other departments also. If they look at the marks of Mathematics and Biology, there is a variation. If they look at other tests being conducted at all-India level like GATE, in those tests the marks of different subjects are normalized. A proposal regarding the normalization in this was also prepared but it is not known why the same has not been placed before them. He suggested that whatever it is, it should be accepted. Besides that for the normalization, a Committee is already working on that and they should do the normalization. The Syndicate would also agree to it. The prospectus is also to be printed at an early date. If the recommendations of that Committee are submitted, they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor to accept that also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is okay with it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it is so that the same is printed in the prospectus.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that normalization of marks in the subject of Biology and Mathematics would be done and it would become common otherwise there are problems that the students score more marks in Biology as compare to Mathematics. Due to this the students of Biology get admission in most of the Departments as compared to the students of Mathematics.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the recommendations of that Committee could be accepted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine.

RESOLVED: That minutes of the Committee dated 20.12.2016 (**as per Appendix-XXXVII**) to re-look into (i) PU-CET (UG) to be conducted during 2017 in the subjects of Biotechnology and Computer Science (ii) Merit displayed while declaring the result of P.U.-CET (UG), be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That normalization of marks of the subject of Mathematics vis-à-vis Biology be carried out and to frame the guidelines for such normalization, the same Committee be authorized.

Amendment of the title of Service & Conduct Rules

21. Considered if, the title of Service & Conduct Rules for Non-Teaching Employees printed under Chapter IV (vii) of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, be amended, as Service & Conduct Rules for University Employees.

NOTE: An office note along with Senate Para XI dated 27.03.2016 enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVIII**).

RESOLVED: That the title of Service & Conduct Rules for Non-Teaching Employees printed under Chapter IV (vii) of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, be amended, as Service & Conduct Rules for University Employees.

Issue regarding permission to conduct interviews for appointment of 4 guest faculty

28. Considered letter dated 21.12.2016 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) of Coordinator (Applied Sciences), UIET, P.U., regarding permission to conduct interviews for appointment of 4 guest faculty.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the report of the Dean of University Instruction and Vice-Chancellor is not attached with the documents. It should be checked. The appointments of guest faculty have to be come through the Dean of University Instruction.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be got checked and there is the recommendation of the Department.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when this came to him, till that time the directive of the MHRD had come that no guest faculty be appointed. If he would have done it, it would have been a violation of the directive. That is why he had marked it to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after approving it, should be sent to the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no need to take it to the Board of Finance. It was done when the next date of hearing in the Court was not done and to protect that point, it was done. If he had approved it, then it could be said that there is a directive of Ministry of Human Resource Development. The hearing which took place two days ago in the Court, there is no such condition.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and other members congratulated the Vice-Chancellor for his struggle.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma congratulated the Vice-Chancellor for being a fighter and a winner.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma also congratulated the Vice-Chancellor for fighting for the cause of the University. As a captain of the team, the fight he is fighting is a very big thing.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that appreciation for the Vice-Chancellor and his team be recorded on behalf of the Syndicate for the efforts made by him for the dignity of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this work could not be done by a person individually. So many people are silently helping in it. They could not imagine as to how many people are contributing. At the moment, he is just sitting at the top of a heap and it could not be done by a single person.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the role of the captain of the team is laudable.

RESOLVED: That request of Coordinator (Applied Sciences), UIET, P.U., dated 21.12.2016 (**as per Appendix-XXXIX**) regarding permission to conduct interviews for appointment of 4 guest faculty, be acceded to.

**Appointment on
compassionate grounds**

29. Considered minutes dated 21.12.2016 (**Appendix-XL**) of the Sub-Committee (constituted by the Committee for appointment on compassionate grounds), to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

Principal B.C. Josan said that one employee namely, Shri Parveen Gupta, Dept. of Chemistry had also expired and his case should also be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the case has been put in the file, but the person has to fulfill the qualifications and it would be done.

Professor Mukesh Arora enquired as to why in one of the cases the appointment has not been recommended.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that, that case is not covered under the rules of appointment on compassionate grounds.

Professor Mukesh Arora enquired as to what is the criteria/qualification for appointment on compassionate grounds.

It was clarified that in that case the employee had already retired from the service. The compassionate appointment could be given only to the dependents of an employee who dies in harness.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as pointed out by Principal B.C. Josan, the retirement benefits to the family of the employee had not been released.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired why not the retirement benefits to the employee of CIL, who had expired, had been released.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the main reason for not releasing the benefits is that the previous record from the PGI has not been received in the Panjab University. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to take personal interest in getting the retirement/financial benefits released.

It was clarified that the service of the employee, who had expired, is of very short term in the University and not entitled to benefits from the University. The service benefits from the previous employer have to be released to the University and the Establishment branch is taking up the matter and has written the letter to the previous employer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would talk Dr. Awasthy, the Deputy Director, PGI in this matter.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the query of the previous employer is that the confirmation of the deceased employee had been approved in the Senate meeting held on 9th October 2016, have not been communicated. That is the reason why the PGI is not proceeding further in the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to take up all the papers and follow it up and he would also talk to Dr. Awasthy.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the appointment be also given to the dependent.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the case of appointment of the son of the deceased employee has already been taken up.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is somewhat delay on the part of the Establishment branch.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that the matter be expedited up.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the wife of the deceased employee is having a grouse/complaint and the enquiry in the death case be expedited. Otherwise, the benefits are secondary things for the wife. She felt that harassment was caused to her husband.

The Vice-Chancellor intervened to say that he would ask the Committee to expedite the enquiry.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested that the case be expedited so that she may get the justice.

The Vice-Chancellor again said that he is not disputing it and would ask the Committee to expedite the enquiry.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has come to know that one of the employees had given his witness in writing in the police station that he is also being harassed and something untoward may also happen with him and that person belongs to the same department.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not take it as everywhere threat is given and they could not function under threats.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that, in this case, he wanted that the University should expedite the enquiry and requested that some members be added in that Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no new member could be added and the enquiry would be expedited. The people have avenues within the system to voice their grievances. If the system fails, only then it is a different story. All the Committees dealing with the grievances have been approved by the Syndicate. If a person is not taking the proper route and directly approaches the police, then nothing could be done and they could not function under threats and coercion.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that approaching the police is the last resort. He requested to expedite the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be done. He said that the son of the deceased employee is undergoing the study of engineering which is yet to be completed. He said that the Syndicate recommends that the approval in this case be taken from the Board of Finance in its next meeting.

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 21.12.2016 (**as per Appendix-XL**) of the Sub-Committee (constituted by the Committee for appointment on compassionate grounds), to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds, be approved.

Case of Dr. Rashmi Yadav for continuation in service beyond the age of 60 years

30. Considered the following proposal, pursuant to the interim directions issued by a Division Bench of the Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 in CWP No.25990 of 2016 (Dr. Rashmi Yadav Vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh that:

- (i) Dr. Rashmi Yadav, Deputy Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., Chandigarh may be allowed to continue to work as such after 31.01.2017 (the date on which she completes the age of 60 years) till the final outcome of the Hon'ble High Court in CWP No. 25990 of 2016 (Dr. Rashmi Yadav Vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh) in terms of interim directions issued by the Division Bench of the court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No. 1505 of 2016 (**Appendix-XLI**).
- (ii) She may be allowed to retain the residential accommodation(s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions (**Appendix-XLI**)
- (iii) Dr. Rashmi Yadav may be paid salary on the same conditions as the Vice-Chancellor has already ordered in the court case LPA No. 1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and others and connected LPAs as follows i.e. "the appellant teachers in the court case (LPA No. 1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. PU and others are connected LPAs) be paid salary which they were drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order dated 16.08.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. P.U. and other excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone) as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the LPA filled by them. The payments to all such appellants shall be

adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit the undertaking as per enclosed *pro forma* (**Appendix-XLI**).

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item under consideration is right. But another issue is that a decision was taken in the case of the teachers, who had completed the age of 60 years, that they would not be given the charge of Chairperson or any other financial power. In the case of Librarians, Dr. Raj Kumar, Librarian retired and he is continuing as such through a decision of the Court on re-employment and is exercising the same authority as was earlier being exercised by him before the retirement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has studied this case. The position of Librarian in the University framework is a very unique position. The Department of Library and Information Science is different from the Library. If the Court has given liberty to Dr. Raj Kumar to continue as Librarian, then he has to perform all the duties of a Librarian. Neither he (Vice-Chancellor) nor the members have any authority to appoint somebody as Librarian. They could not pick up somebody and appoint as a Librarian because the office of Librarian is not an office under rotation system. So, the Librarian has to be treated somewhat different from the Chairpersons of the Departments. No one is appointed as a Chairperson of a Department. One is appointed as a teacher and then one could serve as a Chairperson. If they take any decision in the case of Librarian, then it could become a legal point. Right now the final hearing in the case of the teachers is fixed on 14th February and they did not know as to what would be the final decision. If they need, they could come back to this item in the next Syndicate. But right now they have to wait for the decision of the Court. However, they could get the information as to what action they could take in the case of the Librarian as it is a different category.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what the Vice-Chancellor is saying is right. But while taking the extension, Dr. Raj Kumar had hidden something and the University did not take any action on that. According to the University Statute, the position of Librarian is a non-teaching position. But Dr. Raj Kumar had got the relief from the Court on having himself shown as a teacher. Therefore, all the other conditions applicable to teachers should be also made applicable in this case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could inform the University counsel to clarify this situation to the Court and leave it to the Judge.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in consultation with the counsel, they could issue a letter asking for the response on the judgment delivered by the court on the basis of petition filed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would clarify all these things to the University counsel.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is a part of the Panjab University Calendar that the Librarians and D.P.Es, for all purposes, are treated as teachers for the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Librarians have been given the status because it is a unique position and for all practical purposes, they are treated as teachers and as academic persons.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he agreed with the Vice-Chancellor on this that the designating a person on rotation is not making an appointment. The Departments have the rotation system.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he expected that the previous judgment would clarify something. The previous judgment has dismissed all the things. He expected the current Judge to clarify this issue and issues a direction to the Centre that the retirement age would be 65 years, then the matter is over. If the direction is not given, then they should tell the University counsel to bring it to the notice of the Judge. If the Judge concurs for the retirement age to be 60 years, then also the matter ends. If some decision is not clearly done, in that situation they should clarify. Still the final hearing is to be held.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as said by Professor Navdeep Goyal if he (Dr. Raj Kumar) has taken the benefit of a teacher as also of the Librarian. As said by Shri Jarnail Singh, they could ask the Librarian that since he has taken the benefit as a teacher how he is getting the benefit as a Librarian also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Court has taken the decision and now the matter is sub-judice and they could not interfere in the matter.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the benefit was granted by the Judge to Dr. Raj Kumar by treating him as a teacher.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they could consult the University counsel.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not proper for the University to call a Librarian as a non-academician, it is an academic position.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is clearly mentioned in the Calendar.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they could review it after 14th February.

RESOLVED: That the proposal, pursuant to the interim directions issued by a Division Bench of the Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 in CWP No.25990 of 2016 (Dr. Rashmi Yadav Vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved.

Deferred Item

33. Considered if,

- (i) the admissions of the candidates sought for the session 2016-17 on the basis of their having passed their qualifying examinations from the E.I.I.L.M. University, Sikkim prior to the session 2014-15 be confirmed as the said University is not functioning since December 2014; and

- (ii) the degree/s of the E.I.I.L.M. University, Sikkim be de-recognized w.e.f. the session 2014-15.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.07.2013 (Para 46) has decided that the degree/s awarded by C.M.J. University, Shillong (Meghalaya), irrespective of year of award of degree, which are placed or are to be placed before the Registrar or Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate after 12.06.2013, be not granted equivalence.

2. An office note enclosed.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that the name of the C.M.J. University is in the list of fake universities, only then they could take a decision.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a note regarding CMJ University and perhaps the Supreme Court has allowed the CMJ University. Therefore, they could allow the students of CMJ University.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that in the meetings of the Selection Committees, they do not consider such students.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that such a decision should have been circulated to the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the circular should have been sent.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the letter should be endorsed by the Dean College Development Council.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could defer the item and all the papers be circulated and could resolve the issue. He requested the members to volunteer for the purpose of collecting all the related documents.

Dr. Dalip Kumar and Professor Navdeep Goyal volunteered for this purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor instructed the S.O. to make available all the related papers to Dr. Dalip Kumar and Professor Navdeep Goyal and if both of these are not member of the earlier Committee, they should be added as members as special invitee and the matter be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate and the matter should not be delayed.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred and this item along with the matter related to C.M.J. University be also placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

**Recommendation of
Committee dated
16.12.2016 regarding
promotion of Laboratory
& Technical Staff**

34. Considered minutes dated 16.12.2016 (**Appendix-XLII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in order to make recommendations to reframe the rules for promotion of Laboratory & Technical Staff, in the light of the recommendations of the JCM approved by the Syndicate with regard to the revision of guidelines for promotion to Laboratory and Technical posts in the Panjab University.

- NOTE:**
1. The recommendations of the JCM dated 29.12.2015 were approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 1/15/28 & 29 May, 2016 (Para 52) enclosed (**Appendix-XLII**).
 2. Photocopies of circular Nos. 8748-8847/Estt. dated 22.07.1994, 1640-1740/Estt. dated 05.02.1997, 2597-2696/Estt. dated 24.02.1998 and 15196-295/Estt. dated 10.07.2013 enclosed (**Appendix-XLII**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the way the minutes of the JCM are recorded is that the same are recorded in a continuous manner. These should be recorded in such a manner that the resolved part should be clearly mentioned. A discussion was held and in that discussion, it was desired that for the non-teaching staff working in the Departments there should be a central policy. If they generally see that policy is not good. The present recommendations of the Committee are good that the earlier promotion policy has to be continued and they should approve it. In future, the minutes of the JCM should be prepared in a proper manner. Sometimes, it happens that the whole discussion is placed before the Syndicate and they approve the same as it is. Since the resolved part is not there, so many things are approved as such. In future, the resolved parts should be there in the minutes of the JCM and as such, they approve the new recommendations of the Committee.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is said that some of the Laboratory and Technical Staff get the promotion in 8 years after appointment on a post whereas some of the persons have not got promotion for the last 18 years since their appointment and are working on the same post on which they were appointed. Such persons say that why they are not being promoted as the JCM has also recommended the same. For example, there is one Mr. Sanjeev in Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology is working on the same post for the last 18 years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that sometimes the posts are not advertised timely.

It was clarified that if somebody would retire, only then the promotion could be granted.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that earlier that person was in the Department of Biochemistry from where he was transferred to the Chemical Engineering. The post is also vacant in the Department of Biochemistry. That person is neither being promoted in Biochemistry nor in Chemical Engineering.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the problem is coming as the advertisement is not given in time. Whenever a post would fall vacant, that would be advertised and the internal candidates could apply. If no candidate in the Department is eligible, then it is made open to the candidates within the University. If no eligible candidate is found within the University, then an open advertisement is to be given. The delay in promotions takes place due to delay in advertising the posts.

The Vice-Chancellor said that do they have a clarity that just as everyone gets minimum two promotions whether there is a post or not. Could they have such a policy that it applies to everyone. Second thing is that there are posts which fall vacant within a given Department and that is independent of two promotions in life. Do they have a clarity on it that at least two promotions could be granted. In addition to it, there is a possibility of competing within. And if it is there, then why the same is not being implemented?

It was informed that in the personal promotion scheme, the scales are given. However, the designation could be granted only when there is a vacant slot.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that that persons says that he has not got the designation even after the completion of service of 18 years.

It was clarified that it is because there is no post available in the Department in which that person is working. In other departments, even a junior person with the same qualification is getting the promotion because of availability of posts. That is the problem which is happening. Earlier it was proposed that it should be open across all the departments. But there were some problems also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that some other issues also arise.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if a person says that he/she has not got the promotion even after a period of 8 or 18 years. He cited the example that there are Classical posts of Teachers in the State Government. Supposing a person is appointed as a Drawing Teacher, he/she does not get any promotion even after serving for a long time and retires as a Drawing Teacher. It should not be such that a person approaches the Syndicate members in such cases. That candidate must keep this thing in mind. He did not know about the case. It should be kept in mind whether that post has promotion policy or not. Only the Master cadre in the State gets promotion to the post of Principal in the ratio of 40% or 60%. Similarly, the persons appointed in the Master cadre retire on the same post. Even the Drawing Teachers do not get increment during the whole service. Therefore, it should be checked as to what is the designation of that person and whether he is eligible or not. If there is a promotion channel in the clerical cadre, the persons would get the promotion. If there is no promotion in that technical cadre, the promotion could not be granted.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he was saying that the promotion should be granted as per the rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the promotions are neither done according to the new policy nor the old policy. The pending cases are to be cleared as per the old policy.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if there is promotion policy for that cadre, then the promotion could be granted otherwise not.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he is also saying that the promotion should be granted as per the promotion policy. The promotion policy is there but there is no vacant post available.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the regularization policy recommended by the JCM should also be taken up.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment it could not be done. Until they get the money from the Centre, they could not do anything. They are dependent on the Centre and any small violation at the moment would jeopardize everything. The Punjab Government is not giving the grants. Either they could become self-sufficient by generating the whole income on their own so that they need nothing from the Centre, then they could do whatever they wanted. The Punjab Government has given the directive that as it is appointing employees on temporary basis for three years and paying Rs.15600/21600, the University should also do the same. But they could not do it. When the Vice-Chancellor has to give a certificate for the NAAC that they are following the UGC guidelines, there would be problems. Their status is very dangerous and till the status is not clear, they could not do anything.

Professor Mukesh Arora appreciated the efforts made by the Vice-Chancellor and the teachers are now getting Rs.21600/- in the Colleges for the whole of the year whereas earlier they were getting Rs.8-10,000.

Principal B.C. Josan said that there is a financial crunch in the Punjab Government. Now, the U.T. Administration has issued a notification that the teachers in the aided Colleges are to be appointed on a salary of Rs.21600/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should not be so. He requested Principal B.C. Josan to give him in writing and he would take up the matter with the Governor and the Administrator.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the Khalsa College has already implemented it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Director, Higher Education in the presence of Principal B.C. Josan said that the matter is not in his knowledge and it would be taken care of. Even Dr. Bhushan was also there.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Punjab Government has sent that letter to the U.T. and have endorsed it that whatever the Punjab Government is doing, the U.T. should also follow it. The Punjab Government has sent the letter without applying their mind.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Dalip Kumar to convene the meeting of HSEC and after having an agenda item, a resolution should be approved in this regard.

Principal B.C. Josan requested the Vice-Chancellor to invite the Principals of the aided Colleges also to the meeting of HSEC.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Dalip Kumar to take action in this regard and also invited the Syndicate members of the local Colleges in the meeting.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Punjab Government has fixed the salary of Principals at Rs.37400/- and it is an injustice to them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not acceptable.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that as Associate Professors, they were getting about Rs.1.2 lacs and now they are getting Rs. 37400/-

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a way out that the Principals could become the part of the Public Interest Litigation. The Punjab Government is already a party in this matter.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that such persons should have become the party in that case much earlier.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they were following up the matter at administrative level and it was assured that it would be rectified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Panjab University Teachers Association, PUSA and the students have also become a party. Similarly, the Principals could also become a party in the case.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the main purpose of the Government is that the persons might not become Principals because earlier such persons were getting a salary of about Rs.1 lac and now they would get Rs.37400/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is ethically wrong.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that due to this, there is humiliation of the Principals.

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 16.12.2016, (as per **Appendix-XLII**), of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in order to make recommendations to reframe the rules for promotion of Laboratory & Technical Staff, in the light of the recommendations of the JCM approved by the Syndicate with regard to the revision of guidelines for promotion to Laboratory and Technical posts in the Panjab University, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That in future JCM minutes will also include resolved parts.

Issue regarding teachers promoted from 24.07.2013 till the date of capping

35. Considered the recommendations (Sr. No. (ii)) dated 14.09.2016 (**Appendix-XLIII**) of the Screening Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to screen the applications of the teachers promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards till the date of capping on API score for promotion implemented in the University that:

- (i) the API score obtained by Shri Harpreet Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Economics and Dr. Arun Rashmi Tickoo, Assistant Professor, Department of French and Francophone Studies does not meet the requisite API score (i.e. 40/100 API with capping) for promotions from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) and Assistant Professor (Stage 2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), respectively .
- (ii) the API score obtained by Dr. Anjana Khurana, Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics does not meet the requisite API score (i.e. 100 API with capping) for her promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3).

NOTE: The recommendations of the Committee dated 14.09.2016 at Sr. No. (i) with regard to promotion of Dr. S.P. Pandhi, Department of Economics and Dr. Keerti Vardhan, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC (Mathematics), P.U. have already been approved by the Syndicate meeting dated 27.11.2016 (Para 24) (**Appendix-XLIII**).

RESOLVED: That recommendations (Sr. No. (ii)) dated 14.09.2016 (**Appendix-XLIII**) of the Screening Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to screen the applications of the teachers promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards till the date of capping on API score for promotion implemented in the University, be approved.

**Issue regarding
Secretary, Faculty of
Science**

36. Considered if the Secretary for the meetings of the Faculty of Science be appointed from amongst the members of the Science Faculty, as is being done in the other certain Faculties, pursuant to the decision of the meeting of the Faculty of Science dated 19.12.2016 (Current Discussion 3) (**Appendix-XLIV**).

- NOTE:**
1. Earlier too, the issue was discussed in the Syndicate meeting dated 1/15/28 & 29 May, 2016 (Para 36) (**Appendix-XLIV**) and it was resolved that the item be referred to the Governance Reforms Committee. But the matter is pending with the Governance Reforms Committee.
 2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLIV**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Regulation 6.2 appearing at page 49 clearly says that “The Syndicate may from time to time determine the Faculties of which Deputy Registrar or an Assistant Registrar shall act as Secretary. The other Faculties shall elect the Secretary for the year at the time of electing the Dean.” Since the Syndicate has the authority, they are taking a decision in the Syndicate itself that the Faculty of Science should have the Secretary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all the major Faculties should have a Secretary.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the request from the Faculty of Science has come, they could do it and if other Faculties also request, the same could also be considered.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that for the Faculty of Science, they should take a decision.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to which of the Faculties did not have the Secretary.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Faculties of Arts and Languages also did not have the Secretaries.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they take the decision for all the three Faculties of Arts, Languages and Science.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is resolved and it would go to the Senate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that during the meeting of the Faculties in the month of March, 2017, the Faculties should have their own Secretaries whether the Vice-Chancellor be authorized or the Deans be authorized for this purpose.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at the moment they could take a decision that for the current year, the Deans would nominate the Secretaries of all the three Faculties and from next year onwards, there would be elections. Normally also, they authorize the Deans. They authorize the Deans to nominate the Secretaries for this year only.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That Secretary for the meetings of the Faculty of Science be appointed from amongst the members of the Science Faculty, as is being done in other certain Faculties, pursuant to the decision of the meeting of the Faculty of Science dated 19.12.2016 (Current Discussion 3) (**as per Appendix-**).

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (1) the same procedure be followed for other major Faculties (Arts and Languages);
- (2) for this year, Deans of respective Faculties be authorized to nominate Secretaries for the rest of the term and from the next year, the election of the Secretaries would take place as per rules.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 10.01.2017 regarding transfer of students of Law courses

39. Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 10.01.2017 (**Appendix-XLV**) along with the applications (**Appendix-XLV**) of the students, pursuant to the policy framed by the Committee in its meeting dated 28.12.2016 and 02.01.2017 (**Appendix-XLV**) duly approved by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to evaluate the applications of the students of Law Courses for transfer

from one institution to the other within the Panjab University System of Institutions.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that all the cases which have been approved are okay. In some of the cases, the medical certificates were not there, the same were to be placed before the Syndicate and the same Committee be authorized to consider the other pending cases also and the permission be granted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could authorize the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate, as the policy says that the Syndicate has to accord the approval.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that there is no such provision in University Institute of Engineering & Technology. As the seats are lying vacant in the 3rd and 5th semester, they could earn money by transferring the students.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Mukesh Arora to submit a proposal and it would be sent to the University Institute of Engineering & Technology.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that not only the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, there are other departments also. He suggested that in the first instance, a broad based Committee should be formed to frame a policy. The University would earn money as there are so many seats lying vacant.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that in the Dental College also, some seats are lying vacant.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since this year, the time is not left for the admission, the admission would be made from the next year, now they could form a Committee to frame a migration policy for all the departments including the Dental College.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Committee should also consider the lateral admissions also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, okay, he would ask Professor A.K. Bhandari to chair the Committee for other courses.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that other members for the Committee from the Syndicate be also included.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the some of the members from the Syndicate and Senate would also be included in the Committee to be chaired by Professor A.K. Bhandari. If they ask the Dean of University Instruction, he would be overburdened. Therefore, they could ask the Dean of University Instruction to join the Committee whenever he feels.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the recommendations of the Committee dated 10.01.2017 (**Appendix-XLV**) along with the applications (**Appendix-XLV**) of the students, pursuant to the policy framed by the Committee in its meeting

dated 28.12.2016 and 02.01.2017 (**Appendix-XLV**) duly approved by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to evaluate the applications of the students of Law Courses for transfer from one institution to the other within the Panjab University System of Institutions, be approved;

- (2) the same Committee be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, for other students whose medical certificates were still pending.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized, on behalf of the Syndicate, to form a Committee to frame rules and regulations for migration cases of other departments under the Chairmanship of Professor A.K. Bhandari and the Dean of University Instruction may join the Committee as per his convenience.

Academic Calendar for 2017-18

40. Considered minutes dated 16.01.2017 (**Appendix-XLVI**) of the Committee constituted by 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 2017-2018).

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that at page 191, in the resolved part of the recommendation (2) "it is further recommended that the Vice-Chancellor may be requested to convene a meeting of senior officers of the Government i.e. Director Higher Education, U.T. and D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab regarding observance of 5-days week in the affiliated Colleges". He requested that the issue started in the year 2013 and was clinched in the year 2014. The Punjab Government backed out from this in the year 2015 and they do not agree with it. He requested the Vice-Chancellor that it should be convened in a time framework manner after 4th February.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue is to be reopened with the Punjab Government.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the issue is clinched and the work module is already prepared and the Committee had prepared the work plan. U.T. also did not object at that time. The DPI, Punjab does not attend the meetings and sends some representative but the University says that the senior officer should attend the meeting. He requested that a meeting be convened after 4th February as the DPI, Punjab is busy till then and the matter be clinched.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Dalip Kumar to remind him in this regard.

Shri Varinder Singh said that item no. 40 is required to be corrected. In the colleges there are six days working and in the Panjab University it is five days working in a week. They want make changes in the winter leave. As per UGC, minimum ten weeks leave are required in the colleges. Total working days of both, colleges and University, should be 180 days. As per this calculation, Colleges have 197 working days. Colleges have less holidays. Minimum 10 weeks holiday be adjusted

Professor Navdeep Goyal said the University has done equal holidays. It was done 197 days presuming six days a week. Actually they are recommending five days a week. When they will do five days week, rather they will have to see it further to have actual working days. Five days week is more important than these holidays. They are recommending five days week. It will not be possible to change it. These are two separate issues.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that is there any need for doing five days week in colleges.

Principal B.C. Josan said that it is very urgent; students do not come.

The Vice Chancellor said that UT colleges say five days week and Punjab colleges say six days week.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said these are separate issues.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Shri Varinder Singh wants to say that if there are 197 days, the minimum 10 weeks vacations condition is not fulfilled.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that minimum five functions are organized in the colleges i.e. Annual Sports Day, Annual Convocation, Annual Prize Distribution Function, It took time on their preparatory; therefore, these are extra 7-8 days in the colleges, which are not in the University at the larger level. These were proposed 217 working days that day and these were reduced to 197. As Gurdip Ji also said that they need more time for admissions and their classes begin late. Now, the classes will commence from 22nd July. Earlier these were proposed 217 and now these are 197, keeping in view that point only. All the students of the college are involved Youth Festival, they thought in that background only.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that you may pass it if you want. He wants to say that if you have 117 days leave, remaining days left would be 195. Then there are admission days, the classes are not taking on the admission day. Then there are examination days also.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they can extend winter vacations for 5-7 days. Colleges have been reopening on 3rd and they can extend this date, then the number of days will be equal.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that functions are also being conducted in the University and the one way or the other way students involved in these functions. In sports functions they are also involved.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that earlier there were 60 days summer vacations in the colleges, but now these have been reduced to 40-42 days. They are 2-3 representatives; their job is also in the colleges. Evaluation is done in vacations; they do not get any leave. There is no semester, whose evaluation is done in working days. They can see the exams end on 30th or 31st May and the vacation starts from 1st June. Evaluation is done in the month of June. Although payment is made for evaluations, but it is done during vacations.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that, why don't they say when they don't give duty and check the papers.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as Shri Varinder Singh told that 180 days are required according to UGC and these are 197 days, 4-5 days may be adjusted. Vacations may be done same as in the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that University has less vacations. Actually, the vacations of colleges and University are recommended from the same date and are exactly the same. Working days position is there, but five days working is also recommended.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they can do as feel easy. There are 37 holidays, which are earlier 42. Earlier there were 60 days vacations in the colleges. All these my friends who are Principal, has enjoyed 60 days leave when they were teachers.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that now the Principals are not enjoying any leave.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that even on karva chauth the colleges don't open. Lohri is our major festival in northern India, we celebrate it. Even the students don't come in the college on that day.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said the revised detail of vacations will be given to the office.

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 16.01.2017 (**as per Appendix-XLVI**) of the Committee constituted by 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 2017-2018), be approved with the modification that (Annexure 'B' - Academic Calendar for Affiliated Colleges) the period of Semester Vacation (winter break) be from 22.12.2017 to 07.01.2018 and the Colleges to reopen after semester examination on 08.01.2018.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form a Committee of the Syndics including the DPI (Punjab) and DHE (U.T. Chandigarh) to discuss the issue of 5-day week in the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor abstained from the meeting when the item No. 6 was taken up for consideration.

Dr. Dalip Kumar proposed the name of Shri Jarnail Singh to chair the meeting for this item to which all the members agreed and accordingly Shri Jarnail Singh chaired the meeting.

Letter of Director (U.II), MHRD and minutes of the meeting attended by the Registrar at the office of National Commission for Women

6. Considered letter No. F.2-5/2015-U.II dated 09.01.2017 received from Director (U.II), Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, Govt. of India, along with minutes of the meeting attended by the Registrar at the office of National Commission for Women which was also attended by the officials from MHRD on 22.12.2016 and letter No. VPS/15/1/2016-

Vol. II dated 19.12.2016 received from Shri Anshuman Gaur, Officer on Special Duty to the Vice-President of India, New Delhi.:

Shri Jarnail Singh expressed his gratitude and thanks to the members for reposing faith in him and requested the members to give their proposals.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that initially there was a complaint from Professor Rajesh Gill about misbehavior and later on it was said that it is a complaint of sexual harassment and she made the complaints to Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) and National Commission for Women (NCW) and other quarters. The MHRD had said that the Internal Complaint Committee should decide the issue. But the internal Committee did nothing saying that the Panjab University policy is having flaws. Again the Syndicate formed a Committee and the Chairperson, PUCASH was requested to frame a policy and the policy was drafted and it was approved by the Syndicate and Senate. Then again it was said that there is a flaw in it. Actually, the Chairperson, PUCASH was reluctant to take up the case. Since the complaint was also with the National Commission for Women (NCW) and the University had to tell that PUCASH is reluctant to take up this case. They directed the Ministry of Human Resource Development to submit the report at an early date. The Ministry of Human Resource Development directed the University that for this particular case an Internal Complaint Committee be formed which is, of course, to be formed by the Senate and has the concurrence of the Chancellor. Whatever has to go to the Senate, it has to go through the Syndicate and they could recommend the names for the Committee.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that everybody is aware of the issue and there is a direction from the Chancellor on this issue.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the Committee should be headed by a woman and suggested the names of:

1. Mrs. Meenakshi Anand Chaudhary
Former Chief Secretary, Haryana
2. Professor Pam Rajput (Fellow)
3. Principal (Dr.) Anita Kaushal (Fellow)
4. Dr. Devi Sirohi
5. Justice (Retd.) Harbans Lal (Fellow)
6. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi (Fellow)
7. Nominee of the U.T. Administration

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there is a proposal from one of the members and wanted to have the opinion of other members about it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a senior level IPS officer should be associated with the Committee. Shri Malhi has been a senior IPS officer and if the enquiry is conducted by a senior officer, then the lower-level officers could not oppose and the case could be solved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would cover both the things that it would be an Internal Complaints Committee having internal members of the Governing body of Panjab University, one of them is the retired DGP. How could they except a person better than Justice (Retd.) Harbans Lal

Shri Varinder Singh said that they could also talk to Mr. Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh, a former acting Chief Justice of Punjab and Haryana High Court.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could also have Mr. Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh as one of the members.

Dr. Dalip Kumar also endorsed the viewpoint of Professor Navdeep Goyal.

It was informed that the proposition of the Committee has to be in accordance with the Act.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these are some of the recommendations which they could send to the Senate.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the willingness of the members be also sought.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the consent of the members be sought.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after taking the consent, they could see whether it is in accordance with the Act and only they could contact the members.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that first they should see as to what the Act says and only then they should contact the members.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a timeframe be fixed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that a Committee be formed as per the Act and recommend to the Senate so that the Senate could take a final decision.

Shri Varinder Singh said that a timeframe be fixed to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Senate would take a final decision.

It was informed that since the matter is time bound, they could call a special meeting of the Senate on 29th January 2017 for this purpose only.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that no other item be placed before this special meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be a special meeting and only this one item would be discussed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that with the formation of this Committee, the earlier Committee headed by Professor Shelley Walia constituted by the Syndicate for this purpose becomes null and void.

RESOLVED: That the earlier Sub-Committee headed by Professor Shelley Walia becomes null and void and it be recommended to the Senate that the following Committee, which should be in accordance with the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, be constituted:

1. Mrs. Meenakshi Anand ChaudharyChairperson

Former Chief Secretary, Haryana

2. Professor Pam Rajput (Fellow)
3. Principal (Dr.) Anita Kaushal (Fellow)
4. Dr. Devi Sirohi, Chairperson
Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights
5. Justice (Retd.) Harbans Lal (Fellow), Former Justice Punjab & Haryana High Court
6. Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh, Former Acting Chief Justice (Retd.) of Punjab & Haryana High Court
7. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi (Fellow)
8. Nominee of the U.T. Administration

Mrs. Poonam Chopra
Deputy Registrar (Estt.)

.....Convener

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a special meeting of the Senate be convened on 29th January at 11.00 a.m. for the above said purpose.

**Fee Structure of
University Teaching
Departments and
Regional Centres for
2017-18**

12. Considered minutes of the fee structure Committee dated 22.12.2016 (**Appendix-XLVII**) and Sub-Committee dated 27.12.2016 (**Appendix-XLVII**) constituted by fee structure Committee, to decide the fee structure of the University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres for the session 2017-18.

The Vice-Chancellor while giving a little background said that one of the issues that is posed again and again to the Panjab University is that why the Panjab University is not making adequate efforts to generate income from the tuition fee on the lines of what the universities in this region are doing. So, the plea is that if they look at the students' population in the universities in the region, namely at Patiala, Amritsar, Kurukshetra, Shimla. All these universities compete for students with undergraduate or after passing out from the schools to enroll for the so-called honours courses or integrated courses and, all the traditional courses. The University has engineering in University Institute of Engineering & Technology. The question that was posed to him repeatedly by the Secretary and the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development, the Secretary, UGC and the Chairman, UGC is as to why the fee of Panjab University is less than those universities. If the income of those universities from the tuition fee is a certain fraction of their expenditure. What is the income of the University? It is from the tuition fee from traditional courses, so-called self-financed courses and the examination fee as there is a ratio of this income and the MHRD/UGC are saying that why the University is lagging in it. This was specifically posed to him by the Secretary, UGC, who incidentally is from Guru Nanak Dev University, that Panjab University is charging less fee from the campus as well as the College students and also from the Constituent Colleges whose expenditure is borne by the Government and these Colleges also generate some income. The Secretary had said that the main cause of the problem of Panjab

University is that it is charging less fee from the students. They say that the income of the University, considering the stature of the University and the fact that Panjab University is more sought after, the fee of Panjab University should be more than other universities. Since Panjab University is more sought after, it could afford to have more fee. So, the minimum directive is that gradually the fee should be enhanced to the maximum in that area wherever it is. This is the directive and this directive is a little draconian because even if it has to be implemented, it could not be implemented in one step but it should be done gradually otherwise the structure would be disturbed. He went through the microscopic of the fee structure which has been recommended by the Committee. This has been prepared after giving a good thought in a way that there are 3-4 types of courses, one of such courses is where the fee charged is very less for the last so many years which include the honours schools in sciences, M.A. courses. The fee of these courses is so less that even if such a course is going on in the Colleges, the fee there must be higher than the University. But the University is a place where the very best College students used to come and take admission. So, the idea of keeping the tuition fee low in the University was that, since many of the students could not get the scholarship and the admission is only by merit, the meritorious students should not be burdened. It is an indirect way of rewarding the meritorious students. It is nowhere mentioned but he believed that this was the philosophy of keeping the tuition fee low as the University commenced. Similarly, the fee of the hostel was also kept at low level. Staying in the Panjab University hostel was considered a very subsidized living considering the facilities and the kind of construction that was provided at the Panjab University campus. Today, the buildings are very good as compared to earlier ones. They could compare the hostels of Panjab University with the hostels of the Colleges of U.T. and could find that the University hostels are better. All this was done for good performing students. All this was done with this thought but with the passage of time, teachers' salary is inflation protected like the salary of the civil servants. All these things are of the time when there was no regulation for teachers' salary. The salary of the teachers was regulated for the first time when Kothari Commission was formed in 1966. Till that time, all the structure had been installed. The salary of teachers was inflation protected after the 3rd Pay Commission. The first pay commission of the teachers was the only thing what Dr. Bhatnagar had got written that the teachers in the University should be given the salary which was paid to Panjab University Teachers at Lahore. This was the first pay commission for teachers in India. The second commission was the Kothari Commission. The third pay commission was in 1973. In the fourth Pay Commission, the salary was completely inflation protected and the CAS came for the College and University teachers. Then the fifth Pay Commission came and there was some more improvement and the middle level teachers were the biggest beneficiaries in the grade of Rs.3700-5700 and the Professors' scale was Rs.4500-7300. No teacher in the University reached the stage of Rs.7300. Then the sixth Pay Commission came and the scale of Rs.3700-5700 was the real boon for the College teachers in the Senior Lecturer's scale as well as teachers in the Reader's scale. In the sixth Pay Commission, Professor G.K. Chadha provided the career advancement scheme for all the teachers. Now, the salaries have become good which is not determined by the universities but by the Central Government. Since the IAS officers are in the Central Government as well as State Government, once they revised the salaries of the civil servants and the civil servants are

posted in the States, so the States also get the benefit of pay revisions carried out in the Centre. Since Panjab University, from time immemorial, gives salaries from the income of the University, so somewhere it becomes compulsive that the income has to be continuously increased. Due to this, the other universities of Punjab are in trouble. The Punjab Government does not provide the grants to those universities too. Everybody has to pay the salary as per the Centre. This is the dilemma and compulsion under which this proposal is that they have to once take a hard step that they have to start enhancing the income via tuition fee and the income from the tuition fee is not more than 30-40% of the total income. Majority of the income is from the examination fee. So, the Centre says that the University should impose a development charge on the students and the affiliated institutions and the students who write the University examination. His plea to them was that imposing another development charge on the students is not appropriate as the examination fee is like a development charge. If the Government asks the University to impose the development charge and then asks to use the same for the purpose of payment of salaries, it is like a new paradigm. As of today, since the teachers were appointed from the profit of the examination fee, they said that let that paradigm remain there. If a development charge is to be imposed, then for whose development it could be. Teachers' salary is not a development purpose. If the development charge is to be imposed, that should be spent for development purposes. So, he was not comfortable when such a proposal was made. Presently also, the Government has put this in the affidavit submitted in the Court. So, in his view there is no sense of additional development charges. When it is said that they are supporting the salary component from the own income and if that percentage has to increase in the same percentage at which the expenditure is increasing. So, they are in a very typical situation at the moment. Personally, he could not see any way. This proposal is just a proposal and he is not sure whether with the passage of time they would be able to accept the diktat of the Central Government that the share of the salary fraction should remain the same. He had worked with the Finance and Development Officer and the share of the University would be less if the 7th Pay Commission is implemented. Right now, they have to just make the Centre accept that they have a responsibility towards the University and is trying to withdraw from that responsibility. So, actually it is the Public Interest Litigation. That is what Justice Saron keeps asking the Centre. It is fortunate for the University that the UGC has put the University in such a budget head which already has the Constituent Colleges of University of Delhi and the University of Allahabad. Delhi University is the responsibility of Centre since the UGC came into existence. The UGC cunningly wanted to withdraw Panjab University from that budget head and put in a separately created budget head saying that the problems of Panjab University would be over when a separate budget head is created. It could solve the problems but also could aggravate the problems. If the University remains in the same budget head and plead that the same consideration be given to the University as is being given to the constituent Colleges of University of Delhi, University of Allahabad, Dyalbagh University, the Sanskrit University which Professor Murli Manohar Joshi had got approved as Deemed University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences or the Inter-University Centres like Nuclear Science Centre or Pune Centre. If the University keeps attached with these, these Centres have been opened by the UGC itself and the UGC has taken the liability of these centres since a

very long time and the Government would have to provide the same grants which these centres would be provided.

It is the compulsion of the University and the proposal for tuition fee enhancement has been made in a scientific way. It might not be a case where the University increases the fee in an arbitrary manner of such a course where the enrolment of the students is already less. So it has been balanced out that the fee be increased only for those courses where the fee is very less to start with. If the fee is to be increased, then they have to commit that as on date, the students who take the admission on merit, in future there should be a way so that the University could support such meritorious students who are not able to pay the fee. They would have to set up a machinery that when the next year, the new students come, they would have to devise the form in a new way that the form should contain a column about the background of the students and the form has to be examined at a personal level. This would be applicable only in the case of new students and not for the old students. If the University gets 3-4000 new students in the next year, every teacher would minutely examine the background of 8-10 form and then recommend. They would have to find out a way, before they enhance the fee, to provide cross subsidy to the needy students. The vacancies which the University is not able to fill up, they would impart some training in skills to the students so that they could do it through part-time job. So, they have to do a lot of homework before the next academic session begins. If they do not do, they would not be able to carry the society with them. This is the proposal which the members could examine and discuss it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they are here for the welfare of the students and have to work for them. Firstly, the Government is against the students and wanted to commercialize the education as is the case with private universities. The rich students who could afford to pay higher fee go abroad or take admission in private universities. Only the intelligent students belonging to poor sections try to take admission in Panjab University because of good quality of education. If the fee is increased, the students belonging to poor families or low income group would not be able to take admission in the University. If the education in Panjab University is also expensive, the students belonging to far off areas like Abohar, would not come to Panjab University for admission but would prefer to take admission in his/her own area and would not have to leave his/her own area to come to such an expensive city like Chandigarh. The students would have to face other things also. It means that firstly the Government is against the students and that is why it is saying to increase the fee of the students so that the salary of the teachers could be paid. Secondly, otherwise also the education and health facilities should be provided free of cost throughout the country as it is the first basic human right. The Government is against the students. Secondly, all these problems have started coming only now for the last 2-3 years. They all are together and not saying something otherwise or from the time the selection of the Registrar was made or some persons who are making complaints in the UGC or the Secretary or the Secretary is thinking otherwise wrong about the University. Meaning to say, that there is a politics in it. They could see that till the tenure of the Vice-Chancellor or if the Government appoints a Vice-Chancellor of its own like-minded, all the problems would be over. According to him, this all is just to harass the Vice-Chancellor or the students. This is in the minds of all the members as also in the mind of the Vice-Chancellor

as he could not say it being on this post. But everyone understands that this all is being done to harass the Vice-Chancellor or the Government does not want to keep in view the interest of the students. If they want to fill up the posts, the Government has stopped the same and asked the University to do some other things so that they could not take steps towards filling up the posts. The Government is already building so much pressure and diverting the attention from filling up the posts. The Government wanted that when the new Vice-Chancellor is appointed according to their wish, he/she could fill up the posts according to their wish. He has read the minutes and Shri Sanjay Tandon says that the extra land available with the University be sold off instead of suggesting any solution to the problem. This suggestion could also have been given that the land allotted to the University in Sarangpur, the shopping mall or theatre could be opened and with that income the University could be run. Meaning to say, that the members of the Syndicate and Senate belonging to BJP, whatever they might say, but nobody has made efforts.

Professor Mukesh Arora objected to it and said that no mention of any party should be made and the word Government could be used.

Shri Varinder Singh felt sorry for it. He said that Shri Sanjay Tandon has said that the extra land available with the University in Sarangpur be sold off. It is not a permanent solution. It is like a poor family making livelihood by selling the land. In some of the departments, the fee has been increased very much which could be reduced somewhat. But for the permanent solution, they, including the members of the Syndicate and Senate should send a message and pressurize the Government that the students are suffering due to petty politics. It is also harming the Vice-Chancellor as also his health. The burden of any kind also affects the health of a person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they need not bother about his health as he is alright.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he means to say that whoever is in the position, it could affect the health. They should fight against the Government and send a message that the Panjab University being 'A' grade University, could not be compared with Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University and the fee could not be enhanced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that those universities are also good universities.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is right but the reputation of Panjab University is very high being No.1 University in India. It is all politics as this has started for the last 2-3 years which was not the case earlier. Before that the Centre or the UGC did not ask for such things but has started these things only now. The Government of India is also taking other steps like demonetization, etc. whereas the Government is against the students and where the poor students would go. There are some of the Departments where the fee is in the range of Rs.2.5 lacs to Rs.6 lacs. It means that the poor students would not be able to take admission in the University. The poor or the low income group students have only a hope of taking admission in the Government universities and Panjab University is the only best University in north India. Where such poor students would go? The

students of far off areas like Abohar would take admission there and obtain a degree. The standard of education would also fall due to this. It is not only that it would put a burden on the students but the education level of the University would also fall. Instead of defending the Secretaries, they should send a reply to them. It could be said to close the University. It is just a politics only to harass the Vice-Chancellor and the students' interests are not being kept in view all over India. He requested that since in some of the courses the fee is very high, it could be decreased. But the increase in fee is not a permanent solution. How much of income could they have from the fee with which they could run the University? They could not do anything with the income from the fee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct. The University Departments were established with the fee. The University was run from the examination fee of the Matriculation examination. This revenue model worked when the Matriculation examination was taken from the University and handed over to the Education Board. The problem begin.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is right but it is not that they could run the University on the basis of the income generated from the fee of the students. Would the Government not support? Till now everything had been going smoothly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct. They should read through all the papers that he has sent to them. However, it might be difficult to read all the papers running in about 500 pages. But if they read through it, they could realize that it is not happening for the first time. This problem was faced by Professor R.C. Paul in the year 1976 and the University did not have the money to pay the salaries.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is a lot of difference in the conditions of the country of then and now. There is also a lot of difference in the education of then and now. Actually, the Government is harassing the University. As is being talked about of the year 1976, at that time the admissions were not made in M.A. courses. Now so many courses have started and the country has changed since 1976.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the 4th Pay Commission was to be implemented, then they faced the problems. In the background of the problems of the 4th Pay Commission, the University Institute of Engineering & Technology and other departments were opened. For some time, the income from the self-financed courses was quite high but the outflow was very less. The cross subsidy continued for some years but the inflation is overtaking the cross subsidy. Then the problem cropped up in the year 2000 when the terrorism in Punjab declined and the Centre stopped the grants after 2001 which were being given to Punjab and the burden was put on Punjab and all that was converted as a loan and Punjab Government could not even pay the interest on that loan. When the Punjab Government faced the problem, it reduced the grants to the University. U.T. Administration also faced problems in the 6th Pay Commission because the U.T. also did not get any money separately for Panjab University. The money was extracted from a budget head for the Panjab University. When the Government squeezed the budget of U.T., the U.T. abandoned the University. Why did Dr. Manmohan

Singh, the Prime Minister come to rescue of Panjab University? Is because the U.T. Administration at that time did exactly what the MHRD is doing now. U.T. played the same role which the UGC and MHRD are playing today. For some time, it went on. When he came as the Vice-Chancellor, the problem started before the present Government came into power. When Mr. Ashok Thakur came to the Panjab University, he said that the University is getting the *ad hoc* money for salaries and it could not continue and it would have to be made part of the non-plan budget. When it became a part of the non-plan budget which has a ceiling and it could not be expanded at will. The rate of expenditure was more than the normal rate of increase of non-plan budget, the Government started to withdraw. When the University needed at least 12% increase, the Government fixed it at 8% that the University could get 8% annual increase. This is not a decision of this Government but a decision of the previous Government when Shri Kapil Sibal was the HRD Minister. When he had said this thing earlier, it did not suit Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal. The problem is with the Government of India. The Government of India is shrinking its role in supporting the higher education. The Governments want to expand the higher education but want to decrease their role per Institution. The Governments are doing good things by having IITs, IIMs, everywhere and All India Institutes of Medical Sciences one for every State. So, the public at large is being served. The amount of money being put in such public sector in the form of Central Universities, IIMs, AIIMS, new NITs has increased but the per institution, the support has decreased. Since the Panjab University is a unique institution, there are no such institutions, so Panjab University is a soft target to squeeze more than the other institutions. This is where the crux of the problem is. It is not that the Government has decreased the budget for health/education. The budget for health or education, even for scientific research science has actually not decreased but it has become uneven in the sense that the budget head of IIMs and IITs has increased very much but the expenditure per IIM and IIT has been decreased and the number of IIMs and IITs has been increased. In science, in order to promote inter institutional science at the global level, a huge amount has been given for Associate Membership of CERN as well as for 30 meter telescope being installed by CALTECH. India's participation in gravitational lab is 10% and Rs.1500 crore has gone there. So the budget of the small departments which used to get grants in the range of Rs.10-40 lacs has squeezed and some big projects got funded. It is a very complex thing. When a debate takes in Lok Sabha, they could get the numbers easily, that the grant has been enhanced for the education, technology, scientific research. Those figures look right. But every individual player in that bracket feels that money is not given to that because within a bracket there is an uneven distribution. So, this is the problem.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he wanted to make a thing clear as he was a member of the Committee. None of the members of that Committee was interested that the fee of the students should be enhanced. As Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the needy and meritorious students should also be kept in view. When the fee was enhanced, two conditions were imposed that the students whose income is up to Rs.5 lacs, 70% of their fee would be exempted and up to Rs.2.5 lacs, it is 100%.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that according to him, it is an issue on which the people have been thinking as to on which track the

University would go. Whether the burden of this crisis would be put on the students whether related to the salaries of the teachers or other things. Honestly speaking, the way the Vice-Chancellor is facing this crisis, he has seen for the first time that the Vice-Chancellor is sincerely taking up the matter in High Court, hats off to him. He has been continuing in the Senate since 1992, such a crisis has not come for the first time but not of such a nature which is at present. He agreed to some extent to Shri Varinder Singh what he has said. He suggested that it is an issue on which they should not take a decision and refer it to the Senate. Since it is a very big issue they should not take such a decision that the history of the University shows that it has a democratic content in the form of Syndicate and Senate, the teachers and the students have a role and discussions and debates have taken place and only then the decision on the fee hike are taken. He remembered that at one time Shri Khushal Behl was the Education Minister and Shri N.S. Rattan was the Education Secretary, they took a sweeping decision on the fee hike that it would be implemented in all the Colleges, Universities and the hostels and thereafter full grant-in-aid would be given after collecting the funds from this hike. He was one of them, when they had called a special session of the Senate saying that who is the Punjab Government to take a decision and it is the prerogative of the University to take whatever decision in this matter. Generally, two things are clear. One is that the Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University are not comparable with the Panjab University because in those universities there is no Senate election. He would like to be forgiven, the Vice-Chancellors of those universities receive and see off the DPI, the Education Secretary is the bigger Bose for those universities and whatever directive is given to them by the Punjab Government, the same is approved without any discussion. Panjab University is a traditional University of more than 100 years of standing and they would not let it down in this way. They feel lucky to have the Vice-Chancellor as a captain of this team who is looking after the interests of the University day and night. This was applauded with the thumping of desks by the members. When Dr. Man Mohan Singh was the Prime Minister, the University had bountiful of money. Those persons had an attachment with the University and tried to save the historical background of the University and the Vice-Chancellors did not face any problems. That is the reason that so many developments had taken place in the University. At that time, he had said that the University should not be expanded so much and so much expenditure should not be done as sometimes it happens that a person builds a very big house and a time comes when that person is not in a position even to pay for the electricity bills. He had suggested that the money which has been granted should be spent in a useful way and not much expansion should be done. But so many departments which were not needed were also opened. All this has happened. It is the duty of the Central Government and hats off to the Judges of the High Court who have taken a suo moto notice and a debate has opened for the University and the Government of India has to release the grant. The issue is also being discussed in the Parliament. Shri Dhindsa has also raised this issue in the Parliament. So, everyone is feeling concerned about the University. The Vice-Chancellor has initiated this debate. If the Vice-Chancellor had not talked about it in the Senate, the issued would not have been taken up. Every Vice-Chancellor had to face the crisis. There were the Government earlier also and they did not face any difficulties. The Vice-Chancellor is also concerned about the students as much as the members. There is a ratio of 60:40 defined in the Act. The diktats and the arm twisting by

the Government could not force the University to surrender. He suggested that this issue should be highlighted in the public that the Government of India is not fulfilling its responsibility. With this all things should be globalised and a pressure should be built on the Government through the Member of Parliament and other people. This issue could also be raised in the coming session of the Parliament and the debate should be held everywhere that they would not allow such a situation to occur. The universities could not be run with increasing the fee. Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University are not a parallel to Panjab University and if one wanted to compare the Panjab University, it should be compared with Aligarh Muslim University, Jawaharlal Nehru University, University of Hyderabad, University of Allahabad. It is not that Panjab University is compared with the universities which have been a part of Panjab. They would not allow this heritage University to decay whatever be the compulsions of the Government. It is being said that the students in the University has so many cars. It is not that all the 18000 students are having the cars, the number of such students could be 1500-2000. They are in favor of it that if the students belonging to elite class are charged more, they would discuss with the Vice-Chancellor in this matter. But the talent always comes from the lower middle class and the poor class. The elite class students are not bothered about study and come only for enjoyment. The actual talent comes from the lower class and the students belonging to this class could become doctors, engineers, etc. Therefore, these students should not be burdened. As the Government does that the price of petrol is hiked by Rs.20 and then Rs.5 is reduced saying that the concession is being given. It should not be so. They should not increase the fee in a blanket way and then reduce a little. He is not in favor of it. As the Vice-Chancellor is under pressure, they would like that the pressure should be confronted and resisted. It should not be that whatever has been proposed should be unanimously approved otherwise it would send a message that earlier University was not doing well but now it has taken a right decision and the Government is right. He agreed with Shri Varinder Singh that the bureaucrats behave in the same way what the political leadership says. Therefore, this issue should be debated and should be sent to the Senate and only then a decision should be taken. The number of students belonging to rich class is very less. He would like to point out that there are some such students belonging to poor sections that they share their diet with each other to reduce the expenses. There are some poor students in the hostels who after having the breakfast do not take lunch. All these things needed to be kept in mind. As is suggested that the extra land should be sold off, why it should be sold off. Earlier, there was a proposal for the construction of a science museum in Sector-25 for which 60 acre land was required, at that time in the Syndicate, he had said that why this land should be given as it is of no use and the University could not afford that in future it would become a liability on the University. Therefore, the land should not be given. The PUTA also took a stand and the proposal was dropped. They should look for the future on this issue as to how to save the University. Enhancing the fee would send a wrong signal to the society. They should resist and they should try other sources for revenue generation and the wasteful expenditure should be reduced as also the luxury should be reduced. They should do all such things but the students should not be burdened.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that whatever good things have been said by the members should also be told as that member had

said that he would go with the Vice-Chancellor to the HRD and Finance Minister. That member is also against putting a burden on the students. The shops which could not be rented out could be rented out on a less rent and earning could also be done through the vacant canteens and the income from other sources should also be generated. There should be no backbiting. He was also a member of the Committee.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they should not take such a decision which they might have to withdraw. Therefore, he agrees with Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that it should be sent to the Senate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Vice-Chancellor also feels that the fee should not be increased. This is the decision of the House that it should be sent to the Senate. If the fee is to be increased, it should be increased only marginally and that also only in those courses where the fee is actually very low.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in the Senate a discussion was that the fee would be increased 2.5% every year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 2.5% increase is not an increase.

Shri Varinder Singh said that 2.5% increase was according to the situation of that time. It is also right as said by the Vice-Chancellor that the present situation is a different one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is a rate of increase of expenditure and the income of the University has to match that. If the income does not increase with the rate of expenditure, it means that the University's share is decreasing. The share is decreasing as the salaries are determined by the Centre. If the share has to decrease, then the share of the Punjab Government and the Central Government has to continuously enhance otherwise the books would not get balanced. He wanted a revenue model from those who are saying that the income could be increased by increasing the rent of the shops in a substantial way or by renting out few more things in the campus. That is not possible. They could get only 1-2% of the total income from this but could not get hundreds of crores from this. The shopkeepers are crying that entry into Sector-14 is restricted and they do not get customers from outside. There is hardly any parking place. They do not get customers and now all sales are going to be monitored and very soon it could be known as to what is the income of the shopkeepers and what are the profits. The shopkeepers are crying that the rent should not be increased by a phenomenal increase. The University has few shops which they could e-tender and it could be known as to how much rent the University could get from those shops.

It was informed that e-tendering was done but no response was received. Therefore, retendering is to be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is very nice to say that the rent of the shops should be increased and do other things like advertising for commercial use. But tens of crores of income could not be generated through that.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Shri Varinder Singh said that it would disfigure the University and it would become like a mall.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the faculty could also provide the consultancy services.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even the IITs do not have sufficient income from patents, consultancies. They could generate money for development purposes. Whatever money the IITs get through patents, consultancies, it goes only to create the facilities within the IITs and the salaries could not be paid through this amount. Most of the expenditure of all educational institutions in the country is the salary and infrastructure bill, bills which are related to electricity, water, maintenance of essential services. So, those numbers are extremely large. The boundary of the University is limited and could not increase such income by a substantial amount. They could earn only a few crores. The alumni could start contributing but those things could take 10 to 30 years or so before the University could generate money from them. How do they survive month after month? Right now, the major problem is this. At the moment, they do not know as to how to go up to 31st March. The Court has given a directive yesterday that as 15% increase has been given to other institutions, the University should also be given the same but that money has not been released. He would send to all the members through e-mail/hard copy of the document/affidavit that has been submitted to the Court. The office was directed to provide the copies. In brief, whatever affidavit has been submitted, it gives a little bit of history, it gives the break-up and everything. Break-up of the income and sources and how the expenditure is incurred. There is some projection just to convince the MHRD that the University is serious about its affairs and the MHRD should keep the University at the same level as it is keeping the other institutions which are in the same pocket. What the MHRD wanted to do is that during the next three-five years, the University should bring its deficit to zero. The members are talking about 60:40, but the Government wanted to bring it from 60% to zero. The share of the Punjab Government which was 40% has decreased to 9%. The problem is very severe. Right now, the strategy is that the University should remain in the same pocket and receive the same treatment as is given to Jawaharlal Nehru University. Panjab University could not be like JNU because it is not an affiliating University and it has no income. University of Delhi at least has some income from the School of Open Learning having about 80-90000 students enrolled whereas Panjab University is having about 23000. Their difficulty is at this level that given the history, they could not take a stand that they would not generate the internal income because they have generated their income. So, the internal income should commensurate with the expenditure. If they could stand at this level, then they could force the Government for other things. If they abandon that they would not match the income at the same rate as the expenditure, then they would lose the battle with the Centre completely. Take it from him, the Government would have no hesitation in closing down the University. He has seen the old records also, statements exist in the University files as well as MHRD files that the Colleges of Punjab be attached with the Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it could not be done as the people of Punjab would not accept it as the people resist it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that such Colleges are situated in about 8-9 districts and the Government could not dare to do it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Government has done it. Actually previously Punjabi University was a residential University and in the first instance, the Colleges of four districts were attached with it.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is a lot of difference in the situation of that time and present.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no difference. They have an exonerated notion. The Government could do it just with an executive order and they would not be able to do anything.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Punjab Government had itself said that Panjab University be made a Central University but when the public rose against this decision, the Punjab Government withdrew the decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was not the public but a political class rose against this. Why did Shri Parkash Singh Badal withdraw? It was because that all the other political parties were also with him for the withdrawal.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it was a political compulsion and it is not an academic compulsion.

Shri Varinder Singh said that now what they wanted to do.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they leave this position that they would not match the income with the expenditure, all their arguments would collapse. None of the MPs would stand with the Panjab University.

Shri Varinder Singh said that now also no MP is with Panjab University and does not favour the University. For the last 3-4 years, the University is facing so many problems as the grant is received in instalments. It is not the solution. Which are the MPs who have talked in favour of the University or have talked to the Secretaries or the UGC as to what they are doing? Has anyone questioned it? Instead of fighting with the Government, they are fighting amongst themselves. All the members are of the opinion that the fee should not be increased but have never talked to the MPs. There are MPs in the Senate and how much efforts they have made for the release of the grants for the University. They always put a burden on the students. The posts are also needed to be filled up and this is also affecting the students. Basically, the Government is pressurizing them so much so that they could not think of other things and increase the fee for which the students would agitate.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he agreed with Shri Varinder Singh and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that the fee should not be enhanced excessively but they should have an alternative also as to how to generate the revenue. The Punjab Government has put a ban on the posts and the grant-in-aid is also being decreased in a phased manner (10% every year). The Colleges went to the Court and the Court ordered that the Government could not curtail these grants (95%) and almost all the Colleges have recovered their balance from

the Punjab Government. The University should not leave its claim. When the Punjab Government reduces the grant year by year, they should claim whatever grant is due from the Punjab Government and could also approach the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to balance the books by March 31, 2017 and a copy of the document would be provided to the members and start taking up the matter afresh from 1st April, 2017.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the problems of the University started more with the setting up of the Dental College as by donating an amount of Rs.2 crore that person has also taken a house in the campus. Actually, that person came to Chandigarh to purchase a house which he could not get with an amount of Rs.2 crores. He donated Rs.2 crores to the University and got the building named after him.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is not a reality.

Shri Varinder Singh said that wrong information be not given.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Dental College is also a burden as on date. According to him, it is not self-financing.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Dental College is not the core of the problem. If by closing the Dental College, the problems of the University could be solved, they could close it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he is not suggesting that. He suggested that no further such departments should be set up which are not financially viable. Some of the departments could be merged.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is already on the cards.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the teaching positions should also be reviewed and what is the expenditure on the re-employment.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they stop the re-employment, they would lose about 70 re-employed teachers and they would not be allowed to fill up the vacancies. Already the teacher-student ratio is very less. If the re-employment is stopped, the teaching-non teaching ratio would also get imbalanced as per the Government criteria. He has submitted a plan to the Government of India that the existing teachers would do extra work so as to participate in the courses. Every teacher is not only a teacher of the department but every teacher would also take up the burden of the Distance Education so that the Distance Education agenda of the University could be improved and the income could be increased by a factor 2 to 3% over the next five years and that additional income should exclusively be used only to employ the teachers so that the 400 positions of the teachers which are vacant as on date, could be filled up so that the teacher-non teacher remains healthy, student-teacher ratio also remains healthy. The additional income that the University would generate, that should exclusively go towards employing more teachers. They have given a proposal that they could have more teachers, have

teacher-non teacher ratio healthy, teacher-student ratio healthy. Merging and shrinking of the departments is a part of the proposal.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the teaching-non teaching ratio of 1:1.5 should not include the non-teaching posts of the Examination and College Branches. They are charging separate fee from the Colleges. The University is having about 15000 students whereas there are about 2.5 lac students from the Colleges, who would take care of the students of the Colleges. They should have taken that plea also.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is all in that document and he would provide a copy of it to the members. All such things have been put in the documents so as to avoid the diktats of the Government and minimum number of employees are reduced. Everything has been put in the document. But the centre piece of this is that the internal income of the University would match with the increase in expenditure. If they could continuously reduce the expenditure, then the internal income could be stabilised. Then they could keep a cap as to how much fee is to be enhanced. But there is a limit to cap that could be put because they are not determining the salary structure of the teachers and non-teaching. The salary structure for all is determined by the Government. So, it is a very complex situation. Right now, the strategy is that the deficit should be zero by 31st March, 2017 so that the books are balanced and then start afresh. The Judge is with the University only on this count that whatever the University could do, it has done. The Government should match it and if the Government wanted to close down the University then why wait up to 31st March and close down immediately. That was the basis of asking the Government to release an amount of Rs.30.5 crores. The Centre is also waiting as to what is there in the written part of the judgment. What the Judge says in the Court, sometimes it has not that severity when the judgment is written. He was also asked yesterday about the release of the grant, but he could not confirm it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that earlier also they had enhanced the examination fee and at that time they had approved that the enhanced fee would not be charged from the students whose parents' income is below Rs.5 lacs.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was passed that the students who would seek the support, they would be granted.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired as to how it would be given in the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Colleges would determine and submit a claim.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired as to how the students would claim and what would be the income criteria.

The Vice Chancellor said that the support is to be given to the students in income group of below Rs.2.5 lacs.

Shri Varinder Singh said that what would be criteria of the income certificate, whether it would be issued by the Tehsildar or some other authority.

The Vice Chancellor said that that has to be verified.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Committee was to be formed but it could not be formed. He suggested that the modalities of the same be framed so that the students do not face the problems.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee could be formed within a day and the modalities be worked out at the earliest.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if the fee is to be enhanced, the poor students should be given the concession.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that they could request about 200-300 persons to provide the suggestions on the ways of generating the income and out of those they could pick up some good suggestions.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that on page 78, the Committee has made two recommendations relating to the income of up to Rs. 5 lacs and up to Rs.2.5 lacs. He is surprised over it that the Committee has recommended the concession for the students who have studied and qualified their 10+2 examination from a Government School. In areas like Jalalabad and others, there are private schools which are not charging hefty amount of fee and there are no Government schools in the vicinity. These recommendations of the Committee would deprive such students. They could not have a bar that only the students who have studied in the Government schools would be entitled.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is valid and it would be taken care of.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that when they talk about professional courses, there are professional courses such as MBA running in the University Business School and the University Institute of Applied Management Sciences and it could be supposed that they are charging Rs.2 lacs. He would like to give the example of Deemed Universities like Thapar, VIT Vellore. For these institutions, the parents have a mindset that if by paying a big amount of fee they get admitted their wards, they are sure that the wards would get 99% placement. The University should also make efforts in this regard. The professional courses of the University should also be strengthened to that level by increasing the fee so that the parents have a mindset that if their ward is admitted in these courses, placement would be given. At the moment, there is no such opinion in the minds of the parents in the society that by paying such a fee the students could get the placements. Secondly, it has not been laid down that they would increase in all the courses. If they increase the intake in all the courses, it would automatically increase the revenue by 10%. Even the MHRD has several times said that the University should initiate the capacity building courses.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not increase the intake in the courses which are controlled by the regulatory bodies.

Professor Mukesh Arora clarified that there was a discussion on increasing the intake, but since it was not a part of their task, so they could not mention it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that regarding NRI seats, there is a mention that there would be no conversion of NRI seats to general category. If they could have a legal opinion and some way out comes and the NRI seats are filled, that would also increase the revenue. He had read it in the media that Haryana Government wanted to affiliate the Colleges of Panchkula and Ambala with Panjab University. He wanted to know whether any such proposal has been received by the University or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that Haryana Government has become a party in the Public Interest Litigation but no proposal has been received.

Principal B.C. Josan suggested that the Colleges of Mohali could also be affiliated with Panjab University.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that it should be forwarded to the Senate. Since the issue is related with revenue generation, there could be more suggestions in the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the decision has to be taken by the members.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he does not agree with the suggestion of Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma regarding the Dental College. It should not be said about any department of the University that it is a burden on the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Dental College is not a burden on the University. At Lahore, there used to be a separate faculty for Dental. When the University came from Lahore to Shimla and the dental faculty remained at Lahore and there was no faculty in dental sciences. The U.T. did not have a Dental College. Even a Medical College in U.T. was set up only after 1987 and the U.T. was so overwhelmed by it that 85 seats were allotted and did not think of a Dental College.

When the meeting resumed after the lunch, the Vice Chancellor said that the consensus of item no. 12 is that it will go to the Senate. So, it will take a little while before the discussion can all be written up. So, it will go to the March meeting of the Senate. It cannot be done immediately. In the meanwhile he will make available all the documents pertaining to the case in the High Court to all the members of Senate by e-mail well in advance. He will not wait for the agenda papers to go. He will immediately send these on e-mail and if they need hard copy that can be sent to them. Today's judgment will also come to us. You will be given hard copy. Other members of the Senate will also be sent hard copy. He will send documents by making a proper index. The papers that have already been sent in the old Senate meeting that will not be sent again. The papers that have not been gone, by making the index, will be sent to all the members. As far as soft copy is concerned, let him arrange to send it before the 29th meeting of the Senate. So that the members, who will come, can discuss each other. It just will give time to cope to each other. If the document will be available, then it will be done immediately. He will briefly tell them. They have been given two bundles. One bundle is whose front page is submission of physical expenditure and revenue plan of P.U. This was desired by them within a period of one month on 15th of December. They had sent it

on e-mail on 13th of January and on 16th January, Monday, in the morning made it available in the office both at the MHRD level as well as at the UGC level. This document, of course there is submission sent by the Registrar. Along with this, the report of the old sub-committee of the year 2010 by making transcript was attached. This sub-committee considered all such issues six years ago in 2010. He felt that if these issues are revisited one should know the background that what the decision last time was. So, deliberately they have added these 2010 papers. Then there is last page of this that the additional submission he has made to the Secretary, MHRD by a personal letter whole title is, "A cause for generation of additional resources for improving teacher people ratio at P.U. you are initiating" This is a thought. This is a thought; this was also submitted to them. This one page document was also given to the court as an addendum to this affidavit which was filed on the 16th of January in the High Court. It was sent on 16th of January on email to Shri Sat Pal Jain Ji counsel of MHRD and on 17th after getting it stamped, copies were distributed to all the council. With that affidavit, the addendum of last page was also attached. It was this one page, abstracted part of which was made the part of affidavit. So, it is all before you. These all things along with all relevant documents including the orders and making their proper index, will be send to all by e-mail.

RESOLVED: That the matter related with the fee structure of Panjab University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres for the session 2017-18 be referred to the Senate.

Issue relating to the extension in service to Class 'C' employees after attaining the age of superannuation

27. Discussed the issue relating to the extension in service to Class 'C' employees after attaining the age of superannuation, pursuant to the Regulation 17.1 and 17.2 appearing at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 17.1 and 17.2 appearing at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 are reproduced below:

16.1. All whole time members of the non-teaching staff, except Class 'C' employees, shall retire on attaining the age of 60 years.

16.2. All whole time Class C employees shall retire on reaching the age of 60 years; provided that extension may be allowed up to the age of 65 years on the recommendation of the officer concerned and on production of certificate of Physical Fitness from the University Chief Medical officer, every two years."

2. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 06.07.2002 vide Para 23 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to give the extension in service to the Class 'C' employees.

3. The Vice-Chancellor while granting extension in service to 7 Class 'C' employees up to 31.01.2017 has also ordered that "to be discussed in Syndicate, January 2017."
4. An office note along with office order No.19211-221 dated 29.12.2016 enclosed **(Appendix-XLVIII)**.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him give the little background. After that meeting of 15th December in MHRD Office and the proceedings in the Court of 19th of December, it became very apparent that manpower is an issue with the central government, particularly the manpower in the non-teaching. So when the proposals came to him for giving extension to the 'C' class employees up to the age of 65, it is done in two plus two plus one. When things came to him, he felt if he had signed it blindly, then there will make an issue to reduce the manpower. He felt it safer to recommend sanction only upto 31st January, 2017. He had to put the matter to the Syndicate. These are the things the Vice-Chancellor should not decide at his own level. To safe guard himself and protect the interest of the University, he gave extension upto 31st of January, 2017, so that it cannot become an issue and anybody raises the finger. In the court, since the Hon'ble Judge agreed to give a directive to them that the University be paid 15% increase which it is asking, and nothing else was decided of the matter. They gave an affidavit. Those are replies they have filed. So as of today, they have to make some adjustment or to proceed further. His suggestion and advice is that they will take decisions in two steps i.e. decision upto 31st March, 2017 and decision beyond 31st March, 2017. We are still not completely out of options. The idea is we just are trying to balance them. Since there a directive that manpower should be reduced, somehow or the others, so whatever is within the regulations that one can get extension. It is not compulsory that it is a matter of right. It is an extension which may be given. So, he did not want the Centre to say that they have already excess manpower and not adhere to reduce the manpower. We have given an undertaking that during the next five years, if five hundred people will reach the age of 60 years, we will not recruit the new people, leaving aside such positions where there is a possibility of managing or not appointing then those people will be filled up for some time. Otherwise, there is no way. We cannot ask any regular employee to leave. They have recommended that University must encourage people to opt for voluntary retirement. So, we have to check now the possibility of voluntary retirement. But to encourage people to go on voluntary retirement normally some incentives are offered. At present we are not in that position. So with this background, it is not possible. One is to take an interim call, the persons who had already been given extension, we should not curtail. So at the moment they can take an interim solution, they be given extension upto 31st March and by then 15th March will also passed. They will not be in a situation and then they will review in the Syndicate meeting after 15th March. By then the decision of court will also come. Then we will decide what to do after 31st of March. The persons who have already been given extension, suppose somebody have crossed 64 in the month of October, 2016 and we have given him one year extension, he will go upto October, 2017. It is not sensible to curtail his extension at this time. If any person came before 62, he

has been given two years i.e. from October 2016 to October, 2018, is also not sensible to curtail his extension. Therefore, we have one deadline of October/November 2017 and the second deadline is November, 2018, whom we had already given extension. Their services should not be curtailed.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that do it upto 2018 i.e. the date they have already been given extension so that junior may not retire earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now they be given extension upto 31st March, 2017.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they do only this, there will be continuous simmering. He will suggest some other way. He is not saying that they should take it at their own. The decision of 31st March is right. In addition to this we should recommend other way. If we talk about 'C' Class, we had already taken a decision that this a diminishing cadre, these posts will not be filled again and some persons of 'C' Class goes to Class 'B' after getting promotion. They will also not go beyond 60 years. There are only some people. We, besides recommending immediately to 31st of March and also recommend with this and send to the Board of Finance that we should continue with this policy with the arguments that these are very few people, when they were appointed because it was a continuous thing.

The Vice Chancellor said that in any case we should do this upto October/November, 2018.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that if we took it to the Board of Finance and they refused, may we not get into trouble.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no, it is regulation. We are saying not to stop the implementation of regulation to B.O.F.

The Vice Chancellor said that they cannot go forward without B.O.F. At this stage, B.O.F. will give trouble in all the things which have the financial implications.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they can say that they are not scrapping these regulations for these people. When these people got the job, they presumed that they will continue like that and their number is not too much. We can find out their number and making a strong case, we should take it in B.O.F. The policy will continue as such and in future it is diminishing.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is okay, we should make a strong case and send it to the B.O.F.

It was informed that it is not mandatory, it is may. In regulation it is that they may give extension.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Syndicate recommendations should be that when these were given jobs, they presumed to continue beyond 60. That's why they stop them.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that these have not been violated till date.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it is re-employment or extension.

Some members said that it is an extension.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said is there any benefit in the pension also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that yes, they get all the benefits. We will say them that now they are doing it. Particularly they belong to this cadres and it is important for them. Recommendations will be of the Syndicate and let it be decided by the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor said that they will say that it is important for you and why it is not important for Punjab Government, U.T. and Centre.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they got job it was not there, but it is here from the beginning. It is the regulation.

The Vice Chancellor said that is it mandatory to send it in the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor said that we cannot give as there is word may for extension and we have given the commitment to the Centre.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that that's why he is saying to take the proposal in Board of Finance.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that will the permission be given in the Board of Finance. List will come from there to whom they are giving and not giving.

The Vice Chancellor said that let us try in the Board of Finance, there are persons from Punjab, persons from UGC and persons from U.T., they may not allow, but we must be seen to be trying.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if it happened due to financial crunch to lowest cadre it will be big causality. What the message will go?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that we will take up the matter there.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now what will you do.

Professor Mukesh Arora said first see that can it be done without going to the Board of Finance. Was it earlier sent to Board of Finance? Earlier it was done automatically or sent to B.O.F.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they will say that it is already regulation. The case should be so framed that they are not asking any new thing. They are not demanding for new benefits but they are saying to continue the continuing benefits. Looking at previous practice and circumstances and these posts are not going to be filled in again due to diminishing cadre and many of them get promotion, there is a very few number who will hurt with the decision if we discontinue this.

It was informed that they will have to give facts.

Professor Mukesh Arora said were these cases of extension sent to the Board of Finance earlier?

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they have not improved qualifications and they cannot be promoted and will remain in the same position.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said these are the old persons and very few persons who are facing problem. New persons have improved their qualification and they will go to class 'B'.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that his request is that whether earlier cases of extension were sent to BOF or not. You may get it checked.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier these were not sent to B.O.F. But if the Vice Chancellor took the decision, somebody may say that they have been told to reduce the non-teaching and they are not doing so. This is may, but not compulsory. As it is practice, it should be. That's why we are doing so.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they have not been promoted and they are on the lowest rank.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the people in the BOF are influential persons. We will request them to do it. First do it 31st of March, 2017 and ask the BOF to continue it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it be taken to the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, it is up to 31st March, 2017.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it be approved up to 31st March and after getting it recommended from the Board of Finance, it is to be continued.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the practice which has been continuing till now, let they try to continue that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a strong recommendation would go that they have to continue the previous practice.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, the Syndicate recommends that the previous practice would go on and the extension is given up to 31st March, 2017 as an interim measure and all facts to be put before the Board of Finance.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if they are recommending it up to 31st March, 2017, the Board of Finance might want to go beyond that period and would say the Syndicate has done it up to 31st March, 2017.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now, he has a difficulty that if they give it beyond, then the Centre would come down heavily.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is a Regulation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a Regulation, it is alright but Regulation is not a must. Where is it that it is a must?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is already going and there is no pick and choose.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they do not do pick and choose according to their will.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is necessary to get it from Board of Finance.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they could give the reasons.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the strong reasons have to be given. It is also a diminishing cadre. Some of the employees would get promoted and there would remain very less employees in this cadre.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Finance and Development Officer to collect all facts and said that some of the members would work the Finance and Development Officer so that all the facts are put in a strong way.

Professor Mukesh Arora and Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested the name of Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there should be a promotion policy also for these employees as some of the employees must be highly qualified.

The Vice-Chancellor said that their interest is that the employees of this category could go in 'B' category.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is already a policy for this purpose.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the benefit could be given by framing a promotion policy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could provide special training to the employees of this cadre so that they could qualify the test.

It was informed that some of the employees are not interested in taking the promotion because they are nearing their retirement and the basic pay has reached almost to the level of next promotion and they are also interested that they would get five years in the lower category.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that maximum of the employees would get promoted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it be found that how many employees who have been given the extension. A factual position be put up and try to put off this unrest. Their purpose is to secure the financial status of the University. They will not sacrifice them. If they

can secure it without getting into all these things, then fine. They can help here and do not make the issue regarding centre. The persons who are coming in the Board of Finance meeting, make political pressure on them so that it may be done.

RESOLVED: That all those 'C' class employees whose retirement on attaining the age of 60 years falls up to February 2017, be given extension in service up to 31st March 2017. For further extension, the matter be referred to the Board of Finance with strong recommendation of Syndicate that the present policy be continued.

Deferred Item

41. Considered letter dated 19.01.2017 of Chairperson, PUCASH, containing letters addressed to the Chairperson, National Commission for Women, New Delhi and the Secretary, MHRD, New Delhi.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the University has already taken decision in this regard and any way he thinks there is no point the University seems to be in confrontation with the MHRD

The Vice Chancellor said that this letter came to him, let him give the background. Letter came to him in a sealed cover. When he opened it, he found that he has been directed to send these things ahead. So, he felt that he should not be taking this decision that he had to send it ahead. He did not know what was there in it, what was the purpose. Why he is being asked to. Last time he had also received a packet. But last time it was addressed to the Chancellor. Since it was addressed to the Chancellor so, he let it go. But this time it is addressed not to the Chancellor, but it is addressed to National Commission for Women or MHRD. So, there he felt that he will not take this decision; he will leave the decision to the Syndicate

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is no reason that letter should go there from the PUCASH as per act. And if it is going through the Vice-Chancellor, it will look as if the University has all his consent in it and what is in it. So, why University should be confronting these two organizations.

The Vice Chancellor said that the option is to pass it to the Senate meeting of 29th. Now, this item is deferred.

All the members unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred.

Confirmation of certain faculty members

42. Considered if, the following faculty members, be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the dated mentioned against each:

(i) Department of Chemistry

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	^Dr. (Ms) Sonal Singhal	Associate Professor in Inorganic Chemistry	1.4.1975	28.10.2015	27.10.2016

2.	^Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary	Associate Professor in Physical Chemistry	22.1.1977	28.10.2015	28.10.2016
3.	Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur	Associate Professor in Organic Chemistry	7.2.1977	29.10.2015	29.10.2016

^ In case two or more persons join on the same date in different departments, their seniority be determined on the basis of date of birth, the person who is senior in age will be senior, provided the Selection Committees are different. Accordingly date of confirmations has been proposed as mentioned above for consideration.

(ii) Department of Zoology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. (Ms.) Harpreet Kaur	Associate Professor	30.9.1963	03.11.2015	03.11.2016

(iii) Department of Hindi

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Ashok Kumar	Associate Professor	13.5.1970	27.11.2015	27.11.2016

(iv) Department of Education

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
%1.	Dr. Jatinder Grover	Associate Professor	12.07.1976	27.11.2015	27.11.2016
%2.	Dr. Satvinderpal Kaur	Associate Professor	09.09.1973	09.12.2015	9.12.2016

% In order of merit

(v) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
@1.	Dr. Naveen Aggarwal	Associate Professor	09.02.1979	28.10.2015	28.10.2016
@2.	Dr. Ajay Mittal	Associate Professor	16.11.1979	23.11.2015	23.11.2016

@ In order of merit

(vi) Centre for Nano Science & Nano Tech.

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Sunil Kumar Arora	Associate Professor	06.10.1966	30.10.2015	30.10.2016

(vii) Department of Biochemistry

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Navneet Agnihotri	Associate Professor	21.08.1966	27.11.2015	27.11.2016

(viii) (a) Department of Physics

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	*Dr. Bivash Ranjan Behera	Professor	01.06.1972	28.10.2015	27.10.2016
2.	*Prof. Vipin Bhatnagar	Professor	15.09.1969	28.10.2015	28.10.2016

* in order of merit

(viii) (b) Department of Physics

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	#Dr. Ashok Kumar	Associate Professor	30.07.1964	06.11.2015	05.11.2016
2.	#Dr. Sunita Srivastava	Associate Professor	20.10.1962	06.11.2015	06.11.2016

in order of merit

(ix) Department of Anthropology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Kewal Krishan	Associate Professor	24.11.1973	26.11.2015	26.11.2016

NOTE: 1. Confirmation of all the above will be Subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

2. A detailed office note enclosed **(Appendix-XLIX)**.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that following persons be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against their names:

(i) Department of Chemistry

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	^Dr. (Ms) Sonal Singhal	Associate Professor in Inorganic Chemistry	1.4.1975	28.10.2015	27.10.2016
2.	^Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary	Associate Professor in	22.1.1977	28.10.2015	28.10.2016

		Physical Chemistry			
3.	Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur	Associate Professor in Organic Chemistry	7.2.1977	29.10.2015	29.10.2016

^ In case two or more persons join on the same date in different departments, their seniority be determined on the basis of date of birth, the person who is senior in age will be senior, provided the Selection Committees are different. Accordingly date of confirmations has been proposed as mentioned above for consideration.

(ii) Department of Zoology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. (Ms.) Harpreet Kaur	Associate Professor	30.9.1963	03.11.2015	03.11.2016

(iii) Department of Hindi

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Ashok Kumar	Associate Professor	13.5.1970	27.11.2015	27.11.2016

(iv) Department of Education

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
%1.	Dr. Jatinder Grover	Associate Professor	12.07.1976	27.11.2015	27.11.2016
%2.	Dr. Satvinderpal Kaur	Associate Professor	09.09.1973	09.12.2015	9.12.2016

% In order of merit

(v) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
@1.	Dr. Naveen Aggarwal	Associate Professor	09.02.1979	28.10.2015	28.10.2016
@2.	Dr. Ajay Mittal	Associate Professor	16.11.1979	23.11.2015	23.11.2016

@ In order of merit

(vi) Centre for Nano Science & Nano Tech.

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Sunil Kumar Arora	Associate Professor	06.10.1966	30.10.2015	30.10.2016

(vii) Department of Biochemistry

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Navneet Agnihotri	Associate Professor	21.08.1966	27.11.2015	27.11.2016

(viii) (a) Department of Physics

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	*Dr. Bivash Ranjan Behera	Professor	01.06.1972	28.10.2015	27.10.2016
2.	*Prof. Vipin Bhatnagar	Professor	15.09.1969	28.10.2015	28.10.2016

* in order of merit

(viii) (b) Department of Physics

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	#Dr. Ashok Kumar	Associate Professor	30.07.1964	06.11.2015	05.11.2016
2.	#Dr. Sunita Srivastava	Associate Professor	20.10.1962	06.11.2015	06.11.2016

in order of merit

(ix) Department of Anthropology

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of confirmation
1.	Dr. Kewal Krishan	Associate Professor	24.11.1973	26.11.2015	26.11.2016

NOTE: Confirmation of all the above will be Subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

Change of nomenclature of 5½ year B.E. (Chemical) with MBA course

43. Considered if, the nomenclature of 5 ½ year B.E. (Chemical) with MBA being run by the Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, be changed to 'Integrated B.E. (Chemical)-MBA' from the academic session 2017-2018.

NOTE: An office note along with letter dated 09.01.2017 of the Chairperson, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, enclosed (**Appendix-L**).

RESOLVED: That the nomenclature of 5 ½ year B.E. (Chemical) with MBA being run by the Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, be changed to 'Integrated B.E. (Chemical)-MBA' from the academic session 2017-2018.

Extension in contractual term of appointment of Library Assistants

44. Considered if, the contractual term of appointment of the following Library Assistants, be extended beyond 31.01.2017:

Sr. No.	Name of employees	Department
1	Mr. Sandeep Kaushal	SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur
2	Ms. Gagandeep	Evening Studies
3	Ms. Poonam Himdan	UIAMS
4	Ms. Varinder Kaur	UIAMS
5	Ms. Anita Rani	AC Joshi Library
6	Ms. Jyoti Suneja	AC Joshi Library
7	Ms. Seema Aggarwal	AC Joshi Library
8	Ms. Parminder Kaur	AC Joshi Library
9	Ms. Puja Rai	AC Joshi Library
10	Mr. Anil Kumar	U.I.L.S.
11	Ms. Renu Garg	Physics
12	Mr. Jatinder Markanda	UIAMS
13	Mr. Sumer Chand	Geology
14	Ms. Shubh Lakhan Sharma	Chemistry
15	Ms. Inderjit Kaur	U.I.E.T.
16	Ms. Karuna Rani	U.I.E.T.
17	Ms. Simranjeet Kaur	USOL
18	Ms. Preety	Education
19	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Department-cum- Centre for Women Std. & Development
20	Ms. Ramandeep Kaur	PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana
21	Mr. Surinder Kumar	PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana
22	Ms. Ramandeep Kaur Gill	PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana
23	Mr. Manpreet Singh	PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana
24	Ms. Taru Verma	Botany
25	Ms. Ritu Rani	UICET
26	Ms. Vijayata Devi	Evening Studies
27	Ms. Renu Gupta	AC Joshi Library

NOTE: 1. The contractual term of appointment of the above persons has been extended up to 31.01.2017 vide No.734-49/Estt. dated 13.01.2017 (**Appendix-LI**).

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

RESOLVED: That the contractual term of appointment of the following Library Assistants, be extended beyond 31.01.2017, as proposed in accordance with rules as under:

Sr. No.	Name of employees	Department	Period of further extension upto
1	Mr. Sandeep Kaushal	SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur	20.03.2017
2	Ms. Gagandeep	Evening Studies	
3	Ms. Poonam Himdan	UIAMS	
4	Ms. Varinder Kaur	UIAMS	
5	Ms. Anita Rani	AC Joshi Library	
6	Ms. Jyoti Suneja	AC Joshi Library	
7	Ms. Seema Aggarwal	AC Joshi Library	
8	Ms. Parminder Kaur	AC Joshi Library	
9	Ms. Puja Rai	AC Joshi Library	
10	Mr. Anil Kumar	U.I.L.S.	
11	Ms. Renu Garg	Physics	
12	Mr. Jatinder Markanda	UIAMS	
13	Mr. Sumer Chand	Geology	
14	Ms. Shubh Lakhan Sharma	Chemistry	
15	Ms. Inderjit Kaur	U.I.E.T.	
16	Ms. Karuna Rani	U.I.E.T.	
17	Ms. Simranjeet Kaur	USOL	
18	Ms. Preety	Education	
19	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Department-cum- Centre for Women Std. & Development	
20	Ms. Ramandeep Kaur	PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana	
21	Mr. Surinder Kumar	PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana	
22	Ms. Ramandeep Kaur Gill	PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana	
23	Mr. Manpreet Singh	PU Ext. Library, Ludhiana	
24	Ms. Taru Verma	Botany	
25	Ms. Ritu Rani	UICET	
26	Ms. Vijayata Devi	Evening Studies	
27	Ms. Renu Gupta	AC Joshi Library	20.02.2017

Re-employment of class 'A' and 'B' employees

45. Considered if, following Class 'A' and 'B' employees of the University, be given re-employment beyond 31.01.2017, after attaining the age of superannuation.

Sr. No.	Name of the employee/Designation
1.	Shri Birender Singh Driver DUI Office
2.	Shri Surmukh Singh Work Inspector Construction office
3.	Shri Ashwani Kumar Sr. Technical Officer (G-II)
4.	Shri Pritam Chand Technical Officer (G-I) Department of Physics
5.	Shri Pritam Chand Technical Officer (G-II) Department of Biotechnology

6.	Shri Bikram Singh Driver Vice-Chancellor's Office
----	---

- NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the Syndicate has re-employed the above employees till 31.01.2017 and an item in this regard is being placed before the Syndicate as ratification item.
2. An office note along with office orders enclosed (**Appendix-LII**).

The Vice Chancellor said that the reemployment after superannuation be given upto 31st of March, 2017.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that get the medical of drivers done.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is good idea, but extension upto 31st March will be given. This is the last chance; no extension after 31st March. They will have to stop this at some time.

RESOLVED: That the above mentioned Class 'A' and 'B' employees of the University, be given re-employment beyond 31.01.2017 after attaining the age of superannuation, only up to 31st March 2017.

Minutes of Board of Finance dated 19.1.2017 regarding setting up of two new Constituent Colleges

46. Considered the minutes of the emergency meeting of Board of Finance dated 19.01.2017 (**Appendix-LIII**, supplied on the table, to discuss the issue of two new Constituent Colleges at Dharamkot & Ferozpur in the State of Punjab.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in minutes of its meeting dated 19.01.2017, (**as per Appendix-LIII**), be endorsed to the Senate for approval.

Routine and formal matters

47. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xxxii)** on the agenda was read out and ratified, viz. –

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to recommendation by the Leave Cases Committee and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted Extra Ordinary Leave without pay for one year w.e.f. 29.12.2016 to Dr. Akshat Mehta, Assistant Professor, Centre for Police Administration, UIEASS, P.U., under Regulation 11 (G) at pages 139-140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 to enable him to join as Associate Professor (Police Administration) at Raksha Shakti University, Ahmedabad:

NOTE: Application dated 07.12.2016 of Dr. Akshat Mehta, Assistant Professor along with recommendation of the Joint meeting of Academic and Administrative Committee of Centre for Police Administration dated 09.12.2016 duly

forwarded by the Coordinator, Centre for Police Administration, UIEASS, P.U. is enclosed (**Appendix-LIV**).

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Professor (Mrs.) Mohinder Kaur Grewal, Government College for Women, Ludhiana, as Vice-Chairman of the Library Advisory Committee for the P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana for a term of two calendar years i.e. 01.01.2017 to 31.12.2018 as per Rule 1 (ii) appearing at page 36 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended (post-facto) the term of appointment, of the following Assistant Professors, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, till the end of session 2015-16 i.e. 30.06.2016, purely on temporary basis, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2015-16, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:-

Sr. No.	Name of the person	Designation & Subject
1.	Ms. Inderjot Kaur	Assistant Professor in Law
2.	Shri Hardip Singh	Assistant Professor in Punjabi

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Shri Gurmukh Singh, Assistant Professor (temporary), UIET w.e.f. 28.12.2016 with the condition that he will have to deposit salary in lieu of short of one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2009.

NOTE: Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Pooja Garg, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Applied Management Studies (UIAMS), w.e.f. 16.06.2016, with the condition that she will have to deposit amount in lieu of short period of notice of three months, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, as medical leave applied for by her for the period from 19.08.2014 to 16.06.2016 has not been sanctioned due to non receipt of Medical documents. However, in case she fails to deposit the amount in lieu of short period of notice of three months, the

same amount shall be deducted from her dues lying with the University.

NOTE: Regulation 6, page 118, Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 11.11.2016 (**Appendix-LV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to firm up the guidelines for admission to various courses under the Reserved category of Persons with Disability (PWD) for the session 2017-2018.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 09.11.2016 (**Appendix-LVI**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following eligibility condition for admission to M.Sc. (H.S.) Biotechnology in Panjab University and Colleges affiliated to P.U. and the same be incorporated in Prospectus for Entrance Test PU-CET (PG) 2017:

Biotechnology (H.S.), P.U.

- I For 5+2 (SC) + 2 (NRI) Only those students who have cleared B.Sc. Biotechnology (50% marks)/B.Sc. with 50% marks with biotechnology as elective/vocational subject (Studied for 3 years) are eligible.

Biotechnology (in Colleges):-

Bachelor’s degree (under the 10+2+3 pattern of education) in physical, Biological, Pharmaceutical, Agricultural, Veterinary or Fishery Sciences or Bachelor’s degree in engineering/Technology, Home Science, Medicine (MBBS) from any University/Institute recognized by the Panjab

University. The candidate must have obtained at least 55% marks at the Bachelor's level.

- II The candidates seeking admission in M.Sc. Biotechnology should fill separate admission forms in Colleges offering M.Sc. course in Biotechnology.

No Centralized counselling will be done by the Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

NOTE A copy of page No.27 in the prospectus as mentioned in the Hand Book of Information 2016 at page No.169 is enclosed (**Appendix-LVI**).

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 15.11.2016 (**Appendix-LVII**) with regard to guidelines for admission under reserved category of sports for the session 2017-18.
- (ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 03.01.2017 (**Appendix-LVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to modify/amend Format of Certificates (**Appendix-LVIII**) to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information-2017.
- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 07.10.2016 (**Appendix-LIX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider and review the guidelines for candidates desirous of seeking admission under NRI Category for the session 2017-18.
- (xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation (Item No.6) of the partial minutes of Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee dated 21.12.2016 (**Appendix-LX**) that the "Achievement (s) only during the preceding 3 years of the year of the admission will be considered" and the same be added in the existing guidelines for admission to additional seat for Youth Welfare.
- (xii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Joint Admission Committee dated 06.12.2016 (**Appendix-LXI**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the following eligibility criteria for admission in 2017 in various BE courses of UIET, UICET and SSGPURC, Hoshiarpur:

For B.E. Courses

The admission to the First semester B.E. Courses will be open to a candidate, who:

- (i) has qualified in the JEE (Main) 2017 conducted by the C.B.S.E. for admission to these courses.
- (ii) has passed 10+2 examination with Physics and Mathematics as compulsory subjects along with one of the Chemistry/Biotechnology/ Biology/Technical Vocational subject and at least 60% marks in aggregate (55% marks in case of SC/ST/Physically Handicapped), conducted by a recognized Board/ University/Council in March/April 2017 and not earlier than March/April 2015.

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following age criteria for admission to B.A./B.Com. LL.B. Hons. 5-year Integrated Course from the session 2017-2018, as recommended by the Administrative Committee dated 18.10.2016 (**Appendix-LXII**) pursuant to letter dated 17.09.2016 (**Appendix-LXII**) of Joint Secretary, Bar Council of India:

“The candidate must not be above 20 years of age as on the last date fixed for submission of application form of Entrance Test of B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 years Integrated Course of the year in which admission is sought to the said course (22 years in case of SC/ST).

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the total number of seats for B.Sc. 1st Year, be increased from 29 to 30 in the Department of Microbiology, in order to keep uniformity in the admission process (as in the several departments).

NOTE: Request dated 21.11.2016 of the Chairperson, Department of Microbiology regarding increase of one seat for B.Sc. 1st Year in the Department of Microbiology is enclosed (**Appendix-LXIII**).

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Board of Control in Punjabi dated 16.11.2016 (**Appendix-LXIV**) that 15 students be admitted in M.Phil. Punjabi and 10 students be admitted in M.Phil. Guru Granth Sahib Studies instead of 25, for each course for the academic year 2017-2018.

NOTE: It has been mentioned in the minutes of the Board of Control that the seats for M.Phil. Punjabi and M.Phil. Guru Granth Sahib Studies has been decreased, as there are only 4 faculty members in the

Department, which is not sufficient to supervise the research of 50 students of M.Phil. in addition to teaching and research.

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Board of Control dated 09.11.2016 (**Appendix-LXV**) that an entrance test for admission to M.A. History Semester-I, be held from the session 2017-18.

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the intake of the students admitted for the following courses, in the Department of German, P.U. from the academic year 2017 and beyond as recommended by the Academic and Technical Committee of the Department of German dated 15.11.2016 (**Appendix-LXV**):

Sr. No.	Courses	Students Intake (Number of Seats)
1.	Certificate Courses in German	130
2.	Diploma Courses in German	30
3.	Advanced Diploma Courses in German	20

(xviii) Pursuant to the discussion held during zero hour in the meeting of the Senate dated 09.10.2016 (**Appendix-LXVII**), the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed:

- (i) S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Distt. Hoshiarpur, to continue the D.P.Ed. Course-1st year (50 seats) for the session 2016-17, subject to the approval of the Regulatory Body; and
- (ii) that the College shall not make admissions to D.P.Ed. Course-1st year from the next academic session, i.e., 2017-18 without getting prior permission from the University.

(xix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved Partnership Working Agreement (**Appendix-LXVIII**) between Skills Anytime, BKSB India Private Limited, based at Shop 2a, Taj Hotel, Block No. 17, Sector-17-A, Chandigarh, and Panjab University, Sector-14, Chandigarh.

(xx) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of Ms. Rajni Chauhan, Assistant Professor in Commerce (purely on temporary basis), University School of Open Learning for even semester in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- + allowances for the session 2016-17, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(xxi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has: -

- (i) re-appointed afresh the following faculty members purely on temporary/Contractual basis w.e.f. 12.1.2017 for 11 months i.e. up to 11.12.2017 with one day break on 11.1.2017 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
Temporary basis		
1.	Dr. Maninder Pal Singh Gill	Associate Professor in General Surgery
2.	Dr. Satya Narain	Associate Professor in Oral/Maxillofacial Surgery
Contractual basis		
3.	*Dr. Prabhjot Cheema	Sr. Lecturer in Anatomy
4.	*Dr. Rajdeep Brar	Assistant Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology

* Their nature of appointment will be decided after the final decision of Senate.

- (ii) re-appointed afresh the following faculty members purely on temporary/Contractual basis mentioned against each w.e.f. 10.2.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 9.1.2018 with one day break on 9.2.2017 (Break day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
Contractual basis		
1.	*Dr. Shally Gupta	Professor in Oral Pathology
Temporary basis		
2.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma	Associate Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology
3.	Dr. Ikreet Singh Bal	Associate Professor in Public Health Dentistry
4.	Dr. Simranjit Singh	Senior Assistant Professor in Oral Pathology

* Her nature of appointment will be decided after the final decision of Senate.

- (iii) re-appointed afresh Dr. Vandana Chhabra, Associate Professor in Oral Surgery, on temporary basis w.e.f. 19.2.2017 for 11

months i.e. upto 18.1.2018 with one day break on 18.2.2017 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier.

- (iv) re-appointed afresh Dr. Sanjeev Verma, Associate Professor in Orthodontics on temporary basis w.e.f. 18.1.2017 for 11 months i.e. upto 17.12.2017 with one day break on 17.1.2017(Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he was working earlier.

(xxii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the proposed modification in following existing criteria approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016 (Para 16) **(Appendix-LXIX)**, for admitting the students falling under categories of Rural Area students and Border Area, over and above the sanctioned seats for UG/PG courses offered by the Departments of Panjab University, Constituent Colleges, Regional Centres and Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, from the session 2016-17:

Existing	Proposed
<p>(i) Two additional Seats for Rural Area Students</p> <p>Only those candidates will be considered in this category, which have passed their matriculation and +2 examinations from those rural schools that do not fall in the area of the Municipal Corporation/ Municipal Committee /Small Town/ Notified Area. Further the candidates should have been studying in such school for at least five years before passing the last examination. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the D.E.O./Principal of the concerned institute of the area certifying that the school from where the candidate has passed the Matriculation and +2 examination, falls within the aforesaid rural area.</p>	<p>(i) "Two additional Seats for Rural Area Students</p> <p>Only those candidates will be considered in this category, who have passed their matriculation and +2 examinations from those rural schools that do not fall in the area of the Municipal Corporation/ Municipal Committee /Small Town/ Notified Area/Cantonment Area. Further the candidates should have been studying in such school for at least five years before passing the last examination. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the D.E.O./Principal of the concerned institute of the area certifying that the school from where the candidate has passed the Matriculation and +2</p>

Existing	Proposed
<p>(ii) One Additional Seat for Border Area Students</p> <p>The Border Area students shall mean those candidates who have passed their matriculation and +2 examination from the Border Area Schools situated within 20 kilometres from the International border. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the Tehsildar or the Principal/ Headmaster/Head of the School certifying that the School from where the candidate has passed the matriculation or +2 examination, falls within the aforesaid Border area.</p>	<p>examination, falls within the aforesaid rural area.”</p> <p>(ii) “One Additional Seat for Border Area Students</p> <p>The Border Area students shall mean those candidates who have passed their matriculation and +2 examination from the Border Area Schools situated within 20 kilometres from the International border. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the Tehsildar or the Principal/ Headmaster/Head of the School certifying that the School from where the candidate has passed the matriculation and +2 examination, falls within the aforesaid Border area.”</p>

NOTE: A copy of letter No.Misc./A-6/77824-78124 dated 20.04.2016 issued by D.R. (Colleges) is enclosed (**Appendix-LXIX**).

(xxiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the request of Ms. Sukhdev Kaur, Assistant Registrar, University Business School, P.U., for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 31.12.2016 (A.N.) from the University service and sanctioned the following benefits, under regulation 17.5, at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at pages 131 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Furlough, for six months as admissible under Regulation 12.2 (B) (iii) at pages 124-125 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of furlough; and

Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at Page 96 of Panjab University, Calendar, Volume-III.

(xxiv) The Vice-Chancellor, has not recommended further extension in re-employment to Dr. Arun Rashmi Tickoo, Assistant Professor (Reemployed), Department of French as

requested by her vide application dated 02.01.2017 (**Appendix-LXX**).

NOTE: Dr. Arun Rashmi Tickoo, Assistant Professor, Department of French was retired on 31.08.2014 and she was granted reemployment upto 31.08.2019 i.e. the date of her attaining the age of 65 years and the same was ratified by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 14.12.2014 (Para XXIV) (**Appendix-LXX**).

(xxv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Sanjeev Verma, Associate Professor in Orthodontics (Temporary), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, w.e.f. 13.01.2017 with the conditions that he has to deposit one month salary in lieu of one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 given at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

NOTE: Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

(xxvi) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Parmatma Ram, Sr. Tech. (G-II), Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology. His pay be fixed as per University rules.

(xxvii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation (Item No.32) of the Faculty of Science dated 19.12.2016 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has revised the eligibility criteria for admission to M.Sc. 1st year (Nuclear Medicine), as under, w.e.f. the session 2017-18:

Course	Seats	Duration	Eligibility/Admission Criteria
M.Sc.	10+2 NRI	2 years (4 semester)	Minimum qualification for admission to M.Sc. first year in Nuclear Medicine will be B.Sc. from a recognised University with Physics and Chemistry (non-medical stream) or Chemistry and Zoology/Biotechnology (Medical Stream) as core subjects. Candidates having B.Sc. Nuclear

			<p>Medicine/Biophysics shall also be eligible for admission to the course. Candidates with B.Sc. degree in X-Ray/Medical Technology. B.Sc. through correspondence and open University stream are not eligible.</p> <p>Admission to M.Sc. course in Nuclear Medicine will be through Entrance Test to be conducted by Panjab University. The candidates should have passed the graduation (B.Sc. from a recognised University/Institute with at least 50% marks, while deciding the final merit of Entrance Test, a weightage shall also be given to the B.Sc. marks obtained by the candidate, as per University rules. The cut off percentage marks secured in the entrance test will also be as per University rules.</p>
--	--	--	---

(xxviii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation (Item No.31) of the Faculty of Science dated 19.12.2016 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the proposed eligibility criteria for admission to M.Sc. (Hons.) Chemistry, as under:

Existing (Page No.175, Handbook of Information, 2016)	Proposed
<p>(a) B.Sc. (H.S.) students of P.U. after passing B.Sc. (H.S.) in Chemistry from Department of Chemistry, P.U. OR</p> <p>(b) Admission based on P.U. CET-(P.G.) for B.Sc. (Pass of Hons.) examination with 50% marks from P.U. or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry (ii) Physics (iii) Mathematics or any Science subject during all three years of graduation.</p>	<p>(a) -----No Change-----</p> <p>OR</p> <p>(b) Admission based on P.U. CET-(P.G.) for B.Sc. (Pass or Hons.) examination with 50% marks from P.U. or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (i) Chemistry in all the three years/six semesters and (ii) any two Science subjects during two years/four semesters during graduation. One of the subjects can be Mathematics along with another Science subject.</p> <p>(c) The maximum of 5% weightage be given to B.Sc. (Hons.) students.</p>

(xxix) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendation dated 23.12.2016 (**Appendix-LXXI**) of the Committee to discharge the functions of Board of Studies in M.Sc. Forensic & Criminology, that the admission to M.Sc. Forensic Science & Criminology examination be made on the basis of OCET conducted by Panjab University, Chandigarh w.e.f. the session

2017-18 and the same be incorporated in the Hand Book of the Information and Prospectus of OCET as well.

(xxx) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Proposed Eligibility/Admission Criteria for admission to Master of Social work as recommended by the Academic and Administrative Committee (through circulation) dated 29.11.2016 (**Appendix-LXXII**) of Centre for Social Work, University Institute of Emerging Areas in Social Science.

(xxxi) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has condoned the shortage of lectures of the students of various courses/classes of the following Departments for the session as recommended by the Board of Control of the respective department as per enclosed lists (**Appendix/Annexures-LXXIII**):

Sr. No.	Department	Name of the Student	Appendix/ Annexure
1.	Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education	Mr. Ankit Ms. Kamalpreet Kaur Ms. Maninder Kaur Ms. Manjot Kaur Ms. Munisha Kumari Mr. Sahajveer Singh Mr. Anam Iqbal Mr. Harkirat Singh	'A' (11-17)
2.	Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology	Mr. Anurag Kamboj Mr. Manvir Singh	'B' (18-20)
3.	Department of Chemistry	Ms. Garima Garg Mr. Rishab Dua Mr. Rubledeep Singh Mr. Sargun Singh Rohewal Mr. Nitish Kumar	'C' (21-31)
4.	Department of Library & Information Science, P.U.	Mr. Nikhil Sharma Mr. Atul Chopra	'D' (32-35)
5.	Department of Public Administration	Mr. Sukhwinder Singh Mr. Avneet Singh Dhaliwal Mr. Ritesh	'E' (36-39)
6.	Department of Geology	Ms. Devanti Bansal Mr. Gaurav Sharma	'F' (40-46)
7.	Department of Defence and National Security Studies	Mr. Gursahib Singh	'G' (47-48)
8.	Department of Statistics	Mr. Bharam Dario	'H' (49-50)
9.	Department of Geography	Mr. C. Beipakhaisa Mr. Khetrimayum Robindo Mr. Tsering Kunzes Ms. Ritupreet Kaur Mr. Stanzin Tundup Mr. Ashish Kumar	'I' (51-57)
10.	Centre for Social Work University Institute of Emerging Areas in Social Sciences	Mr. Karmanpreet Singh Mr. Ranjeet Kamboj	'J' (58-59)

Syndicate Proceedings dated 21st January 2017

Sr. No.	Department	Name of the Student	Appendix/ Annexure
11.	Department of Economics	Ms. Anjali Chandok Ms. Arzoo Arora Ms. Chahat Sekhon Mr. Abdullah Hamid Mr. Shahabuddin Noori	'K' (60-67)
12.	Centre for Human Rights & Duties	Ms. Neelu Bhandari Mr. Davinderbir Singh Mr. Rigzen Motup Mr. Rigzen Tamochos	'L' (68-71)
13.	Department of Education	Mr. Lakhvir Singh	'M' (72-73)
14.	Department of Biophysics	Ms. Venus	'N' (74-77)
15.	University Institute of Legal Studies	Mr. Abhishek Chugh Mr. Darshan Singh Mr. Keshavam Chaudhri	'O' (78-80)
16.	Department of Evening Studies-Multi Disciplinary Research Centre	Mr. Bhavni Bajaj Mr. Sonam Yangjor Ms. Priyanjali Ms. Kritika Sharma Mr. Jaspinder Singh Mr. Pritpal Singh Mr. Ahsanuddin Khan Mr. Arundeeep Singh Mr. Sunil Rawat Mr. Pardeep Kumar Ms. Mansi Khurana Ms. Garima Watts Mr. Jaskiranpreet Singh	'P' (1-11)
17.	Department of Art History & Visual Arts	Mr. Jitender Singh Ms. Manjot Kaur	'Q' (12-15)
18.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology	Mr. Shivang Mishra	'R' (16-17)
19.	Department of Laws	Mr. Bharat Bhandari Mr. Deepak Mr. Jatinder Singh Mr. Shamandeep Singh Mr. Skalzang Angmo Mr. Subham Bhattacharjee Mr. Viren Sharma Mr. Abhijot Singh Mr. Gaurav Thakur Mr. Siddharth S. Khandelwal Mr. Abhishek Mehan Mr. Vineet Bhanwala Ms. Kamaljit Kaur Mr. Ankur Dhiman Mr. Anshul Bhardwaj Ms. Ritika Ahuza Mr. Mohd. Uzair Ms. Shiffali Mr. Deepak Singh Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Ms. Mahima Gill Mr. Amarjeet Singh	'S' (18-44)

Sr. No.	Department	Name of the Student	Appendix/ Annexure
		Mr. Ravisher Singh	
20.	Department of Philosophy	Mr. Gurdeep Singh Mr. Apurapar Singh Mr. Jaspal Singh	'T' (45-48)
21.	School of Communication Studies	Mr. Ravinder Singh Ms. Shimran Lamba Ms. Nipunya	'U' (49-52)
22.	Department of Psychology	Mr. Abhijeet Kataria Mr. Parvinder Singh Mr. Aviral Goswami Ms. Hardevi Verma Ms. Jasmine	'V' (53-59)

(xxxii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-employed the following persons, purely on contract basis upto 31.01.2017 (with one day break after their superannuation) w.e.f. the date they reports for duty or till the posts (against which they are appointed) are filled in through regular selection, 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 they have opted for pension or not:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee/ Department	Retirement date	Salary Charge will be charged
1.	Shri Birender Singh Driver DUI Office	30.11.2016	Against his substantive post in General Pool of Driver
2.	Shri Surmukh Singh Work Inspector Construction office	31.08.2016	Against the vacant post of Carpenter, Construction Office, subsequently his salary may be charged from the post of Carpenter, Construction Office
3.	Shri Ashwani Kumar Sr. Technical Officer (G-II)	30.09.2016	Against his substantive post
4.	Shri Pritam Chand Technical Officer (G-I) Department of Physics	31.03.2016	Against his substantive post
NOTE: Shri Pritam Chand, Technical Officer (G-I), Department of Physics has re-employed w.e.f. 04.04.2016 on contract basis for four months and the same was ratified by the Syndicate meeting dated 1/15/28 & 29 May 2016 (Para 117-R-(ix).			
5.	Shri Pritam Chand Technical Officer (G-II) Department of Biotechnology	30.04.2016	Against his substantive post
NOTE: Shri Pritam Chand, Technical Officer (G-I), Department			

of Biotechnology has re-employed on contract basis for six month and the same was ratified by the Syndicate meeting dated 31.07.2016 (Para 48 R-(ix)).			
6.	Shri Bikram Singh Driver Vice-Chancellor's Office	31.08.2013	Under Budget Head 'General Administration-Sub head temporary establishment/ Contractual Services/Hiring Services/Outsourcing/Casual Worker's

NOTE: 1. A separate item has been placed before the Syndicate to consider the re-employment of the above employees beyond 31.01.2017.

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

Routine and formal matters

48. The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(xviii)** on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

(i) To note the summary of the reports (**Appendix-LXXV**) submitted by the Chief Vigilance Officer, P.U., on various matters.

(ii) To note the comparative statement containing status of re-evaluation of answer books of the students of B.A. LL.B. 10th semester in the paper: Company Law, Sub code-5059 held in May 2016, from external examiners, pursuant to general discussion held in the meeting of Syndicate dated 31.07.2016.

(iii) In pursuance of orders dated 24.10.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 22165 of 2016 (Dr. Krishna Saini Vs Panjab University & Ors.) which is fixed for hearing on 25.04.2017, wherein the counsel of University has submitted that the benefit of the interim direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court on 22.08.2016 in LPA No.1505 of 2016 would also ensure to the present petitioner. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 14.02.2017.

(i) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. Krishna Saini, Professor, V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur be considered to continue in service on re-employment basis w.e.f. 01.11.2016 as applicable in cases of other teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 31.10.2016 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by her. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking.

- (ii) all those teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that in the court case (LPA No.1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and others and connected LPAs) following employees be paid salary which they were drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order dated 16.08.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. P.U and other excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone) as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the LPA filed by them. The payment to all such appellants shall be adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit the undertaking as per enclosed *pro-forma*:

Sr. No.	Name of employees/ Designation	Department
1.	Dr. Raj Kumar, Librarian	A.C. Joshi Library, P.U.
2.	Shri Pardeep Kumar, Deputy Librarian	U.S.O.L, P.U.

NOTE A copy of office orders No. 16237-16249 dated 28.10.2016 enclosed **(Appendix-LXXVI)**.

- (v) In pursuance of orders dated 09.11.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 23201 of 2016 (1. Dr. Sukhjinder Singh Gill, 2. Dr. (Mrs.) Dhian Kaur Vs Panjab University & Ors.) to be heard along with CWP No.22165 of 2016 on 06.12.2016, wherein she has got interim orders on the same terms as allowed in other similar cases (LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others and connected LPAs):

- (ii) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. (Mrs.) Dhian Kaur, Professor, Department of Geography be considered on re-employment basis as in all other such cases and salary paid which she was drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order dated 09.11.2016 passed by Hon'ble Court in above said case, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim order measures subject to the final outcome of the Court filled by them. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking.
- (iii) all those teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the

same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) allowed that the lien of Late Dr. Rahul Sharma, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, P.U., as continued on his substantive post of Senior Lecturer, be retained for the period of having his actually worked as Reader on contract basis w.e.f. from 19.07.2010 to 05.12.2015.
- (ii) granted post-facto approval towards his due provident Fund contribution as per P.U. Rules along with University share for the above said period for which he actually worked as Reader on contract basis i.e. from 19.07.2010 to 05.12.2015.

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-LXXVII**).

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the period of Agreement (**Appendix-LXXVIII**) between the Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Punjab Postal Circle, Chandigarh w.e.f. 01.01.2017 to 31.12.2017 for collection of Examination/Re-Evaluation Fees of Panjab University through various Post Offices under e-payment service throughout the country.

NOTE: Earlier, an agreement was executed between the Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Punjab Postal Circle, Chandigarh w.e.f. 01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016 which was noted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 vide Para 41-I (xiii) (**Appendix-LXXVIII**).

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor has accepted the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Ms. Meenaxi Anand Chaudhry, IAS (Retd.), Ms. Urvashi Gulati, IAS (Retd.), and Ms. Keshni Anand Arora, IAS, Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana, Revenue & Disaster Management and Consolidation Department, for institution of Medal, to be awarded to the topper in Women's Studies post-graduation course, in the memory of their mother-Late. Smt. Savitri Anand wife of Professor J.C. Anand, Department of Political Science, P.U.

NOTE: A copy of letter 09.01.2017 enclosed (**Appendix-LXXIX**).

Syndicate Proceedings dated 21st January 2017

(ix) 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. Sushma Devi Assistant Registrar Examination-II	09.02.1976	31.12.2016	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri V.K. Mahajan Assistant Registrar Election Cell	16.08.1976	31.12.2016	
3.	Shri Kishan Singh Superintendent Examination- I	11.06.1976	31.12.2016	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
4.	Shri Ashok Kumar Electrician (Tech. G-II) P.U. Construction Office	01.01.1988	31.12.2016	
5.	Shri Sham Lal Work Inspector (Tech. G-II) P.U. Construction Office	24.04.1987	31.12.2016	
6.	Shri Nanak Chand Mason (Technician G-II) P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	31.01.2017	
7.	Shri Uttam Chand Offset Inker P.U. Press	25.09.1975	31.01.2017	
8.	Smt. Bundia Peon Examination-III	01.03.1996	30.11.2016	

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 allowed that the Syndicate Para 48 I-(ii) and (iii) dated 27.11.2016, regarding re-employment of Dr. A.K. Vashisht, Professor, UBS, and Dr. Saroj Ghosh, Department of Music, be kept pending.

NOTE: Both the above faculty members are continuing in service beyond the age of 60 years as per interim orders of

the Hon'ble Court, noted by the Syndicate vide Para 48 I-(xxx) dated 27.11.2016.

- (xi) The Vice-Chancellor, has granted extension in extraordinary leave (without pay) to Dr. Sawarn Singh, Assistant Director, Population Research Centre, P.U., for five weeks w.e.f. 18.12.2016 to 23.01.2017, under Regulation 2.2 (c) (iv), b. 12.2 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to work as secretary-cum-Advisor to Vice-Chancellor, Akal University, Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda.

NOTE: 1 Earlier, Dr. Sawarn Singh was granted Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) for another six months w.e.f. 18.06.2016 to 17.12.2016 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.10.2016 (Para 4) (**Appendix-LXXX**).

2. Request dated 19.12.2016 of Dr. Sawarn Singh duly forwarded by Director, Population Research Centre, P.U. is enclosed (**Appendix-LXXX**).

Item I-(xii) be treated as withdrawn and be read as item R-(xxxii).

- (xii) The Vice-Chancellor has re-employed the following persons, purely on contract basis up to 31.01.2017 (with one day break after their superannuation) w.e.f. the date they reports for duty or till the posts (against which they are appointed) are filled in through regular selection, 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 they have opted for pension or not:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee/ Department	Retirement date	Salary Charge will be charged
1.	Shri Birender Singh Driver DUI Office	30.11.2016	Against his substantive post in General Pool of Driver
2.	Shri Surmukh Singh Work Inspector Construction office	31.08.2016	Against the vacant post of Carpenter, Construction Office, subsequently his salary may be charged from the post of Carpenter, Construction Office
3.	Shri Ashwani Kumar Sr. Technical Officer (G-II)	30.09.2016	Against his substantive post
4.	Shri Pritam Chand Technical Officer (G-I) Department of Physics	31.03.2016	Against his substantive post
NOTE: Shri Pritam Chand, Technical			

Officer (G-I), Department of Physics has re-employed w.e.f. 04.04.2016 on contract basis for four months and the same was ratified by the Syndicate meeting dated 1/15/28 & 29 May 2016 (Para 117-R-(ix).			
5.	Shri Pritam Chand Technical Officer (G-II) Department of Biotechnology	30.04.2016	Against his substantive post
<p>NOTE: Shri Pritam Chand, Technical Officer (G-I), Department of Biotechnology has re-employed on contract basis for six month and the same was ratified by the Syndicate meeting dated 31.07.2016 (Para 48 R-(ix)).</p>			

NOTE: An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-LXXXI**).

(xiii) Pursuant to the orders of the Hon'ble Court dated 07.09.2016 (in case CNR No. CHCH02-004069-2014, Registration No.2186/of 15.09.2014) (**Appendix-LXXXII**), the Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned the following terminal benefits, as per the settlement in the Mediation to release the amount i.e. 50% are in favour of defendant No.3 (Anita Raj), 25% share in favour of the Plaintiff No.2 (Prem S/o Chaman Lal) and 25% share defendants No.7 (Monika D/o Late Sarwan) & 8 (Kiran D/o Late Sarwan) jointly as per the terms and conditions of the Mediation of the order dated 03.03.2015 to collect the service benefits lying in the account of deceased Shri Tilka S/o Shri Chaman Lal employee of Panjab University, Boys Hostel No.1, P.U. Chandigarh:

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

(xiv) To note the orders dated 06.12.2016 (**Appendix-LXXXII**) of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in LPA No.1505 of 2016 (O&M), along with connected cases filed by Amrik Singh Ahluwalia and another Vs. Panjab University and others.

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor has approved the appointment of Dr. Kalpana as full time Medical Officer (on contract) at Bhai Ghanayia Ji Institute of Health Sciences, P.U. for the period of one month from the date she joins the duty, on fixed emoluments of Rs.45,000/- p.m. against the vacant post of Additional C.M.O. (Dr. B.S. Lal), who has proceeded on leave without pay.

- (xvi)** The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to reverse the excess interest credited to the GPF/CPF subscribers for the year 2014-2015, in accordance with the decision of the Syndicate dated 23.01.2016/06.02.2016(Para 17) and Senate dated 27.03.2016 (Para XV), as per the recommendations of the Interest Committee dated 04.01.2016 (**Appendix-LXXXIV**).

NOTE: An office note along with decisions of the Syndicate dated 23.1.2016/6.2.2016 and Senate dated 27.3.2016 is enclosed (**Appendix-LXXXIV**).

- (xvii)** Pursuant to General discussion (4) of the Syndicate meeting dated 19.08.2016 (**Appendix-LXXXV**), the Vice-Chancellor has permitted the LL.B passed out candidates to join B.Ed. w.e.f. for the session 2017-18, whatever be their background B.A. or B.Sc. or B.Com., subject to fulfilment of other eligibility conditions as prescribed by the University/NCTE.

- (xviii)** The Vice-Chancellor has executed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-LXXXVI**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Fresenius Kabi Oncology Limited, B-310, Som Dutt Chambers-1, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the information contained in **Items I-(i) to (v), (vii) to (xi) and (xiii) to (xviii)** be noted;
- (ii) the information contained in **Item I-(vi)** be noted and allowed; and
- (iii) the information contained in **Item I-(xii)** be treated as withdrawn.

General Discussion

- (1) Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has a suggestion. The way they write down the minutes of Syndicate. First he would talk about the Syndicate; he will talk about Senate later on. We take a lot of decisions here and after taking the decision, we record the verbatim minutes, video recording is done. And, what happens is that it takes a lot of time to record the minutes, and the members who had attended the meeting forget the details. If recording process is now changed, first only summary of discussion should come, of course summary part and resolved part be done first and then it be circulated to the members. If from the members, anyone wanted to record some other details which was missed out and they feel that specific details to be recorded, then they give it in writing and by doing this the minutes can be ready within a week. Now, it takes one month to type the minutes by the time they forgot all that.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is number of agenda items is so large, meeting lasts such a long time, verbatim record obviously will take some time.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that why he is suggesting to change this.

The Vice Chancellor said whatever to do, do it gradually. If they do it in one step, it could cause problems. His suggestion is that resolved part should be done within a week. Now, somebody must accept responsibility from a given Syndicate meeting to follow up and get the resolved part done.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that what Professor Navdeep Goyal has suggested, in this light, some years back a decision was taken and the same was reversed back again. In this regard, stories and debates appeared in the newspapers and the people gave suggestions on this. Any organisation, either it is Parliament, Assembly or Senate or whatever it is, whatever a person says there, talks in some perspective or context, if that is deleted or neglected and only theme is taken then that spirit will not go. Because what a person says on some issue, whatever he makes the ground, it should be verbatim. This issue has already been rejected. He thinks earlier it was decided at the time of Professor Sobti and there was a debate, full public debate. In the newspapers, public suggestions were taken. It was withdrawn. It is totally undemocratic. It does not happen in any organisation. He thinks it has already been tested.

The Vice Chancellor said that earlier he told that that they should go step by step. Step one is, they will do and record it as they are doing. But recording can take one month's time. The operative part of the decision should be done within a week and the operative part of meeting be sent all members, either they attended the meeting or not, all the members of Syndicate will first get that file. So that its operation be done. If anything is done wrong or something is left in the resolved part, they should not come six weeks later that this had to be done in the resolved part.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if you do the minutes in two parts, it's okay for quick decision. Otherwise, all the recording should be there.

The Vice Chancellor said that is okay, let them do like this two-three times. After that they will get the confidence.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said you can test that. It has been rejected earlier.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if it looks good then we will take it up as an item.

The Vice Chancellor said that then they will see, after 2-3 months, whether it is necessary to continue the same. Then, while the discussion is going on, then they can take the decision that there will be complete recording of this item and this item we can put as summary. They will do it item-wise which discussing. But, at the moment do nothing. At the moment just makes sure that all the operative part be circulated within a week. Also recording is there.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this time do the experiment.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that now there is no issue like this, it will be short, matter will not be too long.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the repeated part may be left. . If Navdeep is saying the same issue what he is saying, then repetition part be removed.

The Vice Chancellor said the he needs some volunteer who make sure that resolved part is done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he will get it done.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Shaminder Singh will get it done. They both will make it sure that the resolved part of each item is done and circulated to all members, whether they attended the meeting or nor attended. Whether do this for Senate or not, they will see it later. Do it one by one, don't do change things.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that what about the Senate. He said there will be problem in the Senate, therefore, do this as experiment in the Syndicate. Do one by one.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first do here in the Syndicate. If it worked good then they can talk further.

(2) Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there are 2-3 issues and he will take two three minutes. Employees and teachers are honoured on 26th January and give them appreciation/award. Many times they see that when a drama is being played, they see the persons who are playing their role in the front, there are a lot of persons in the background who had done the work for very long time. There is an incident of 7th January, when there was a heavy rain. There were two-three members who were running the centre, Sushil Puri or Shashi Puri, Rai and one another boy. They, three persons, worked by 2:30 in the morning and saved all the answer sheets. He had been told about this by some other person. If they had not done that all the answer sheets would have been spoiled, there was so much rain. When we give the appreciation, the persons who are close to the Officer or who are of examination branch and close to Controller Saheb, appear to be doing more work and persons who are in the background appear doing less work. Those persons should also be appreciated who are doing work in the background for the betterment of the University.

(3) Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there are contractual posts in the University and a decision was taken in the last Syndicate meeting. There is a girl, working on contract basis in the Department of University Institute of Engineering & Technology, daughter of Shri Prabhjot Puri. She has gone two-three times to the Establishment Branch regarding her maternity leave. They said that till date no decision had been taken regarding their maternity leave. I think we are giving same leave to all, six months maternity leave is given. They are giving maternity leave to contract employees, one person of his college had also taken maternity leave. Therefore, the

other teachers who had not been given maternity leave, they should be given their right.

(4) Professor Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he had already told the Controller Sir and given a letter of the colleges, regarding the reservation of the riot victims of 1984 and their wards i.e. grandsons who has been given 2% reservation. The letter had not been issued till date in the Law Department. They issue a letter regarding riot victims' reservation every year in these days but, it had not been issued this time. They (students) don't know about reservation. The letter regarding reservation should be issued well before the admission.

(5) Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there was another issue regarding dates of examination. Boards' examinations had become very late and our entrance tests are conducted earlier. If possible, dates of entrance tests be adjusted as per examinations of the boards.

(6) Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there is an issue which involves finances. Consider it if possible, otherwise he will take back his issue. They had charges of Rs. 2500 for odd and even examination. This issue was raised in the Principals' meeting that in the B.A. Classes or Humanity Classes, for Physical Education, there is practical exam, its fee is Rs. 2500 whereas for other subjects fee is Rs. 1500. In the odd examination, where no practical was conducted, Controller Saheb had given a commitment to reduce it in the next time. As the practical exam of that subject was not conducted, the fee should have been reduced. The decision regarding their fee should be taken immediately that whether be charged Rs. 2500 or Rs. 1500 and be conveyed to the Colleges.

Vice Chancellor said that the issue should be given in writing as it was not available that time.

(7) Principal Balbir Chand Josan said that he had one or two requests that they have passed a regulation regarding Central Council of Homeopathy. It is item no.5. There is one college in Sector-26, Chandigarh. A committee consisting of Syndicate members may be constituted for their promotion policy.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for its operative part, a Committee may be constituted.

(8) Principal Balbir Chand Josan said that Principals of colleges are requesting to the University for a very long time that there should be M.B.A. in the Colleges. Last year also they had applied, but no reply had been given to them till today. It is his humble request that in all Colleges, either it is in Abohar or Muktsar, 10 or 15 or 20 seats, as much as possible, should be given to them.

(9) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the issue of MBA about which Dr. Josan is talking, was also discussed in last Senate. There were three colleges whose request had received. These are S.D. Colleges, Government College of Commerce, Sector-50 and DAV College. University has its own norms, if they follow

the norms, then they should be given seats. There is a mind set at the University level that MBA should not be given to colleges. If these colleges fulfill the parameters, the applications of three colleges which is pending, or of some other colleges are also willing to start MBA in their respective colleges, they be allowed to start MBA. He has not seen the report of the DAV College; he has seen the report of Government College of Commerce, Sector-50, Chandigarh. The NAAC Committee has clearly mentioned that you are dedicated college of commerce college, you must start MBA programme in the institution.

Principal. B.C. Josan said that the NAAC also said the same thing for the DAV College.

The Vice Chancellor said that if University has not done, there has to be some reason.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that what is the reason? They want to know what the reason is.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there no special reason.

The Vice Chancellor said that one of the reasons is that it is a professional course which comes under the purview of AICTE.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if they come under the norms, they should start MBA.

Professor. Navdeep Goyal said that they should follow the AICTE norms.

Principal B.C. Josan said that even AICTE had allowed them but their request was not acceded to.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that obviously that all norms should have to be followed whatever required for that course. If these are AICTE norms then follow these norms.

The Vice Chancellor said that they will get the old record to look into the case.

- (10) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are two issues pending in the colleges regarding Research Centres and approval of the teachers related to Ph.D. Till date, in sciences, centres have been given and are being given. Neither anyone have visited in Commerce nor in Social Sciences or Arts. There is one case of GCG-11 of Research Centre of Botany, initially the committee without going to the college, they have rejected saying that their college is not competent to start research centre, there are many such cases. He requested that if the Committee is constituted by Vice-Chancellor, that Committee must first visit the College before turning down the request of the College. Similarly, so many cases of Research Supervisors are also pending.

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

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that in the subject of Commerce, lots of cases are pending.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could understand that it could be so in the subject of Commerce but not in the case of Botany. He would get it checked as he (Dr. Dalip Kumar) is making a very serious accusation that the Committee has not visited the College and has written the report without visiting. This is not a very light thing. He (Dr. Dalip Kumar) could not just say something and get away with it. He would get it checked.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested the Vice-Chancellor to get it checked.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would check it. He is for having research being done in the Colleges and Colleges assuming responsibility to run pre-Ph.D. courses, etc. He would also get the report as to how many Colleges have been granted the Research Centres and how many Colleges have started the courses, what is the enrolment. The Registrar was directed to get all this information from the Director, Research Promotion Cell (RPC). He thought that the Research Promotion Cell for the Colleges is also dormant. Let them revive the Research Promotion Cell which is College related and make sure that they assume the responsibility for this thing. It should not be such that if a Syndicate member points out it and only then it is done. The Research Promotion Cell of the Colleges should assume the responsibility. He has also got complaints from Ludhiana. There are so many PG Colleges in Ludhiana. Let them revise it and make sure that the Colleges related RPC looks after, not only the Colleges of Chandigarh but also worry about people particularly in Ludhiana. They must accept the responsibility on behalf of the University. He requested Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal to follow up with him regarding the Research Centres of Ludhiana. If they could start the pre-Ph.D. course in two Colleges of Ludhiana by getting the faculty from the other PG Colleges, it be made sure that they are working.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he had a Research Centre, but it could not be run.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be started.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that last year the affiliation of the Colleges was done which went up to September or October and accordingly the letters were given. This time, he appreciated the Vice-Chancellor that the Committees have been formed, he would request that a timeframe be fixed so that everything should be finalized before 30th April 2017 so that the Colleges could notify the things in the prospectus.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine.

- (11) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the panel for the RSD College has not been given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what happened in this case is that the College conducted interview related to the subject of Commerce. A particular candidate was not selected by a Committee of the University. Then another Committee with different members also went, again that particular candidate was not selected. The third Committee also did not select. When the 4th Committee went, there was dissent of the College Principal and the Chairperson for not selecting the candidate, but the same candidate which was rejected thrice, the other members of the Committee said that the candidate be selected and the proceedings of the same came in this way. Then what happened was that the candidate was not allowed to join. The issue was raised time and again. He thought that if something is there with dissent, it should not be a big issue as the College is a century old one. It is also not that any such thing had happened in the past. Thereafter, it was decided that in addition to the subject of Commerce, the panel in the subject of Physics was also not given.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to who said that the panel should not be given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was decided in the Syndicate. The College has already been penalized.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into the circumstances in which the Syndicate took this decision.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested the Vice-Chancellor to give a hearing to the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the College was asked to explain the things by visiting the University and the College has already explained the things to the Controller of Examinations. Now the panel should be given.

- (12) Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that as said by Dr. Dalip Kumar regarding MBA, similarly, M.A. Education should be given to the Colleges of Education. The applications have been sent to the University. The Colleges of Education, which fulfill the norms, should be granted the permission to start the courses.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay. Considering that the University campus is far away from the Affiliated Colleges, most unfortunate part of the University is that majority of its Colleges are so far away from the campus that large number of students do not get hostel in the campus. Chandigarh is an expensive place to stay, he is more conscious about it, that the students would not have a desire to do postgraduate because Chandigarh is very far. He is okay with the idea of having campus like facilities being available in good PG Colleges of the University. It should be encouraged more. Otherwise what would happen that the students of that region instead of coming to Panjab University would go to Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University. But they have to maintain

quality and without diluting the quality, those facilities should be provided. He would look into it.

- (13) Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that the UGC has prepared the list of journals. The pending list of journals be sought and on behalf of the University, it should be sent to the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had talked to Professor A.K. Bhandari and given him the responsibility

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that it should be made time bound and the list from the Colleges be also sought.

- (14) Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that the NCTE has revised the eligibility in M.A. and M.Ed. from 50% to 55%. Some of the teachers already working in the Colleges are having 50% marks in M.A. and wanted to shift to some other College, in this regard a Committee was formed according to the NCTE norms, the meeting of the Committee has not been held. He requested that a new Committee be formed.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang to give it in writing and he would peruse the file and have a follow up.

- (15) Principal N.R. Sharma said that they have given the permission for two new Constituent Colleges but in the already running Constituent Colleges, both the teaching and non-teaching staff working on contractual basis has not been given the salary for the last four months. He said that the staff members have met the Finance and Development Officer but he is surprised to know that he does not know as to what is the problem. The non-teaching staff is paid a salary of Rs.9-10,000 and they could estimate as to in which conditions this staff is living for the last four months.

It was enquired as to which of the officers had been contacted.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that this is related with the three-four Constituent Colleges. Earlier, it was said that the D.C. rates of the Colleges would be according to the district D.C. rate whereas earlier, the University was paying the salary as per D.C. rates prevailing at Chandigarh.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the D.C. rates should be paid which are available at Chandigarh.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that the salary of the teaching staff has also not been released.

It was informed that the same could be pending only if the sanction has not been given. This has come to the knowledge for the first time and it would be got checked. It could be pending in the Establishment section due to non-sanction. No salary bill could be pending in the salary section.

Principal N.R. Sharma requested that it should be got checked.

It was informed that it would be got checked.

- (16) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that their College (DAV College, Chandigarh) had recently got a grant of Rs.1.5 crore and they are establishing a Centre for Research laboratory. The universities of the region, like Guru Nanak Dev University, Punjabi University and Punjab Technical University, issue a certificate to the Colleges that the instruments being imported are being used for research work for which the customs duty of 30% is exempted. He requested that the Panjab University should also issue such a certificate to DAV College.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the College is an affiliated College of Panjab University and with the issue of such a certificate the College could save a sum of Rs.2 lacs on account of customs duty.

It was informed that the University could not issue such a certificate to the Colleges.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that a certificate to the effect that the instruments are being used for research work could be taken from the College and on the basis of that the University could issue such a certificate.

It was informed that on the basis of registration certificate of the University, returns are being filed. The University is an entity and only for the consignments which are to be imported by the University, such a certificate is issued.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said he could show such letters issued by PTU and Punjabi University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the College could also get itself registered.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the registration certificate is not issued and to obtain the same is a lengthy process.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the Central Government is involved in it.

Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that such a certificate could be countersigned by the University.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the PTU and Punjabi University have issued such a letter.

It was informed that the University and Colleges are different entities. The books of accounts and the Society of the Colleges are different. The returns for the renewal of the exemption are being filed every six months.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to which department grants this certificate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar informed that the Customs and Excise Department of U.T. Chandigarh issues the registration certificate.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal B.C. Josan to provide the name of the officers of Chandigarh Administration who issue such a certificate. He would call him up as the officers of the Chandigarh Administration are very cooperative. He would help the College to set up a meeting with the dealing officers. He said that they could also call the officer on behalf of the State Higher Education Council and tell him that their aim is to promote research in higher education in the city and they are happy that the Colleges are getting grants. It would be good for the Colleges if the exemption is granted which would result in saving some money for the Colleges and the grant would be utilized. It should be expedited as per the rules and regulations of the Government.

It was informed that there is a notification of the Government of India in which exemption for excise duty has been granted for import of the instruments.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu to work with him.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Principal, Government Medical College and Hospital, Chandigarh has already got this registration and he should be contacted to know the procedure of getting the registration.

- (17) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that in the year 2011, the earned leaves were enhanced from 8 to 12. At that time, the teachers could avail 180 earned leave. This limit was enhanced from 240 and then 300, but the University has not enhanced it, due to this, the Colleges are facing some problems.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the Panjab University Calendar it is 180 days, the University has recommended its modification and the Regulation is yet to be approved by the Government.

- (18) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he had given a representation signed by himself and Mrs. Surinder, Fellow in the last meeting of the Senate relating to the problems being faced by the teachers working on contract basis or in unaided Colleges that the full pay scale, annual increment is not being given, PF is also not being deducted. Those teachers are also not allowed the casual and maternity leaves as per Panjab University Calendar rules. He requested to initiate the action on the representation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could put up this matter as an agenda item in the Principals' meeting and could write to the managements.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the teachers who have been appointed on contract basis for three years, they could request the DPI to allow all the benefits available to the teachers working on aided posts otherwise the audit would deduct the amount from the salary.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be taken up with the Dean College Development Council and the DPI. The other thing is that it could be put up as an agenda in the Principals' meeting and on the basis of those minutes, they could approach the DPI and pressure has to be built for this.

- (19) Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Registrar had helped in the case of Mrs. Ranjana Sharma, Library Assistant, but it is not known whether the matter has been resolved or not. She is a contractual employee and had proceeded on maternity leave. When she returned after availing the maternity, she has not been allowed to join since the last five months.

It was informed that the written instructions were issued and it would be followed up.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the employee is still working in the Library but her attendance is not being taken as someone suggested. She is working while sitting in front of the camera for the last five months.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it should be done in a time bound manner.

It was informed that it would be got checked up.

- (20) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they are doing the inspection of the Colleges and granting new courses even to the Colleges which did not fulfill the required conditions. They should grant new courses only to those Colleges which are running the already granted courses in an effective manner and are paying full salary to the teachers as per service conditions. They always talk of quality education, but he is sure that till the time the teachers are not paid the full salary, they could not provide quality education, the humiliated teachers could not provide quality education. If they wanted to provide quality education, they would have to improve the service conditions.

- (21) Shri Varinder Singh said that some private Colleges admit non-attending students and the students rarely attend the classes. Such Colleges charge higher fees from the students and indulge in mass copying through manipulation and the students are passed. Some of the Colleges are functioning only on this basis. He requested that a Committee be formed to have a check on such Colleges whenever there is a complaint. He could talk to the Committee in this matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested Shri Varinder Singh to point out the specific cases to the Committee.

To this, Shri Varinder Singh said that he would point out such cases if a Committee is formed. There are so many Colleges, in the area to which he belongs, that the students do not attend the Colleges and the Colleges are charging higher fees from those students for not attending the classes and their main motive is with the money.

The Vice-Chancellor said that most of the Colleges are so far away from the University campus.

Shri Varinder Singh said that small Committees of the Fellows belonging to a particular area be formed so that they could keep a check on it. It is a very serious issue.

(22) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they are running a B.Sc. course in which one of the subjects is Chemistry. The medical and non-medical students are studying the subject of Chemistry. If a student wanted to take admission in M.Sc., he/she is told that since that if he/she has not studied the subject of Mathematics, he/she could not be granted admission to M.Sc. Chemistry. He requested that if a student has studied Chemistry at the graduation level, he/she should be given the admission to M.Sc. Chemistry. A science student who has studied three subjects at the graduation level, he/she could do M.Sc. in any of those subjects. Why a student who has studied Chemistry at graduation level is denied admission to M.Sc. Chemistry while in other two subjects, the admission is granted. It is objectionable.

(23) Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he had also pointed out it at one point of time to which the Vice-Chancellor had said that if a student did not have Mathematics at graduation level, that student could not take admission in M.Sc. Chemistry. Sometime back subjects like Biotechnology and Computer Applications were added in the B.Sc. courses. He suggested that either the earlier subjects of Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics (in non-medical stream) and Physics, Chemistry, Biology (in medical stream) be retained or there should be made an amendment for admission so that the students who had studied the subjects like Biotechnology and Computer Applications could also take admission in M.Sc. If a student of non-medical had studied the subjects for three years in addition to the three subjects, he/she should be allowed to take admission to M.Sc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are decisions as every department of the University has taken independently as to what they teach. So, if they feel that a person without the Mathematics background would not be able to cope up, then it is their decision and if they want people not to fail. They could explore that if somebody comes without Mathematics background, he/she could either pass some threshold test or take Mathematics as a subject.

(24) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that as the University honours distinguished persons, he is in the knowledge of such an eminent person who is internationally acclaimed. If the

Vice-Chancellor thinks it proper, he could provide the details of that personality.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to give the details and the name could be considered.

- (25) The Vice-Chancellor said that they were proposing to name the Panjab University Auditorium after Dyal Singh Majithia, whether it was approved or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was not approved. However, it could be checked and if not approved, they could do it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should do it and now the auditorium has become very good.

- (26) The Vice-Chancellor said that the inscription on Dewan Anand Kumar has been done in a very good manner. He has talked to the daughter of Mrs. Sushma Swaraj for its inauguration as and when she gets time. The photographs of it would be sent to all the members.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it should be got inaugurated.

Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.)
Registrar

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)
VICE-CHANCELLOR