

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the **SENATE** held on **Sunday, 26th May 2019** at **10.00 a.m.**
in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Raj Kumar ... (in the chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor Akhtar Mahmood
4. Dr. Anita Kaushal
5. Dr. Ajay Ranga
6. Dr. Amit Joshi
7. Dr. Ameer Sultan
8. Dr. Baljinder Singh
9. Professor B.S. Ghuman
10. Dr. B.C. Josan
11. Professor Chaman Lal
12. Shri Deepak Kaushik
13. Dr. Dalip Kumar
14. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhwa
15. Professor Emanuel Nahar
16. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
17. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
18. Dr. Gurmit Singh
19. Dr. Harjodh Singh
20. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
21. Dr. Harsh Batra
22. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
23. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu
24. Professor J.K. Goswamy
25. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
26. Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta
27. Dr. Jarnail Singh
28. Dr. K.K. Sharma
29. Professor Keshav Malhotra
30. Professor Manoj K. Sharma
31. Professor Mukesh Arora
32. Shri Naresh Gaur
33. Professor Navdeep Goyal
34. Dr. N.R. Sharma
35. Dr. Neeru Malik
36. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
37. Dr. Nisha Bhargawa
38. Professor Pam Rajput
39. Dr. Parveen Goyal
40. Shri Prabhjit Singh
41. Principal Paramjit Singh
42. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
43. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
44. Professor Rajat Sandhir
45. Professor R.P. Bambah
46. Professor Rajesh Gill

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

I. The Vice Chancellor said, “I am pleased to inform the honourable members of the Senate that:

- (i) Professor Pam Rajput, Fellow, has been invited by the U.N. Women – Multi Country Office, an agency of United Nations for Women, to serve as Advisor and be part of their Advisory Group to help shape their agenda, strategic vision and provide technical support to U.N. Women’s portfolio in four countries, i.e., India, Bhutan, Maldives and Sri Lanka, while actively playing an advocacy role at the level of national government.

The members congratulated Professor Pam Rajput on this achievement by thumping of desks.

- (ii) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, UIPS, has recently been awarded with “Pharmaceutical Quality by Design (QbD) Excellence Award” by M/s Shengjie Business Management & Consulting Co. Ltd., Shanghai, during a two-day Pharmaceutical Industry Internationalization Strategy Summit, held on 16th -17th May 2019 in Shanghai, China.

- (iii) Panjab University feels pride that several distinguished alumni of Panjab University, including Hon'ble Smt. Kirron Kher, Hon'ble Shri Manish Tewari, Hon'ble S. Sukhbir Singh Badal, Hon'ble Shri Rajiv Pratap Rudi and others have been elected as Members of Parliament. They congratulate them on their own behalf and on behalf of the entire University fraternity.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that they have congratulated several persons, who have been associated with the University. One more very important development has taken place at the national level that Shri Narinder Damodar Dass Modi has again become the Prime Minister of the country. The entire House should congratulate and felicitate him. First, this resolution should be pass and thereafter others.

All the Senate members congratulated Shri Narinder Damodar Dass Modi on becoming the Prime Minister of the country for the second time.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they have congratulated the alumni, who have been elected as Members of Parliament. Principal Paramjit Singh has become the Senate member for the first time, he should also be congratulated and welcomed.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Heartiest congratulations to Principal Paramjit Singh ji”.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that one of their Senate members, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, has become the President of Bar Council. They should feel proud of it and congratulate & felicitate him.

The entire Senate congratulated Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa by thumping of desks.

The Vice Chancellor said that if anybody is missed his/her name would be included as all deserve congratulations and it is proud for the University. In fact, it is really a great honour for the University.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019**RESOLVED:** That:

- (1) felicitations of the Senate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Hon'ble Shri Narinder Damodar Dass Modi, on becoming the Prime Minister of India for the second time;
 - (ii) Hon'ble Smt. Kirron Kher, Shri Manish Tewari, S. Sukhbir Singh Badal, Shri Rajiv Pratap Rudi and others on their having been elected as Members of Parliament;
 - (iii) Professor Pam Rajput, Fellow, on having been invited by the U.N. Women – Multi Country Office, an agency of United Nations for Women, to serve as Advisor and be part of their Advisory Group to help shape their agenda, strategic vision and provide technical support to U.N. Women's portfolio in four countries, i.e., India, Bhutan, Maldives and Sri Lanka; and
 - (iv) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, UIPS, on having recently been awarded with "Pharmaceutical Quality by design (QbD) Excellence Award" by M/s Shengjie Business Management & Consulting Co. Ltd., Shanghai, China.
2. the Action Taken Report in respect of the decisions of the Senate meeting dated 3.11.2018, be noted.

The Vice Chancellor said that now, they should take up the agenda items for consideration.

II.

At this stage, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it seemed to him that several issues had been raised in the last so many meetings and no action had been taken on all those issues. They discussed the entire agenda and the issues, which were raised during the zero hour discussion and several of them are associated to the prestige of the University and there is a great resentment amongst the Senators on all those issues. He himself had raised the issue relating to DAV College, but has not received even a single reply from his (Vice Chancellor) office. 19 Senators wrote a letter to him (Vice Chancellor) for discussing an issue, they did not know what he (Vice Chancellor) has done about that. They have only come to know from the newspaper, but they did not receive any reply from the University office on the issue. Besides, there are several issues, e.g., constitution of Committees in an arbitrary manner and the way the office of the Vice Chancellor is being tried to be diluted. He urged that first discussion should be held on all those issues and thereafter, the agenda should be taken up for consideration; otherwise, there would be no benefit of considering the agenda.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is completely in agreement whatever Dr. Subhash Sharma has said. 19 Senators had given in writing, but till date none of them has been informed as to what the status is. Professor R.P. Bambah and Shri V.K. Sibal are present in the House and it had never happened before. 19 Senators have given in writing as they had a right to call a special meeting of the Senate, but the Syndicate has completely over right them. In fact, the Syndicate has vetoed them, but they have not been informed as to what it has been done. Keeping in view the democratic spirit of this House, it should be discussed as to whether the Syndicate is empowered to reject it, under the clause it has been rejected.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

The Vice Chancellor said that he has noted it.

To this, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that what is meant by noted. They have told him (Vice Chancellor) and would continue to tell him. This is a very big issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would take decision on this only.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that the working of Panjab University Senate is governed under the Regulations/Rules contained in Panjab University Calendars. It is not necessary that each and every issue should be placed before the Senate. However, there are no two opinions that the issue, which has come to the Senate, should be discussed, and decision taken thereon. It has been rightly said that there could be several issue, which might be pending owing to one reason or the other. He requested that the items, which are there on the agenda, should be taken up for consideration one by one and tried to finish the agenda by lunch or any other time fixed for the purpose. Thereafter, the issue, which could be taken up, should be taken up for consideration. Several powers are available with the Vice Chancellor, several with the Syndicate and several with the Senate and the powers are normally used when there is not much problem in the matter involved. There could be difference of opinion, but it is not that the suggestion of each and every body could be accepted. He urged that they should go ahead in accordance with the agenda. At the moment, there is a different kind of atmosphere as the people are proceeding for vacation. Therefore, they should proceed with the agenda. Earlier also, they have fixed a date for this purpose only and unfortunately the entire day was spent on the debate. Hence, they should go ahead with the agenda and thereafter, whatever issues come, the same could be discussed and there might not be any problem, but they should deviate from the agenda. If they deviated from the agenda, it would not prove to be a good practice; and otherwise, the agenda would remain undiscussed in every Senate meeting.

At this stage, a din prevailed as 4-5 members started speaking together.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma remarked that only 10 members would be present at the time of zero hour and then the quorum would also be not complete.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then the sanctity of the zero hour would also not be there.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they were waiting for the Senate since long. Their several issues are pending, on which injustice has been done to them. Therefore, it is their common request that first the zero hour discussion should be allowed and there should not be any problem to anybody. At times, several persons go to their homes in the evening and then none listen carefully. Therefore, they wished that the zero hour discussion should be allowed first. They have certain demands since long, which have been ignored.

Dr. Dalip Kumar asked would the zero hour be allowed only for a particular item or it would be open for everyone.

Certain members, including Professor Mukesh Arora said that the zero hour would be open for everyone.

Dr. Dalip Kumar remarked that otherwise also they are meeting today after a period of more than three months. Had a meeting of the Senate held in between, perhaps, this situation might not have arisen. Hence, the zero hour would not be specific item basis, but it should be for each and everyone.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

The Vice Chancellor said that let them start with the zero hour, but they should try to be very specific.

III. ZERO HOUR

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that first of all he would like to thank him (Vice Chancellor) for respecting the wish of the Senate members and has agreed to take up the zero hour first. The issue, which he wished to raise, was also raised by him in the previous meeting of the Senate. He (Vice Chancellor) might be remembering that the said issue is not related to any particular College/Institute. In fact, the issue is whether the process of affiliation of Colleges/Institutes is for enhancing the prestige of the University or jeopardizing. Has the affiliation process of the University become a mimic? The Vice Chancellor might also be remembering that recently the UGC has written a letter to all the Institutions. He did not know whether the same has been received by Panjab University or not. They have categorically written in the said letter that they have serious concern the way the affiliated Colleges of the Universities in the entire country are violating the regulations/rules/ guidelines/norms of affiliation. The UGC has written to all the Universities that they should ask the Colleges to comply with the regulations, which is in the Act of the University. He would like to refer to a particular case though could refer to many of the cases. He would like to quote an example, to show as to how they violate the regulations/rules/norms of the University. There is a DAV Institute of Management, the issue of which was also discussed in the previous meeting. He would not take much time of the House as they are aware of the majority of the developments. The minutes of the last meeting of the Syndicate along with the relevant papers, in which the Syndicate has taken a decision, have been appended with the item. He himself was a member of the Affiliation Committee along with Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan. They had denied affiliation to several Colleges. The affiliations were denied because the Inspection Committees, which had visited the Colleges concerned, had pointed out certain deficiencies and when those deficiencies were not complied. They have given chance to majority of the Colleges to comply with the conditions and they have remained so much lenient. Several Colleges had complied with the conditions and removed the deficiencies, but certain not and they gave them chance again. Majority of them removed the deficiencies, but several still remained. Helplessly, they have to deny the affiliation to those Colleges. Dean, College Development Council, is sitting here, perhaps he might be able to tell in a better way that they have denied affiliation to several Colleges. But he is astonished that one of the Institutions is such, the violation of which is more serious than the Colleges, which had been denied affiliation, but despite that extension has been given to it continuously. He could read out from the sequence of note appended with the item as to how this entire issue has been dealt with. The University had received Inspection Report on 31st May, and thereafter, they submit the compliance report. The University wrote a letter to the Institute stating that until they fulfilled the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee, the Institute should not make any admission. Issue went on and on and the situation came that when they did not make the compliance, a meeting was held about which Shri Ashok Goyal would explain in a better way as he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had chaired that meeting and he was not present in that meeting. In that meeting, the Institute was denied affiliation as had been done in the case of other Colleges, which did not comply with the conditions despite giving them sufficient time. When the affiliation was denied, a letter was received from the Institute stating that their request for affiliation should be reconsidered. The other Colleges might also have requested for reconsideration of their cases for affiliation, but they did not reconsider their cases. However, the request of this Institute was reconsidered and thereafter, a meeting was again held, which was

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

convened on 24 hours notice about which he had also received a phone call. However, he and some of his friends could not attend the said meeting. Two-three members, who attended the meeting, gave them (Institute) conditional affiliation saying that they have been given another three months' time, whereas the other Colleges were not given this three months' time. Perhaps, they were also given date, i.e., they were asked to comply with the conditions by 14th February, whereas the other Colleges were denied affiliation in the months of September and October. Because they had a special status, as is being said "Might is right", they were given extension again up to 14th February. Despite extension up to 14th February, whereas that extension was not to be given to this Institute, which was given wrongly and by convening a meeting on a short notice, but interestingly in spite of extension up to 14th February, the compliance report did not come up to 14th February, which is mentioned in the office note and the Dean College Development Council would explain it. Meaning thereby, that the conditions, which were to be complied by the Institute last year, were not complied up to 14th February 2019 and the Institute did not bother to submit the compliance report. He is reading from the office note which was provided to the Syndicate. If he would be wrong somewhere, the Dean College Development Council could correct him. It is written that the Institute was required to give the compliance report up to 14th February. On completion of three months, the Institute of Management was asked to submit the compliance report vide this office e-mail dated 14th February. When the compliance report was not submitted up to 14th February, an e-mail was sent from the office of the Dean, College Development Council. All this has been mentioned in the office note. Even after completion of three months', the compliance report was not submitted. Thereafter, a line has been written "In the meantime, the Institute vide its letter No.386 dated 14.02.2019 (in the evening)". He would like to ask the Dean College Development Council as to when in the evening the report was received. When did they send e-mail to the Institute? If the compliance report had been received after 5.00 p.m., i.e., closure of the office, did they permit the students to deposit fees after the stipulated time? Whether they allow the students to deposit the fees after 9.00 p.m.? The Institute, which was given extension again and again, did not bother submit the compliance report thinking that the University people are foolish, who are sending Inspection Committees one after the other and giving them extension after extension. The Inspection Committee comprised of Professor Sanjay Kaushik (Dean College Development Council), Professor Karamjeet Singh (Registrar) and Professor Manoj Kumar (Fellow). The office note says "in the compliance report, it has been found that the Institute of Management has not complied with the observations of the Inspection Committee during their visit on 30.10.2018". The period of three months' had elapsed and before that also three months' time had elapsed, and thereafter, the compliance report came and despite that the office note says that they did not comply with any of the observations. It has further been written that "the Institute has not appointed the requisite staff as mentioned in the observations of the Inspection Committee. It is pertinent to mention that the appointments of one Associate Professor and two Assistant Professors have not been approved by the University due to lack of prescribed quorum of Selection Committee ...", and he has to speak on this issue. The kind of mockery of the system of this University is being made, he thought perhaps is not made in any of the University in the country. He was the member of the Affiliation Committee. On the particular issue of appointments, he said that a set of proceedings of the meeting of the Selection Committee came to the University stating that they have appointed these members of staff, but the quorum was not complete in that proceedings. Thereafter, another set of proceedings came. Have they ever listened that two proceedings were prepared of a single meeting? He has not listened this so far that two proceedings are prepared of a meeting. After first proceedings, they said, "No" it is wrong proceedings and thereafter sent another set of proceedings, wherein signature of one person was extra and they said that now the quorum is complete. Who was the

extra person, who completed the quorum? He is saying this on record and the society would laugh on them as to how the University is functioning. The signatures were of a person, whom they had appointed Director. In this way, they had said that the quorum for the meeting of the Selection Committee was complete. First of all, how two proceedings of a single meeting of the Selection Committee were prepared? According to him, it is a fraud. Moreover, the story of the Director is very interesting. He was in the Affiliation Committee and Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. R.K. Mahajan might be remembering that a letter had come to them stating that they have appointed the Director. The letter was written by Dr. B.C. Josan, who was Principal of DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, at that time. All the letters are in record, which they could have from the Dean College Development Council. It was written in that letter that they have appointed the Director and the Director has joined and after joining, he has resigned. Interestingly, thereafter the University received another letter from the Management of DAV of which Dr. Satish Sharma, Fellow, was also a member, stating that they had appointed the Director, but he did not join. He added that Dr. Satish Sharma was also the Chairman of the Affiliation Committee. They could themselves see that two different official communications were being made to the University on a single issue. If it is not a fraud, then what it is? One communication said that the Director had been appointed and he has joined, and on the contrary the other communication said that the Director was appointed, but he did not join. When they asked in the Affiliation Committee, he said that they should ignore the letter written by Principal B.C. Josan. The letter, which he has written, is correct and the Director did not join. The Director, who did not join, how his signatures were obtained on the proceedings of the meeting of the Selection Committee(s) for appointment of Assistant Professors and Associate Professor and recommended appointments. How the condition of quorum was fulfilled? Such a fraudulent work is being done in this University. The Inspection Committee of the University has continuously said that the record of separation of land for the Institute of Management should be shown. He still remembers when it was approved by the Syndicate in its first meeting and at that time Principal I.S. Sandhu, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and even Professor Mukesh Arora had come to the conclusion that the record of separation of land for the Institute of Management should be provided to the University. He did not know as to what has been done on this issue and Dr. Parvinder Singh would update them on the issue. It is interesting that they are saying that they had separate the Institute of Management, but if they themselves see even today they would not find separate gate of the Institute. During the last Semester Examinations, the Controller of Examinations had gone there (DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh) for inspection as it is his duty to inspect the Examination Centres, and while inspecting from one room to the other (from inside itself), he reached Institute of Management and found that the examination of students of DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, was going on in the Institute of Management. If he is saying false, it should be pointed out. They could themselves see that the Institute, to which they are saying that they have separated it and also giving affidavit, why they were conducting examination of DAV College students in the Institute of Management. Why the examination centre of students of DAV College was made in the Institute of Management? Could the examination centre of students of GGSDS College, Sector 32, Chandigarh, be created at DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh? Why the class rooms of Institute of Management were being used for the students of DAV College? He is saying it with responsibility that the classes of students of DAV College were held at the first floor of Institute of Management. After making such a mockery of the University system and also throwing the regulations/rules/norms for affiliation as also this office note, their Syndicate has given them further extension for three months (up to June 2019) to do whatever they wished. Meaning thereby, they are least concerned whether the Institute had the teachers, infrastructure and they follow the regulations/rules/ norms of the University and they are free to run their shop, charge fee of lacs of rupees from the students,

without teaching the students, and sell the degree of the University and earn as much money as they wished. If this could be done by the DAV Institute, then they did not have any moral right to send Inspection Committees to other privately managed affiliated Colleges. They should stop sending Inspection Committees to the Colleges. Why are they wasting their valuable time? Several Hon'ble members of this House spent their valuable time for doing inspections and if they have to throw their reports in the dustbin, and gave affiliations by giving them time after time and date after date, they should not send Inspection Committees at all. Since the month of May is over and the students had appeared in the examination, soon the students would get degrees. The Institute, which has so far not been given affiliation for the session 2018-19, had given an advertisement in the newspapers, the copy of which is available with him and he could show the same to him (Vice Chancellor) and the same has also been sent to him through e-mail, stating that the students could take admission in the Institute for the session 2019-20 and it has been written below that "the Institute is affiliated with Panjab University". He should be informed as to which affiliation has been given to the Institute by the Panjab University and who has given it (Institute) right to mislead/misguide the students. Isn't it a fraud? This is a very prestigious University and the way they have made a mockery of the affiliation system, he is pained to say that they did not have any moral right to ask the other affiliated Colleges to do the compliance. An Institute, which is situated just 2 k.ms. away from the University Campus, is not ready to listen to them. They should listen another interesting this. The compliance report, which came late, in that they have written about filling up of a post of Professor in one subject as desired by the Inspection Committee, though the full facts could be told by the Dean College Development Council, that they have asked certain Professors of University Business School (unofficially) who told them that there is no need to fill up the post of Professor. That was why, they did not advertise the post of Professor. This is the official reply received from the Institute. If they have to do the things just by asking people unofficially, why did they waste time of the Inspection Committees, which include persons like Professor Sanjay Kaushik and Professor Karamjeet Singh? This is a big mockery of the system. If the Senate did not deny affiliation to the Institute, a message would go outside (in the whole state of Punjab as well the country) that to hell with the affiliation system of Panjab University that they just running shops and doing profiteering. Allegations might be levelled on them that they have vested interests, and that was why, they are allowing these shops to function. He would like to make a request to the House through him (Vice Chancellor) that they should deny affiliation to this Institute. The Syndicate has taken a wrong decision and today they must deny affiliation to the Institute and the affiliation should not be given to it under any circumstances. He would like to add one more thing that they all used one weapon while running the shops and that weapon is that first they made wrong admissions and then plead as to where would the students go and they get everything done in the names of the students. This *modus operandi* is going in the entire country and at least they should not allow this *modus operandi* to be successful. Whatever is to be done should be decided at the earliest. Even if a Committee is to be constituted, the same should be constituted and at this belated stage there is not valid reason to give affiliation to this Institute for the session 2018-19. The entire House is there and it is request to all of them to take a conscious decision as the prestige of the University is at stake.

Shri Varinder Singh said that whatever has been said by Dr. Subhash Sharma is 100 per cent correct.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Dr. Subhash Sharma is speaking emotionally.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Varinder Singh intervened to say that he (Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma) should not say so and instead he should put his own viewpoints before the House.

At this stage, a din prevailed as few members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is a matter of being emotional.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that, sometime ago, he (Dr. Subhash Sharma) was supporting this issue.

Dr. Subhash Sharma intervened to say, "Not at all". He should show him a single point on record, where he had supported it. In fact, he (Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma) is misleading the House. The agenda of the Senate is also a part of the record and they should him even a single line, where he had supported it. One should not cast false accusation. He said that he did not name any person; rather, he has only raised an issue. Since he (Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma) is mentioning his (Dr. Subhash Sharma) name, he should prove it; otherwise, he would not allow him to speak.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma stated that if any issue would be raised here, its reply would be given.

At this stage, heated arguments started between Dr. Subhash Sharma and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is his request to each member of the Senate that they should not quote the name of any member, and instead they should address him (Vice Chancellor).

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma stated that the DAV Management, which is running 912 Institutes, is being called a shop. They are running a University and several best Colleges and Schools in the country. Their intentions on the issue are not bad. They have started an Institute and they have got the land separated by passing a Resolution. The All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) has allowed them affiliation on the same land. Only small technical issues are involved in it, e.g., gate carved or there is another way, etc. The Institute is a separate Institute and they have passed a Resolution on the issue. When they start any course in the University, do they go and get it separated. No. It is an Institute and has been established by getting the land separated and a Resolution in this regard has been passed by the DAV Management. The AICTE, which is a regulatory body, has allowed them. So far as appointment of Director is concerned, delay is there, but the fault for the same lies with the University also. The interview for the post of Director had been fixed 4-time and though Professor Rajat Sandhir had gone there, but the other persons did not go. Later on, after due consideration, the panel has been changed and the interview was to be fixed, but in the meantime, the model code of conduct came into force. Now, the Institute is thinking for fixing the date for the interview. The second condition for grant of affiliation usually is for appointment of teaching faculty and in the case of this Institute, the condition was appointment of one Associate Professor and three Assistant Professors and they were appointed by the Institute. However, owing to technical problem, approval to those appointments could not be given and one of the problems was lack of quorum. So far as quorum is concerned, the nominee of the Vice Chancellor, who is present in the meeting of the Selection Committee, is responsible to ensure that the meeting would only be allowed to be held if the quorum is complete. In fact, he (nominee of the Vice Chancellor) represents the Vice Chancellor and the nominee of the Vice Chancellor is actually the Vice Chancellor. If the nominee of the Vice Chancellor has not seen it, it

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

is not the fault of the staff. As regards to appointment of other staff, they have been given proper appointment letters. Earlier, they were appointed on a salary of Rs.21,600/- p.m. and later on, their salary has been raised to full (as per the pay-scales). Secondly, the Institute was directed to purchase a software, but he is sorry to say that the said software is not available at University Business School (UBS). The cost of the software is about Rs.5 lacs and the Institute has purchased the same. As such, the intentions of the Management are not bad. The DAV Management is running numerous Institutions across the country and they are running best University and Colleges. If they compare the result of the Institute with the UBS, they would find that out of 10 positions, 7 have been held by the students of this Institute. The first rank has been obtained by the student of the Institute. Moreover, 100 per cent placements of the students of the Institute had been done. They have to make the Colleges, which are affiliated with the University, to function and they could make the correction(s) done and if need be, they could give time to them for the purpose. If time has been given to the Institute, it has rightly been given. If the Institute still not complied with the conditions, they could do anything. As such, there is no difference in the intentions of the Management.

Dr. B.C. Josan, while addressed to the Vice Chancellor and the Hon'ble members, stated that this proposal of MBA course was actually initiated by him and he had initiated it in the year 2008 or 2009. No doubt, that land belonged to DAV Managing Committee. The DAV Managing Committee had passed a Resolution that they have given this much of land to the Institute of Management and the same was duly approved by the Union Territory Administration. The Union Territory Administration has permitted them and has also issued them No Objection Certificate. So far as infrastructure is concerned, he could inform them with full conviction that the infrastructure of the Institute is far-far better than the University (UBS). It was his humble effort that the Colleges must be allowed MBA course as they also have qualified teachers and good infrastructure. He was trying for this from the year 2009, but he could not succeed. This was given to them in the year 2016-17 and they have tried their best to come up to the expectations of the University. So far as appointment of Director is concerned, though the Vice Chancellor's nominee had gone 2-3 times, the other University experts did not go. The President of DAV Managing Committee fixed the meeting of the Selection Committee 4-time. He was also there (in Delhi) yesterday. DAV Institution is a very big institution and Shri Raman Singh, former Chief Minister, had given 74 schools to the DAV Management. DAV Institution is one of the biggest non-governmental organizations than other private and public institutions. Since the model code of conduct came into force, the interview for the post of Director could not be fixed. No doubt, they have got the gate separated, but the students could go there and there is nothing like false in it, but infrastructure is there and only the shortcoming of Director is there, which would be met by them shortly. Hence, it is his humble request to the Hon'ble members of the Senate that the Colleges should be promoted with which the prestige of the University would increase and the Institute should be given one more chance and he would like to assure them that the Director would be appointed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he had asked three questions and the replies to those questions should be given instead of side tracking them. Firstly, how two letters were written to the University? Whether the Director was appointed and he had submitted resignation after getting the appointed or he has not joined? It should also be replied as to how two proceedings of a single meeting were submitted to the University. Further, it should also be replied whether Examination Centre of DAV students' was made in the Institute? The Controller of Examinations, who is sitting here, should inform the House whether Examination Centre of DAV students' was going

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

on in the Institute, when he visited the Institute. These are the most important questions, but he is not replying to these questions.

Dr. B.C. Josan tried to speak, the Vice Chancellor said that he would seek reply from him later. When Dr. Josan tried to speak forcefully, the Vice Chancellor said, "No, he would not allow him to speak". Dr. Josan said that he (Vice Chancellor) has to listen to him and when the Vice Chancellor said that he would not allow him (Dr. Josan), he (Dr. Josan) said that he would speak irrespective of whether he (Vice Chancellor) allow him or not. He said that Panjab University had given them four Examination Centres, but later on one more Centre was given. Why an extra Examination Centre was given? Why the Examination Centres are given to them forcefully.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that since Controller of Examinations is sitting here, he should clarify whether that Examination Centre is legitimate. If the Controller of Examinations replied, 'Yes', it was legitimate, it would be acceptable to him.

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan stated that he did not know where the intentions of DAV Management about the Institute of Management are bad. Their Management fixed the interview for the post of Director for four times. First of all, by chance, he was in Delhi on that day and he was surprised to see the panel and he talked to him whether the Vice Chancellor has made this panel for the appointment of a Director for an Institute of Management! Except one person in the panel, none else belonged to Management. This meant, the intentions of the University are bad to the extent that the affiliation would not be given to DAV Institute of Management. Despite fixing the interview for the post of Director four times, it could not be held, whereas in other affiliated Colleges, other persons are got arranged just on the basis of telephone call made by the Dean College Development Council. Why another person was not called at the time of interview at Institute of Management? It is nothing, but insult of DAV Institution and the University must see and take action against persons, who did not go/report on the fixed date(s).

On a point of order, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that first time, Professor V.R. Sinha had gone for the interview for the post of Director and at that time, the University was not at fault, but the system evolved by the Management was not found to be satisfactory, and that was why, he refused to conduct the interview. As such, it was a lapse on the part of the Management.

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan said that if there is a mistake on the part of the DAV Management, action must be taken, but before that it should be assessed as to what the University is doing.

Dr. Subhash Sharma intervened to say that University has denied affiliation to other Colleges, whereas extension has been given to DAV Institute.

To this, Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan remarked that there are several such cases of the Colleges, where the affiliation has not been denied and the Colleges, where they had made surprised visit, were granted affiliation in their absence.

Principal N.R. Sharma stated that according to him, there is no need for more discussion on this issue as a lot of discussion has already been done. There is no doubt that the DAV Institution has played a significant role and contributed a lot in the education system of the country. Perhaps, no particular Institution is being affected. In fact, DAV is not getting affected, but the University is getting affected as well as teachers and the students. Even this body (Senate) is also getting affected as he has

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

been watching that a lot of discussion is continuously taking place here for the last 2-3 years. Citing an example, he said that he is unable to understand and anybody could tell him as to what is the status of DAV Management. When the students go for taking admission, they did not know whether the affiliated or has been disaffiliated. The major issue, which is emerging here, on which he would also like to speak is that first they are trying to hit without any reason and thereafter would protect them. Earlier also, there was an issue relating to a teacher of this very Institute, but it is very surprising that those teachers still do not know whether the degree, which they possessed, is fake or the original one. Are those teachers eligible or ineligible? It is matter of great surprise. It is beyond his understanding as to how could they give time again and again to comply with the conditions? When such things appeared in the media, he felt as if first they intentionally tried to hit and then come to their rescue. They would also allow them to comply with the conditions. Now, the question is as to what is their status and the same should be told. Unless and until the status is not made clear, Dr. Subhash Sharma is rightly saying that the students, teachers and the parents should not be kept in the dark. Why did not take clear-cut decision? Even today, there are teachers, who have been penalized and they still do not know as to what the status of their degree. Even the students of his area ask as to what the status of DAV Institute of Management, which is a DAV College, is. If this is the status, they should not permit the students to take admission.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha stated that they send Inspection Committee for grant of affiliation and there are six types of Institutions, i.e., aided, unaided, Government, Constituent Colleges, Regional Centres and Panjab University Campus. First of all, they did not function in a democratic way because they did inspections of only three types of Institutions and leaving aside another three. Though they conduct the inspection of the Colleges, and not of the Constituent Colleges, Regional Centre and Departments because there are several Departments where there are 15 sanctioned posts, but even five teachers are not there. On the other hand, they imposed different conditions on the privately managed and aided Colleges and different on the Government Colleges. In the Government Colleges, teachers have not been appointed on regular basis, whereas in the aided and unaided Colleges, they compel them to appoint teachers on regular basis even if only 5-6 students are there, but neither in the Government Colleges nor in the Constituent Colleges, they insisted for appointment of teachers on regular basis. Citing an example, he said that last year, a case had come to the Syndicate relating to transfer of a teacher (in the subject of Commerce) from a Constituent College to another Constituent College and after his/her transfer only one teacher remained there. He should be told as to how he would be able to teach three classes, i.e., 1st year, 2nd year and 3rd year and how would workload be completed. First of all, they should be democratic so far as inspections are concerned, the same should be got done of all the Colleges, Constituent Colleges, Regional Centres and Departments and not only of the Colleges alone. They should ponder over this issue seriously. Only those persons go on the Inspections in whose Department(s) inspections were never got done and they impose conditions, which even their own Department did not fulfil.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta stated that he belonged to DAV Institution. When the proposal for MBA course was mooted, the Teachers' Union had categorically opposed the proposal that MBA should not be started because they were of the view that it is the campus of DAV College. Secondly, it is a norm of the AICTE/NCTE that unless and until a separate campus is created, MBA Programme could not be started. Perhaps, the President of the Teachers' Union had also talked with Dr. B.C. Josan, who was Principal of the College at that time and he (Dr. Josan) had made a commitment that first they should be allowed to start MBA course and later on the MBA course would be merged in the DAV College after getting a resolution passed by the DAV

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Management, which is perhaps called a composite scheme. That was the reason, under which the Teachers' Union had given consent to start MBA course. They had categorically said that if the MBA course is started in a different Institution, they did not give their consent. Perhaps, they had also written a letter to the AICTE, but he did not know whether the said letter was sent or not as also whether any action has been initiated by the AICTE or not. At the moment, 30% of the infrastructure has become unutilized for DAV College. Resultantly, it has affected DAV College and its students. Moreover, the expenditure has also been incurred from the sources of DAV College. However, one could argue that the matter is of the Management Committee. One more clarity he wanted to give is that the DAV College Sector 10 is regulated by Governing Body Committee of Sector 10 and not by the DAV Central Managing Committee, New Delhi. Of course, the persons are the same, the controls are same, but the DAV College Governing Body is controlling only one College i.e. DAV College, Sector 10. The land of DAV College which has gone to the Institute of Management, he as a part of the DAV teachers Union, wanted to say, that land should be given back to the DAV College. He further said that if the MBA is being started in the DAV College, then they welcome it, but if it is being started in the name of Institute of Management, they oppose it. Secondly, if they ask the students as to from where they are doing their MBA, then the students say that they are doing MBA from DAV College Sector 10, whereas the Institute of Management is an independent entity. He realized that there was something of identity crises. The future of students cannot be kept in dark whether they are the students of DAV College, Sector 10 or the Institute of Management. He said that as he himself belong to the teachers community, he would like to say specifically for teachers as he represents the teachers that so far as the matter of payment is concerned, the DAV Management and DAV College has immensely contributed in establishing the Institute of Management at Chandigarh and also all over India, but when it comes to payment of salary to the teachers, they pay very less salary to them. He said one Associate Professor is being paid a salary of Rs.21,600/-p.m. and the Assistant Professors who are teaching the MBA classes, are paid Rs.15,600/- p.m. only. He questioned is this standard representing that standard where they are contributing all over India. He said that these two things should be taken care of.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the journey of Institute of Management, Sector 10, Chandigarh as stated by Shri Subhash Sharma had started from 3rd of July 2017. The office note is up to of 14th February 2019, these are the details. But it is very interesting that when they talked about this Institute, it also came to fore as to whether the Panjab University should give MBA. From the campus, there was opposition that the Colleges should not be given MBA. He said that at that time he was also in the Syndicate and he had stated that so far as Chandigarh is concerned, SD College and DAV College, are well established colleges. If they want to go, they should have a liberal attitude in starting these types of programmes in these Colleges. He said that what happened is that when the affiliation or any new start is done, four things are taken into consideration. That first issue was that what was the view of AICTE. In case the AICTE had not given approval to the DAV, then it was very clear that this process would not have moved further. The AICTE has its norms and AICTE Committee had visited the College. After that the Survey Committee under the Chairmanship of the Registrar visits the Colleges and UT Administration gives an NOC for it. The nominee of UT Administration happens to be there and thereafter, University Committee further visits and it says that it is fit for running MBA programmes. What happens after that is that one panel goes. He said that he did not want to discuss all the details here today. He said that as all of them have talked that about 912 institutes across the country are running, but he would also like to say that even the present President of India is the alumnus of DAV College, Kanpur. His question is that they are taking this issue only and only for the appointment of Director or other staff also. When they talk about the

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

results, presently on quality education, MHRD or Government of India says three issues. They should have human resource, they should have infrastructure resource and when both these things are compared, these are seen as output. Here two things have been said, i.e. the results and placement. He said that he realized that on these two counts, the House should feel satisfied that as far as this particular batch is concerned. On 14th February 2019, they have given them extension for three months and on 11th of March, 2019 the Code of Conduct was imposed. It is very important that in these three months of March, April and May, the College was unable to do anything. The Management was unable to do anything. So far as the separate entries and separate entry and separate Examination Centres are concerned, it has nowhere been written and even Knowledge Commission has also said about the usage. He question usage of what. It is common utilization of resources. He said that the Vice Chancellor has stated in his own statement that his (Vice Chancellor's) Laboratories shall remain open for 24 hours that that is open also to the affiliated colleges of Chandigarh. He said that the common utilization of resources, that should be promoted in the present set up. We cannot deny that one. It is only for the Centre and the Centre is given of course, with the permission of the University only. The college cannot enter. He said that he just want to conclude that if the extension has been given of three months starting from 14th of February, 2019, they should follow these three months and see that if one month's relaxation could be given in view of the Model Code of Conduct. He further said that they should not be in a hurry to disaffiliate the Institution, but he is of the firm opinion that if such types of violations are going on further, he is also of the opinion that they should go for the closure of the Institute.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that they are not in a hurry, this was not the first extension, it was continuing since 2017. He said that it is the fifth extension. He said that the matter was not only of Director, there was a requirement of Professor too which has not been fulfilled till today. He questioned as to if the advertisement for the post of Professor was ever made, they should tell about this. They claim that the University has not given panel for the post of Director but for the post of Professor, the advertisement has not been issued as yet. He asked the Registrar to clarify if the condition for requirement of a Professor was imposed or not and whether the advertisement for this has surfaced or not.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he has two three questions to make. He said that as has been said that there should be no single entry provision, is that only for the DAV College and as to if the others should be exonerated from it. He said that earlier this was the practice that in all the inspection which were done in different colleges, they were told to have separate entries for separate institutes. He said that the colleges are disaffiliated for want of staff and infrastructure. If such colleges are given permission and if denied later, there must be some reason. So, it cannot be said that the DAV could be excluded from this condition and other are penalized. He said that the DAV Group have 180-190 colleges and on the contrary they are having only one college, and they think that let the government colleges be penalized. He requested that this should not be done and uniform rules should be applied to all. If separate entry needed for the DAV, then this condition should also be imposed on others also.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that one of his colleagues has stated that they are paying Rs.21,600/- salary to an Assistant Professor and Associate Professors. He wanted to rectify him that as per UGC grade, with all allowances, whatever the PF rules by the Panjab University, the payment is being made. He said that if they do not know about the salary being paid, they could check it from the bank accounts of the concerned. He again said that the payment is being made as per rules. The second thing, as have been said, that there should be parallelism, it is okay. He said that they are giving grade to the Associate Professor and others have been appointing the Associate

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Professors on Rs.21,600/-. He questioned as to if what did it mean to be parallel. On one hand, the DAV was being talked of and about DAV one more things needs to be disclosed is that recently MHRD conducted a survey and published in 'India Today' in which it has been mentioned that the DAV Colleges at Chandigarh and in Punjab are leading in quality education. In survey they are having upper hand and they are being dragged in discussion on the issue. He said that they were talking about the quality education, the DAV has already been imparting very qualitative education. If parallel was being talked of, then the parallelism should be uniform for all. He asked why the delay occurred. The fault is not of the college but of the University also. He posed a query that if the University representative was not going there, then how the college could be held responsible. How the college could intervene. When the panel goes from the University, there arises the problem of quorum. When the quorum is not complete, the things cannot be executed. He said that when the Examination Centre is unwillingly imposed upon them and in the MBA case, they have managed the students to sit in the rooms where these were available. That is what they have done.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that the rooms about which they have talked, did not belong to College. These rooms are of Institute of Management. How can they make the students of DAV College to sit in the rooms of Institute of Management?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk of disaffiliation, in the last three years, he had been a member of the Affiliation Committee for two years. In rarest of the rare cases, there comes the situation for disaffiliation. He said that it did not seem to him if the cases of last three years are examined, the talk is made of disaffiliation of college but in that case too, only a notice has been issued to one college or so but actually the college does not stand disaffiliated. The Colleges are not disaffiliated in this manner. Those who make efforts either on the part of the affiliation Committee or on the part of the Syndicate or on the part of Senate, there remains only one effort that whatever conditions have been imposed or whatever conditions are needed to run that particular course, those are required to be fulfilled, the college should fulfil it. Only the DAV College has not been given the time specifically, the time has been given to so many colleges. He said that the records could be requisitioned and there would see at least 50 such College where time is given time and again. He said that it is a general thing. He said that Principal S.S. Sangha has rightly said that they take the things differently, that fact is true also. He further stated that if the matter of appointment relating to the Government Colleges is considered, either these are colleges of Punjab or are the college of Chandigarh, no new appointment has been made. Every affiliated college either it be aided college or so, they have been instructed that they should appoint regular teachers. The teachers are not appointed even if they are allowed to continue to promote education. He said in the Government Colleges, the students are able to get education on lower fees, there are the instances that the University has granted to continue with some discrepancies. He further stated that the main purpose of this Body is to see that no student is deprived of education. In the matter of Management Courses, as has been stated by Dr. Dalip Kumar, the two institutes in Chandigarh i.e. SD College and DAV College are very distinctive, particularly in management. He further said that it was due to the AICTE condition that the permission for starting MBA could only be granted if a separate institution is established from that of the existing one. It was perhaps due to this backdrop that the Management of DAV thought of taking this decision and the University accepted that decision. He said that lot of discussion has taken place in the Syndicate on this issue and so far as the matter of giving extension is concerned, that has rightly been given because the circumstances at that time were so and the conditions were such that due to enforcement of Code of Conduct and also the UGC was not permitting to fill up the posts, the case has got delayed. He is of the view that if time has been given to fulfill the conditions, the college would be able to fulfill all the conditions.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

On a point of order, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as has been stated by Professor Navdeep Goyal that in government colleges the appointments are not taking place, he wanted to inform the House that 24 new selections have been made by the UPSC and the remaining selections are in pipeline.

Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Dr. Dalip Kumar was talking of the colleges of Chandigarh and not of the colleges situated in Punjab. He said that he himself remained to be the member of the affiliation Committee for long time in the last. Time and again the news courses are given but no teachers were being appointed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the speakers should be specific to the issue.

Principal Nisha Bhargava said that she is the assessor of NAAC and she wanted to say something from that point of view. She said that the NAAC has appointed the MCM College as Mentor college of NAAC for the regional colleges and in the year 2016, the DAV and MCM have got accreditation of NAAC. As of today, the gradation of DAV and MCM is equivalent to that of A+ with 3.27 and 3.31. It is because of this ranking of DAV by the NAAC, it is understood that the NAAC has accredited the DAV admitting that the DAV have sufficient infrastructure. She stated that she would like to inform that whatever number of students are admitted, the applicants are double to that numbers. The DAV had to have more than ten thousand students in any point of time in the past, the DAV has intentionally reduced the number of students, they have sufficient infrastructure. She said that the second thing is that NAAC says that you should make best use of your infrastructure. Every Sunday, there happens the conduct of examination in her college and they provide their campus to other agencies. Even today their campus in MCM is being used for conduct of test by some external agencies. When the Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Nisha Bhargava to focus on the issue and not to repeat, she said that these are the issues. She wanted to know as to why the MBA students of Institute of Management could not take examination in DAV College.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that the Controller of Examination should respond to this issue in the first instance. The Controller of Examination should verify as to whether the Centre is legitimate or not. Whether they can take examination or not, let the Controller of examination should verify.

Professor Ronki Ram said that this issue, rather than being contextual, it should be dealt with a general spirit and its very solution shall lie in that end. He said that some anomalies have been pointed out by Shri Subhash Sharma and some viewpoints, which have come from the members, their saying is that real anomalies exist in some cases and in other cases, the only misunderstanding prevails. The anomalies which have been admitted, those anomalies could be seen and wherever the misunderstandings exist, those could be removed. He further said that so far as the issue of Director is concerned, he has the full idea and knowledge of it because he was very much in that Committee and when the issue of Director was to be considered, at that time, there was Principal in DAV college and the University felt that if the new Institute was to be run, then for that a new Director shall have to be appointed. The University authorities disapproved of the proposal of DAV to run the new institute with Principal. He said that he was the Chairman of that Committee and the new Director who was selected, got appointment from somewhere else and he could not join the new Institute in DAV College as Director. It might be due to this fact that the appointment letter could not have been issued at that time. He further said that so far as the question of sources is concerned, as has been stated by Dr. Dalip Kumar, it could be seen how they could utilize the resources of the DAV. He said that disaffiliation issues has been withheld for some time, as has been stated by Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

that there are so many colleges and he agree with him on the point that they neither get Assistant Professor nor they get Associate Professors. They have been passing through these circumstances. He said that this is the flow of time and it will pass but they have to play the positive role in discussion.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that in his view, two issues needs to be clarified. One is which has taken by Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu in the Syndicate and another is Shri Ashok Goyal and he has to request to these two persons to take note of the things.

Professor Mahmood Akhtar said that the matter should be dealt with as per University regulations. If it is against the regulations, they should not go for it. He said that the policy for all the college should be uniform. If the concession is given to one, the others may also be eligible for them.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired as to if the students admitted has been taken through the CAT and secondly what conditions were imposed by the NAAC and if the condition of having separate institute was imposed, as to whether that condition has been fulfilled. He said that the issue has been in there since 2017. He further said that the Vice Chancellor should take the reply from the DAV authorities as to if they have made admission to MBA through CAT or not. As per the AICTE guidelines, there should have been a separate Institute, have the DAV management constructed that or not. The thirdly which has recently been stated by Professor Navdeep Goyal that as per Principal Sangha, that it should be uniform for all, have they ever raised such an issue in the Syndicate because they sit in the affiliation Committees, that there should be a uniform way for all. He cited an example that there existed a College in Chubarianwali near Malout, which was co-education college earlier, one of the members from our Senate visited that College and he raised an objection and the college was converted to that of college for girls only. He said that they all together opposed the move and now in the Syndicate they have made it the college for girls only. He pointed out that at that time why they have not raised a voice that the parameters should be equal for all. He further said that the authorities should not think that they say that their parameters are equal for all and they give chance to everyone. He said he wanted to disclose the true fact that the managements of the private colleges has been squeezed and pressurized. He said that he is not blaming the all but there are few persons who in the first instance apply pressure tactics on the colleges and when they approach them in turn, then they console them. This is the way of working. He said that it is only the talk of the mouth that all are treated equally. When such persons leave the House, they behave differently. He said that his submission to the House is that the authorities of DAV should be asked as to what were the criteria of admitting the students for MBA. Another issue is of the staff. The authorities have not appointed the Director, the condition of which was to be fulfilled as per AICTE norms. If they have not fulfilled all the conditions imposed and now it is 2017, then there students should be shifted to UIAMS, Panjab University and their institute should be closed.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that they must have a complimentary attitude for affiliated colleges while a college wants to start an MBA or any other new course, to fulfil that ambition, their attitude should be of complimentary nature. He said that the way the DAV has been striving for the last so many years and have attempted to start MBA, it is mostly natural that whenever someone tries to start a new mission, some anomalies are likely to occur. To his view, to commit a mistake does not mean that they engage in larger structures and such a tiny mishaps are not meant to be taken care of in the serious manner by others. He said that Shri Subhash Sharma has very rightly raised the issue and they should correct the things. He said that the DAV has been given complimentary chance time and again, but they should rather correct the things instead of enumerating the list of achievement. He further pointed out that the

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Syndicate has shown its displeasure over the anomalies taking place in the matter but keeping in view of the interests of the students, the remedy was granted for the time being. The affiliation which has been shown in the advertisement to be for the 2019-20, he said that no such affiliation for 2019-20 was given and in fact would not be given. The issue was discussed in the Syndicate that even to the extent that if need be to shift the students to University Business School, the continuation of MBA students in DAV would not be allowed in 2019-20 session and perhaps, the Dean College Development Council was entrusted the task that the DAV authorities should be informed through email or letter telling them that they are not entitled to display the advertisement in the manner until they have affiliation for 2019-20. The Syndicate with its wisdom has properly said that for 2019-20, there would be no affiliation to DAV Institute for MBA programme. He said that the affiliation which has been in force was allowed only for 2018-19 keeping in view the interest of the students and they were asked to stop the advertisement process which was floated by them for 2019-20.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that the issues raised by Dr. Subhash Sharma should be discussed and address firstly. He further said that actually nothing has happened to address to the queries raised by Dr. Subhash Sharma.

The Vice Chancellor said that from the time onwards, the issue based comments should be there on the part of the members.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that in this case the Syndicate had given time in peculiar circumstances. As Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma has said that the Model Code of Conduct was imposed, but even today it is their duty to watch and they have not to allow the even the DAV College to violate any rule, rather, the Syndicate and Senate cannot allow any College to violate any rule. The time which was given to the Institute, in peculiar circumstances, to complete the requirements, was okay, but if the Institute does not meet with the conditions imposed on it, then agreeing to the viewpoint of Dr. K.K. Sharma, he is also of the view that they would shift the students. The time which was taken by the Syndicate in the interest of students, should be given. They were also talking about the parameters and added that those parameters are not correct. The Inspection Committees which visit the Colleges have put some conditions on them, but their yardstick is not the same and it would create problems in the Affiliation Committee meeting. Different Inspection Committees have imposed different conditions for different Courses. In one college, it has imposed the condition for appointment of two teachers whereas in the other college it has put the condition of appointment of one teacher to teach the same course. Somewhere, the condition for appointment of one *ad hoc* teacher is being imposed and at other places the condition of appointing four regular teachers has been imposed. So, the yardstick is not the same. He informed that he visited one college where a teacher told him that there is strength of 125 students and three Commerce Teachers are required to teach the students. In some of the colleges, there are four units and four teachers are teaching the course. He urged the Vice Chancellor that some parameters should be set, otherwise there would be a lot of problem in the Affiliation Committee meeting.

Professor Manoj Kumar Sharma said that this issue has been going on for the last many years before he (Vice Chancellor) joined the University. In his department, in particular, many years ago some vested interests did not allow to start M.Com. in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University. When he was a student, he was also a victim of that decision. There were very few departments in Northern India which had MBA. They did not incur the management education to spread to various Colleges and other places. Secondly, after so many debates, the M.Com was started. They know today one of the best M.Com. student in India is their Registrar. He is a product of this University. Thirdly, a few years back, their children, they were going to the South

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

because they did not give them opportunities to the good Institutes of Northern India to start MBA course over here. Fortunately, after so much struggle, they have been able to get some MBA Course started in one college. He is not going to discuss about the merits and demerits as to what has happened there, that is something which could be objective and subjective thing, but his humble request to the House is that for the sake of management education, it is very-very important that some of the Institutes are hundred times better than those shops running in and around Chandigarh which impart third grade management education and so he would like that the current management course should be encouraged and these should not be closed.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that her issues are not directly related to the DAV College. She would like to talk about the affiliation and approvals only.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that first they should conclude the issue of DAV College only.

Dr. Subhash Subhash Sharma said that the discussion is being done on one issue again and again. He has just asked three things. The first issue was that when the Inspection Committee visited the College on 23th July, 2017, it has asked about three things, the first point was, requirement of land for the proposed Institute be got separated from the master plan of land allotted to DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh. On this issue, they are not saying anything specifically on this issue and rather talking about using the land/resources commonly. Principal Sandhu has raised some very specific points on this issue in the Syndicate. He would like that Principal I.S. Sandhu should give some clarification on this. Secondly, when this issue was being discussed in the Affiliation Committee, Shri Ashok Goyal in the Affiliation Committee meeting which was held on September, 2018, they have denied the permission. After denying them, they have given them time to complete the requirements till February. Even at that time, Shri Ashok Goyal has raised very serious things on the issue of land separation. He urged that Shri Ashok Goyal and Principal I.S. Sandhu should deliberate on the issue, because the land issue is the most important issue on which they are not talking properly.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that earlier when the fee was raised, there was stone pelting and F.I.Rs. were lodged against the students. This issue was discussed many times and it was said that the F.I.R. would be cancelled. He enquired whether that case dismissed. As regards the issue of DAV College, he said that the DAV College be asked to fulfill the requirements as asked for by the Affiliation Committee. There is no need to have more and more discussion on the issue as nothing would come out of it. If that Institute is closes, then the students of that Institute would definitely go to some private university and they are well aware of the state of affairs of such private Universities.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said the issue related to DAV College has been very well concluded by Professor Manoj Kumar. When they talk about various affiliated colleges, there are many problems, which are also not being solved even by the government. They are not to close the Institutes. But the University has to help to run such Institutes. They should not just become so rigid to the rules without taking into consideration the prevailing circumstances. If some Institute has tried to run the MBA Course, they should help him. However, they should be asked to fulfill the shortcomings pointed out by the Affiliation Committee. The Syndicate has imposed the certain condition on the College and asked them to complete these conditions by February. The College should be given time by excluding the period of Model Code of Conduct. They should not unnecessarily criticize the Institute. He has given a solution of this problem in the last meeting of the Senate. He has said that if the meeting of the

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Affiliation Committee is held in camera, all the problems would be solved, but that suggestion was not accepted so he did not take it ahead. Last time, they have granted affiliation to Satyam College which has never shown the attendance of teachers and students. He would not like to speak anymore on this issue now and requested that this issue should be closed down.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Dr. Subhash Sharma was talking about his statement. He wanted to make it clear that neither he was talking against anybody, nor in favour of anybody. At that time also, he had given the statement as per norms and he would repeat the same statement again. As and when there comes a new Course from the UGC, there should be a separate Institute, it should have separate boundary. He had been in the DAV College and there are many good things about the DAV Institutions. But he did not know whether they have followed what he had said, because for the last two years he has not been a member of the Syndicate, he has not even read the report. There was a problem with regard to the staff. They have transferred some staff from the Commerce Faculty to the Institute of Management. He has told them that this could not be done as the staff transferred to Institute of Management belonged to the DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh. He said that at that time, he was the teacher representative and today too, he is the teacher representative. It had been told to them that they had to make different appointments as per the conditions. By doing this, the teachers are likely to be made sufferer. He further said that he did not know what date has been given to them and when it was given. He said that his record of the inspections for the last 10-11 years could be checked, he has always stressed upon compliance after checking the work load. He further said that Dr. Sangha had rightly raised the issue and it was said by Dr. Dalip that in the Colleges of Chandigarh are being made at Rs.15600/-. He had been in the affiliation Committee for long and always reiterated that in government colleges, the courses should not be given and let the colleges run with the old courses because they do not appoint any new teachers. If the conditions are imposed on the affiliated colleges, then we must put conditions on others too. He further said that even today the government colleges are being given new courses and all should make efforts that there happens appointments. He said that the present scenario is that the conditions which are imposed on the colleges, they are not complied with and they try to avoid it. He said that he would like to make appeal that if the DAV has fulfilled the conditions, then the affiliation could be given, if not the University should not give approval.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they had resolved and he would tell about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that much was done on the part of Dr. Subhash Sharma while resolving in the Syndicate. He said that the major condition on the issue was that the Land of the Institute should be got separated as per the master plan and now it is 2019 and it is being said by them they no separation of land have been made and Principal Josan has recently told that the separation has been done and what is the stand of the University over the issue as to which of the two has been saying rightly. As to why the University could not explain about it till now or it does not want to tell. He said that the Vice Chancellor has been commanding that do not respond to each other and he himself (Vice Chancellor) has not been responding by this time. He said that it could have been said by the Vice Chancellor at some intervals that before proceeding further in the matter, let the things be made clear.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has told to everyone that they should be very clear and specific. All have been said to be very specific on the issues. What he could do if anybody diverts.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there comes any contradictory thing on the issue, he feels that clarification should be sought from the very person at the moment so that the discussion is shortened.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could only be possible if all are ready for it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is indulging only in specific talks.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could be right with him (Ashok Goyal) and what about the others.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor has rightly said that he is a member of the Syndicate and according to him, the proceedings of the Syndicate meeting is with Dr. Subhash Sharma.

Dr. Subhash Sharma intervened to say that the proceedings of the last meeting of the Syndicate have not come to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to bring to their kind notice that this issue of grant of affiliation to the Institute of Management has been continuing since 2017-18 and not of 2018-19. The conditions, on which the affiliation was granted to the Institute in the year 2017-18, has the then Syndicate ever tried to get those conditions fulfilled? According to him, it was not done. Had it been done, this issue (for the year 2018-19) would not have been before the Senate? Why it was not done, perhaps, Dr. Subhash Sharma, who was a member of the then Syndicate and other persons, who were in the Syndicate at that time, could know better. The major condition was that the land should be got separated in the Master Plan. Though they have stepped into the year 2019 and they are saying that the land has not been got separated. However, Dr. B.C. Josan has told right now that the land has already been got separated, but who is telling the truth nobody knew because the University has not made it clear so far. The Vice Chancellor is also saying from the very beginning that they should not reply to each other queries, but he himself is also not responding. The Vice Chancellor could also say that before moving ahead, they should first clear this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has to be very specific on the issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if there is any contradiction, the same should be got clarified then and there so that there is no need to discuss the issue at length. Clarifying, he said that the conditions imposed in the year 2017-18 have not so far been fulfilled. The issue raised by Shri Varinder Singh that it should be asked from the Institute whether the admissions were made through CAT or not. It appears to him that all this has been written in the proceedings. In case the conditions have not been fulfilled, what cognizance the then Syndicate has taken. If it was the decision of the Syndicate that the admissions be made through CAT, and if it is not done, what cognizance the University has taken? Till the arrival of 2018-19, if they could not get the conditions fulfilled because the appointment of Director was not made at that time also and even now and if they could not do it within a period of one year. Now, they are talking about 2018-19, and thereafter the affiliation for the year 2018-19 has not been given to them, still the Institute gave an advertisement in the newspapers inviting applications for admission to MBA for the session 2018-19. All these things have already been discussed in the Affiliation Committee and Syndicate. When discussion took place in Affiliation Committee on the issue, Dr. Subhash Sharma was there. Taking into consideration the non-appointment of the requisite staff, non-separation of

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

land and deliberate defiance on the part of the Institution about the instructions issued by the University from time to time and taking into consideration other things like non-fulfilment of requirement of quorum, etc., the affiliation was denied. He admits that even if he did not admit it, it is part of the proceedings of the Syndicate. Thereafter, what happened, the people who were present there, could explain about it in a better way as he himself and Dr. Subhash Sharma were not there. Finally, superseding that denial of affiliation, the decision was taken by the Committee and affiliation was given to the Institute subject to condition that the deficiencies should be fulfilled within a stipulated period. The Institute, which did not fulfil the conditions imposed for the session 2017-18, he should be told as to why the application for grant of affiliation for the year 2018-19 of the same Institute was entertained and why the Inspection Committee was sent only once. Even if the Inspection Committee was sent, the Committee submitted its report stating that the Institute has not even fulfilled the conditions imposed for the session 2017-18. Despite this, when the issue came up in the meeting of the Affiliation Committee, it was told that the students of 1st year have already reached 2nd year of the course, and they have to care of them. Hence, time should be given to the Institute, which was also recommended by the Inspection Committee. Keeping in view the recommendation of the Inspection Committee, time was given to the Institute. Forgetting 2017-18, they are talking about 2018-19 in the context of 2017-18 and 2018-19, whereas the status has not changed in addition to what was recommended by the Inspection Committee in terms of appointment of staff, improvement of infrastructure, etc. They were given time to fulfil the condition by 14th February, 2019, when the session is going to end. After that when it came to Syndicate for consideration, what was the matter of consideration for the year 2017-18, this remained an issue of consideration for the session 2018-19, he should be told that till the end of 2018-19, whether the condition would improve or deteriorate. Keeping all these things in mind that they have to keep in mind the interests of the students of the session 2017-18, who have entered into the 2nd year and going to pass the examination as also of the students of the session 2018-19, they have taken this decision, that the Institute should be given some more time. But, what has been told by Dr. Subhash Sharma is matter of surprise to the Syndicate because even if the minutes have not been made available to the members, the Syndicate took the decision, as has been stated by Dr. K.K. Sharma, that at the moment they are not talking about the session 2019-20 and admissions for the session 2019-20 would not be permitted, as also that the application for grant of affiliation for the session 2019-20 would not be entertained. Dean College Development Council who was present there was specifically instructed that even by mistake or even through an oversight, no Inspection Committee be got appointed for inspection the Institute for grant of affiliation for the session 2019-20. However, whatever Dr. Subhash Sharma is saying, is correct because he has the advertisement in his telephone in which it has been claimed that the Institute is affiliated to Panjab University for session 2019-20, which is a serious matter and needed to be discussed. As far as compliance of conditions, within the period stipulated by the Syndicate, is probably somewhere upto June 2019, that can also be discussed. He further stated that his simple submission in this regard is that if with the change of situation, they do not change their stand. He thinks with this approach, the University is going to achieve greater heights. Unfortunately, with the change of situation, they do not change their stand, which should not happen. Had they been careful in 2017 itself, probably the situation would not have come to this stage. He wanted to put one more question that what Dr. Subhash Sharma could see, could be seen by anybody in the University, the University officials as well the members of the Senate and on the top of that, by the Vice Chancellor himself also, what was appearing in the media, what is being advertised in the newspapers. and what are the real conditions. He has no hesitation in saying that the Vice Chancellor as head of the University, has sometimes, to take *suo motto* notice also of some glaring deficiencies even if these are not pointed

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

out unofficially by the members of the Senate, or Vice Chancellor should not be waiting for the meeting of the Senate or Syndicate, rather like any other member of the Syndicate and Senate, the Vice Chancellor should also come up with some observation and let them discuss those observations that the Syndicate, only keeping in mind the interests of the students, wrongly or rightly, had granted time for three months for the session 2018-19 only and not beyond 2018-19.

On Dr. Mukesh Arora's raising the issue of Government Colleges, the Vice Chancellor said that the issue of appointment in government colleges would be taken up later and let them firstly focus on the issue which was being discussed here.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is one of those members of Syndicate who had taken the decision in 2017 to grant affiliation to Institute of Management with certain conditions. Dr. Subash Sharma and some other persons were the members of that Syndicate. He said that he could say that since 2017 till date, he would like to say three things about this institute, the first one is the emoluments to the staff. As per his information, there are 4 staff members, one of which is Associate Professor and three are Assistant Professors. They are being given the grades of Punjab Government and paid salary accordingly. As such there is complete protection of their salary.

He also knew that the college is not indulged in any malpractice as he had approached Principal (Dr.) Josan for admission to a candidate, who did not want to join a private University, and he was told that the candidate could only be admitted if he had qualified the CAT. Since, the candidate had qualified CAT, he was given admission by the Institute. Thirdly, he would like to point out that he happened to be the employee of DAV from 1969 to 1999 as Lecturer, and he could say with honesty that that the people of DAV never indulged in wrong doings and this could be vouched by the persons who are serving in DAV and present here, whereas the other educational institutions have become shops and are earning profits and are in the possession of properties to the tune of lacs of rupees. The exploitation prevailing in other institutes did not exist in the educational institutions run by the DAV Managements, which was because of the proper management. The loot which exists elsewhere, did not exist because the Trust of DAV is not run on profiteering basis, it has helped them to run the things in correct way. As has been stated by Dr. Dalip Kumar, the interview for the post of Director be conducted at the earliest and thereafter, the number of teachers would be five, which is the requirement. It would be a good opportunity that they help them promote their institute.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that when it comes to the Government Colleges, he would like to say that none is below the grade of Rs.21600/- and once appointed is never expelled. The part-time teachers are being paid to the tune of Rs.53000/-. In private colleges their colleagues who have been working there on contract basis against regular posts they are being paid Rs.21600/- for the last three years. He further said that from that comparative point of view they are in much better position. They approach Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua when they are expelled. So far as the Government colleges are concerned they do not relieve the teachers so appreciation should be made of Government colleges.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that whatever issues have come to fore, at least they are to be addressed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are having bulky agenda and they have to take the decision by limiting the discussion.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it would be very unfair. On the point of order he said that right from the very beginning the Vice-Chancellor said that they should talk to the Vice-Chancellor and he would respond them. Now, the Vice-Chancellor has not been responding to the points raised by the members which they expected of him. Rather, the Vice-Chancellor declared straightaway that there were two options. He said that at least inputs should have come from the part of the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor said that the input would certainly come from his side. He further said that there can be no option except to choose one of the alternatives. In the House, some are in favour and others are not in favour, the decision shall have to be taken reasonably.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there might be different opinions of the members but it will have to be seen that as to what is the opinion of the office in this regard. In the Syndicate of January, 2017 when this decision was taken, four conditions were imposed. Shri Ashok Goyal has also talked about that. The first of the condition was that the land for the proposed institute be got separated. He asked, if the DAV has got it separated it or not? Is the office satisfied with it? It was the most important condition. Secondly, the DAV management was asked to appoint regular faculty in the year, 2017. What did they do in this regard during the last two years? The reason behind denying the affiliation was that they are serial offenders. They did not care for the compliance of the conditions imposed by the University. They even did not report the compliance. They have been given extension time and again. He enquired as to what was the stand of the office for not complying with the conditions imposed in the year, 2017-18 and why they have been entertained in the year, 2019. He further said that once they have been denied affiliation how it happened that they have been given three months extension by the Committee secretly. Even they did not care to reply after the expiry of the three months extension period. He said that the DCDC should clarify as to if they received their reply and if it has been received late then why it has been entertained. The fourth point which he would like to raise is that in case the Controller of Examination was aware of the fact that there existed a centre there, he should have seen as to whether the centre was legitimate or not. If it was illegitimate then what action has been taken? The 5th point is that there are two types of versions of proceedings with the University. There are distinctive opinions in it and what was the stand of the University on it. He further said that without having affiliation they have floated false advertisement in the newspapers and did a fraudulent act. If such type of things happen to occur on the part of any other person there could have been registered an FIR against him. He said that he wanted to know what action the University has been taking on all these issues and what is the opinion of the Chair in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should keep trust in him. His staff has been working on the issue.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that he has to raise one point. He said that they are following the regulatory bodies. He said that so far as the issue of land is concerned, they follow the rules of regulating bodies. For B.Ed. Colleges, there is a requirement of land at least of 5 acre, and it could be verified from the ex-DCDC and the present DCDC, we follow the NCTE conditions and it is less than 2 acre as per NCTE, and in the case of DAV, the UT administration has given its approval, the AICTE has also granted permission and keeping in view all these conditions.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that Professor Parvinder Singh, the then DCDC, whatever was his statement in the Syndicate of 2017, he has the minutes of that Syndicate.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

The Vice Chancellor said that it is somewhat old case. He urged Professor Parvinder Singh, who was then in both the capacities of COE and DCDC, to explain and the present DCDC would give the updates. He further said that one thing more, he would like to tell to the House is that when he got the information from the established sources regarding the admissions in MBA programme, they had taken the immediate cognizance and the matter was brought to the Syndicate and the DAV was given notice immediately.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to if the Controller of Examination is speaking on the behalf of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that what he has to say in this matter, all the members already know it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said this will have to be told by the Vice Chancellor about the statement of the Controller of Examination.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Controller of Examination has always been allowed to speak in the House and also during the tenure of the former Vice Chancellor, if need arise so, the Controller of Examination was made to allow to speak on behalf of the authorities. He further said that as to why a certain persons have been feeling uncomfortable on the eloquence of the Controller of Examination.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that in simple terms, he had no problem over the speaking of the Controller of Examination.

Shri Varinder Singh said that even the FDO was allowed to speak in the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor should remain cautious about the word 'objectionable'.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he has not stated something which may denote the word objectionable.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has nowhere said that the Controller of Examination be not allowed to speak. He has just to say that the Controller of Examination be allowed to speak whatever he wants to but as per the practice whatever the COE will say, it would be on behalf of the Vice Chancellor. He said that Earlier too, whatever the Controller of Examination did speak, that was also on behalf of the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examination said that it was his duty to give clarification on some of the issues which are being raised particularly when he was having the charge of Dean, College Development Council and he was the member of the Survey Committee. He said that probably it was June 2017, as per the constitution of the Survey Committee, they visited that College. The request which was firstly poured to them in the month of February 2017 and that was kept pending. There was a condition on the part of the Panjab University and regulatory body Syndicate did not give clearance to it. After getting the clearance from AICTE, the DAV authorities submit application that they have got approval of the AICTE to start MBA, thereafter, with the permission of Vice Chancellor, the Committee went there and he said that he might be little emotional because he was the student of that College, and he was well aware of the infrastructure of the College and he has got his first lecturer's salary from that College, he did know about the geography and management of the College even though the colleagues of the College were known to him as a teacher. He said that whatever the requirement of MBA was there, and what was their infrastructure and it was written

on the separate Gate of the DAV College, the DAV Institute of Management, Sector 10, Chandigarh. He further said that it was his first observation and in the Syndicate of July 2017, he too had said that it looked improper to him to have another institute within the Institute. He further said that the worthy colleagues of him, who are sitting over here, they would agree with him that this matter was discussed in the meeting of 5th January 2018 which was with the DAV authorities, he was there as Dean, College Development Council. He said that he had brought this issue to their kind notice that everything was well and they give compliments to them for this. It is the duty of the University to promote MBA in colleges but the basic requirements are must to be met and he has read nowhere to have an institute within another one. Dr. Punam Suri, President DAV Managing Committee, had assured that whatever the drawback were there, those would be completed at the earliest. It is on record and whosoever was the Principal of DAV, he was the member of that Committee. Secondly, the issue which was discussed about staff, it was told that they were on deputation. It was told to them as they are already the approved teachers by the Panjab University, then cannot hold the position on deputation in other institute. It was decided that the Commerce teachers of the DAV would be made to impart instruction to the MBA. It was pointed out in the Syndicate and the Syndicate's observation has been appended in the documents. These two pending issues which were in place in the past, there came no solution of it during the session of 2017-18 and 2018-19 to them despite frequent reminders. The remainder was also issued regarding admission. Probably, on 17th July, they had sent a letter and e-mailed was sent requiring that they should not make the admissions by that time. But that was overruled and serious view was taken by the Affiliation Committee of 2018-19 in which Dr. Subhash Sharma, Dr. Amit Joshi and Shri Ashok Goyal were the members. Professor Satish was the Chairperson. The DAV College authorities were asked to fulfil the requirements and they were told in the Affiliation Committee. Our worthy Vice Chancellor was in that Committee, the Dean College Development Council, Dr. Sanjay Kaushik was there. The DAV was given time and after that the second visit was conducted. The affiliation Committee kept on holding meetings and they made the admissions. They were asked as to why they had made the admissions which was not allowed. The data was gathered from the college that the admission process should not have taken place. He continued saying that in May 2018, they came to notice a news item that College Coordinator Dr. Himanshu was attacked by some student. After reading this news, he (COE) gave a call to the Principal (Dr. Pawan) as to how the incident happened. He said that he was informed that they were prohibiting the students from copying, followed by the attack outside. He (COE) tried to meet him but he was hospitalized. There was no Superintendent because the Centre was merged. He took round of the college because he did know all about the buildings of the College. When he came from the other side, the person asked him to come to another side, but he told him that he would not go there as it is the Institute, and the person told that the examination is going on there. He expressed his displeasure then and there as to why the Centre is going on in that building. He did agree that there was a Centre in the Institute of Management, but that Centre was meant only for conduct of MBA Examination, whereas they were talking about the examination which was going on. At that time, there was no much strength of students, which might have compelled the College to hold examination in that building. He disagreed, and told them that this should not be done. The person said that he will tell the Superintendent, but at the moment the examination is going on, what should they do? He just wanted to clarify that the displeasure was conveyed to the Superintendent also and explicitly told that the building was meant for the Institute of Management only. He went to two or three rooms and they were told that this should not recur. Thereafter, he gave the report to his branch and instructed that action be taken immediately and the flying squad must be told that there should be no seating plan for Institute building. They can only make use of their furniture, their infrastructure and they can have the common pooling as

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

and when required because there are number of occasions when the strength of students exceeds thousand. Then there is no option for the Principal how to allow the students instead of sitting outside and that could be managed. But on that day, there was no such a situation. He felt that it was being misused. Thereafter, a meeting took place in September and October to discuss the issue, and then his colleague, Dr. Sanjay Kaushik took over as Dean College Development Council and he (COE) was not a part in that meeting. However, on that day, he (COE) was informed that only a Centre for MBA would be created there. Since the examination has commenced, the Committee took the decision, on behalf of the Syndicate. That was why, MBA Centre was created on 1st December 2018, this was the background of the issue.

Dr. Sanjay Kaushik, Dean College Development Council, said that the earlier position (from 2017 till date) has already been explained. So far as the status of DAV Management affairs is concerned, he said that they received request for approval of the faculty members, who had been appointed in the Institute, but because the quorum was not complete, they refused the approvals. They again received a letter from the Institute that the Director were present in the interview, but somehow her signatures were not there and they have written that the quorum was complete and approvals should be given. This was the second letter, and they again refused approval saying that she did not join the Institute. They had written the word "Director Designate" and someone informed that no such position of 'Director Designate' existed. That was how, the approval of the appointed persons was refused once again. So far as the position of Director is concerned, the interview it is yet to be held, three months restriction was there as the model code of conduct was enforced by the Election Commission of India. Though the panel was given thrice, the interview could not be held, and the Director is yet to be appointed. So far as land issue is concerned, the same has already been explained. The advertisements for admission to MBA course for the session 2019-20 appeared in the newspapers and the University asked the College not to make admissions till the issue is resolved. This is the current situation.

Dr. Subhash Sharma, while pointing to the DCDC, said that he wanted to add something more to his statement that the affiliation Committee had given the period of up to 14th February that they should comply with the conditions imposed. The email was sent to the college on 14th February. He wanted to know as to if the report from the college side had come prior to the issue of email or it had reached after the email. It is understood it might not have come prior to the email because email was done as the report was not received. He said that he wants to know at what point of time, the email was sent to the college and at what time, the reply was received.

The Dean College Development Council responded that they waited till 5.00 p.m. on 14th February and roughly a couple of minutes after 5 o'clock.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it means that they have already waited till 5 p.m. and email was sent after 5 p.m. It is evident that the report might have come after 5 p.m.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if the stipulation period of three months is seen, it is such that they are so serial offenders. They even did not care that the affiliation Committee had given them three months time but they did not want to give any reply. This was their seriousness. He further said that whatever the issues he had raised, he wanted that all should be authenticated. The Centre has been created violatively, advertisement has been issued in the newspapers unauthorizedly. There has become the mockery of the University.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the interview was scheduled for 12th February and they had visited the college but the interview could not be held.

On this Dr. Subhash Sharma raised a query that then the reply should have been given. He said that they should be taught a lesson that their University is not a joke and their system is not a mockery.

The Vice Chancellor said that his observation is very straight forward. After going through the basic given by each and every member on the issue as well as the officials of the University that they have examined entire thing relating to the affiliation and appointment of Director in DAV. He said that there were three basic things which he has observed. The first one is that the conditions were not satisfied, whatever the conditions they put starting from the year 2017 almost, always there is some sort of slackness on the part of the Institution. Secondly there are the anomalies existing in a system. The third one is that there are two proceedings of Selection Committee that they received. He said that in the light of the given circumstances, let them conclude as number one, time for complying with conditions or not to give time and proceed with disaffiliation.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that straightaway the process for disaffiliation should be initiated as they have already given them enough time. They have been giving time since January 2017. Two years have passed and they are giving the advertisement for 2019-20.

The Vice Chancellor said that those who have taken time to speak, should refrain from intervening by this time because they have now to conclude.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the affiliation would be withdrawn if it would have been granted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is meant by the Vice Chancellor that the people who had spoken will not be allowed to speak more now. It carries the meaning that now the matter would be referred to the jury. He objected to the Vice Chancellor's categorizing the members into Seniors and Juniors. He said that all are equal here. No discrimination should be there.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he had listened very carefully to arguments and counter-arguments. He said that they are handicapped because this is not an item agenda and there are no papers and they are not able to see one or the other thing. The second thing is that the zero hour is very useful in communicating the views of the Senate to the Vice Chancellor but is not wary for the Calendar and therefore it would be very embarrassing if a decision on whatever has happened in the House. It would be better if all these points are noted and then examined at the administrative level and then bring it according to the established procedure before the Syndicate or Senate, whatever it is, so that nobody should say that he was not aware and he need time of a decision which has been taken in the zero hour, and he is protesting that zero hour is not in Calendar and the University have to communicate him in a letter that they agree that it is not in the calendar and the Senate cannot be seen violating the Calendar. There is no serious embarrassment in it.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that in general there is a problem balancing, balancing the needs of the society and the balancing tact that the institutions do not exploit to students or teachers. He said that when institution started an MA courses, they are not going to build infrastructure because they are not sure about its persistence. The infrastructure comes gradually and sometimes our rules are so rigid that they counter to it. For example for having a separate land, if the institution has not

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

been using it properly without authenticating the institution there, then why should be they so rigid. It seems that the rule is everything, the rule is above the objective. In that situation, when it comes to taking of their responsibility, that look, rules are there and we respect them. Here the objective should be above the rules, the thing which needs to be seen that the students are not shortened and teachers are not shortened. The decision should be taken that we give them probation for one year and they should be asked if they do not follow the condition, they would not be allowed to continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Bambah should conclude and the members should keep patience.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that he had been invited to speak. He said that they should have open mind about the objectives. The rules should not become everything. The objectives here are that they are managing a course, they must rise, the rules should not become such a thing that it sets bad precedence. He said that taking all precautions, as Shri Sibal had said that they cannot take a decision but suggestion could be made to the Vice Chancellor that he (Vice Chancellor) might insist that the affiliation for 2019-20 were not given, and which would only be given after satisfying the conditions imposed and the students taken earlier cannot be disposed off and the staff which is there be allowed to continue to be there, but no further admission will be made until the decisions by the University are made. He further said that it was just a suggestion, but decision can only be taken if there would have been an agenda item on it. He further said that they should not unnecessarily make the things to halt but on the same time, it should be ensured that rules are respected and there would be no affiliation and the students which are there, be allowed to complete their course and no further admissions be made until conditions are satisfied.

Professor Chaman Lal said that first of all, he wanted to clarify it that he did not interrupt Professor Bambah. Firstly the Vice Chancellor asked me to speak and then Professor Bambah was allowed to speak. He said that he with full respect wanted Professor Bambah to continue. So he should not be put in between the things. He wanted to speak on the two issues. The one is on the affiliation issue. There had been good debate that about affiliation, the University has been very lax, very selective, very partisan, some colleges are given preference, some colleges are targeted as such and lot many colleges are violating the University rules with impunity and without any check and without a guilt but he wanted to see from this collateral expression that Institution of DAV which is one of the biggest education institution and like Khalsa College, there are two three which are biggest kind of education promoters. This should be taken as a message that DAV College in case of this particular admission should be censored but not as an inclusive institution. It should be added to that any college whosoever it may be or its management, they should be given a kind of warning that if they will violate the University rules, they shall also be censored, censored in number one thing, they have already noted, that such and such are the issues. He further said that he also acknowledged that DAV institution has played very great role from the freedom struggle to the post-independence in the field of education and the Khalsa College also. He said that this should be kept in mind while taking a decision. Thirdly, he said that in case of violation of rules and actions in affiliation matters or other versions of college system. He suggested that this Senate can start a new practice, however it might not be agreed by many a members, but it is his suggestion that any college which is violating University principles and University practices, rules of education and other things like salary of teachers, we should start fining those institutions. We should start fining colleges if they are not giving proper salaries, one lac or five lac rupees fine. He said that finding system should be started and it should be made a practice. He further said that even they are not giving proper salary to the staff, we should also be penalized. He further said that in the instance case, after censoring and putting some fine as a token

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

money but he is also in favour of giving them more one month since the report, etc. has come. One more month should be given to fulfil all the conditions and they do not want to harass the students because students are the primary concern for any institution. He further said that as has been stated by Shri Ashok Goyal that everybody here is equal, he said that he will support Shri Ashok Goyal. He said that even he has more respect for Professor Bambah than the Vice Chancellor but he wanted to tell one thing that everybody whether he is MP, Minister and in this House each one is equal and the Vice Chancellor should give equal time to each one. He (Vice Chancellor) has been giving more time to some people and giving less time to others. Here so much time has been given to Dr. Subhash Sharma and others have been denied that.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that for the last about two and a half hours, they have been discussing over the item which has been permitted in the name of the Zero Hour. He said that about two and quarter of a hour have been spent by both the parties on placing the facts and both the sides have submitted their view about as to if permission was granted or not, two months, four months, quorum, low quorum etc. and at about 12.15 p.m. two proposals were placed by the Vice Chancellor before the House. Now it will take one or two hours to discuss about which of the proposal is to be accepted and it may be presumed that after four hours discussion, it would be decided that let the things go in its present way. He said that he had two requests to put before the Vice Chancellor. If this practice is started today, the agenda would become bulky having items along with proceedings of Senate and Syndicate. He asked as to why these documents have been appended with the agenda. He could recall that once there had been started a practice in this very House that the proceedings of the Syndicate would not go the Senators. He put a query that if the proceeding of the Syndicate would not be with them, how they would come to know about the matters. He said that once there happened to be the times when even when an application was submitted, the photocopy of which happened to be distributed among the members. Why it was so. The purpose of this was that whenever they are going to discuss any item, there should have been complete facts about that with the members. He said that the Senate is an academic body and it is not a political body and they are expected of judicial decisions. It is expected of us that keeping in view all the facts, decision be delivered. He continued saying that for the first time, he wanted to request the Vice Chancellor in principle while favouring or not favouring the DAV and whether DAV have justified the case of not, he did not want to go in that direction. He said that if this practice is introduced, which in his view, is being started for the first time, he had never seen it before, during zero hour, it has never been demanded that this College should be disaffiliated and after discussion, you disaffiliate the College or not. He said that he is suspicious about the post meeting happenings when some of the Hon'ble members would come with a proposal to disaffiliate this or that college. it might be of Khalsa College, DAV College, Government College and sometimes it would be of Garhdiwala, etc. He said that it was his request to all the Hon'ble members of the House that by flowing into their emotionality, they should not introduce this practice. He said that it is his first suggestion and Shri Sibal and Professor Bambah might have their own views on the issue. Rather he considered them as 'Bhisham Pitamah' and he can never think of equating with them. There has been a custom of paying heed to the advice of the Seniors.

He continued saying that if the suggestion of withdrawing the affiliation is acted upon which is one of the option, supposedly it is done, at least the persons who know about the legal background of the issue, would not give approval to it. He said that they are going to take action against an institute without issuing any notice to them, the institute would approach the Court and relief would be given within five minutes to the effected institute.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

On this, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is the prerogative of the Senate.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that it is not the point of order. This is the way to interrupt the speaker. He is doing wrong. To talk about the point of order, one must understand the concept of point of order first. He told Shri Subhash Sharma that when he was speaking, he did not interrupt him. Shri Jain asked Dr. Subhash Sharma to learn first as to how to respect the elders.

He continued saying that today the proposal put up forth by the Vice Chancellor, which has now come to fore, his request to the Vice Chancellor is that this should not be started as a practice. The Vice Chancellor has listened to all, all the pros and opposites, their proceedings have also been heard, of the seniors and juniors also, his submission to the Vice Chancellor is that after listening to all the facts, the Vice Chancellor should act as per law, whatever appropriate step he deems fit. He said that he did not want to quote that under regulation 13, the Vice Chancellor has been empowered to give permission, which he did not want to challenge. The Senate shall not consider any item which is not in the interest of the general public. He further added that even if there comes emergency, as has been seen in the instant case, there has been no consensus. Some are in favour and others are not in favour, then do the affiliation or disaffiliation would be decided by voting. He quoted the example that for the appointment of former Registrar, Col. G.S. Chadha, he had opposed to the appointment, there took a discussion on it. Someone suggested that let there be voting. He said that he opposed such a move. He continued saying that it would be most unfortunate for the University if the appointment, affiliation and disaffiliation matter start decided by voting. These are the matter, which are to be decided after rising from the judicial point of view. He said that it might be his liking or disliking, He said that it has been stated by many a members that this practice is prevalent in all the colleges, it is in the Government colleges and somewhere is in the Private colleges also. He said that it is about 12.30 p.m. and it is his request to the Vice Chancellor that if they have to spend more than three hours on non agenda items, then there was no need of sending agenda. He said that two bulky volumes has been sent to them, the matter could be included in the agenda, it has been written here that if some member want to raise the issue, he could bring the facts. No documentary records are available to the members. He said that he being a lawyer cannot give any solution until we see all the documents of the either sides, they cannot give any solution. No decision could be given without hearing to both the side. He said that it is his proposal and it is up to the Vice Chancellor or the House to admit it or not. He said that after examining all the facts, the decision should be made as per law. If they think, affiliation is to be withdrawn, then after bringing item into the concerned body, if it is Senate or Syndicate and take action against them. He said that if it would be attempted to take decision after bringing item into the zero hour, nobody would be safe. There would be every possibility of bringing any type of item, against anyone and it would not be in the interest of the University. He said that University will persist for ever, irrespective of the existence of the one person or another. Such type of practice should not be started that may increase our problems in the time to come instead of reducing it.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that the item is very much is in the agenda and all the documents have been appended with it. One should have come after reading the agenda so as to have full acquaintance with the issue. The items are in volume II in ratification section.

Shri Varinder Singh Gill said that it was being realized for the last long time that there could not be held any meeting. However Shri Satya Pal Jain had been saying right. The other thing is that they feel that despite of putting resolutions and giving in written they feel that they have deliberately disordered the things with the University. It

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

was only that the matter was being discussed today here. If there would have been continuity in the matter, they might have discussed in the last Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is agreed with Hon'ble Satya Pal Jain, Professor Bambah and Shri Sibal that by raising an issue during Zero Hour, because they are not on the agenda, the decision are not taken. He said that even on the persuasion of the Vice Chancellor, he might have not ready to speak it the Vice Chancellor in the very beginning would have not given the ruling that let the decision be taken on the issue after discussion. He further added that he was surprised that none from the House objected to the proposal that decision cannot be taken by raising the issues in the zero hour, despite of the fact, to which he agreed that he did not want to speak because of the fact that he did realize that it was not a new practice which they are going to start, where one or two such type of practices have happened to start. He said that perhaps S.P. Jain was not in that meeting. He respectfully did want to say to the Vice Chancellor that if they start taking decisions by taking the issues in Zero hour which is not on the agenda, it would not be in the interest of the Institution. He said that he wanted to bring it into the kind notice of the Vice Chancellor that one of the member has left the House after murmuring that no documentary papers or agenda papers are with them and a few persons who know the issue very well are discussing it and they just want to get it decided through their just presence. The person is Professor Shelley Walia. They have left the House.

Shri Varidner Singh said that it might be that Professor Shelley Walia had left the meeting but what about the resolution which had been moved by them. The nineteen persons had given in writing as to if they have not set an example that the Special Senate was to be convened but despite of that the Special Senate have not been held.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this is a particular item it has been written in the agenda very much, i.e. item No. 146. If they have not read out the agenda, then what they can do to it

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that if the item was in the agenda, then the discussion must have taken place on the agenda. They have been taking the advantage of both the sides. He said that if the item is in agenda, then the discussion should be made when the items come before the House for discussion.

Dr. Subash Sharma raised the question as to why such an important agenda has not been brought in consideration items. He further said that if the technicalities of the Colanders are to be seen, then where it has been written that there was no affiliation for the session 2017-18 and affiliation for 2019-19 be given.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Calendar of the University has been drastically violated by them. It has happened for the first time in the History of Syndicate that they have made mockery of the Calendar.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked that the Vice Chancellor should issue a statement as to whether the rules have been violated or not. The query of Dr. Dua was supported by Shri Naresh Gaur.

A din prevailed.

Shri Varinder Singh said that really they could be accused of violative of the rules. He further said that on the demise of Shri Raghbir Dyal who had still some time of his term, a wrong person has been replaced vice him in the Board of Finance by

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

them. The person on whom there were the charges of corruption that has been appointed in the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor said that the way the things are going on, the House cannot be run.

Dr. Subash Sharma said that they cannot be selective in reading rules and regulations. If we are not following the rules and regulations of affiliation, we have not any right to say that this or that regulation states about zero about such and such.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he wanted to know as to which power the Syndicate have that while the government had issued NOC to run the course and that NOC had been dismissed by them and the Syndicate had passed that the course be made to be closed. He further said that the Syndicate has become so reign-less that it rests at his will to do whatever it wants and reject otherwise. He put a query that while the decisions were being taken, was the Chairperson of Syndicate not aware of what the rules prevailed. He said that firstly the Vice Chancellor should clarify on it, it is only after that the proceedings of the Senate would be allowed to move further. He insisted on having the reply from the side of the Vice Chancellor. Why the Vice Chancellor had allowed the things to happen.

The Vice Chancellor said that now nobody would be allowed to speak. They should now listen to the resolution which they are bringing in.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is holding the floor and he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that he would not allow anybody now to speak.

Just because I did not interrupt anybody, even if, somebody was speaking, please listen to me. I told you that I agree with those people, who are saying that as per Regulations decision can't be taken on an issue by raising it during Zero Hour. After it, when the Vice Chancellor gave the ruling that we have to take this decision, so, on asking of the Vice Chancellor, I have just narrated the facts. I have not talked about any merits or demerits. But, after listening the facts, the Vice Chancellor gave the proposal that we do this or that. At that time, this thing cropped up that without Agenda we can't decide. And, if we can't decide without an Agenda, then this thing should have been told in the beginning that give the inputs, based on that input we will decide what course of action is to be adopted. Now, if we go with the Chair then it appears that the Chair did not remember the Regulations at that time. And, if we don't go with the Chair then it appears that it used to happen earlier also than what is the problem today. Hence, please tell me what way we have i.e. to agree with it or not. We should abide by the Regulations or not. As Chairman of the Committee please guide us, as till today we have not understood it.

Addressing to the Chair, Shri Ajay Ranga said that through you it is my request to Shri Ashok Goyal to answer that during the last Syndicate meeting. However, before he could say anything further, the Vice Chancellor interrupted him and did not allow him to put any question/s to Shri Ashok Goyal. At this, Shri Ajay Ranga asked the Vice Chancellor that whether any Agenda Item relating to policy in context of Dental Institute of the University was brought in the last meeting of Syndicate. Here again, the Vice Chancellor interrupted him and did not allow him to say anything further. At this stage, Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that lot of things have been said just now that it was not there in Agenda Item and you decided it in Zero Hour. He further stated that in last to last Syndicate meeting the item related to the post of Dean Research was not there in the Agenda and no other Agenda Item was discussed by the Syndicate for four hours till the time it was presented. At that time why this thing was not remembered that how

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

could it be discussed without the Agenda Item. How the Syndicate took a decision without an Agenda? When you have to do something you can do anything and today you are teaching us that decisions can't be taken during Zero Hour. Was the Agenda Item concerning the post of Dean Research there in the Agenda of the Syndicate? And if it was not there, then how without taking up the Agenda it was deliberated upon till lunch? Dr. Sharma asked the Vice Chancellor, tell me where the post of Dean Research is there in the Calendar. And the Calendar, wherein there is no post of Dean Research, the Syndicate, without an Agenda Item, appointed the Dean Research. Where are the Rules and Regulations, and they talked of Calendar? It is the height.

Addressing the Vice Chancellor, Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that my question is to you that if during Zero Hour or without an Agenda Item we can't take a decision then is it person specific that if he/she raises an issue, decision will not be taken on his/her issue. If the Agenda Item concerning the post of Dean Research was not there in Agenda of Syndicate, decision was taken on that, who took that, you were also there.

To this, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the decision was taken in violation of the Calendar.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that no issue concerning the policy of Dental College was brought in the last meeting of Syndicate. And the people who labored for the last 12 years to make a policy for those people, there the Syndicate took the decision without an Agenda item. Before that six Committees were constituted and 12 years have elapsed, & whenever any policy is about to be clinched a new Committee is constituted. He asked the Chair is it not an exploitation. Is it not a violation of the Calendar? He asked the Vice Chancellor to reply to it. If you take a decision there by violating the Calendar and exploiting those people for the last 12 years, you are again constituting a Committee, and if you add two members in that, then the Hon'ble Members say that we will not attend the meetings of the Committee.

Shri Varinder Singh intervened to say that in the similar manner a member was added in Board of Finance i.e. without any Agenda item.

Continuing further, Shri Ranga further stated that Shri Varinder Singh has given you a letter for Board of Finance, but till date you have not brought it on record and without it, the Syndicate decided it and forwarded it. At this the Vice Chancellor stated that we will discuss on all the issues. Shri Ranga asked the Vice Chancellor that whether the discussion will be held and decision will be taken or not. The Vice Chancellor stated that we will take. Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is a serious violation and if discussion can be held at that time why it can't be held now and the Vice Chancellor should revoke all the decisions. Shri Ajay Ranga said an issue has been raised and no decision is being taken, only talks are being held.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the Committee has been changed by the Vice Chancellor.

At this stage the pandemonium prevailed as several members started speaking at the same time.

Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that you kept me as a member of the Committee and we worked very hard, read various policies, and then one fine morning we come to know that a new Committee has been constituted for the purpose. Does their time has no value? It is a matter of humiliation. You constitute a Committee and without waiting for its report, you constitute a new Committee. Why it is happening? Selective things of the Calendar will not do. If Calendar has to be implemented then it will have

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

to be implemented on all including the Syndicate. How the Syndicate is taking decisions without Agenda? Addressing Dr. Subhash Sharma, Shri Sandeep Singh stated that you say this or that thing happens in Syndicate and decisions are taken as per will. I want to tell you that decisions, which are taken in Syndicate or during Zero Hour are not implemented even after the conduct of two-three successive meetings of Syndicate. Shri Sandeep Singh further stated that what you are talking our here is the same, but what is needed to be pondered upon is what we want to do. At this stage the pandemonium prevailed as many members started speaking at the same time. Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that arbitrary practice will not do. Shri Jarnail Singh addressing the Chair said that this is not the way of conducting the meeting. So, kindly bring the House in order. He further stated that we are discussing this issue for the last three hours, so, please clinch the issue. Further, he wanted to give his opinion about the issue, but, the Vice Chancellor said that he is there to give the opinion.

Shri Tarlochan Singh addressing the Vice Chancellor said that he will take only two minutes and would like to clear that from where the practice of Zero Hour started. He said that Zero Hour is the practice of Parliament. In parliament, first hour of every day is Zero Hour and every Member of Parliament, who has to speak in Zero Hour, gives it in writing one day prior to start of the session that I may be allowed to speak during Zero Hour. Every member is allowed three minutes time. Three minutes are given to raise any issue of your choice in Parliament but there is no discussion on that. The only option is that if the Minister concerned wants to give reply then he can reply immediately. Otherwise, that is noted and later on the Minister In charge sends a written reply to the Member, who has raised the issue. Discussion during Zero Hour is never allowed in Parliament. Further, speaking on the discussion, so far held in the meeting, he said that every member has a right to speak and whatever has happened has happened. We have had quite a lengthy discussion on the matter and as per me the intention of the DAV Institution was not bad. They were trying to help the people of Chandigarh, as all Members are saying that there is need of management courses, as all go to South. So, if they were keen to start it, we should appreciate it. As far as what members have spoken about rules and regulations, I agree with them. These should be applied. Speaking about the fault, he said that I don't think it is of the Institution. The Institution is very big and it has served the society a lot. Chief Justice of India has remained its Chairman and even today learned personalities are members of its Board, as Professor Chaman Lal Ji told me just now. It is my submission that in order to resolve the issue within two-three days, after due compliance of Rules and Regulations, let Vice Chancellor appoint a new Committee of three-four senior Members of the House and Institute's representatives. Students should not suffer and we should not ignore the positive fact of such a long debate and keeping the good cause of students in mind we all should do it by coming together. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan addressing the Chair stated that you have not replied to my question. Why the College is suffering. At this stage din prevailed, as many members started speaking at the same time. The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to read the resolution. The Registrar said that this is not a resolved part but on behalf of the Vice Chancellor what would be recorded after listening to view point of Hon'ble Members that in the interest of the students, time, as given by the Syndicate, may be allowed for 18-19, however, no affiliation for 19-20 will be granted till all conditions are satisfied for 18-19 and further after following due procedure affiliation will be granted. Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that the Syndicate has already decided the same. The college, which is a serial offender continuously, why you are granting it a time of three months again and again? Already enough time has been given and it is not acceptable to me at all. He asked the Chair that what the University Administration has done in respect of the advertisement published by the Institute, double-double proceedings recorded by the Institute and non- advertisement of post of Professors. He stated that it is not acceptable. He further asked the Chair to

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

form a Committee for this, which, after inquiry, should give its report within 5-7 days, otherwise, it is not acceptable.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Institute has not been granted affiliation for 2019-20.

Dr. Subhash Sharma stated that it is not an issue of 2019-20. The issue is that in 2018-19 the Institute did not have teachers, Director, infrastructure, land is not got separated, etc. Why you are forcing the students to study over there and doing injustice to them.

The Vice Chancellor stated that in the interest of students, affiliation for 2018-19 has been allowed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked that for how long would they allow them in the interest of students? They would not entertain their application for grant of affiliation to the Institute for 2019-20 until they fulfil the conditions, including separation of land. He further said that as to what action the University is going to take against the Institute for giving advertisement in the newspapers for admission of students for the session 2019-20 saying that the Institute is affiliated to Panjab University. Similarly, what action has been taken by the University against the Institute for sending two different set of proceedings of the Selection Committee for the same appointment(s). First, this should be made clear and so far as affiliation is concerned, it is a secondary issue. He remarked that they are intentionally misleading the people. What action is to be taken by the University against the Institute in this regard? He urged the Vice Chancellor to form a Committee immediately to collect all the facts and proposed action as suggested by Shri Tarlochan Singh. The Committee should comprise Shri Ashok Goyal, Shri Tarlochan Singh and another member and requested the Chair to announce the Committee. Addressing the Vice Chancellor he said that they authorize him (Vice Chancellor) to form a Committee, which will discuss all these issues and suggest a remedy.

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested the Registrar to read out the resolved part, as we have authorized the Vice Chancellor to form a Committee.

Prof. Pam Rajput while speaking on the matter stated that Shri Sibal has raised a legal point, the reply of which has not come and you please give the reply of that to approve the formation of Committee proposed by Dr. Subhash Sharma. She also requested the Chair to clinch the issue, if the Zero Hour has started. Addressing the Vice Chancellor she stated that you have congratulated the Prime Minister and there was a news item on front page of yesterday's newspaper, "100 Days Education Agenda for Higher Education.," She further stated that she has with her minutes of the meeting, which was held with the Secretary, Higher Education. As per the minutes of the said meeting 05 lakh posts are going to be filled. Referring to the ongoing discussion, she stated that all this will keep going, but we should look at the interest of Panjab University and should try to get the ban lifted, which is imposed on filling up of the posts, because our Departments are suffering a lot. And we should not think of about filling up of these 26 posts only. She further stated that Hon'ble Chancellor of the University had wished the University to scale greater heights of glory. And it is possible only if we appoint good faculty. So, please look towards it too. Secondly in many Departments we are managing the teaching work with Guest Faculty, till the time the posts are not filled up, and UGC has done a very commendable job by enhancing their remuneration from Rs.1000/- to Rs.1500/- per lecture. But, I am surprised that a letter has gone to all the Chairpersons of the Department saying that when the Guest Faculty is provided, it will work from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. As per her, the circular is

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

totally illegal and it should be withdrawn and the Guest Faculty should be allowed to take lectures as per their need. She requested the Chair to kindly take notice of it.

Dr. Sarabjit Kaur addressing the Vice-Chancellor stated that UGC is releasing care list of journals on 31st May 2019. Many of our Colleges and University departments are publishing research journals and she request your good self to provide required information and guidance to include these journals in the list of “UGC care list of Journals”, in our University, which will recommend our Journals, as we do not know. Number two ICSSR is there and it should be made clear to Colleges and Departments that whether it is valid or not. Secondly, she stated that NCTE norms are followed in our Colleges of Education. Inspection Committees visiting the Colleges of Education for extension of affiliation are imposing conditions to appoint Teaching and Non-Teaching staff. No doubt NCTE norms should be followed but care should be taken to check the number of admission in B.Ed. and M.Ed. courses and recommendations for appointment should be made accordingly. Hence, the matter needs to be reconsidered and accordingly please get it reviewed through a Committee or otherwise. The third issue is related to affiliation. University is not granting approvals of Principals and Assistant Professor should be a time bound exercise as cases for approvals are pending from a long time, approximately 4 years. Hence, it should be made a time bound process, irrespective of the fact that whether you accept it or reject it, i.e. up to you, but the process should be transparent. Another demand of starting M.A. Education in Colleges of Education is a pending issue which needs your immediate attention. Affiliated colleges are assets for this University, financially as well as publically, as the education has to be imparted in remote areas too. But, we are denying MA in Education on the basis that NCTE needs to be approached for this. NCTE has no role in recognizing MA Education, only University is authorized. She stated that we are very liberal in creating examination centers and one college i.e. GGS College of Education, Malout, your university had inspected that college approximately two years back and members are sitting in this House only. But, till date no examination center has been created in that particular college. She needed to know the reason. She stated that examination Centre of Guru Gobind Singh College of Education, Theri, Malout need to be created at the earliest. All the conditions imposed by the Committee have been already fulfilled by the College, but, still they are going to a far off place in the interior of Malout to give the examinations. Kindly pursue it.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to express the issues, if any, within two minutes.

Dr. Mukesh Arora, addressing the Chair stated that some Chowkidars were appointed by the University, who were later on deputed as Security Guards. Many of the said Chowkidars, who were appointed by 2008, have been granted the grade of Security Guards. But, those, who were appointed in 2009 or after it, have not been granted the same, hence, the grade of Security Guard may please also be granted to them. Secondly, the admissions are going to start and the tenure of DSW is up to 31st May, and, therefore, please let us know whether extension has been granted to him or not. If yes, we may congratulate him and if not, then please throw some light on the status of the case, as it would be better.

Dr. N.R. Sharma addressing the Vice Chancellor enquired about the present status of degrees awarded to its students by CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya, in respect of which there was some confusion and in context of which a team from here had visited the CMJ University. He requested the Vice Chancellor to make such students aware about the status of their degrees i.e. whether these are genuine/original. Otherwise, the students will pursue higher education from somewhere else.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that 19 Fellows had given you a request to call a Special Meeting as per the University Calendar. It is very unfortunate that till today none of the 19 Fellows have received response to our said request. He further stated that I am a member of Senate since 1992 and have never seen any such instance. He asked whether the Syndicate has overriding powers. The Syndicate can give its differing opinion and refer it to the Senate. It is the prerogative of the Senate to take a decision. As per me it is a totally undemocratic decision and even till today we are not able to reconcile that it is nowhere mentioned in the University Calendar that Syndicate had to fix the date and time only. And in a very arbitrary manner the system has been demolished and no reply has been received till today. We are feeling aggrieved and it should be decided here in the presence of Bambah Saheb, other seniors persons, advocates that whether Syndicate has the power as per that. We know that if a Member of Senate moves a Resolution and the Syndicate takes a decision to reject it, it comes to Senate. It becomes the property of the Senate, but, I am astonished that what has happened and we have met you personally too to know about the outcome to decide further course of action. Today 19 members have given a request, tomorrow 29/39 Members will give a request, it means that Syndicate has the overriding power. But, it will never happen and the Veto Power can't be given and it should be decided once and for all. Secondly, Hon'ble Dr. Ranga, had raised an issue in 2016, regarding very poor quality of construction in the Campus and a Committee was constituted and that Committee, in which besides me, other members were also there. The Committee accompanied by Cameraman of DPR had visited and examined different buildings/places. The Committee examined UIAMS, Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan and other six-seven buildings and a report was submitted. Shri Jarnail Singh was the Chairman of that Committee, having myself, Dalip Ji and Subhash Ji, as members. The Committee decided to submit its findings to the Syndicate and on 08th December, 2018, you had accepted the findings/decision of the Committee and it was also decided to fix the responsibility i.e. who all are responsible for this i.e. Officers/Officials/ Contractor. But, it is a matter of regret that no Committee has been formed till date even after the lapse of more than six months. I had reminded you about it and requested to decide the matter. At least it should come to fore that who all are answerable for this. And the thing which is intriguing is that all said buildings have been got repaired. From where the budget came and how it was got done. It means, if a Committee visits now, it will find everything okay. It is a very big dishonesty that when we presented the report along with the photos, everything was there, and today it is alright. He further stated that it is a big fraud.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he agreed with the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further stated that this thing will not be tolerated at any cost and there is a big collusion to suppress it, involving our Fellows and Officials, I talk of it openly. Shri Ajay Ranga stated that it is absolutely right and this House also promotes it. Many a times this House has also been informed. Official are being protected and now after repairing all buildings, it will be shown that there is no corruption. Coming back to the issue of request of 19 Fellows, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma stated that senior members like Shri Satya Pal Jain ji are sitting in the House, and in their presence it should be decided once and for all that whether the Syndicate has the power to overrule the request of 19 Fellows.

Dr. Subhash Sharma intervened to say that this issue needs discussion.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he agreed with Dr. Subhash Sharma.

The Vice Chancellor stated that they would take it up.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that it is hundred percent correct that Syndicate has the power to give date and time only and it has no power to reject.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that this action of Syndicate should be condemned.

Dr. Subhash Sharma reiterated that this issue needs discussion as it is a matter of respect of 19 people.

The Vice Chancellor said they would take it up.

Dr. Subhash Sharma also desired that there should be discussion on the issue of Dean Research too.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Yes, they would have". He requested the members to have patience and stated that today we will decide everything and members should speak on their issues for two minutes only. He is noting down the issues/concerns of all members and their written replies will be sent to them.

Dr. Parveen Goyal stated that he had written a complaint letter to the Construction Office regarding problems. In response to it he was asked to give a proposal, which he submitted on 08.03.2019, having columns and rows. But, he did not receive any response to in spite of my taking feedback physically and verbally. He again met the concerned official on 01.04.2019 and gave a reply. Then he was called by Shri R.K. Rai ji, Construction Office that see this thing are there and he had written a lengthy love letter, what should be done of it. He told him that he had given him in writing and he should give the reply in writing. However, he, instead of replying, denied it. After it, he again gave a reminder on 24th April, but, no reply was received. He again gave a reminder on 13th May, but, no reply was received. He received a letter on 14th May that please download your WhatsApp message and see that a person has been deputed i.e. a J.E. Will it not be the first reply in the history of Panjab University, which has been received through WhatsApp. And if a Fellow leaves a message through WhatsApp, it is said that Fellow you are an Employer. What kind of an Employer they are? He was not doing it for himself. He had taken up the grievances of Sector 25 and 14.

He further stated that notices are not updated on PU Website. Further, these are not date wise too. Four faculty members had to suffer its consequences, as they took LTC from 2014-15 onwards in October-November with prior permission, as post facto approval is not granted for availing LTC. A letter was received on 23rd December from MHRD that it will not be granted for 2014-15. They were not informed that you do not go. They had the permission, so, they left to avail LTC in January February. But when they submitted their claim for LTC, a letter was handed over to them that you can't be granted LTC because we have received a letter on 23rd December. If you had received a letter, you should have intimated it to them, so that they could return air tickets and thus had to spend lesser money. Hence, the notices should be updated date wise. We have to suffer its consequences otherwise also as the guidelines of 27th August, 2018 have not been updated till date, as a result of which persons with disabilities are suffering from its consequences.

Some students and teachers have raised some grievances in connection with construction. The construction work should be carried out keeping in view the National Green Tribunal (NGT) Act, so that nobody can create an objection anywhere.

He further stated that the House Allotment counselling, which has not been conducted, may please be got conducted.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that in 2015-16, Punjab Government did a very commendable effort by filling 1925 posts of Assistant Professor under Higher Education

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

in a phased manner. The teachers have now served the society for three years, but unfortunately after completion of three years, their probation has been extended for another year. Now, on the one hand, they talked about the quality education/parameters, and on the other hand, the said teachers are not in a position to attend to orientation programmes. He added that if the teacher concerned is able to do Ph.D. in four years, his Academic Grade Pay goes up to Rs.7,000/-. At present, these teachers are working at a monthly salary of Rs.21,600/-. He urged the House to pass a resolution to request the Punjab Government through a D.O. letter to regularize the services of these teachers as they have completed the probation period successfully and there is no break in their service. One of the teachers had met him and told that his laboratory staff is getting salary of Rs.30,000/- per month, whereas these teachers are getting just a sum of Rs.21,000/- per month even though they are NET/Ph.D. The same situation is prevailing in the Colleges situated in Chandigarh. Principal of DAV College had also told in a meeting that had he been aware of fact that he would get a salary of Rs.47,000/- per month, perhaps he would not have joined. Since it would result into dilution of quality, a letter in this regard be written to the UT Government and Punjab Government so that the dignity of the teachers is maintained.

In April, an election of Principal Constituency was held. As per today's position 109 Principals fell in this constituency. As per the Voters' List, they have 60 regular Principals. It meant that 49 Colleges are functioning with Officiating Principals. Similar situation is prevailing in the colleges situated in Chandigarh. He added that there are sixteen Colleges in Chandigarh and in 05 Colleges only regular Principals are there. Hence, the University will have to ponder very seriously over this issue too that if a College is without permanent leadership, it can't grow. Hence, leadership is required and that can be imparted only by way of regular appointment.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu talking about inspections of colleges, which are being conducted nowadays in context of affiliations, stated that the Inspection Committees, which visit for inspection, impose different conditions for the same course in different colleges. Some of my friends, here in the House, had raised this issue earlier also and there should be a uniform format so that conditions can't not be imposed seeing the College and there should be uniform conditions. Secondly, dates for inspection have been given to the Colleges i.e. up to which date compliance is to be done. And perhaps because of Code of Conduct, Panels for Selections were not provided. It is, therefore, my request that Panels should be provided to the Colleges at the earliest so that compliance can be done timely and affiliation process can be completed.

Dr. Surinder Kaur stated that her request is also concerning with 1925 posts, they should think of their future. The teachers are young and it is time for their marriage/setting. Hence, the letter must be written so that something could be done for them. The papers from Punjab concerning Psychology, Home Science and Fine Arts subjects are checked here in the University and are not sent in Punjab. The students over there write the answers in Punjabi (as their medium is Punjabi) and they suffer a lot as they are marked as fail on evaluation. However, on rechecking 12 to 13 marks are increased. Hence, it is a matter which needs due consideration of the authorities.

Dr. (Mrs.) Harsh Batra addressing the Chair stated that 3rd year of the present Senate has started but till date we have not been provided with Second Volume of University Calendar and Diary. At this, some members told they have been provided with. However, the Vice Chancellor directed the concerned officials to provide these to all the members during lunch time.

Dr. (Mrs.) Rajesh Gill speaking about Notice concerning Guest Faculty, which Professor Pam Rajput had taken up earlier, stated that it should be withdrawn because

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

we had decided in a Committee, the minutes of which are different, and Guest Faculty should not be exploited. Secondly in context of 7th Pay Commission PUTA is requesting you since the beginning and you had assured us too but a lot of time has passed. So, if there is any development with regard to the matter, please let us know.

House allotment has been stopped because of some writ petition of non-teaching staff. I have written a letter in this regard and request the Registrar to conduct the counselling for it immediately.

In the name of beautification environment is being tear apart. A budget of Rs.93,00,000/- is there for beautification. To me it does not appear to be beautification. The practice of fixing stones around the trees has been stopped but a large number of trees died because of this practice. She has photos of the same with her and she would send these to him (Vice Chancellor) today. She requested to remove the stones, wherever they are fixed around the trees and an Environmental Policy should be framed. We are teaching environment to the students, we have got School of Environment Sciences and what we are doing with environment. Hence, a policy should be framed, as per which the work of beautification should be done in future. And the existing proposal should be undone and I have told this in Syndicate earlier too.

Apart from above, she had sought an information as a Fellow about funding of foreign visits of former Vice Chancellor, his wife and certain other members. She had got the reply that funds of British Council were spent for the purpose. After it she asked for the purpose for which funds of British Council were meant, who sanctioned these, how were they diverted for funding the said visit. To this she had got the reply that it all got burnt in the fire. Will the University be satisfied with it? Is it not the duty of the University to check that whether only one file has got burnt in the fire? Are there no parallel records? She is disgusted at the kind of reply that she had received. And finally, in all Convocations girls outnumber boys in getting medals, getting degrees, our Faculty also comprises more women, but, the Committees, which are constituted, are all patriarchal, male dominated. She requested that gender balance might be kept in mind while constituting Committees.

Shri Prabhjit Singh addressing the Vice Chancellor stated that it is a very serious matter, if a former Vice Chancellor along with his wife had visited abroad by diverting the funds, and you should give reply to the House in this regard. He desired the Vice Chancellor to constitute a Committee on the matter and just saying noted will not serve the purpose. He further asked the Vice Chancellor what was the interest of the University to send his wife with him. He would propose that a Vigilance Inquiry should be conducted for this. He asked the Vice Chancellor that whether the reply sent to Prof. Rajesh Gill was sent with his consent. To this the Vice Chancellor said yes. Shri Prabhjit Singh said then it is very serious. At this, the Vice Chancellor said no-no. Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if a Deputy Registrar/Assistant Registrar/Superintendent of the University sends a reply at his/her own level without the approval of the competent authority/Vice Chancellor then it is more serious. He asked the Vice Chancellor that what action you have taken against those, who have given the reply. It means that reply is wrong.

Prof. Rajesh Gill intervened to say that she has to write to British Council and she is doing it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if the reply is not given by the competent authority that means we believe the reply or not.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

One of the members stated that the University authority should ask for Utilization Certificate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh asked the Vice Chancellor to tell the House that whether they accept the reply or not. He further stated that how can a reply be accepted, when the same has not been approved by the competent authority/Vice Chancellor, as he is saying. He asked the Vice Chancellor to give reply.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is Constituting a Committee right now.

Shri Varinder Singh addressing the Vice Chancellor stated that you can't constitute a Committee because in this way you will have to constitute a number of Committees. He said once a demand for CBI probe was raised in an allegation levelled against DSW but later on the matter was taken to the Board of Finance. Hence, in no way a Committee can be constituted on the matter. The then Vice Chancellor has retired and it is a deliberate attempt to drag him into marsh and there is nothing like it.

Shri V.K. Sibal stated that he just want to point out here that we are using two procedures in the discussion in zero hour. The first is diversion of British Council Funds. You have taken decisions. In other cases, you have supported a quick action. He just want to submit with utmost respect that in the first case, whatever decision you take, if you record it here, anybody, who is adversely affected has a very serious case to go to Court. It is better if you don't record a decision but do whatever, you are trying. Just note all these, i.e., the best procedure. He requested the Vice Chancellor not to constitute a Committee, rather, as per the procedure, he should say that he has noted it.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that he must confess that Zero Hour was started when he became Vice Chancellor. At that time the purpose was, if you want an information, for that you should give notice to the Registrar that this one week so that the information is made available and secondly make any suggestions, but no decisions and bring it to the notice of the Vice Chancellor anything that you think is considerable but the idea of the Zero Hour was not that we take decisions here on the matters. A decision can be taken, only after the Syndicate has discussed a matter, resolution brought there, and then Syndicate recommendation has to be there, except in emergent situations where the Vice Chancellor has the discretion, but normally the matters of consideration and decision should have been considered by the Syndicate before coming here.

Professor B.S. Ghuman stated that he thinks a rational decision has been taken after discussion. The Zero Hour should be used for healthy practice. It has come from the Parliament, as former Member of Parliament has shared with us that a one day advance the question should reach the appropriate authority so that a suitable answer or reply can be given on the floor of the House. Second, discussion should be avoided, third, no final decision on the basis of Zero Hour because we have paper with us, therefore, we have to take informed, rational decision which needs documents to be placed before the House before arriving at a rational decision.

Professor Chaman Lal stated that as per Tarlochan Singhji Zero Hour is meant for three minutes each speaker in Parliament. For Senate, the average of members, who attend the meeting, comes to sixty. Hence, if one to three minutes are allowed to every member, the average comes to two minutes. Accordingly, two hours would be required for the purpose and it should be conducted, as it is being conducted now. Secondly, as all have stated, Zero Hour is not a discussion hour, it is a suggestion hour. All suggestions should be noted/accepted, even if these are submitted in writing, and

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

response should be given to every possible query. It is not essential that there would be queries from all sixty members. Ten to twenty queries can be there. All queries should be replied through e-mail and it will become a kind of productive thing. In the same manner, He wants that the meeting should be conducted in a normal way and there should not be any discrimination on the basis of position of respective members i.e. time should be allotted to members irrespective of their position i.e. an MP or something like that. He should take the names and call each one & fix a time, equal for everybody. Thirdly, is the Whatsapp group official group? Nobody should post unofficial things such as good morning, good night messages in this group. The Administrator of this group should be the Registrar. In this group, only official notifications and news related to the development of the University such as anything about Colleges, teachers, students, etc., should be posted.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that there should be a separate Committee for the Self-financed Colleges regarding fee structure because these Colleges are not receiving any grant from the Government and their funds are solely dependent upon the fees generated through the courses. Therefore, the fee structure of self-financed Colleges should be very rational keeping in view the recommendations of the new pay commission. Secondly, Dr. Amit Joshi wanted to know whether there is constitutional position if they are holding zero hour and if they are taking decisions during zero hour. He enquired whether the same is applied in Syndicate also. Whether the questions raised in the Syndicate in zero hour are also subject to the same terms and conditions which are being referred to here because whichever comes here is from the decision of the Syndicate. Nothing new has come. All the decisions of the Syndicate are being raised by various members. There were many issues in which items were not there on the agenda of the Syndicate, Committees have been changed, members nominated by the Vice-Chancellor to certain Committees have been objected by the certain Fellows, he wanted reply in this context that what is the constitutional position of the action on the decisions taken in the Syndicate on those items which were not in the agenda of the Syndicate. Can we take decisions on those items?

It was decided that legal opinion may be obtained on this issue.

Dr. Amit Joshi further stated that another issue is regarding Dental policy. What is the fate of the Dental Promotion Policy because this is again related to the formation of the Committees? The Vice-Chancellor may form certain Committee and certain members may not like that Committee. So the reasons have to be recorded in proper context because in this case, this is a very peculiar scenario that the teachers, who have been working in the Dental College & Hospital, Sector-25 from the last 13 years, are being denied their promotional benefits. No University can do this type of arrangements where teachers are denied their due benefits. He questioned what is the fate of the policy which had been passed in the Syndicate? He further said that as far as he knew the positions were advertised, interviews were also arranged based on the policy which was approved by the Syndicate and he has come to know that the same policy has again come for discussion in the Syndicate and again Sub-Committee has been constituted. It is ok. It is the prerogative of the Syndicate. He is not questioning, but once the policy has been accepted, he wanted to know what the present status in this case?

Dr. Neeru Malik stated that her concern is about the appointment of Assistant Professors in the affiliated Colleges. She said that one circular was issued for Colleges of Education that non-UGC NET qualified can be recruited as Assistant Professors. Then, there was correction in the circular that the essential qualification for the appointment of Assistant Professors in Colleges of Education is UGC NET qualified. But the panels are being demanded from the Colleges for appointment of non-UGC NET teachers and

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

the panels are being sent to recruit non-UGC NET teachers in the B.Ed. Colleges. She questioned when there is already correction in the circular that non-UGC NET person cannot be appointed as Assistant Professor in Colleges of Education, then why University is sending the panels for the same and even approval to those appointments is also being given by the University. At the same time, there are certain cases approval to which is not being granted. She questioned whether these non-UGC NET approved teachers are eligible to cast their vote or not in the next Senate election. If these teachers are eligible to cast their vote, what about persons, who have not been given approval. She requested to initiate steps to vacate the stay because it is very serious matter. Secondly, she pointed out the issue related to maternity leave in the Colleges, which is a right of a woman. She said that this issue was raised two years back also. There are many Colleges which are giving maternity leave only for one month/two months/three months or even without pay. She stated that a circular be issued in this regard. Further, the University has implemented paternity leave policy which should also be extended to the affiliated Colleges also. Thirdly, she talked about the Ph.D. thesis. The Colleges did not know the name of the teachers who are being repeated as supervisors. She suggested that a list be circulated of repeated teachers so that the research scholars may not suffer.

Professor Manoj Kumar Sharma said that whenever any external examiner came, they did not get accommodation in the University Guest House despite obtaining the prior permission and they had to take the examiner in the hostel for stay. This is very serious issue. Secondly, this time, many theses have been submitted and the Controller of Examinations was sitting over there and he knew that the viva of the Ph.D. students are not being conducted for 9-10 months, which is very serious and it should be looked into.

Dr. Rajat Sandhir talked about the seniority of teachers. It is not good thing that seniority list is not available for the teachers in the University. It should be prepared on priority. Secondly, there is no designated place for the office of PUCASH. There are 17000 students on the campus and there has to be designated place in the campus for PUCASH. Further, the two University gates remained closed at night. They should have access to the campus from all the gates at night or, he suggested, to extend the timings of opening the gates. Further, he supported the issue raised by Dr. Neeru Malik last time to change the Committees which are continuing for more than 10 years.

Professor J.K. Goswamy talked about the promises which were made regarding 7th pay commission. They should think seriously about it. He further said that there are certain complaints from the faculty members regarding the CAS promotion. He also talked about the circular dated 25.2.2017 regarding deputation. He requested to implement the same.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that he has 2-3 issues which are related to the Offices of the Controller of Examinations and Dean College Development Council. The examination has been started and the rates of remuneration have not been increased. It was already passed by the Syndicate and Senate that rates of remuneration be increased by 10% every year. But now three years have been lapsed and rates have not been increased. He requested to enhance the rates of remuneration. Secondly, he talked about the 1925 posts of Punjab. He said that the Colleges of Punjab affiliated to P.U., are giving Rs.21,600/- to the contractual teachers but the position is worst in the Chandigarh Colleges as the Colleges situated at Chandigarh are giving only Rs.15600/- to the contractual teachers and after deduction, these teachers gets only Rs.13,000/-. It is not possible to meet the household expenses with this meager income. Earlier, the teachers who were appointed on consolidated salary of Rs.15,600/-, were on probation for the period of 10 years. Now, these teachers have completed their period of probation.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

He requested the Vice-Chancellor to take up the matter with Chandigarh Administration on personal level to resolve the issue. Further, Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta talked about the extension of Principal, SD College, Chandigarh. He said that the extension of Principal SD College, Chandigarh is totally illegal as per Regulations. He further said that the meeting of the Approval Committee has not been held for a long time. The Procedure of approval is also very lengthy. It should be shorten so that the approvals to the teachers may be given well in time. Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta further said we always talk about quality of education and giving best possible direction to youth; when our leaders of higher educational institutions/ colleges like principals themselves have lacking vision and leadership qualities, how can we expect quality of education with desired direction to youth. First of all, he would like to ask from DCDC, whether we can collect the money (apart from fees) from students to spend on inviting professional singer and akharas of Punjabi singers in a college campus that too for two consecutive working days. Our college principals are collecting money to the tune of Rs.25 lakhs to spent on akharas and dance. Even if we can collect money from students, should not it be spent on skill development, placement, training and other welfare activities of the students. So he requests DCDC to hold regular training for the principals of colleges like 'orientation and 'refresher centre'. Training of principals is must for effective function of the college and right direction to youth.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the case regarding giving the status of Panjab University as Central University has already been put up. He also talked about the implementation of recommendations of 7th pay commission. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to take up the matter with Hon'ble Prime Minister. He further stated that there is a scheme in Punjab Govt. under which the education to SC students belonging to the State of Punjab is almost free. But the Haryana and Himachal Govt. is not giving this benefit to the SC benefits of their states. He suggested that the Panjab University should inform the Haryana Govt. and Himachal Govt. that Panjab University is reimbursing the fee of SC students belonging to Punjab, who are studying in Panjab University. The other two Governments should also give this benefit to the SC students of their respective states. This will benefit many SC students of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh. He said that a copy of letter to be written to both the Governments may be supplied to him for his information.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that he wanted to talk on two issues. The first issue is that the Dental College & Hospital was established in the year 2006, but till today no Assistant Professor has been given promotion. Interestingly, there are regular Assistant Professors and temporary Associate Professors and even Professors. Secondly, CAS policy for Dental College was approved by the Board of Finance, Syndicate and the Senate on 10.3.2007, 20.3.2007 and 25.3.2007 respectively. But the objection was raised that in this policy, there was no quality assessment and after that Talwar Committee was constituted. That Committee inserted the quality assessment in it. The recommendations of that Committee were also approved by the Syndicate, Senate and Board of Finance in the year 2014. After that, again on 25.2.2017 the Syndicate had constituted another Committee giving authorization on behalf of the Syndicate in which it was stated that the recommendations of this Committee were deemed to be approved by the Syndicate. The recommendations of this Committee were sent to the U.G.C. and D.C.I. The UGC stated that the promotion policy of Dental College did not come under its purview. The reply of D.C.I. was not received. At that time, the University should have implemented this policy. Due to this, the teachers working in the Dental College are being harassed, tortured from the last 12-13 years. He suggested that the promotion policy which was passed by the Syndicate, Senate and Board of Finance in the year 2007 may be implemented and on the basis of this policy, the applications of teachers may be invited, screening of the applications may be made and give them promotions.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that second issue is related to the teachers working in Hoshiarpur in particular and for Panjab University, in general. The University is giving salaries to even those teachers who have zero work-load at Hoshiarpur. The Director is writing letters to the University but reply is not being given. The University should save money. In University campus, some temporary teachers are getting full salary even without teaching work-load. When RAO raised objection, the office said that it is correct. He requested that the work load of the department should be approved as prepared/sent by them and should be sent back well in time. He requested to look onto the matter.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa stated that the status of Panjab University should remain as it is. He further stated that earlier, a case was registered against some of the students. It was already discussed and passed by the Senate that the University should withdraw the case. Therefore, the University should initiate steps in this direction keeping in view the future of the students. He further stated that whatever allegations made on the Construction Office/XEN Office should be looked into on priority basis and transparency should be maintained.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that earlier also, he had requested in the meeting of the Syndicate that the Chairperson of the Inspection Committees visiting to Girls Colleges in Punjab, should be woman and also 50% members of the Inspection Committees should be consisting of women members so that the inspection work in Girls Colleges could be done easily.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu also talked about the contractual teachers who are getting salary of Rs.15,600/-. He said that after deduction, these teachers get salary of Rs.13,800/- and it is not possible to manage all the household expenses with this income. If the situation remains same, the quality of education will suffer. Therefore, the University should think seriously on the issue to maintain the quality of education. He suggested that a Committee be constituted to follow up the issue as this issue is lingering on from the last so many years. Secondly, he talked about the C.I.L. department. The research scholars of the University campus fall in the first category, the industry people falls on the second category and the research centre have been created in the Colleges to promote research work. He said that the research scholars of the Colleges coming to CIL for their laboratory work/tests are being charged fee as is charged by the industries. He suggested that the same fee should be charged from the students coming from Research Centres as is being charged from the research scholars in the Campus. He further talked about the appointment of Principals after superannuation. He said that all the policies relating to appointment of Principal after retirement are illegal. These policies should be abolished. Earlier, this policy was started when eligible Principals were not available but now sufficient numbers of eligible persons are available for appointment as Principals.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that at an initial stage, when teachers were appointed on contractual basis, he was the first one to raise objection not to give panels to these Colleges as there is no provision to appoint the teacher on contractual basis. But later on keeping in view that the students and Colleges may not suffer due to lack of teachers, it was allowed to appoint the teachers on contractual basis. But now some well established colleges are also giving Rs.21600/- to their teachers on the plea that teachers appointed in Punjab Govt. are also getting the same salary. The self-financed B.Ed. Colleges got stay which was not got vacated by anyone so far. This stay is not applicable on the Degree Colleges but it was shocked to learn that 90% colleges are giving Rs.21600/- to their contractual teachers and even some colleges are giving Rs.8000/- to Rs.10,000/- or minimum wages of D.C. rate. These teachers are being treated like labourers in the Colleges. All should work together on this issue so that

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

these teachers can get full salary. Secondly, Dr. I.S. Sandhu supported the viewpoint of Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu regarding appointment of Principals after retirement. He said that as of now, there are many eligible teachers to be appointed as Principals. Earlier, when the decision was taken to appoint the Principals after retirement, it was for the time being appointment due to non-availability of the eligible Principal. Earlier, he/she was appointed for one year, then two years, then three years. Now, the Principals, after retirement, joined another College and their appointments are being approved by the University. The approval given to such Principals is wrong and if any such approval is given, that should be withdrawn. He requested that sometimes, the Selections Committee unknowingly appoint those Principals, therefore, the panel should be consisting of the members who know the background of the case.

Dr. Subhash Sharma added that one ineligible Principal was appointed and there was question mark on his/her appointment. The Committee was constituted under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.S. Sangha. The Committee had also stated that he/she is ineligible. He had brought to the notice of the Registrar and Dean College Development Council that ineligible Principal is working in the College. Though more than one year has elapsed, he/she is doing work in the College as Principal. Similarly, two ineligible Assistant Professors were appointed in the Chandigarh College. They did not possess the qualifications as was required for those posts. A Committee was constituted under the Chairmanship of Dr. Karamjeet Singh. The Committee recommended that they were ineligible. But more than one and half year has passed, those ineligible Assistant Professors are still working in the College. The money of the management of the College is going to ineligible persons. This is very serious issue. It should be noted and action should be taken and the house should be informed accordingly.

Sh. Prabhjit Singh said that many Committees were constituted in this house and that Committees did very hard work and submitted the report to the University. He referred one of the Committees in which he himself, Sh. Ashok Goyal and the Controller of Examinations were the members. He went to CJM University. Many students wanted to do Ph.D. from CJM University but they did not know the status of this University. In the meeting of the Syndicate held on 8.12.2018, it was decided to obtain legal opinion but till date no legal opinion is received. Secondly, one Committee was constituted for Library Assistant. The recommendations of that Committee were also submitted to the University but the status of this Committee is also not known till date. Shri Prabhjit Singh further stated that it is good to appoint teachers in the Colleges but nobody has talked about the appointment of non-teaching staff in the Colleges. There is lack of non-teaching staff in the Colleges. In the University Campus also, more than 50% non-teaching posts are lying vacant. The staff in the examination branch, accounts branch etc. is being appointed through contractor. The University should initiate steps to appoint regular staff.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the teachers who came to the University from the affiliated Colleges situated in Punjab did not get accommodation in the Guest House/Faculty House. The College Bhawan was constructed from the funds collected from the Colleges. It was already discussed in the Syndicate and Senate that 50% rooms in the College Bhawan should be reserved for the teachers of the Colleges. He stressed to ensure the reservation of rooms in the College Bhawan for the teachers/staff coming to the University for Official work. Secondly, room No. 4 in the faculty house is reserved for the doctor of Health Centre for night duty. He said that there is already a room in the health centre for the doctor on duty at night, therefore, room No. 4 may be got vacated so that it can be used to give it to other persons and the University can get income out of it. Further, in the Alumni House there are 11 rooms and 6 suites and also there are 11 rooms in the Academic Staff College. These rooms did not occupy

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

through-out the year. He suggested to give these rooms on rent so that income can be generated out of it. He further said that he has already shared the issue with the Controller of Examinations that the re-appear examinations should be held in the summer vacations/winter vacations and not with the regular examinations to be held in May/December to avoid clash in examinations.

Shri Deepak Kaushik talked about the security of the University. The new barricades have been placed on different locations in the University. He suggested that the barricades placed in front of the Administrative Office should be removed from there as these may be harmful to other people. Recently, one accident has taken place in that area. Citing 2-3 examples of security, he said that the CCTV cameras in front of University Gate are not working from the last one month. Further, he said that Chief Security Officers are being appointed among the faculty members of the University. The present Chief Security Officer is one of the faculty members. He has to take his classes also. He cannot work as whole time Chief Security Officer, therefore, Shri Deepak Kaushik suggested that another Chief Security Officer may be appointed through proper selection procedure. Sh. Deepak Kaushik further talked about the house allotment policy. He said that there are two types of house allotment policies i.e. one for the teaching staff and another for the non-teaching staff. One non-teaching staff member has filed a case in the Hon'ble Court regarding allotment of some particular houses. But due to this case, the counselling for allotment of all the houses to non-teaching staff has been stopped which is not right. He suggested that only the houses which are involved in the case may be left to include in the counselling but the counselling for other houses may be continued from this month so that the houses, which are not objectionable for allotment, may be allotted to the eligible staff. Shri Deepak Kaushik further talked about the status of Panjab University as Central University. He was not in favour of declaring the Panjab University as Central University due to the reason if Panjab University become Central University, out of 200 affiliated Colleges, 100 College will go to the Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and 100 Colleges will go to Punjabi University, Patiala. No College will be left with the Panjab University. As per MHRD and UGC, the grant given to the University is for the salary of the teachers only. The salary of non-teaching staff is being given from the funds generated through affiliated Colleges and if there remain no college then what will be income of the University. How the funds will be generated to give salary to non-teaching staff. He further talked about the daily wage employees of the University. He said that many employees are working as daily wagers from the last about 22 years. Earlier, the Committee was constituted in the Syndicate and Senate consisting of Prof. Navdeep Goyal, Prof. Gurdip Sharma, Shri Prabhjit Singh, etc. to regularize their services. That Committee gave the report/recommendations in November 2016. But till date, no action has been taken on the recommendations of that Committee. He requested the Vice Chancellor to initiate steps to take action on the recommendations of the Committee and in the meantime, DA + G.P. to those daily wages employees who are getting consolidated salary, may be released immediately. At that time also, they had said that the regulations, rules, etc. of the Central Universities should be shown to them as well as of the Punjab Government, and they have never refused. Even today, they are saying that they should sit together, and thereafter, would take appropriate decision.

Shri Varinder Singh stated that earlier, Shri Raghbir Dyal had got elected as a member of the Board of Finance, but unfortunately he died. Before the commencement of his term (as member of Board of Finance) they (Syndicate) nominated Professor Keshav Malhotra as member of Board of Finance in place of Shri Raghbir Dyal. They had also written a letter to the Vice Chancellor on this issue, but so far no reply has been received, and they did not know the fate of that letter. He urged the Vice Chancellor to see/examine whether the Syndicate could nominate Professor

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Keshav Malhotra in place of Shri Raghbir Dyal, who was elected as member of Board of Finance by the Senate and also under what regulation/rule the Syndicate has done this. So far as his knowledge goes, they (Syndicate) could not do this. Secondly, corruption allegations had been levelled against the former Dean Student Welfare (Professor Navdeep Goyal), and there are certain persons, who earlier used to say/suggest that the matter should be got enquired by the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) and they would get him (Professor Navdeep Goyal) handcuffed and put behind the bars and those very members have sent him (Professor Navdeep Goyal) to the Board of Finance. He has another submission that the person, against whom allegations are levelled and who has not yet been cleared by the Senate, and he also says that there was a company, viz. Sunrise, which provided manpower, which is used to outsource manpower to the University. Maybe, he could be wrong, but there are certain other such cases, which needed to be enquired into by the University. If such kind of serious allegations have been levelled against someone, according to him, to send him to the Board of Finance, is not justified. Moreover, he (Vice Chancellor) should see/examine whether Professor Keshav Malhotra, who has been nominated to the Board of Finance, could be nominated because the term of Shri Raghbir Dyal was yet to commence. Secondly, Professor Navdeep Goyal, who has been sent to the Board of Finance, is also not ethically correct because until he is not cleared from the allegations, he could not technically do so. It has also come to his notice from a newspaper that he has been given clean chit, but he did not know from where he has got the clean chit and what type of clean chit has been given. He requested that the Vice Chancellor to bring the case to the Senate at the earliest and the other cases, e.g., as pointed out by him (case regarding outsourcing of manpower) should also be got investigated. There was one company namely Sunrise and he would disclose others also, if he is associated with the Committee, if appointed by the Vice Chancellor.

Continuing, Shri Varinder Singh stated that three persons had gone to CMJ University to check/verify whether the degrees awarded by the University were in order or not. The persons, who had gone there, had in fact raised this issue and were against the degrees awarded by CMJ University. They had spoken against the University in the Syndicate/Senate several times. They had sent those very persons to check/verify the degrees to CMJ University. In this regard, his request is that, if need be, the University Officer(s)/officials should be sent to CMJ University for the purpose. Since the members of the Senate are involved in the elections of Syndicate, Board of Finance and other statutory bodies and wherever elections are held, politics is obviously/bound to be played. He did not wish that the students, who have qualified exams from CMJ University irrespective of whether their degrees are fake or not, should suffer, but the intention of these persons in it. Maybe, all this is being done in view of the elections. This meant, they fix the match themselves, play themselves and themselves win. It should not be allowed. The University could send the University Officers again. The report, which has come from there, could not be accepted by them as allegations used to be levelled against them and they are fighting for that from the beginning. Since it is a serious issue, no one from the Senate could go there.

Dr. Amit Joshi intervened to say that though the decision on the issue was taken by the Senate, the Committee was sent by the Syndicate.

Continuing further, Shri Varinder Singh said that the members of the Senate, who had been included in the Committee, should not have been included.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma intervened to say that the decision of the Senate was that the Officer(s)/official(s) would go to check/verify.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the members have wrongly been included in the Committee.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Varinder Singh said that it was going on that inquiry should be got conducted by the CBI/Vigilance, but when they send such persons to the Board of Finance as members, they themselves should see whether it is right. He urged the Vice Chancellor to check as to what happened thereafter and these people started saying that he/she/they are innocent. That meant, earlier which so much was said, was mere wastage of time. On the one hand, the precious time of the Senate was wasted, and on the other hand, a vicious atmosphere was created. He urged that all this should be enquired into. In the end, he said that a golden chance has been given to the candidates, who have left just one paper to qualify the examination, but they still have chance(s) to appear in the examination for qualifying for the degree. They had said in the year 2018 that the candidates, whose degrees are pending just because of one paper, should be allowed to appear in the examination irrespective even or odd semester examinations. He urged the Vice Chancellor to allow this as several students are waiting for this.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Yes, next".

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha stated that they had gone to a College for inspection and they found that there were only five teachers, who were being paid a salary of Rs.21,600/- p.m. even though they were not UGC-NET qualified. They asked the management in a lighter vein that this much amount is not being given by certain College even to the UGC-NET qualified, why are they doing so? However, the management people could not understand. When the asked the teachers by taking them to another side, they told though a cheque of Rs.21,600/- is given to them, they (management) took back some portion of the amount and they are left with only Rs.9,200/-. But they did not have any proof and the teachers were afraid also. They asked the management, but the management did not admit. The group of teachers comprised four female and one male and when they came back, the management called the male teacher inside and he was threatened after taking away his mobile. He asked him as to why he disclosed all this and relieved him from the service from back date. When it was enquired from the female teachers, they told that keeping the fact that the services of only one person would be dispensed with, they named him (male teacher), whereas they had also said that. The teacher concerned, who has five family members to support, has been mentally tortured to the extent that he is now sitting at home. He has also been threatened that if he disclosed to someone, he would have to face the consequences. Thereafter, the teacher concerned has given them in writing also. The teacher has also proofs. They (Committee) have recommended revisit, but question whether all this is within their purview. If need be, a Committee should be constituted to look into the whole issue and the genuine, which is due to him (teacher) should be got released to him and action should be taken against the College. He further stated that the teachers become eligible to supervise Ph.D. students in accordance with the UGC guidelines, whereas several cases are pending in the Department of Education for the last 4 years or more. He remarked that there are two bodies, i.e., UGC and DGC (Department Grants Committee), which has been formed by the Department. Some of the teachers, who had applied for permission to allow them to supervise students, have even retired. The DGC, which the Department has made, has imposed a condition that the teacher concerned should have 5 years' M.Ed. (Dissertation) experience. They asked them to impose another condition on the teachers of the Colleges, where M.Ed. is not being offered, and owing to this the cases are pending for the last 4 years. They are senior teachers, where they are working, and are doing good work. He urged that these teachers must be considered.

Dr. Gurmit Singh stated that he would like to elaborate the issue(s) raised by Dr. Neeru Malik. He has also talked to Dean, Faculty of Education, in the morning and it has also been sent in writing from the Faculty. The Dean, Faculty of Education, has also talked to Dean College Development Council, and has also given in writing to Law

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Officer. A writ petition was filed in the year 2015 in the Punjab & Haryana High Court in which they have allowed non-NET teachers. What they have written is that they could be considered and not that where the NET qualified teachers have applied, non-NET would be given preference and instead the NET qualified persons would be given preference. However, wherever the NET qualified persons are not there, non-NET could be considered, but the Colleges are doing opposite. Taking that plea, they are exploiting the NET qualified persons, who have applied and are available. He has a gazette notification as also a Press Note of Rajya Sabha, and the issue is also on the agenda that the latest conditions would be implemented. He pleaded that the stay should be got vacated. He asked as to what their Lawyer is doing? Why is he not getting the stay vacated? It is a very serious issue. Recently, he has visited a College, where a panel was given and non-NET person(s) have been appointed as teachers. Though the panel has written as on what grade the persons have been recommended to be appointed and they were being given a sum of Rs.8,000/- p.m. Neither they were given Rs.15,600/- p.m. nor Rs.21,600/- p.m. When they are getting non-NET teachers at a monthly salary of Rs.8,000/-, Rs.9,000/- or Rs.10,000/-, why should they appointed NET qualified teachers at a monthly salary of Rs.15,600/- or Rs.21,600/-? He is unable to understand as to why they are not able to get the stay vacated. What problem are they facing? He would also like to ask whether there is a rule that there would different set of condition(s) for Colleges of Education, i.e., Government, aided, unaided and self-financing. He has raised this issue several times. Why are they not taking it seriously? He further said that sometimes those persons are put on the panel(s) for appointment of teachers in the Colleges of Education, who themselves are not eligible for the post(s) for which they are going to conduct the interview. It is also a serious issue and he would request the Dean College Development Council that it should be noted. Since they have senior teachers in the Department of Education and Colleges of Education, only those should be put on the panels. He suggested that at least one senior teacher must be there on the panel.

Dr. Sarabjit Kaur endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Principal Surinder Singh Sangha relating to appointment of College teachers as Supervisors. She pointed out that certain Principals of Colleges of Education have shifted to Degree Colleges and the Department of Education is not allowing them to act as Supervisors. Has their expertise finished? Why are they not being allowed?

Shri Naresh Gaur stated that perhaps, he had raised an issue in the second meeting chaired by the Vice Chancellor that the house earmarked for Director, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, is completely locked and it is apprehended that the house would be ruined. He had requested at that time also that the house earmarked to the Director, P.U. Regional Centre, should be got renovated and the same should be used as a University Guest House. In this way, they could also generate income and whenever any teacher from outside visit Ludhiana, it could be allotted to him/her for the purpose staying. However, no action has been taken on his request so far. Secondly, as said by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and almost in every meeting this issue has been touched by him that before his (Professor Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor) joining the University, the incident, which had taken place after enhancing the fees, and allegations and counter allegations were made against each other, i.e., students and the University administration. They took decision in every meeting and they are also playing with the careers of the students. If FIR(s) has/have been lodged owing to any reason(s), and a student get Government job, even though nowadays it is very difficult to get Government job, he/she would not be able to get the job because of the FIR lodged against him/her. He (Vice Chancellor) had also assured that they would get the FIR(s) cancelled/withdrawn by adopting a procedure to be suggested by the legal luminaries. He suggested that the FIR(s) should be got

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

withdrawn and they should not play with the career of the students. Thirdly, he had raised this issue in the Syndicate thrice and Shri Deepak Kaushik has also touched the said issue. He did not know why he is feeling so when he read this in the newspapers and several people had questioned him also that as to why the Chief of University Security, the charge of which has been given to a Professor, whose salary is between Rs.1.25 lacs and Rs.1.5 lacs for teaching the students. Are they not spoiling the system? The work suits in the hands of the one skilled to do it. If someone else does it, he is sure to mess it up. Had he been in his (Vice Chancellor) place, he would not have accepted it. Similarly, he (Vice Chancellor) should not accept this. He did not know as to what the reason is as to why he (Vice Chancellor) has accepted this and he would not like to go into it. He suggested that the charge of the post of Chief of University Security should be given to the next senior-most person and as far as if he disclose the qualifications of the person, who is senior-most Security Personnel, perhaps, he is a fit employee, who could be given the charge. The person concerned is LL.M., M.A., Diploma, etc. Therefore, his request to the House is that the job should be assigned to the person, whom it suited the most. In the end, he said that he had made request earlier also that the teachers have to travel to Chandigarh to attend Orientation and Refresher Courses, whereas such could be organized at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, where the infrastructure is available because several female teachers are involved and they have small children and could not afford to be away from them for 10-15 days or 1 month and stay in Chandigarh. In fact, it is next to impossible for them because nowadays joint families are not there; rather, there are nuclear families having only one or two children. How could they leave them alone there? He, therefore, requested that Orientation and Refresher Programmes should be conducted at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, as they have the infrastructure and the faculty for the purpose there so that the people of the nearby areas could attend the courses there. Similarly, facility should be made available at Sri Muktsar Sahib and Hoshiarpur, so that the people of the nearby areas could be benefitted.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that he would start from where Shri Naresh Gaur has left. There is a problem of Pre-Ph.D. course work in Ludhiana, especially in the subject of Commerce. Since they had a Regional Centre at Ludhiana and faculty is also available there, if pre-Ph.D. course work is allowed there, it would be better. He pointed out that the Pre-Ph.D. course, which is conducted at University Business School, is of one year's duration owing to which the regular teachers of affiliated Colleges are totally debarred to do the Pre-Ph.D. course work. Firstly, they are not allowed by the Principals of their respective College and secondly, they allowed only those, who have cleared the JRF, whereas those, who are working as teachers in the affiliated College, could not do the Ph.D. due to this in spite of their willingness. In this way, they are forced to do Ph.D. in the private University, which have opened in the surrounding areas. If they are not allowed them here, how they are going there during day time, what is the fee structure there, etc.? He remarked that there some other types of means are used. They could provide them platform because faculty is available and persons could also go from here, if the classes are held there in the afternoon. He further said that he would like to raise another issue relating to Convocation. He is witnessing from the day he has become the member of the Senate that all the Senators are made to sit on the dais/stage. He did not know why a period has come that they are made to sit in the front row instead of dais/stage. Though it is their house and are faculty members, they could not enter the Convocation Hall after the arrival of the Chief Guest. Why they are so much concerned about the security. Perhaps, the bio-data of the Senators along with their photographs might be available in the Chancellor's Officer. Are they not concerned about the security after the Chief Guest leaves the venue? It is very humiliating and should be looked into in a right perspective.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Dr. Ameer Sultana, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor Rajat Sandhir on PUCASH, stated that PUCASH must have an identified place as also almirahs, cabinets, etc. to keep the record. Secondly, so far as she knew in several affiliated Colleges Internal Complaint Committee is not there. Therefore, a circular should be sent to all the affiliated Colleges, P.U. Constituent Colleges and P.U. Regional Centres asking them to compulsorily appoint Internal Complaint Committee, so that the complaints, which are received by them, could be discussed at local level and are not sent to the Vice Chancellor or the Chancellor every time. Thirdly, in accordance with the Sexual Harassment Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, the proceedings of PUCASH are supposed to be made public. What they have experienced is that during the last few years the entire proceedings, including the names of the complainants had appeared in the media, whereas the same is prohibited in the Act. They had also experienced that if the decision(s) is/are to be taken by the Syndicate and Senate, all the papers are provided to the members on the tables and not that all the documents, including the proceedings, are supposed to be sent to the members along with the agenda. She urged that it should be taken care of. She further said that she agreed with Shri Deepak Kaushik and others that they always talked about teaching staff and never about the non-teaching staff. At the moment, majority of their staff is either on *ad hoc* basis or contract basis. Therefore, they should seriously think for giving them the benefit of basic pay, grade pay, dearness allowance, etc. She had also raised this issue when she was a member of the Syndicate. Today also, she is requesting the Vice Chancellor to give attention to this issue and try that their services are regularized. She remarked that people are working for the last so many years, but there is no increase in their salaries has taken place. She has also got information that sometimes the non-teaching employees, who are working on *ad hoc*/daily wage basis/contract basis, did not get their salaries up to 10th of the month, whereas if they (regular employees – both teaching and non-teaching) did not get salary even for two days, they made a lot of huge and cry. Referring to the engagement of multi-task staff, she said that first they give training to them and when they are trained, they are transferred to some other places. She suggested that this practice should be stopped. She also suggested that they should pay serious attention to their finances and they have also a lot of expectations from the present Government, including that the Government would consider Panjab University for giving sufficient grant. She is hopeful that they would definitely be able to get sufficient grant from the Central Government for the University under the stewardship of Professor Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor. So far as the issue of appointment of guest faculty is concerned, there is a practice that they give teaching assignment to Junior Research Fellows (JRFs) and the other persons, who are getting scholarships. However, certain Chairpersons have asked them (JRFs and other scholarship holders) to remain in the Department from 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m.

The Vice Chancellor said that all this has been noted.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that she is talking about the Research Scholars and she is not talking about the guest faculty. The Research Scholars, whom the teaching load is to be given per week, they are asking him/her to sit in the Department up to 5.00 p.m. When would he/she do the research? She further said that security about which they are talking again and again in the University and Shri Deepak Kaushik has said about it a little bit, she would like to know as to why several the iron barricades have been placed at different places. From whom, they have fear? Whether the teachers have fear from the staff or non-teaching staff fear from the teachers or the students have fear from their teachers or non-teaching staff. The iron barricades, which have been placed in front of the Administrative Block, needed persons to take them to other places. She has joined the University in late eighties when the terrorism

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

was at its peak and even then such a fortification had not been done. On the one side, they are saying that they did not have sufficient funds, and on the other side, they are incurring a huge amount on such things. It is a very serious issue and she would like to know where and at what forum this decision has been taken. When the Vice Chancellor said that she has already taken much time, Dr. Ameer Sultana said that he (Vice Chancellor) had given a so much time to other members, whereas she is not allowed to speak. She is only raising the genuine issues.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he would like to speak about two issues, i.e., non-attending Colleges and non-attending Principals. He suggested that a check should be applied on those colleges where the students did not attend classes. An item about the Colleges, which released the Roll Nos. to those students who did not attend classes, should be brought to consider and decide as to how check could be applied. Secondly, from where the issue of non-attending Principal has emerged? In fact, the issue has emerged from whether it is re-employment or extension, which is being given to Principals at the moment. What the status is? Whether the Principals, who are eligible with new conditions, could only take re-employment in the same College or in other College/s also? They should definitely take decision on this issue; otherwise, already a lot of embarrassment has been done to the University as it looked as if they favour someone and asked others to go, which is wrong. They should take a decision on the re-employment for 2 years + 2 years + 1 year (5 years) at the earliest. The earliest they take the decision, the earliest the issue would be settled.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that 19 Fellows had given representation for convening a special meeting of the Senate, but the same has completely been ignored. In the meeting of the Syndicate, two of them (two teachers) had got their dissent recorded when decision on the issue was taken. As said by Shri Satya Pal Jain, the Syndicate was just supposed to fix the date for the special meeting of the Senate. He pleaded that the date for the special meeting of the Senate should be fixed and meeting convened to consider the issue raised by them. Secondly, several teachers have raised the issue of 1925 posts and he had also earlier raised this issue in the Senate, on the basis of which, he (Vice Chancellor) had written to Punjab Government. Since the condition of teachers in the State of Punjab is very pitiable, the Vice Chancellor should again write to Punjab Government. He also urged the Vice Chancellor to take up this issue at the appropriate level. Thirdly, renovation of rooms in Golden Jubilee Guest House has been got done. He had raised the issue in the Senate about six months back that about Rs.50 lacs has been spent there, but with a sum of Rs.50 lacs very good rooms could be constructed, whereas they had got done renovation only. Though such a huge amount (Rs.50 lacs) has been spent, seepage has still taken place there. If a sum of Rs.50 lacs has actually been incurred on the renovation of rooms of Golden Jubilee Guest House, an enquiry should be conducted at the University level as the money belonged to the students. He remarked that since it is public money should not waste like this. He further said that the rates of evolution should be increased as had been decided earlier that the evaluation rates would be increased every year.

Continuing, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that certain persons are working in the University on daily wage basis for the last 7 or more years, and they are facing problem in regularizing their services as stay has been granted by the Court. The University should take necessary steps to get the stay vacated. He further said that when the issue of DAV College was discussed, he had said that the yardsticks of the Inspection Committees, which are sent to inspect the Colleges, are not the same. Citing an example, he said that the College which had a strength of 120 students, the condition of appointment of 3 teachers is imposed and on the Colleges like Arya College, Ludhiana, which had three units of B.Com., similar condition is imposed. He added that in the

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Arya College, Ludhiana where M.Com., B.Com., and B.B.A. courses are being offered, only 4 teachers are there to teach these subjects. On the one hand, where the students' strength is 120, the condition of 4 teachers has been imposed and on the other hand, the same condition of teachers has been imposed where 4 units of B.Com. are existing. Why such a disparity is there? He has a serious concern about it because this issue would be raised in the Affiliation Committee.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that there is a need to conduct the Periodical Inspections, and such an issue could be taken care of in the Periodical Inspection as it related to permanent affiliation.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that this issue should be taken care of as there is a big disparity and he is least concerned whether it is done through permanent affiliation or some other method.

Principal Paramjit Singh stated that it is an honour for him that after 1988, one of the Principals of Government Colleges has become member of this House. None of the Principal of Government Colleges had been elected as a member of the Senate during the last 31 years. Some of the Hon'ble members have said that since appointments of teachers are not being made in the Government Colleges and posts of teachers are getting vacant day by day, they should not be given new courses. Whenever posts fell vacant in the Government Colleges, they appoint guest faculty and pay them salary Rs.21,600/- per month and there is no break in their service. He added that only eligible persons are appointed as guest faculty. First of all, the Government Colleges faced lot of difficulties in demanding new courses, but if certain Colleges demanded new courses, they should be given the same. There are four types of teachers in the Government Colleges, i.e., regular teachers, guest faculty, part-time teachers and teachers to teach self financing courses and all of them are appointed on full salary. Whenever a College applied for a new course, the Inspection Committee, which visited the college, inserted a line in its report that the teachers should be appointed on a regular basis, whereas in Government Colleges, authority to appoint teachers rested with the Government. He knew this because, being Principal, he had got started certain new courses at Government College, Tanda and Government College, Hoshiarpur. In a make shift arrangement, they appoint guest faculty or part-time teachers. They corresponded with the office of the Dean College Development Council again that they have already appointed qualified teachers. He, therefore, pleaded that if condition of appointment of qualified teachers is imposed by the inspection committees, it would be better. A case regarding appointment is pending in the High Court since 2003 on which the Court has granted stay. Despite their best efforts, they are unable to get the stay vacated he knew this because he is a member of the Committee constituted by the Government to get the stay vacated. He urged the Vice Chancellor to use his good offices to get the stay vacated. If regular appointments are made after getting the stay vacated, he being a Government representative would be thankful of him. In the last, he said that as several other Principals and teachers of the Colleges are, he as Principal is also unable to get accommodation reserved in the Guest House of the University. Since the Principals have their own status, they should be allowed to get accommodation reserved in the University Guest House whenever required. Similarly, the teachers of the affiliated Colleges should be allowed to get accommodation reserved in the Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma stated that the issue of regular appointments is being discussed. They have six Constituent Colleges and their expenses are to be given by the Punjab Government. He pointed out that not even a single regular teacher has been there in those six Constituent Colleges. The screening has been done. The

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

process for appointment of teachers on regular basis has been started, only interviews are to be conducted. He urged that the process for conducting the interviews should be initiated at the earliest so that the standard of education could be enhanced. Secondly, the Dean College Development Council has the data as he had sought information from the affiliated Colleges, and if they have a look at it, they would find that 70 posts of Principals are lying vacant in the Colleges of Education. They should issue a strong letter to the Colleges to advertise the posts of Principals by the month of July 2019 and the process to fill up the posts should be started at the earliest. Besides aided Colleges, there are unaided Colleges where regular Principals are not there for the last 10-12 years. He, therefore, urged that letter in this regard must be written at the earliest. The third issue is that the stay, which related to UGC NET, should be got vacated and until the stay is vacant, they have to make appointment on *ad hoc* basis, though it would be a kind of violation. As has been done earlier, the approval should be granted to the *ad hoc* appointments subject to final decision of the Court or the stay should be got vacated immediately. He remarked that they are not following this up as this situation is prevailing since long. In the end, he said that though he did not know whether this issue should be raised here or somewhere else that the Travelling Allowance has not been enhanced for the last eight or more years. When the cost of petrol and diesel was Rs.40/- per litre and Rs.30/- per litre, the rate of Travelling Allowance was fixed at Rs.10/- per kilo meter. Now, since the cost of petrol and diesel is more than the double, if they all agreed, the rates of Travelling Allowance should also be got reviewed.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu stated that 1925 teachers, about whom several members have talked, were given the right to vote in the year 2016 after a long discussion in the Senate and they were treated equivalent to regular teachers because they were interviewed by a full-fledged board, which comprised of DPI and University nominees. That was why, the Dean College Development Council had issued a letter to the affiliated Colleges in the year 2017 that the leave Regulations, which are applicable to the regular teachers, would be applicable to these teachers. However, certain Principals are violating this because only page numbers (135-147 – Chapter VI(B)) were in that letter. What they do is that they applied only Regulation mentioned at page 147, which related to teachers appointed on contract basis. He, therefore, requested that a letter should be issued that they should be given the leaves as par with the regular teachers. He also handed over certain papers relating to this to the Dean College Development Council on the floor of the House. He added that certain teachers forcefully get the leaves at par with the regular teachers, but 99% teachers suffered on this count. He further said that there is a Grievance Committee, which was constituted by the Senate, and the meetings of the same are also held. He urged that a copy of the minutes of the Grievance Committee should be supplied to them as it is a very important Committee and takes good decisions. In the end, he said that there is College namely Malwa College, Bondli, Samrala, where in the management of the College unjustifiably is not giving increment to two teachers for the last two years. He pleaded that an inquiry must be conducted into this because the management of the College has withheld two increments of two teachers without any reason/inquiry.

Dr. Vipul Narang said that about 6 months before, an Approval Committee was constituted about which the Dean College Development Council might be aware, but the meeting of the Committee has never been convened owing to which the approval to the appointment of certain teachers is pending. He urged the Vice Chancellor to direct the Dean College Development Council to convene the meeting of the said Committee at the earliest so that the cases which are pending for the last 2-3 years could be cleared.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean College Development Council to convene the meeting of the Approval Committee at the earliest.

Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan said that he on own his behalf and on behalf of the Colleges is very thankful to the Vice Chancellor for getting them grant sanctioned from RUSA, the issue regarding which was raised by him in the previous meeting of the Syndicate. Now they have got information about this, both from the University as well as Coordinator, RUSA. They are thankful to him (Vice Chancellor) from the core of their hearts for making strenuous efforts for getting them grants/projects sanctioned. If they received the grants, the credit goes exclusively to him. The Principals of other Colleges also joined Dr. Mahajan and thanked to the Vice Chancellor for getting them grants/projects sanctioned.

The Vice Chancellor said that with the grace of God, they would soon have a good news about the non-aided colleges.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that one of the issues that the DMCs and degrees of the students, who have been granted post-matric scholarship, have not released by the University, and the other issue is quashing of FIR lodged against the students, though the matter has already been discussed, no progress has taken place. He urged the Vice Chancellor to get the FIRs quashed as the future/career of the students is at stake. If his help is required in the matter, he is always ready to provide. He further said that the official cars provided to the Directors of the Panjab University. Regional Centre Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana, which have been taken back, should again be provided to them as the same are absolutely necessary for day-to-day work. He remarked that since the Director, P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur has to go through a forest area wherein there are several wild animals, the official car is required to him.

Professor Mukesh Arora urged the Vice Chancellor to provide official cars to both the Directors.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he had already raised two issues out of which one related to representation given by the 19 Fellows for convening the Special meeting of the Senate, which according to him needed more discussion.

Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out that there are 35 tube lights, 6 fans and 4 air conditioners fitted in the Senate Lounge. For God sake, such things should not be done as their eyesight is not weak. The number of lights should be reduced, which might help them to reduce the fee of the students.

Dr. Neeru Malik pointed out that last year, the Selection Committee had recommended appointment Associate Professors at Giddarbaha College of Education, but Principal of the College, who at the moment is an Assistant Professor, is not sent their cases to the University for approval. She urged the Vice Chancellor to look into the matter.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the previous practice of supplying water in small bottles should be started again as the glasses provided to them are unhygienic. He further said that since Shri Raghbir Dyal is no more amongst them, they should condole his death and pass a Condolence Resolution.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that since there cannot be meeting after the condolence, the condolence should be done in the end.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have been enlightened today that no decision could be taken in the zero hour. Today they must resolved that whatever decisions have been taken during the zero hour and without being on the agenda in the meetings of both Syndicate and Senate during the last year, should be declared null and void. All those issues – whether the issue related to Dean Research or appointment of Committees, etc., should be brought on the agenda.

The Vice Chancellor said that now, they should quickly start with the agenda items. Almost all the items have been discussed at the Syndicate level every exhaustively. If any of them is to give any input, it should be given very quickly because it would like to discuss certain issues in the end.

- IV.** Considered that Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English & Cultural Studies, be appointed as Dean, Alumni Relations, for one year with effect from the date she joins as such, in place of Professor Anil Monga, pursuant to Regulation 1 at page 109, of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 (**Item C-1 on the agenda - Syndicate dated 8.12.2018 Para 12**).

It was noted that Professor Deepti Gupta has joined as such w.e.f. 10.12.2018.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that monthly honorarium, which is being given to various persons, who have been given additional responsibilities, should be given for only one position.

The Vice Chancellor said that all such issues would be taken up later on. In fact, he would come with the proposal on such issues.

RESOLVED: That Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English & Cultural Studies, be appointed as Dean, Alumni Relations, for one year w.e.f. 10.12.2018, under Regulation 1 at page 109, of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

- V.** Considered that Professor Shankarji Jha, Dean of University Instruction, be allowed to continue as such for one year more, i.e., w.e.f. 1st May 2019, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 (**Item C-2 on the agenda - Syndicate dated 18.11.2018 Para 10**).

RESOLVED: That Professor Shankarji Jha, Dean of University Instruction, be allowed to continue as such for one year more, i.e., w.e.f. 1st May 2019, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

Professor Shankarji Jha abstained when above item was taken up for consideration.

- VI.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-3, C-4, C-5 and C-6** on the agenda were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

- C-3.** Considered that Dr. Rajesh Chander, Assistant Professor, Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies, be allowed to deposit permissible Provident Fund contribution into his Provident Fund account in Panjab University for the period of his EOL without pay, i.e., 14.09.2016 to 27.3.2017 (for which he had worked as Associate Professor at Centre for the Study of Discrimination and Exclusion, School of Social Sciences, J.N.U., New Delhi), under Regulation 14.5 at page 129 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 22)

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- C-4.** That the following Assistant Registrars (except Sr. No. 5), be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Branch/Deptt.	Date of promotion	Date of confirmation
1.	Shri Kesar Singh, Offg. D.R. Exams	07.05.2015	16.06.2017
2.	Shri Kewal Kumar, Conduct (Retd. on 31.08.2017)	26.06.2015	17.06.2017
3.	Mrs. Tripta Devi, General (Retired on 31.07.2017)	01.12.2015	18.06.2017
4.	Shri Ramesh Kumar, Office of D.U.I. (Retd. on 31.01.2018)	08.12.2015	19.06.2017
5.	Shri Surinder Kumar Thind VVBI&IS Hoshiarpur (Retired on 31.08.2018)	17.03.2016	20.06.2017
6.	Mrs. Veena Re-evaluation	17.03.2016	21.06.2017
7.	Shri Madan Gopal Singh Exams. (Retd. on 28.02.2018)	22.04.2016	21.06.2017
8.	Mrs. Santosh Kumari UIET (Retd. on 30.09.2018)	17.05.2016	01.06.2017
9.	Shri Dhara Dutt, Accounts (Retd. on 31.08.2018)	01.07.2016	01.11.2017
10.	Shri Omesh Verma Conduct	22.09.2016	01.01.2018
11.	Shri Mohinder Singh, Exams (Retd. on 31.03.2018)	18.10.2016	02.01.2018
12.	Mrs. Pawan Kumari Aneja Accounts	22.11.2016	01.05.2018
13.	Mrs. Prem Lata, UIAMS	20.01.2017	01.07.2018
14.	Mrs. Nisha, DUI's Office	24.01.2012	01.09.2018

NOTE: The date of confirmation of these Assistant Registrars is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 24)

- C-5.** That Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund, Assistant Registrar, DSW, be confirmed w.e.f. 01.06.2016 instead of 01.04.2017.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 25)

- C-6.** That the following Deputy Registrars, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch / Department	Date of Promotion	Date of confirmation
1.	Shri Surjeet Singh Thakur General Branch	30.06.2009	01.04.2017

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch / Department	Date of Promotion	Date of confirmation
2.	Mrs. Anuradha Makhija UIET (Voluntary Retired on 08.01.2019)	26.05.2011	06.09.2018
3.	Shri B.B. Talwar Secrecy Branch	16.10.2015	07.09.2018
4.	Mrs. Poonam Chopra UIET	02.06.2016	09.01.2019

- NOTE:** 1. The date of confirmation of the above Deputy Registrars is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.
2. The person at Sr. No. 2 above, has retired from University service, but her confirmation falls prior to the date of her retirement. Similar, such cases have already been got approved by the Syndicate/Senate, earlier.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 5)

VII.

It was informed that **Item C-7** on the agenda has been withdrawn, viz. –

- C-7.** That Dr. Bhushan K. Sharma, Principal (retired on 31.12.2018) G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector 32-C, Chandigarh, be re-appointed, as such, on contract basis until the new Principal is appointed and the process for holding the interview be expedited.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 30)

Dr. Subhash Sharma enquired as to why the above-said item has been withdrawn.

It was informed that the item has been withdrawn because it was an administrative decision as the rule had already been framed. Since the rule was already there, the decision was required to be taken by the Vice Chancellor, but since it had become a peculiar case, the matter was taken to the Syndicate; otherwise, there was no need to take it to the Syndicate even.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that, in fact, this case (the case of Dr. Bhushan K. Sharma, Principal (retired), G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector 32-C, Chandigarh, did not cover under the said rule.

It was told that, that was why, it is being said that this is a unique case. Moreover, he has not been appointed permanently; rather, they had directed them (GGDSD College, Sector 32, Chandigarh) to advertise the post of Principal immediately after the model code of conduct is over.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the issue which was placed before the Syndicate, should also have been placed before the Senate.

It was informed that there are several items, which are part of the rules and the same end at the level of the Syndicate itself.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that but it is not a part of the rule(s), and this case did not cover under the rule(s).

It was clarified that there are certain items, which end at the level of the Vice Chancellor, certain others which end at the level of the Syndicate and certain others come to the Senate. At the first instance, it should not have even gone to the Syndicate also.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should not have gone even to the Syndicate. That is where, they had committed the mistake. What Dr. Subhash Sharma meant to say is that if the matter had been placed before the Syndicate, it should also have been placed before the Senate.

Extension has not been given to him by the Vice Chancellor. When the rule did not permit, how the extension has been given.

It was informed that the extension would be granted by the Management of the College.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the extension, for which there is no provision in the University Calendar, how it could be granted by anyone. He should be informed as to why the Senate should not discuss this issue. Tomorrow, the management could take any decision, e.g., give extension to anyone, which is not permitted in accordance with the provisions of the University Calendar, and they do not bring the same to the Senate on the plea that they have already done it. How it could be done?

It was said that, in fact, it is not extension and the plea, which Dr. Subhash Sharma is giving, is different.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they might not bring this item, but could have brought the item in another form as the entire issue, which had been deliberated without the rules and regulations of the University. They had allowed the person concerned as he was Principal. How he was Principal, should be brought to the notice of the Senate, so that the Senate could discuss whether it is right or wrong or whether it should have been done or not. They did not know as to what the status of Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma is? Which is the competent authority?

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that officiating Principal has been appointed at GGSDS College, Sector 32, Chandigarh.

To this, Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said, 'No', still Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma is working as Principal at GGSDS College, Sector 32, Chandigarh.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that even if he (Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma) has remained as Principal after attaining the age of 60 years, under which rule/regulation he has remained as such. Have they any right to know this or not? They are saying that he (Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma) could not remain Principal and he had remained Principal illegally. Whosoever has given him extension, it is violation of rules and regulations. Should they discuss the same here or not? If the University authorities did not bring the item, it did not mean they could not discuss the issue. If it is accepted, anything would be done. That also did not mean that the office could do anything even through rules and regulations did not permit as also there is no provision in the University Calendar. The person concerned has been given extension without any interview. Though the Syndicate has framed a rule, this person did not cover even

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

in that rule also. However, he is also against the rule, which has been framed by the Syndicate, because the rule is wrong. The case was brought to the Syndicate as a special case keeping it in view that it is a peculiar condition and it did not cover under the rule framed by the Syndicate and in the note it had been mentioned that the call is to be taken by the Syndicate. If the case was brought to the Syndicate under the peculiar condition, it should also have been placed before the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to seek a clarification that after the withdrawal of the item, is the Vice Chancellor allowing the discussion or not? In fact, the item has been withdrawn and the Vice Chancellor is allowing the discussion. They should be told as to what is happening.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that first the agenda items should be discussed and decision taken, and thereafter, this issue could be discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the item would be brought again.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor not to make the statement like this. On whatever grounds the item has been withdrawn – whether that is covered under the rules or whether the said rule existed in the Calendar or not or it is violation of the rule(s) or not, it is a debatable point and that could be discussed only when the item would come. The item had already come to the Syndicate as the Vice Chancellor did not take the decision on his own and he brought the same to the Syndicate. The Syndicate took the cognizance of the letter which was written by the management and took a decision. He did not know, under what circumstances this item has actually come for consideration in the Senate. Though finally he thought that good sense prevailed and he (Vice Chancellor) has withdrawn the item. Now, after withdrawing the item, the Chairman of the House is allowing the discussion, which is not good.

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

C-8. That the roster for teaching position, i.e., Assistant Professors prepared as per the direction of the UGC, noted by the Syndicate dated 10.06.2018/18.11.2018 Para 8, be approved.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that the item before the Senate is that the roster for teaching position, i.e., Assistant Professors prepared as per the direction of the UGC, noted. However, in accordance with the agenda papers, which have been sent to them today, the position is different. So far as roster is concerned, the same has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines of the UGC. Since he was the member of the Committee, he knew that the roster has been prepared rightly. If the Syndicate and Senate approve it, it would be alright. Now, the next question is that the papers (page 1 and 2), which have been supplied now, created confusion. Confusion is at least to him, but if he (Vice Chancellor) or any other member had clarity, he should clarify. It has been written that “It is submitted that the Vice Chancellor has passed orders with regard to 26 posts (Assistant Professors) to be advertised with tagging (unreserved, SC, ST, etc.) and for vetting the same a Committee was constituted (refers N/1)”. Thereafter, it has been written that “During the meeting, Professor Anil Kumar suggested some changes. Accordingly, the office has made/incorporated the changes”. However, from these papers, they are not able to find as to what are the changes. They also did not know as to what Professor Anil Kumar had suggested. Moreover, the issue

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

is not related to advertisement of 26 posts; rather, the item is to approve the roster and the roster has been prepared strictly in accordance with the UGC guidelines and none could raise ifs and buts to that. In fact, the item should not have been placed before the Senate as the roster as has been prepared in accordance with the UGC guidelines, which were prevalent at that time. Now, when they are going to advertise 26 posts of Assistant Professors, how those posts are to be advertised needed to be checked, i.e., how many for SC, how many for ST, and so on, because it could not be done without that. Citing an example, he said that if six posts are vacant in a Department, but only two are to be filled up, whom the same are to be reserved, because roster is to be operated on the basis of filled posts and not on the basis of total sanctioned posts. They did not know of which Department(s) these 26 posts are and whether they belonged to reserved categories or general.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that it is true that confusion has definitely been created by attaching these two pages. First of all, both the notes are different to each other. Neither there is copy of the draft advertisement nor information as to how many posts have been assigned to which Department, what roster point is, etc., etc. has been provided. The biggest problem is that the entire roster is wrong. If they seen the forth line, it has been written "Department-wise Roster". Whichever Department they look into, it is written "Department-wise Roster", whereas the UGC and Government of India guidelines promulgate the Central Education Institution Reservation in Teacher Ordinance 2019 and on the basis of that Section 3, Sub-Clause-2 says that for the purpose of reservation of posts a Central Education Institution shall be regarded as one unit, which meant that the University would be treated as one unit as per this promulgation of Government of India, 2019. On the basis of this, Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD), Government of India, had issued a letter No.FN38-11/2018-CUB dated 7th March 2019 to the UGC stating that whichever rosters are to be prepared, are to be prepared by treating the University as one unit and not College-wise or Department-wise. After this ordinance/MHRD letter, the UGC had sent a letter to Panjab University also, the reference of which is, as per UGC letter No.F.No.1-5/2016(SCT) dated 8th March 2019, in which it has specifically been mentioned that for the purpose of recruitment, the reservation of posts in direct recruitment in teachers' cadre, University/College/Institute shall be regarded as one unit. The letter of the UGC had come to the University specifically. The MHRD, Government of India, passed an Ordinance and write to the UGC, which specifically wrote to the University, still they prepare wrong roster and placed the same before the Senate. Why did they prepare wrong roster. The roster is being prepared for the last five years and people intentionally prepare it wrongly. Either they should say that they are not aware of the letter and even if they are not aware, ignorance of law in itself is a crime. Hence, it is wrong and action must be taken against the guilty people. Thirdly, on page 1 itself it has been written that 3% reservation for physically handicapped persons. In fact, it is not 3% and wrong reference has been given. In fact, this reservation is 4% as per Office Memo No.3605/20/2017 Established Reservation dated 15th January 2018, whereas here it is only 3%. Hence, the entire roster, which has been prepared, is wrong. In the latest guidelines, it has been written that this Ordinance shall be applicable for the minimum period of six months and the six months have not been complete so far. Wrong roster has been prepared knowingly so that some more time is elapsed. He suggested that the roster for the posts of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professors, which is ready, should be implemented. He knew this because he was a member of the Committee, which had prepared this roster. Instead of wasting more time by appointing another Committee to prepare the roster, the said roster referred to by him should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting, which is scheduled for 28th May 2019, and thereafter the same should be placed before the Senate in its next meeting.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that, after listening to Dr. Ajay Ranga, they could come to the conclusion that there is no need to discuss the issue further. In view of the fresh instructions/letters received, the matter should again be placed before the Syndicate, so that the anomalies, if any, could be removed.

Professor Chaman Lal said that he strongly support Dr. Ajay Ranga. This had been a very big issue. All the Universities were charged with SC/ST teachers' resentment and Government was pushed to bring out an Ordinance because they could not break the deadlock in the Parliament at that time. He did not know as to who has advised the administration to prepare this roster. In fact, this roster is completely wrong and it should outrightly be rejected and the new roster should be prepared in accordance with the Ordinance.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that a lot of time had been taken to bring this roster and already a lot of delay had occurred. More delay should not be allowed to occur by appointing another Committee, and the Committee should not mean "cum-mitty" and Sub-Committee "Sara-cum-mitty". For God sake no new Committee should be constituted.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the person, who has knowingly placed the roster here, should be taken to task. The most important documents relating to the benefits of SC/ST are deliberately misplaced by the dealing officials.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Dr. Ajay Ranga is right that if the roster has been brought intentionally in violation of the Ordinance and Professor Chaman Lal has also expressed his serious reservations, but the item looked as if it is based on UGC's direction, which was noted by the Syndicate on 10th June 2018 and 11th November 2018. At that time, what were the instructions because he (Dr. Ajay Ranga) is referring to a letter, which has been received on the basis of the Ordinance, is received somewhere in March 2019. Actually, instead of rejecting this, in view of the revised directions received from the UGC, this item should have been withdrawn. This is the definition of withdrawing the item and once the item is withdrawn, then of course, on the basis of latest communication, which the University has received. So he did not think that anybody has played any mischief only to mislead and only to bring something, which is not inconsonance with the regulations. Now, the question is in terms of Syndicate Para of 18.11.2019. After November 2018, probably they are meeting for the first time in the Senate and in the meantime they have undergone change(s) in the form of Ordinance, which has been issued by the Government. Hence, in view of the latest instructions of UGC, afresh roster be prepared, and as has been shared that the roster is already ready, the same should be placed before the Syndicate, so that the same is also placed before the Senate at the earliest. However, instead of recording that they outrightly reject, because this could not even be considered, the item should be withdrawn.

Professor Chaman Lal said that since Item 8 related to Item 7, it could not be taken up. For the information of the Hon'ble members, he would like to inform them as to why the earlier rosters were considered wrong. Suppose a Department has three posts and they have to give 22% reservation to SCs/STs, but they could not reserve a post for them, and that was why, there was a great resentment and it was agreed that only at the University level posts would be considered for reservation; otherwise, all Department, which have few posts, would not have any reservation.

RESOLVED: That Item C-8 on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

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

C-9. That circular No. F.No. 2-16/2002(PS)Pt. FI.II dated 16.10.2018 of University Grants Commission regarding extension of the date of participation in Orientation/ Refresher Course in respect of Teachers/Assistant Registrar/ Assistant University Librarian/College Librarian/Deputy Librarian/Assistant Director of Physical Education/College Director of Physical Education for promotion under CAS up to 31.12.2018, be adopted.

NOTE: As decided by the Syndicate, a copy of the decision has been sent to Director Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Director Public Instructions, (Colleges), Punjab for information vide email dated 16.4.2019 .

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 5)

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he would just like to say that the MOOC, which is also being promoted by the Government of India, has been made explicitly clear in the 5th amendment that it would be equal to Refresher Course. However, since at the moment the 4th amendment is valid for three years, the faculty members have doubt that the MOOC, which they are doing, has no mention in 4th amendment though it has been mentioned in 5th amendment, whether its benefit would be given as they are applying under 4th amendment. He urged the Vice Chancellor to make it clear that when it is mentioned in the 5th amendment that MOOC is equivalent to Refresher Course. Secondly, MOOC is a huge convenience because the teachers, who could not go outside, could do MOOC along with their job. Hence, this point must be clarified that whosoever has done MOOC, whenever they apply under any amendment, the same be treated equivalent to Refresher Course.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that now the UGC has also allowed online Orientation and Refresher Courses and the same should also be made part of it. It should not happen that later on the Punjab Government and U.T. Administration say that they would not recognize the online courses. In fact, the UGC has itself allowed that the online Orientation and Refresher courses could be done online. Secondly, the notice of 16th October 2018 of the UGC, which has been brought to the Senate today.

At this stage, it was informed that at the moment, Item 8 is being considered.

Continuing, Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that online Refresher and Orientation Courses should be made part of this. Thirdly, what happened is that when the minutes are got confirmed, 1½ to 2 months already got elapsed. Recently, the U.T. Administration had made certain promotions of teachers under the CAS. Since this decision of the UGC is very significant, his request is that this should immediately be circulated to U.T. Administration as well as Punjab Government without waiting for the confirmation of the minutes so that the promotions of the teachers did not get delayed. He added that majority of teachers would get benefit of minimum of 3 years as the UGC had exempted them from Orientation/Refresher Course up to 31.12.2018.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that after including the MOOC, the para should be circulated.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Dr. Dalip Kumar must be knowing that the extension, which has been given up to 31st December 2018, what did it mean? Did it mean that if somebody's promotion was due in 2016, but because of lack of Orientation/Refresher course, he/she could not be promoted? If the person qualifies before 31st December 2018, he/she could also be promoted now. However, from which date the person would be promoted? Would it be after 31st December 2018 or from due date?

Some of the members, including Dr. Dalip Kumar replied that he/she would be promoted from due date.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated, "Alright". They should know there was a purpose of his asking this question. Specially in aided Colleges, nobody is ready to give the promotion from the back date even in view of this letter because they say what should they give the arrears. Thus, it is not clear whether the promotion would be given from the back date even if the courses (Orientation/Refresher) is done now. Secondly, whether the arrears are to be given for the intervening period or the pay is to be fixed notionally. These things are not clear, but to his knowledge, the Punjab Government is not agreeing even to grant promotion from the due date. Whether the arrears are to be paid or not, what is the position with the Chandigarh Administration, he thought Dr. Dalip Kumar might be able to tell because if they have to write a letter to the Chandigarh Administration and Government of Punjab, they must also clarify that they are due for promotion from the date when they were to be promoted subject to having done this course (Orientation/Refresher) up to 31st December 2018.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that, in fact, such a letter comes after every 2-3 years.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that there is a clarification that the Punjab Government has accepted it only up to 2000 even though this date has been extended by the UGC 2-3 times.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is a very serious matter. Why he is saying so because as has been shared Dr. Dalip Kumar, the Chandigarh Administration, which follows Punjab Government, has given the promotion from the back date, as has been told. How and why the Punjab Government could deny the same benefit. He could understand if they say that they could not share the financial responsibility, but the promotion could be given from the due date, so that the teachers could fight for their arrears.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he would like to bring to their kind notice that they are talking about 2018, but in aided Colleges it is only up to the year 2000. However, the position of Government College is different, where it is perhaps up to 31st December 2005. It is because when the file was moved at the Government level, it was said that for private Colleges, the liability is of the Management of the Colleges concerned. So far as Government Colleges are concerned, there was a shortage of teachers owing to which the teachers could not go, and that was why, they had allowed it up to 31st December 2005. Thereafter, there were several court cases, wherein it has been decided that the decision of the Government is right. Personally, he did not have any problem and he is only clarifying. Even if they did it, it would further create litigation because the Government is not going to accept this. At least the Punjab Government is not going to accept this, and if it is so, what would they do? Though the proposal is very good, how it could be implemented practically. In Government Colleges, they are not giving from 2005 and in private Colleges from 2000 onwards even though at that time the pay-scales were old (unrevised).

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma urged the Vice Chancellor to take up the matter with the Secretary, Higher Education as this job could not be done by an Officer of the level of DPI (Colleges).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that his submission in this regard is that even if they knew that Punjab Government is not going to implement it, that should not deter them from sending the letter, which is not only in accordance with the UGC letter but in accordance with the decision which is being taken by the Senate of Panjab University and they are supposed to advise the Government that this what they are supposed to do as per UGC and if the teachers, whose due rights are being denied by the Punjab Government, even if they went to the Court, why should they not go. It is their right, but there are certain Colleges, which are unaided and in unaided Colleges, the managements are ready to give the promotions from the due date, subject to completion of Orientation/ Refresher Course up to 31st December 2018, could they deny this benefit. He informed that in this Senate, they are not supposed to see as to what the Government wants to do. They have to see as Government of the University and what the University wanted to do. They have to see from the academic point of view and also from academic and administrative point of view, especially if the UGC says this. He thought that the letter must be sent clearly mentioning that as per this letter the teachers should be given promotions from the due date subject to their completion Orientation/Refresher course 31.12.2018 and what they say should also be added. He further said that there are certain aided Colleges also, which even if the Government denied this benefit, are ready to share the responsibility and are ready to give the promotions from the due date. So he thought that if such a letter is sent, it would be helping the teachers in getting them the due rights.

It was informed that this practice is continuing when Professor Karamjeet Singh was Director, Academic Staff Colleges. As such, the extension is going on since 2000. First came 2004, then 2012, 2016 and then 2018 has come. In fact, this letter is also available with the Punjab Government, but they did not implement it. When Professor Karamjeet Singh was Director, Academic Staff Colleges, he had written the letter. Now, on the basis of the decision taken by the Syndicate, they had written letters on 16th April 2019 to the DPI (Colleges), Punjab and Director, Higher Education, U.T. Administration, Chandigarh. It is true that instead of referring the circular to them, they would again request them to implement it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the implementation should be by clarifying the date of promotion because he knew what Punjab Government says. Punjab Government says, alright they should come after completing the course (Orientation/Refresher) after 31st December 2018 and they would consider them for promotion subsequently.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that whatever circular is received by the University, the same is forwarded to the Colleges. As said by Shri Ashok Goyal ji, the unaided Colleges have also to implement it, unless and until they did not send it to the Principals of the unaided Colleges, how would they come to know that it is to be implemented by them? He, therefore, suggested that it should also be sent to the Colleges directly.

It was said that for promotion of teachers, (i) API score is required, and one more thing is required. Even if the circular was not received, it would not have mattered because whenever the Orientation Course or Refresher Course is done by the teacher, he/she becomes eligible. The meaning of the circular is that the promotion would be given from back date; otherwise, there is no problem.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, this meant, people would do whatever is suitable to them.

It was informed that they have already sent the circular and a letter has also been written.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why he is saying so because unless and until explicitly expressed letter is sent, how could they expect that its meaning is this. They should not leave anything implied; rather, they should specifically mention that it meant this. The letter should be sent to the Colleges (both aided and unaided), Punjab Government and U.T. Administration, so that those, who are ready to implement, should implement it.

Dr. Gurmit Singh said that he would like to add one thing to it. Perhaps, he could be wrong and Shri Prabhjit Singh would correct him that the DPI (Colleges), Punjab, did not receive promotion cases of teachers directly. Sometimes, the DPI (Colleges), Punjab, demands Committee from the University. As such, the Committee for promotion cases is sent by the University. If they bring that, the Committee could do this.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that certain cases of teachers of the University relating to this, which are known to the Registrar, and they have become Associate Professors w.e.f. 2017, but they are pending with the Audit Department.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Registrar to see to those cases.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice Chancellor to take it very seriously. They could themselves see the plight of the person, who has joined before two years as Associate Professor and the benefit is not been grant to him so far.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is taking it seriously and instructing the Registrar.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to what the Registrar would do.

It was said that here the matter regarding Orientation and Refresher Courses is being discussed and what Professor Rajesh Gill is saying is a different issue. So far as Orientation and Refresher Courses are concerned, not even a single case is pending with them.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that they always raise issues, which are not on the agenda.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the objection, which is being raised by the RAO, should be got cleared by the Finance and Development Officer and Registrar together.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the issue raised by Professor Rajesh Gill is related to the item. It is not known whether the benefit would be given to the teachers after adopting this letter, but the persons, who have already become Associate Professors, they have not got the benefit of their promotion as yet.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the persons concerned had met him also and given three options and one of these options was whether to commit suicide. Therefore, they should take the issue seriously.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter is being taken seriously. Are they here to discuss non-serious issues?

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the circular, which is being considered, is of 16th October 2018, but the same was adopted by the Syndicate on 16th of March 2019. He urged that such things should be updated timely.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Right".

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in Item C-9 on the agenda, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a letter be written to Punjab Government, U.T. Administration, and affiliated Colleges (both aided and unaided) stating the teachers be given promotions in accordance with the above-said circular of UGC dated 16.10.2018.

X. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-10 and C-11** on the agenda were read out, viz. –

C-10. That Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar, Assistant Professor, Department of Library & Information Sciences be confirmed in his post w.e.f. from 23.01.2019 subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in respect of CWP 17501/2011 and LPA No. 62 of 2018.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 11)

C-11. That the deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor (now Associate Professor), Department of Biochemistry, P.U., be fixed as 29.06.2011 i.e. after completion one year from the date of his joining on notional basis i.e. 29.06.2010 on his previous post i.e. Assistant Professor, as has been done in the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja.

NOTE: 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 03.11.2018 (Para XII) while discussing the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 14.10.2018 (Para 3) i.e. item C-11 regarding confirmation case of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, Professor, (now Associate Professor), Shri V.K. Sibal said that this person ought to be given a notional benefit on the basis of a Court decision, but that Court decision is not before them. How could he say anything on it? Secondly, the Court decision is in regard to a different person. As such, this item should be withdrawn, and should be placed again with proper background and documents and it was resolved that in view of the discussion, Item C-9 on the agenda, be withdrawn and be placed again with proper background and relevant documents.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.3.2019 also decided that it should be recorded that the matter has been reconsidered and found in order, as it would again go to the Senate.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 13)

Initiating discussion, Shri Prabhjit Singh said that Item C-10 is to consider that Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar, Assistant Professor, Department of Library & Information Sciences be confirmed in his post w.e.f. from 23.01.2019 subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in respect of CWP 17501/2011 and LPA No. 62 of 2018. This is the decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 16.03.2019, whereas the decision of the Court in both these cases had come before 16.03.2019. The office either deliberately astray the office by not providing the latest information to the Syndicate and Senate or the office has shortage of staff. Though he could not dig out a judgement, another judgement is with him and according to this judgement, his confirmation could be done without condition. He is not opposing the item but the way the system is functioning, it is not good. They could themselves see that the issue was discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate on 16.03.2019, whereas the judgement on CWP 17501/2011 had come on 21.09.2018. Similarly, judgement in the case of LPA No.62, in which Ms. Alka Chatrath had appeared from the University, had come in the month of January 2019, i.e., 30th January 2019. When these judgements had come before the meeting of the Syndicate, why the information was not provided to the Syndicate? Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar, whom they are confirming, would say later on that the conditions imposed on his confirmation should be removed. He, therefore, requested that he should be confirmed without both the conditions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Senate should be informed by the office as to what are facts. The Syndicate was not aware of the development, which Shri Prabhjit Singh has shared just now. There could be two possibilities and one of the possibilities could be that the certified copy of the orders, to which he is referring to, might not have reached the University office or if the same were received, those might have been received after the preparation of the agenda. So he just wanted to say that in case it is fact that the orders were received before 16th of March 2019, then these three lines should be deleted and he be confirmed with effect from 23rd January 2019.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the confirmation should be unconditional.

Referring to Item C-11, Dr. Neeru Malik said that she tried herself to understand but she was unable to understand as to how the benefit could be given from the back date. If the office elaborates a little bit, they would be thankful.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, if they wanted, he could provide the details. Actually, it was a case, which was based on the orders of Punjab & Haryana High Court. In the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja, an order was passed giving the appointment from the back date and then notionally decided the date of joining and subsequently the date of confirmation. Similar was the case of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura. It had come to the Syndicate and the same was approved. Then it came in the Senate and the Senate also approved it, in principle. It was one of the Hon'ble members (Shri V.K. Sibal), who simply said that what they are referring to, should actually been included in the agenda also. That was why, it was again placed before the Syndicate and the Syndicate again endorsed it and it has come to the Senate for the second time with the input which he wanted. As such, this purely based on the orders of Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Dr. Neeru Malik enquired that even if the person was not in the University, could they give him the benefit(s).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the person was here.

Continuing, Dr. Neeru Malik said that if they see carefully the date of his joining because she did not have legal expertise, she is not able to comprehend. Therefore, she wanted clarification from the office.

It was said that the Court had passed orders in the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja and the attention of Dr. Neeru Malik was drawn to Para 6 at page 72 of the Appendix. The case of Dr. Puja Ahuja was the same and she had also not joined the University service, but she had been given benefit from the back date.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that for her (Dr. Puja Ahuja) a seat was kept reserved.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that actually the people are misleading. In fact, there is a lot of difference between not joining and not accepting the joining. She was not given the appointment letter and she approached the Court and the Court allowed her. Thereafter, since she had joined late, the due date for confirmation was something else.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that Dr. Ajay Ranga has raised a valid question that her interview was conducted, selection made and she was placed at number in the merit, but she was not given any information about her appointment. Could the University also commit such a serious offence that the candidate is selected but information regarding her selection?

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that one of these teachers was appointed at UBS in the year 2009 and was teaching there and was also become Reader, but the appointment letter was received in the year 2014.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that this benefit should also be given to the person (Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar – Item C-10) because he had gone to the Court and he has got the appointment letter through Court. Therefore, this benefit should also be given to Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar as he was not at fault.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that if this benefit is to be given, it should be given to all similarly placed persons; otherwise, to none.

Dr. Ajay Ranga suggested that Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar should also be given this benefit and he should be confirmed from back date.

It was informed that Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura approached the Court and on 12.11.2013 the Court ordered that his salary be fixed notionally. Thereafter, they sought legal opinion on the basis of 7.9.2018. Then the entire was prepared and in the last Senate, Shri V.K. Sibal had desired that the relevant documents should be attached with the case. Now, all the documents related to the case, including the Court orders, have been appended.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that his concern is as to why this benefit be not extended to Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar (Item C-10) also.

It was replied that Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar has not gone to the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No". He suggested that Item C-10 should also be examined in the light of Court's orders.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

The Vice Chancellor said that how could they do this when the Court has not passed orders in his case?

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar would make a written request to the Vice Chancellor by giving the reference of this. Thereafter, he should also be given this benefit.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the suggestion that this person should also approach the Court, is wrong. There is no purpose of compelling a person to go to the Court especially when decision of the Court on similar case is already there. Moreover, if the person approached the Court, the University would also have to incur expenditure. If the judgement on a similar case has come, they could decide the case on the basis of that judgement.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would examine the whole issue.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that they are given the benefit from the back date, but it needed to be seen whether he/she was working somewhere during that period.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would discuss this issue later on.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that this should be made clear right now. She remarked that she is restricting herself only to the agenda.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that Item C-10 should be clubbed with Item C-11 and then examined.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would examine it.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor (now Associate Professor), Department of Biochemistry, P.U., be fixed as 29.06.2011 i.e. after completion one year from the date of his joining on notional basis i.e. 29.06.2010 on his previous post i.e. Assistant Professor, as has been done in the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja; and
- (2) the issue of confirmation of Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar, Assistant Professor, Department of Library & Information Science, from the back date, be got examined as has been done in the case of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, Associate Professor, Department of Biochemistry, and the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Senate.

XI.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-12** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

C-12 That the request dated 24.01.2019 of Dr. Devinder Dhawan, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh for further extension of one year w.e.f. 1st June 2019, under Regulation 17.4 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, as a special case, be accepted.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 16)

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Initiating discussion, Dr. Amit Joshi said that this issue came up every time. Are they giving him (Dr. Devinder Dhawan) extension in service or extension as Chief Medical Officer?

It was clarified that they are giving him extension in service as well as Chief Medical Officer.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired as to under which regulation they are giving him extension as Chief Medical Officer.

Professor Mukesh Arora remarked that were extensions, which were earlier given to Dr. Harish Khanna and Dr. Sheila Arora (former Chief Medical Officers), also wrong? Were more Senators with them and less with Dr. Devinder Dhawan? He said that all should be treated equally. If extension was given to them Dr. Harish Khanna and Dr. Sheila Arora (former Chief Medical Officers), he (Dr. Devinder Dhawan) should also be given and the policy of might is right should not be adopted.

Dr. Ameer Sultana said that when they are not giving administrative powers to teaching faculty after retirement, why are they giving the same to him (Dr. Devinder Dhawan)? Legally it is wrong. Either the administrative powers should also be given to teaching faculty or he should also not be given.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma intervened to say that this is the point.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they should be told as to why earlier the administrative powers were given to Dr. Harish Khanna and Dr. Sheila Arora. When Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they had committed the mistake at that time, Professor Arora said that then they should admit the mistake. Moreover, when the case of extension of Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma, noble person came, they did not grant him extension, whereas others are being granted.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that Professor Mukesh Arora is right.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first of all, earlier, all had been given extension. It is not that extension is to be given to the teachers only as they had also given extension to the Librarians.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if the administrative powers are to be given to Dr. Devinder Dhawan, then the same should also be given to the teaching faculty after retirement.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma remarked that they should not adopt double standard.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that at the moment they should grant extension to Dr. Devinder Dhawan, Chief Medical Officer, but henceforth the extension should be given after framing the guidelines for the purpose.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that two issues are involved – (i) extension in service; and (ii) extension in service with full benefits (powers). He added that here the teachers are also re-employed, but they did not allow them to continue on the administrative positions, e.g., Chairpersons of the Departments, etc. However, this is a very exceptional kind of case, where they are not only giving extension in service, but also designating him as Chief Medical Officer whereas eligible person(s) is/are already there at Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh. How could they deny this benefit (designation of Chief Medical Officer) to those persons?

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Professor Mukesh Arora asked that were the previous persons, whom extension in service along with administrative powers was given, were not eligible? Why they are objecting now. That was why, he is pleading that extension should be given to all.

At this stage, din prevailed as several members starting speaking together.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that an impression is being given as if discrimination is being done between the teachers and non-teachers. Dr. Ameer Sultana has said that then this facility should also be given to the teaching faculty. Why the administrative post is not being given to the teachers? He should be told as to which Assistant Professor, who got promoted as Professor, had been re-employed as Assistant Professor. In fact, he/she is re-employed as Professor. So far as administrative position of Chairperson is concerned, the same is neither promotion nor substantive position. Similarly, in the case of Medical Officer, they have been promoted as Chief Medical Officers. They could not appoint Professor by giving extension as Assistant Professor. So far as, the query made by Professor Mukesh Arora is concerned, they had neither committed the mistake earlier in giving the extension nor now they are committing the mistake. In accordance with the Regulation quoted by them, if they did not grant extension to Dr. Devinder Dhawan as CMO, it would be discrimination, and it is not that since extension was given to previous CMOs, he should also be given the extension. In fact, the University community wanted this person to be serving by giving extension. Of course, certain people have objection. His request to them also is that in the interest of the University community, this CMO should be given extension in terms of the Regulations quoted above.

Some of the members said that the item is approved.

When the Vice Chancellor said that now, they should take up Item 13 for consideration, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is wrong. He (Vice Chancellor) is giving importance to one person as if everywhere the final verdict would be given by him and would function like a super Vice Chancellor, and would not like to listen to him (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma). This is not fair.

Several members said that the item is approved and requested the Vice Chancellor to move ahead.

The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to express his viewpoints on the issue.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he knew that the item would finally be approved as a big lobby is present here, but the truth is that in this very University, a Chief Medical Officer (Dr. Pragya Kumar) was not given extension. Even if extension is not given to Dr. Devinder Dhawan and moreover he would automatically go after one year, would the functioning of the University come to a standstill? Why is it happening? When there is eligible doctor, why are they depriving him? In the University system, they are not giving administrative powers to the Professors and allowing him to work as Chairperson, but here they are giving administrative powers to a Doctor. Hence, it is wrong and he knew that every person is being obliged by this Doctor. Here are those persons, who are not even entitled, but get medical treatment. If the House decided to give extension to Dr. Devinder Dhawan as Chief Medical Officer, his dissent should be recorded.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-12 on the agenda**, be approved.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Dr. Amit Joshi recorded their dissent.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

XII. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-13** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-13 That minutes dated 17.01.2019 of the Screening/Selection Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to finalise the promotional cases of Technical Officer-II (Programmer/System Programmer/System Analyst) (Senior Scale) from Step-2 to Step-3 in accordance with the existing promotion policy duly approved by BOF/Syndicate/Senate in the year 2006, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 42)

XIII. Considered amendments/deletions/additions in the Regulations circulated to the Fellows vide letter No. S.T. 5064-5152 dated 8.5.2019 **(Item C-14 on the agenda - (Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 3).**

RESOLVED: That the amendments/deletions/additions in the Regulations be approved as given below:

1. Amendment in Regulation 2 for Certificate Course in Persian appearing at Page 259 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2018-19), in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
2. Change in the nomenclature of the course i.e. “Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged” to that of “Diploma in Fine Arts for Divyng (effective from the session 2018-2019) in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
3. Amendment in Regulation 11.3 for M.A. Women’s Studies appearing at page 92 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2017-18) in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
4. Amendment in Regulation 3 for MBA for Executive Programme at UBS (effective from the session 2018-19), in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
5. Amendment in Regulation 2 for B. Architecture (effective from the session 2016-2017), in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
6. Amendment in Regulations 11(I) STUDY LEAVE (i) to (xv) appearing at Pages 140-141 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007 (effective from the Senate decision dated 29.9.2013), in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
7. Amendments/additions in Regulations for Bachelor of Homeopathic Medicine and Surgery (B.H.M.S.) (effective from the session 2015-16), in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
8. Change in nomenclature of Masters in Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems to Masters in Geoinformatics (effective from the

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

session 2019-2020) and (ii) Regulations for Masters in Geoinformatics (Semester System) (effective from the session 2019-2020, in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

9. Regulations for Masters in Disaster Management (effective from the session 2019-2020), in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
10. Regulations for Bachelor of Business Administration (Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
11. Regulations for Choice Based Credit System B.Sc. (Honours) under the framework of Honours School System (effective from the session 2016-2017), in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.
12. Amendment in Regulation 6.2 meant for M.Sc. (System Biology & Bioinformatics), in anticipation of approval of Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

XIV. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

- C-15.** That the minutes dated 04.12.2018 of the Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 11)

XV. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-16, C-17, C-18, C-19, C-20, C-21, C-22, and C-23** on the agenda were read out viz. –

- C-16.** That the recommendations, of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C., dated 04.10.2018 (relating to Items 7, 9, 10, 18 and 23) be approved.

(Syndicate dated 8.12.2018 Para 5)

- C-17.** That the minutes dated 27.11.2018 (Item No. 6) and minutes dated 24.12.2018 of the Executive Committee, PUSC, be approved.

NOTE: That in future, the minutes of the Executive Committee of PUSC has been placed before the Syndicate as an information item.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 13)

- C-18.** That recommendations (Item No.7, 15, 20, 21 & 27) dated 13.09.2017 of the Executive Committee of PUSC, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 25)

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- C-19.** That the recommendations dated 02.02.2018 (Item Nos. 3, 4, 13, 19, 20, 23 & 24 - enlisted under Sr. No.1 to 7) of the Executive Committee of PUSC, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 30.3/21.4/29.4.2018 Para 30)

- C-20.** That the recommendations (No.5 & 6) dated 27.3.2018 of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C., be approved.

(Syndicate dated 29.4.2018 Para 4)

- C-21.** That the minutes dated 27.03.2018 (Item No.2 and 4) of the General Body of PUSC, be approved.

NOTE: The Syndicate has also resolved that a letter be written to the Colleges which have not paid the sports fee, youth welfare fee and any other similar fee to submit the same failing which the matter be reported to the Syndicate for taking the necessary action.

(Syndicate dated 29.4.2018 Para 5)

- C-22.** That the recommendations (Sr. Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 Item Nos. 33, 34, 35 & 40, respectively) dated 10.5.2018 of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C., be approved.

(Syndicate dated 26.5.2018 Para 36)

- C-23.** That the minutes dated 02.11.2017 (7, 9 & 10) of the Executive Committee of PUSC, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 18)

Professor Chaman Lal enquired as to what do they mean by PUSC? Is it Panjab University Students' Council or something else?

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that PUSC stands for Panjab University Sports Committee.

Professor Chaman Lal further enquired as to what are the functions of this Committee and requested to explain the same.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma informed that Panjab University Sports Committee is an elected Body, which also comprised of students' representatives. These recommendations have been approved unanimously by the PUSC as well as by the Syndicate. Now, it has also been decided that since it is an elected body, its recommendations be placed before the Syndicate for information only.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the recommendations of the PUSC should be placed before the Syndicate/Senate for consideration and not for information only.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Jarnail Singh opined that the recommendations of the PUSC should be placed before the Syndicate/Senate in accordance with the provisions of Panjab University Calendar(s).

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that both the Syndicate and Senate are the elected Bodies. Even the recommendations of the Syndicate are placed before the Senate for consideration. Hence, the recommendations of the PUSC should also be placed before the Syndicate and Senate for consideration.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-16, C-17, C-18, C-19, C-20, C-21, C-22 and C-23** on the agenda, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That in future all the recommendations of PUSC be placed before Syndicate and Senate for consideration

XVI. Considered **(Item C-24 on the agenda)** the reports dated 14.09.2018, 20.09.2018 and 13.10.2018 submitted by the Committee in respect of (i) S.D.P. College, Ludhiana, (ii) Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana and (iii) Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana, be accepted and the action be taken by the College Branch.

- NOTE:** (i) The College Branch has been instructed to entertain only those letters which are written by Principal. Accordingly, letter No. SDPC/19/4677 dated 25.1.2019 written by Director, S.D.P. College for Women, Daresi Road, Ludhiana, be not entertained.
- (ii) Financial statement and other mandatory information of all colleges, as stipulated by the regulations of Panjab University Calendar, be asked for from all the affiliated colleges.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 27)

- (iii) During general discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 it was decided that the letter be issued by the DCDC to SDP College for Women, Ludhiana, for giving point-wise reply on the report of the Committee dated 14.09.2018.
- (iv) An advisory to the General Secretary, S.D.P. Sabha, emphasising that SDP Sabha should extend cooperation to the University and its decision making bodies on the issues under examination and non compliance of the instruction of the University is likely to be taken seriously by the University Syndicate.
- (v) The matter was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 11.5.2019 for consideration if suitable direction be issued to the general secretary S.D.P. It has been resolved that displeasure of the Syndicate be conveyed.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- (vi) The report in respect of D.D. Jain Memorial College will be submitted later, as the same is yet to be considered by the Syndicate.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that the reports are about three Colleges and all the three belonged to Ludhiana. It is a matter of pride for Panjab University that all these Colleges have obtained Grade 'A' from the NAAC. If they see their history, one of these Colleges had been established in the year 1968, another in the year 1970 and the other in the year 2010. The reports had been submitted by the four members of the Senate and if they go through the reports, he did not think that there is more injustice to the teachers anywhere in the country. He has read each and every line of this report and found that neither maternity leave is being given nor the teachers are allowed to go to attend Orientation and Refresher Courses. He would like to congratulate the members of the Committee for raising the issues of non-teaching staff besides teachers. It is astonishing that the person, who is working as Superintendent in one of the Colleges for the last so many years, is getting a salary of Rs.2,500/- p.m. These are reports of September 2018. If they see the item, the item is to consider that the reports dated 14.09.2018, 20.09.2018 and 13.10.2018 submitted by the Committee in respect of (i) S.D.P. College, Ludhiana, (ii) Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana and Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana, be accepted and the action be taken by the Colleges Branch. He is surprised with this line "the action be taken by the Colleges Branch". Is the Colleges Branch supposed to take action against the Colleges? Such lines should not be brought for consideration. All the three reports are explicitly clear. Since the matter could go to the Court, they have to keep it in order. All the observations of the Committee because the Committee has not recommended anything, are alarming and the teachers could not have a dignified status there in view of what treatment is being meted out to them. The teachers did not have any liberty of any kind. How would they sustain the quality parameters? They could not have any quality which is being talked by the Government of India and Panjab University. He was watching a video of one of the Colleges. When the grade of D.D. Jain Memorial College came, full management and staff sat there and the President and Secretary of the Management said (which is on You Tube) that today is a big of the College history and they have got 'A' Grade from NAAC and they should celebrate it. That is an 8 minutes video in which the Management has admitted that they have been able to achieve this only and only because of the teachers, who are working in the College. What would the teachers do? They have brought the College to high profile parameters. Only 30% 'A' Grade Colleges are there in the entire India. Now, it is a torture on the teachers as all types of malpractices are being done with them. One of the teachers wrote (which is part of this report) that he is being given this much salary and his mobile is kept outside and then he is called in by the Chairman of the Management, who asked him that this much of amount is to be withdrawn from his account. Are they giving this message from Panjab University? Ultimately, he/she is working there at a monthly salary of Rs.12,000/- to Rs.13,000/- p.m. Out of these three Colleges, two are functioning under grant-in-aid scheme of the Government and they are old Colleges under the grant-in-aid scheme. On the basis of this report (without waiting for the confirmation of the minutes, which took 2-3 months) the University should immediately take action against these Colleges in accordance with the provisions of the University Regulations, Rules, Guidelines, Instructions, etc., so that the teachers could feel dignified and that he is part of the society. If these reports are diluted in any manner, the members of the Senate as well as the teachers would not be satisfied.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that he 100 per cent agreed with Dr. Dalip Kumar because this is the case of September/October 2018 and recently the Syndicate has accepted

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

these reports. In the Syndicate, they had taken the decision that the Dean, College Development Council should seek point-wise reply from all these three Colleges. Perhaps, the replies have also been received, which would be considered by the Syndicate in its next meeting, which is scheduled for 28th May 2019. They only wish whatever action is to be taken against these Colleges, should be taken at the earliest.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that he had said during the zero hour discussion that the Vice Chancellor should form a Committee. Whosoever are the members of the Committee, they discussed the issue and whatever best option is available with them, is recommended. He is saying so because he was also a member of the Committee, which was constituted for these three Colleges. It is very difficult to leave aside their office work and go with the Committee. He was not able to go to one College, but had gone to two other Colleges. Whatever has been written by them, is the factual position because neither the Committee was competent to propose any action nor they were able to do that because it is the job of the Syndicate and the Senate. They (he (Shri Prabhjit Singh), Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu and Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan, had met the Managing Committee and also interacted with the staff members. The staff only did not weep, but did all other things as water has already crossed over their shoulders. Several things, which were relating to the dignity of the teachers, they did not mention in the reports. 80% of the staff is working in these College on a monthly salary of Rs.6,000/- for the last 10-15 years. The teachers are not being allowed to attend Orientation and Refresher Courses. Just now, they have approved an item relating to teachers exempting them from attending Orientation and Refresher Courses up to 31st December 2018. Whether the date is extended up to 2012 or 2018, it did not matter to them as they are not allowed to attend Orientation and Refresher Courses. In fact, they did not know as to what Orientation and Refresher Courses are. Moreover, they have not applied for grant of next grade of Assistant Professors. This is the position of teachers in majority of the aided and unaided affiliated Colleges. One of the lady Superintendents is working in a College at a monthly salary of Rs.2,500/- and she is working there for the last 20 years. The Receptionist of the College had also met them and when they asked her that her name is not in the attendance register of the College, she showed them her appointment letter. She told them she is not allowed to enter the premises of the College. When they asked the reason from the President of the Management, he told that she has been removed from the College. They asked him to show the orders relating to her removal, expulsion, etc., he told that there are no such orders, but they have removed her from the College. The position in the Colleges is that the President of the College or the Principal directed the guard not to allow entry of any employee to the College premises. If entry of teachers, especially lady teachers, to the College premises is denied, where he/she should go? The Colleges are functioning in this manner, that too, aided Colleges, which is astonishing. The person concerned has made complaint, copy of which has been sent to the office of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Punjab Government, but result is zero as only papers are being passed on from one office to another. They could themselves see that the Committee, which was formed by the Senate, its report is being considered only after almost a year. This is the reason owing to which they did not wish to work on the Committee because they knew that no purpose would be served. He urged that whatever Committee is formed by the Vice Chancellor, it should go to the conclusion or the Committee members should be told that here they have gone wrong, so that they could improve upon their work in future. As told by Dr. K.K. Sharma, the replies of the Colleges would go to the Syndicate and the Syndicate would propose the next course of action.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that first of all, he would like to congratulate the members of the Committee, who have prepared and submitted these reports. They

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

have been raising the issues since long that several malpractices are being done in the affiliated Colleges. Now, they have right time to set example and they should not let this opportunity go. Whatever action is required to be taken, must immediately be taken so that all the Colleges come to the right path and as to how they are supposed to run the Colleges.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he has already spoken on this issue much in the Syndicate meeting. He would like to make a request to the entire House because the Colleges have tried to give a communal colour to the Inspection/Inquiry Committee and has said that this is a Hindu College. The Committee comprised of Sikh person(s), they wanted to malign image of Hindu College. He urged the entire House to condemn this malicious act of the College in totality.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that, in fact, this Committee was formed in the Syndicate, and thereafter, they (he himself, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua) visited the Colleges. Since he himself and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua represented the teachers' constituency, they requested them to tell them without any fear whichever injustice has been done to them. On after getting assurance, they narrated all the difficulties faced by them. Thereafter, they checked the record and prepared their report on the basis of proofs. He had received messages from these teachers from September 2018 to till date and they are saying with folded hands that it would have been better had they not come to them because the harassment being given to them has doubled from the one which they have mentioned in their report. In fact, they are being insulted. Sometimes, they are not allowed to mark their attendance and sometimes debarred from entering the College premises. They and their parents are also being asked to beg from them. Now, the position is that they (Committee members) could never go to that College again. The situation is so alarming that it needed immediate action.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that this issue was also discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate and they had accepted the report and sought point-wise reply. Letters have also been issued by the Registrar as well as Dean, College Development Council. Now, they have only to take action and give message to the society, so that a message should go to other Colleges that if they do injustice to the teachers, they have to face the consequences.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that, in fact, it was a complaint against three Colleges, i.e., (i) S.D.P. College, Ludhiana, (ii) Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana, and (iii) Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana. If they see the report they would find the same kinds of problems in all these three Colleges except one to two problems. For example, full salary, HRA, DA, leave encashment, etc. is not being given to the teachers. Almost the same kinds of problems are there. As is being suggested, all the three Colleges must be taught a lesson, but the question is as to what kind of policy was being framed by the University till date or could frame in future, with which all the Colleges could mend their ways because same problem is prevailing in majority of the Colleges not only in these three Colleges. 90% of the Colleges in Punjab have the same issue. They are discussing action to be taken against three Colleges, which must be taken, but what about the other affiliated Colleges. How the University regulations/rules are to be implemented, needed to be thought. As such, they have to frame a comprehensive policy under which all the affiliated Colleges could be covered.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it has come to his notice that one of the Colleges has terminated the services of several teachers by giving them one month's notice. The teachers concerned had come to him. Once they had taken a decision in the Senate, in the case of Mai Bhago College, Ramgarh, where one of the teachers (Ms.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Anjali, Economics teacher) was not being given full salary, and they had protected her. What the College did was that they discontinued the subject of Economics. He urged that it should be ensured that none of the teachers is removed from the service. Whosoever's services have been terminated, he/she should be taken back by the College concerned.

Dr. Gurmit Singh said that he has come to the meeting after visiting two-three Centres. The teachers of these Colleges met and they had told him that the Committee has done a wonderful job. His only concern is whether some concrete result would come out or not. Secondly, it is for the first time that the wrong doings of certain aided Colleges have been reported. The Vice Chancellor must write about this, on behalf of the Senate, to the Director Public Instructions and Punjab Government that such and such things are happening in aided Colleges, which is very serious.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he did not know what was discussed in the Syndicate and what decision had been taken there and the same is known only to the members of the Syndicate. Whatever decision has been taken by the Syndicate, and perhaps the Syndicate has decided to write a letter to these Colleges. He is surprised that on the one hand, they are writing them a letter seeking explanation from them as to why action be not initiated against them and on the other hand, they are sending Affiliation Committees and giving them new courses. Why it is happening? How the Colleges would stop all this especially when they are sending Affiliation Committees and giving new courses? Even if they constitute numerous Committees to see the functioning of the Colleges, nothing is going to happen and the Colleges would continue to function. He enquired as to why they are sending Inspection Committees to such Colleges.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that their Committee was so sincere that despite visiting the College(s) so many times, they did not charge any money from anyone. So much so they did not take even the payment of T.A. and D.A.

Professor Chaman Lal said that a lot of resentment has been expressed by the entire Senate on this issue. He is listening about the mal-functioning of the Colleges for the last about three years, but action has not been taken against any Colleges during this period. All the Senators received e-mails/messages from the teachers and students of these three Colleges continuously. He has not gone through the reports, but he knew that there are lot of problems in these Colleges. They are also watching that they did not get chance to improve the functioning of the Colleges. In this regard, he would like to suggest that whatever action is to be taken against the College(s), that should be legally tenable, so that they did not face any legal problem in future. Since the managements of the Colleges have money, they approached the Court and get stay. He suggested that they should form a Committee of 2-3 Syndics having legal background, e.g., Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and others or Legal Councillor of the University, in the meeting of the Syndicate, which is scheduled for 28th May 2019. The Committee should suggest/recommend a punishment, which should prove deterrent to other affiliated Colleges, so that the other Colleges are saved. Even if a single College is disaffiliated, the other Colleges would not dare to disobey/violate the regulations, rules, guidelines, instructions, etc. of the University. And if need be, fine to the tune of Rs.10 lacs should be imposed on those Colleges, which violate the regulations, rules, guidelines, norms, instructions, etc. of the University.

Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out that one more College, namely National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, was also clubbed with these Colleges and there were four Colleges in total.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

It was informed by the Dean, College Development Council, that so far as the issue of these three Colleges is concerned, the Hon'ble members who had inspected these Colleges, are present in the House. On the basis of the report received, they had sought explanation from these three Colleges. The reply from all the three Colleges had come and the same was placed before the Syndicate. The Syndicate after considering the reply received from the Colleges decided that para-wise reply should be sought from the Colleges. Now, the matter is being again placed before the Syndicate meeting scheduled for 28th May 2019. As being pointed out by certain Hon'ble members, one of the Colleges (S.D.P. College, Ludhiana) has removed four teachers from the service and the College is considering for removal of fifth teacher. When this issue had come to their knowledge, they had issue a letter to the College asking one person from the Management and the Principal to meet them in the Senate Hall on Monday. The College had replied that since the Principal is injured, she could not come, but the other person(s) also did not come. Then they again wrote to them that if the Principal could not come, she could nominate any other person, so that he/she along with one person from Management come to the University to meet the University authorities. Thereafter, they received a letter from the College stating that the Panjab University is harassing them. The reply of this was given by the Registrar to the SDP College, Ludhiana, that it is completely wrong to say that Panjab University is harassing the College. When the issue was placed before the Syndicate in its previous meeting, it was decided that the College(s) should be issued show cause notices under Regulation 11.1 that if the College(s) did not remove the deficiencies within a very short span of time, action would be taken against it/them under Regulation 11.1. This is the latest development up to now. On being asked whether they are still sending Inspection Committees to these Colleges, it was replied that as said by Professor Chaman Lal, whatever action is to be taken by them, should be legally tenable, and unless and until the competent body ask them to discontinue sending Inspection Committees, they could not stop sending Inspection Committees.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that now they should take a decision in the Senate that the reports of the Inspection Committees, which have been received, should be kept in abeyance.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that the reports of the Inspection Committees, which have been received, should not even be placed before the Affiliation Committee.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that all the tainted Colleges should be treated equally.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that no issue should be decided without placing the same before the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that even if the Inspection Committees have visited the Colleges, against whom action is under consideration, action on the Inspection report(s) in the cases should be kept in abeyance.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stated that in the absence of the Vice Chancellor, the Dean, College Development Council, has explained the position in a very good manner. The Dean, College Development Council, has explained that the College persons had been

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

called to the University to explain their position. Firstly, they told that the Principal of the College is injured and then no person from the Management came. Then the University authorities again wrote to them to send the representative of the Principal along with a person of the Management, and then they wrote that the Panjab University is harassing them. They could themselves gauge the situation because the College is saying that Panjab University is harassing them. The Registrar has replied to them none is harassing them and they have just to come and meet certain Officers and explain the position. Here there is nothing personal. All the members felt concern that a College, which had several deficiencies, where so many Committees had also gone, is neither ready to obey their instructions nor to meet them. The second point is more serious because this issue is continuing for the last about one year. Now, the members are suggesting that, in future, Inspection Committees should not be sent to such tainted Colleges. Even if they request for sending the Inspection Committees, they should be clearly told to first following the Panjab University Calendar. As such, no Inspection Committee be sent to such Colleges. Thirdly, he also felt pained when he (Vice Chancellor) also, perhaps went to one of these Colleges for a Convocation. On the one hand, the College is not ready to follow the norms of the University and the College is saying that Panjab University is harassing them, and on the other hand, their own Vice Chancellor goes to that very College for Convocation to award degrees, which is shameful for all of them. Therefore, whenever he goes to any College, he is most welcomed and could go anywhere, but before going it should be ensured that the College is not indulged in malpractices and it is not harassing the teachers or imposing unnecessary fines on the students, so that no negative news is published by the newspapers and it did not have bad affect on the University.

Dr. Neeru Malik stated that they are talking here about the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab. She would like to inform the House that 17 teachers of a College situated in the Union Territory of Chandigarh itself namely Homoeopathic College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh, have made a combine complaint against the Principal of the College that they are being continuously harassed. The College commenced at 8.30 a.m. and continue to function up to 4.30 p.m. and the teachers stayed there for six hours. Just to harass the teachers, they have been asked them to perform OPD duties from 4.30 p.m. to 6.00 p.m. The medical staff is supposed to be present from 8.00 a.m. to 2.00 p.m. and the teachers would perform OPD duties in the evening. Why? What would the medical staff do in the evening? If they have to run the OPD, they should recruit the requisite medical staff. They should be aware as to what is their jurisdiction with regard to the timings of the teachers. If they are saying that they are doing this in accordance with the Regulations/Rules of Medical Council of India, an Inquiry Committee should be appointed to enquire whether all the appointments and promotions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or Associate Professor to Professor in the Homoeopathic College & Hospital have been made in accordance with the Homoeopathic Medical Council. Another case is going on there, where they are misleading. She would meet him (Vice Chancellor) and inform him about the entire issue.

RESOLVED: That the reports dated 14.09.2018, 20.09.2018 and 13.10.2018 submitted by the Committee in respect of (i) S.D.P. College, Ludhiana, (ii) Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana and (iii) Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana, be accepted and action be initiated against these Colleges.

XVII.

Considered (**Item C-25 on the agenda**) that –

- (i) the UGC Regulations dated 18.07.2018 for promotion under CAS, for teachers in Panjab University and for teachers in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University be adopted.
- (ii) the application forms for promotion under CAS (a) for teachers in Panjab University as per Annexure- and (b) for teachers in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, as per Annexure-along with the minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 16.10.2018, be approved and it be uploaded on the website of Panjab University.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 6)

Initiating discussion, Dr. Parveen Goyal, referring to page 207, said that certain small modifications are needed to be made, e.g., ‘publication for each author – 70% to each Principal/Corresponding author is to be replaced by **70% to each supervisor**. Secondly, for the thesis supervision, it has been written “Supervisor and Co-supervisor”, whereas in Panjab University only **Supervisor** is there. **Hence, in the total score it should be 70% for all Supervisors.**

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that there are two paras in the UGC Regulations dated 18.07.2018 for promotion under CAS. His question is whether they have adopted these regulations. Secondly, have they adopted these regulations for promotions under the CAS? Clause 6.3 of these Regulations is explicitly clear that whether these regulations are in picture at the moment or not, they could make promotions in accordance with the old scheme up to a period of three years. He was also a member of this Committee. The UGC has circulated a notice, which has also been uploaded on its website, stating that they are receiving certain suggestions about it and the UGC has sought suggestions up to 15th December as to what deficiencies are there, so that they could improve upon the deficiencies. So far as he knew, after 15th December, the UGC has not taken any decision on this. Have they adopted these Regulations only for promotions under the CAS or they adopted the total UGC Regulations, 2018? Thirdly, since the Model Code of Conduct is over and they are going to appoint Assistant Professors and the same is very important for them. If they see the position of Colleges situated in Chandigarh, majority of their grant-in-aid positions, i.e., 6-8 positions in every College are lying vacant. Whether their template for Assistant Professors is as per the above-said regulations or in accordance with the UGC Regulations, 2016 (4th Amendment)? In this, several things needed to be clarified. From this, it seemed to him that the University is going to adopt these regulations only for the promotions under CAS. Hence, he wanted clarification(s) from their side.

It was said by the Registrar that though there are certain issues in these regulations, the regulations are to be adopted by them. Secondly, it is never done that they adopt the regulations only for promotions under the CAS and not for open selections. Thirdly, so far as the issue relating Ph.D., etc. is concerned, that they could do. Moreover, though new regulations came in the month of July 2018, the UGC did not withdraw old regulations. The UGC gave new regulations, but a clause inserted that they have the option to adopt or not, especially under the CAS they have the option whether they should adopt these regulations or not. They have to adopt these new regulations because they did not have the option. If tomorrow, the UGC withdraw these regulations or make amendment(s) in these regulations, they would definitely follow that. Until then, they have to follow these Regulations of 2018.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that then they should change the item.

The Registrar said, "Yes, they have to amend the item".

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he would like to have a clarification that now, when a College would conduct the interview for the post of Principal, would they allow the selection in accordance with 400 points (4th Amendment) or in accordance with 120 points (new regulations).

It was clarified that at the moment, they would continue with 400 points because they have not adopted the new regulations so far.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that unless and until they adopted the new UGC Regulations, 2018 and notified the same, the old regulations/procedure would continue.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that, this meant, if they adopted the new regulations, they would allow the selection of Principal(s) with new regulations, i.e., with 120 points.

The reply was given in affirmative.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the selection of Principals with new regulations, i.e., with 120 points, would be allowed after issuance of the notification by the University. However, they notified in the Campus, but the same is not notified to the affiliated Colleges for months together, which led to problems in the Colleges.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they would definitely face problem in the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab because the aided Colleges in Punjab are still conducting the interviews for the posts of Principals in accordance with the old regulations/procedure. This is should be kept in view while sending the experts. It should not happen that they make appointment of Principals in unaided Colleges with 120 points and in aided Colleges with 400 points. He, therefore, suggested this should be made amply clear so that no ambiguity is there.

Dr. Dalip Kumar requested to the Registrar to change the title.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the UGC Regulations dated 18.07.2018 for promotion under CAS and appointments (Open Selections), for teachers in Panjab University and for teachers in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, be adopted;
- (ii) the application forms for promotion under CAS - (a) for teachers in Panjab University as per Annexure-I; and (b) for teachers in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, as per Annexure-II along with the minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 16.10.2018, be approved and uploaded on the website of Panjab University; and
- (iii) the following portions of Annexure-I and Annexure-II mentioned at pages 207 and 219 of the Appendix, be amended and read as:

More than two authors: 70% of total value of publication for the Principal/Corresponding	More than two authors: 70% of total value of publication for each of the Principal/
--	---

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Author and 30% of total value of publication for each of the joint Authors.	Corresponding Author/ Supervisor and 30% of the total value of publication for each of the joint authors.
For joint supervision of research students: the formula shall be 70% of the total score for Supervisor and Co-supervisor.	For joint supervision of research students: the formula shall be 70% of the total score for all Supervisors.

C-26. Shifted to Information (I-51)

XVIII. Considered (**Item C-27 on the agenda**), that the following item in the Department of Physics, be written off as the same is beyond economical repair:

Particulars	PHS No.	Date of Purchase	Purchase Value
63 KVA Genset (Kirloskar make)	PHS/5	06.03.2008	Rs.5,42,000/- + Rs.63,000/- installation charges

(Syndicate dated 23.09.2017 Para 17)

- NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 15.12.2018 (Para XIX) has resolved that Item C-33 be referred back to the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh with the direction to attach a certificate to the effect that the said Generator is beyond repair.
2. Pursuant to above decision of the Senate, a copy of the minutes of the technical expert committee and technical report from the firm is enclosed (Appendix).

RESOLVED: That the following item of Department of Physics, Panjab University, be written off as the same is beyond economical repair:

Particulars	PHS No.	Date of Purchase	Purchase Value
63 KVA Genset (Kirloskar make)	PHS/5	06.03.2008	Rs.5,42,000/- + Rs.63,000/- installation charges

XIX. Considered (**Item C-28 on the agenda**) that recommendations dated 30.03.2019 (Item No. 22) of the Faculty of Science, for award of B.Sc. (General) degree to a student of B.Sc. (Hons.) under the framework of Honours School System (CBCS) passing out in 2019, be approved.

NOTE: That the Vice Chancellor had been authorised to make necessary approval on the recommendations of Dean, Faculty of Science under the framework of Honours School System (CBCS).

(Syndicate dated 10.04.2019 Para 22)

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

RESOLVED: That the recommendations dated 30.03.2019 (Item No. 22) of the Faculty of Science, for award of B.Sc. (General) degree to a student of B.Sc. (Hons.) under the framework of Honours School System (CBCS) passing out in 2019, be approved.

XX. Considered **(Item C-29 on the agenda)** that –

1. The fee structure (Tuition fee, Development fee, etc.) for International Students for the session 2019-20 for various courses being offered at the University Campus, as per Appendix, be approved;
2. The seats under NRI and Foreign National categories in various courses being offered at University Campus, be approved, as per Appendix, with the modification that –
 - (i) Column 2 of Sr.No.45 at pages 94 and 108 be read as **“LL.M. (Self-Finance), LL.M. (Evening) and LL.M. (Evening) for Advocates/Judicial Officers”**;
 - (ii) 2 seats for NRIs mentioned at pages 94 and 108 under LL.M. (Evening) course for Advocates/ Judicial Officers”, be treated as deleted; and
 - (iii) since 46.5% reservation is already there in B.A.LL.B. Course/B.Com. LL.B./LL.B and there could not be more than 50% reservation, remaining 3.5% seats be reserved for NRI candidates. In case, any of such seat(s) remained unfilled, the same be converted to general seat(s).

NOTE: The manpower audit of the staff provided to different Departments/ Offices be got done at the earliest.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 3)

Professor Chaman Lal, while going through the item, stated that though the item related to fee structure, they wanted to get it approved without any discussion. They did not think any need for some discussion on this item, whereas they did know that it related to students' fees and there would be a lot of discussion on it. They wanted to just skip it away.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh clarified that this fee structure is related to only international students.

Professor Chaman Lal enquired as to what is difference between the fee of international students and normal Indian students. How much difference is there? They should explain the item a little bit so that they might not get charged.

It was clarified by the Finance & Development Officer that this agenda Item 20 pertained to fee structure only for foreign nationals and NRI students. The fee structure of NRI students is completely different from the Indian students.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019**RESOLVED:** That –

1. The fee structure (Tuition fee, Development fee, etc.) for International Students for the session 2019-20 for various courses being offered at the University Campus, as per **Appendix-I**, be approved;
2. The seats under NRI and Foreign National categories in various courses being offered at University Campus, be approved, as per **Appendix-I**, with the modification that –
 - (i) Column 2 of Sr.No.45 at pages 94 and 108 be read as **“LL.M. (Self-Finance), LL.M. (Evening) and LL.M. (Evening) for Advocates/Judicial Officers”**;
 - (ii) 2 seats for NRIs mentioned at pages 94 and 108 under LL.M. (Evening) course for Advocates/Judicial Officers”, be treated as deleted; and
 - (iii) since 46.5% reservation is already there in B.A.LL.B. Course/B.Com. LL.B./LL.B and there could not be more than 50% reservation, remaining 3.5% seats be reserved for NRI candidates. In case, any of such seat(s) remained unfilled, the same be converted to general seat(s).

XXI.Considered **(Item C-30 on the agenda)** that –

- (A) the recommendations contained in the minutes dated 01.05.2019 of the Committee (**Appendix-II**), constituted by the Vice Chancellor, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 10.04.2019 (Para 9) (Appendix-II) to examine the proposals regarding increase in number of seats/additional/new courses in various departments of Panjab University, from the academic session 2019-20, be approved as under:
 - (1) that Item No.2 (proposal D mentioned in letter dated 03.04.2019), regarding conversion of 10 seats out of 15 seats to self-financing seats, under NRI category for BDS courses at Dr. HSJIDS be kept pending;
 - (2) that MBA (Entrepreneurship) at UBS, be started and the Regulations/Rules/eligibility criteria, etc. (except fee structure) as proposed by the Chairperson, UBS vide letters dated 06.02.2019 and 06.03.2019 (Appendix), be approved, with the stipulation that the fee structure for this course be the same as is for MBA (Self-financing) course(s) being offered at UIAMS;
 - (3) that Master in Tourism and Travel Management (MTTM) and Master in Hospitality Management and Catering Technology (MHMCT) courses at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, P.U., be started and eligibility criteria, admission criteria, fee structure/

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

financial implications, student intake, etc. as proposed/worked out by the Director, UIHTM vide letter dated 08.01.2019 (Appendix-II), be approved;

- (4) that Certificate course in Yoga and Meditation (Vivekananda Studies), be started and eligibility criteria, number of seats, etc. as proposed by Professor Nandita Singh, Coordinator, Centre for Vivekananda Studies vide letter dated 25.01.2019 (Appendix-II), be approved, with the stipulation the language mentioned at pages 29 and 30 of the Appendix, be modified in consultation with Professor Rajesh Gill;
- (5) that ME Computer Science and Engineering (Cyber Security) at UIET, be started and the intake as also fee structure as proposed by the Coordinator and the Administrative Committee vide letters dated 01.05.2019 and 14.03.2019 (Appendix-II) be approved; with the stipulation word 'Thesis' at page 32 of the Appendix, be replaced with "**Dissertation**", and for other corrections Professor Rajesh Gill be consulted; and
- (6) that PG Diploma in Computer Application (self-financing) at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, be started and eligibility conditions, fee structure, etc. as proposed by the Director vide dated 30.11.2018 (Appendix-II), be approved.

(B) the following recommendations contained in the minutes dated 02.05.2019 of the Committee (Appendix-II) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 10.04.2019 (Para 9) to examine the proposals regarding increase in number of seats/additional/new courses in various Departments of Panjab University, be approved as under:

- (1) that PG Diploma in Radio Production and PG Diploma in Journalism and Mass Communication at School of Mass Communication, be started, from the academic session 2019-20 and the eligibility criteria, fee structure, Rules and Regulations as proposed by the Chairperson, School of Communication Studies vide letter dated 02.05.2019 (Appendix-II), be approved; and
- (2) that the recommendation relating to starting of self-financed Ph.D. Programme at UIPS from the academic session 2019-20, be referred back for reconsideration in the light of the discussion held in the Syndicate.

NOTE: The Syndicate had also resolved that –

- (i) the fees for NRI students for all the above-said courses needed to be revised as the same is on the lower side;
- (ii) the projection, at least for next five year, be provided by the respective

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Departments for all the new courses being introduced, so that the viability of the courses could be assessed; and

- (iii) a circular be issued to all the University Teaching Departments requesting them to be careful while making recommendations regarding starting of course(s), scheme of examination, guidelines, rules, regulations, etc. so that mistakes as pointed out by Professor Rajesh Gill do not recur.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 17)

The Vice Chancellor said that Clause-1 of Part(A) of the item be treated as withdrawn.

RESOLVED: That –

- (A)** the recommendations contained in the minutes dated 01.05.2019 of the Committee (**Appendix-II**), constituted by the Vice Chancellor, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 10.04.2019 (Para 9) (Appendix) to examine the proposals regarding increase in number of seats/ additional/new courses in various departments of Panjab University, from the academic session 2019-20, be approved as under:
 - (1) that MBA (Entrepreneurship) at UBS, be started and the Regulations/Rules/eligibility criteria, etc. (except fee structure) as proposed by the Chairperson, UBS vide letters dated 06.02.2019 and 06.03.2019 (Appendix), be approved, with the stipulation that the fee structure for this course be the same as is for MBA (Self-financing) course(s) being offered at UIAMS;
 - (2) that Master in Tourism and Travel Management (MTTM) and Master in Hospitality Management and Catering Technology (MHMCT) courses at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, P.U., be started and eligibility criteria, admission criteria, fee structure/ financial implications, student intake, etc. as proposed/worked out by the Director, UIHTM vide letter dated 08.01.2019 (**Appendix-II**), be approved;
 - (3) that Certificate course in Yoga and Meditation (Vivekananda Studies), be started and eligibility criteria, number of seats, etc. as proposed by Professor Nandita Singh, Coordinator, Centre for Vivekananda Studies vide letter dated 25.01.2019 (**Appendix-II**), be approved, with the stipulation the language mentioned at pages 29 and 30 of the Appendix, be modified in consultation with Professor Rajesh Gill;

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- (4) that ME Computer Science and Engineering (Cyber Security) at UIET, be started and the intake as also fee structure as proposed by the Coordinator and the Administrative Committee vide letters dated 01.05.2019 and 14.03.2019 (**Appendix-II**) be approved; with the stipulation word 'Thesis' at page 32 of the Appendix, be replaced with "**Dissertation**", and for other corrections Professor Rajesh Gill be consulted; and
- (5) that PG Diploma in Computer Application (self-financing) at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, be started and eligibility conditions, fee structure, etc. as proposed by the Director vide dated 30.11.2018 (**Appendix-II**), be approved.

(B) the following recommendations contained in the minutes dated 02.05.2019 of the Committee (**Appendix-II**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 10.04.2019 (Para 9) to examine the proposals regarding increase in number of seats/additional/new courses in various Departments of Panjab University, be approved as under:

- (1) that PG Diploma in Radio Production and PG Diploma in Journalism and Mass Communication at School of Mass Communication, be started, from the academic session 2019-20 and the eligibility criteria, fee structure, Rules and Regulations as proposed by the Chairperson, School of Communication Studies vide letter dated 02.05.2019 (Appendix), be approved; and
- (2) that the recommendation relating to starting of self-financed Ph.D. Programme at UIPS from the academic session 2019-20, be referred back for reconsideration in the light of the discussion held in the Syndicate on para 17 dated 11.5.2019.

XXII. Considered (**Item C-31 on the agenda – Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 18**)), and

RESOLVED: That, as proposed by the Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies-Multi Disciplinary Research Centre vide letter dated 31.08.2018, B.A. (Hons.) & B.Com. (Hons.) courses, be introduced w.e.f. the academic session 2019-2020, in the Department of Evening Studies-Multi Disciplinary Research Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

XXIII. Considered (**Item C-32 on the agenda**) minutes dated 12.05.2018 (**Appendix-III**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (as authorized by the Senate in its meeting dated 10.09.2017/24.09.2017 (Para IX) (Appendix-III)), to examine the matter in its entirety and to determine the nature of action to be taken against Shri Munish Verma, under the provision of Regulation of Panjab University, so as to resist his membership to Senate in future.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.5.2018 (Para 20) (Appendix-III) considered the minutes of the meeting dated 12.5.2018 as mentioned in the above item and it was resolved that the matter be forwarded to the Senate.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

2. As per recommendations of the Committee 12.5.2018 F.I.R. has been lodge at Police Station, Sector-11, Chandigarh (Appendix-III).

(Syndicate dated 26.5.2018 Para 20)

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 12.5.2018, as per **Appendix-III**, be approved.

XXIV. Considered the recommendations of the Syndicate **(Item C-33 on the agenda)** that enquiry report dated 24.04.2018 submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Officer, District & Session Judge (Retd.), in respect of Shri Kulwant Singh, SDE (Electrical), Construction Office, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for proceeding on Earned Leave (Ex-India) w.e.f. 04.04.2016 without getting the leave sanctioned and without prior approval for leaving the headquarters to visit Canada, be accepted and forwarded to the Senate, being the competent authority, for taking the decision on the penalty to be imposed.

(Syndicate dated 29.4.2018 Para 23)

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) enquiry report dated 24.04.2018 submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Officer, District & Session Judge (Retd.), in respect of Shri Kulwant Singh, SDE (Electrical), Construction Office, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for proceeding on Earned Leave (Ex-India) w.e.f. 04.04.2016 without getting the leave sanctioned and without prior approval for leaving the headquarters to visit Canada, be accepted; and
- (2) so far as imposition of penalty is concerned, the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Senate.

XXV. Considered **(Item C-34 on the agenda – Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 12)**, and

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the report dated 26.11.2018, 09.01.2019 & 13.02.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with reference to acceptance of below specification furniture purchased for boys and girls hostel, be accepted, except the recommendation regarding recoupment of loss of Rs. 69442/- which be recovered from Er. Harmandeep Singh, J.E.
- (ii) warning to be careful in future be issued to Er. S.K. Sharma, SDE II, and Shri R.K. Rai, XEN, Construction Office, P.U.;
- (iii) the enquiry report dated 13.03.2019 submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Enquiry Officer, in respect of Shri Harmandeep Singh, J.E., with regard to remaining absent unauthorizedly without any intimation from duty w.e.f 25.05.2017, be accepted; and
- (iv) the post of Jr. Engineer held by Shri Harmandeep Singh, J.E. be declared vacant w.e.f. 25.5.2017, i.e., date from which he remained absent unauthorizedly.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

XXVI. Considered **(Item C-35 on the agenda)** that the recommendations dated 11.09.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to review the recommendations submitted by the said Committee on 05.06.2017 regarding conversion/shifting of following 9 posts of Demonstrators out of 14 from medical to Dental side and qualifications for the same i.e. Dental side and Medical side at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, be approved:

1.	Physiology	One
2.	Biochemistry	One
3.	Anatomy	Three
4.	Pathology	One
5.	Pharmacology	One
6.	Microbiology	Two

(Syndicate dated 10.12.2017 Para 26)

Initiating discussion, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that, in fact, there are 14 posts of Demonstrators at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital and out of them, 3 Demonstrators were appointed in the year 2007, and at that time, these posts were advertised likely to be made permanent. The interview of these persons was also conducted through proper channel, but they were appointed on temporary basis and they were given temporary positions. They have completed 11 years service without a single day's break and they are working continuously in Panjab University. His humble request is that since they have been appointed against sanctioned posts and they had applied for likely to be made permanent, interview also conducted as such, and they were appointed on likely to be made permanent basis. A great injustice is being meted out to them as they are still working on temporary basis. He urged that proceedings for their regularization should be started and they should be regularized at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Right". It is a positive thing and they would take a call.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that, that was why, the conversion of posts has been done. They could only be adjusted after conversion; otherwise, they did not have any option.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this issue should be got examined, so that nobody is put to loss.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is what, they are going to do.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations dated 11.09.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to review the recommendations submitted by the said Committee on 05.06.2017 regarding conversion/shifting of following 9 posts of Demonstrators out of 14 from medical to Dental side and qualifications for the same i.e. Dental side and Medical side at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, be approved:

1.	Physiology	One
2.	Biochemistry	One
3.	Anatomy	Three
4.	Pathology	One
5.	Pharmacology	One
6.	Microbiology	Two

XXVII. Item C-36 on the agenda was withdrawn, viz. -

C-36. To consider that the recommendation at Sr. No. 1 dated 26.10.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to look into the matter, to review the terms and conditions for engagement of Guest Faculty, be approved.

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor had been authorized to constitute a committee to look into recommendation No. 2 of the Committee and other related matters.

C-37. Shifted to Ratification (R-9)**XXVIII. Item C-38 on the agenda was withdrawn, viz. -**

C-38. To consider the following recommendation of the Committee dated 15.09.2017 regarding status and summary report submitted by the Chief Vigilance Officer, P.U:

- (1) recommendation of the committee at Sr. No. 1 to 4, 7 to 10, 12 to 33 of the status and summary report submitted by the CVO be noted.
- (2) recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No. 5 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted and it be added in the guidelines for appointment of Chief Coordinators/Coordinators of Examination Centres that they would not perform any other duty while working as Chief Coordinators/ Coordinators;
- (3) recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No. 6 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be referred to the same Committee which is already looking into the case;
- (4) recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No. 11 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted; and information from the XEN be solicited on the following points:
 - (i) information about the supplier (Dwivedi Furniture) who had supplied the items in the University during that period;
 - (ii) the list of competitors for the tenders;
 - (iii) the details of the specifications of the tender and the specifications of the items supplied;
 - (iv) the names of the persons who approved the tenders and received the material;
 - (v) legal opinion be sought on the possibility of filing a police complaint against Dwivedi Furniture.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- (5) the complaints which have already been recommended by the CVO as 'filed/withdrawn' be not placed before the Syndicate; and
- (6) an additional column be created in the status and summary report table showing the action taken on the issues.

NOTE: 1. The reports submitted by the CVO were noted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.4.2017 (Para 48(i)). The same was placed before the on 26.3.2017 as Item I-33 and it was decided that the item be placed for consideration in future.

2. As per decision of the Senate dated 26.3.2017, the matter was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.6.2017 (Para 6) (Appendix) for consideration. The Syndicate after discussion resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized, on behalf of the Syndicate, to form a Committee of Syndics to study the reports in detail and submit its report.

3. Accordingly, the Committee comprising of Shri Jarnail Singh, Chairperson, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Dr. Subhash Sharma, Principal N.R. Sharma, Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli and D.R. Estt. (Convener) was constituted by the Vice Chancellor. The committee met on 15.09.2017 and the recommendations of the committee were considered by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.11.2017 (Para 10).

(Syndicate dated 19.11.2017 (Para 10))

XXIX.**Item C-39 on the agenda was withdrawn, viz. -**

C-39. To consider that the -

- (i) minutes dated 07.12.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, regarding revision of rent of Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues at P.U. Sector-14 & South Campus Sector-25 and framing guidelines for booking etc., be approved.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- (ii) Free of cost booking of the Auditoria, Seminar Halls, Lawns and other venues at P.U. Sector-14 & South Campus, Sector 25, be stopped forthwith.

(Syndicate dated 30.3./21.4/29.4.2018 (Para 26)

XXX. **Item C-40 on the agenda was withdrawn, viz. -**

C-40. To consider that recommendation (No.1) of the Committee dated 27.03.2018, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to discuss the various representations made by students of Integrated-BE (Chemical)-MBA course for reducing the course period from five and half years to five years for students already admitted for the session 2018-19, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 29.4.2018 (Para 3)

C-41. Shifted to Ratification (R-10)

XXXI. Considered (Item C-42 on the agenda – Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 4), and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 11.03.2019, be approved, with the stipulation that the proposed provision for promotion for G-IV to G-III be read as under:

“100% by promotion satisfying the following qualification and experience –

- The person, who possessed the qualification 10th + 3-Year Diploma or Graduate in Science and having 6 years experience in G-IV, are eligible for applying for the post of G-III under Clause 2.4 and Clause 2.5.
- 8 Years experience in Group-IV for those persons, who are Matric with Science or XII Class with Science, pass as prescribed by the Senate for Group-IV posts.
- 15 Years experience in Group-IV for those persons, who are under Matric, i.e., don't have the qualification prescribed by the Senate for Group-IV.”

XXXII. Considered the following recommendations of the Syndicate (Item C-43 on the agenda) to rationalize the fee structure and other charges (Appendix-IV) for courses offered in the University Teaching Departments and Regional Centres of Panjab University, Chandigarh, for the session 2019-20:

1. the enhancements in the provisions of following concessions for the session 2019-20:

Sr. No.	Type of Concession	Actual Amount of Concession (2018-19)	Proposed Amount (2019-20)
1.	Orphan(none of the parents is alive or only mother is alive)	43,22,070/-	47,00,000/-

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

2.	5% Freeship under Economically weaker section	1,01,16,384/-	1,10,00,000/-
3.	Sports Category (Full fee concession)	10,33,206/-	11,00,000/-
4.	Student Aid Fund	35,49,410/-	36,00,000/-
5.	Merit-Cum-Means Tuition Fee support	54,65,552/-	1,10,00,000/-
6.	Other Concessions	1,25,470/-	2,00,000/-
Total		2,46,12,092/-	3,16,00,000/-

2. henceforth, the fee structure of University shall be determined for the complete programme/course and not for each Academic Session. Therefore, the Fee Structure for the students who are to be admitted from the Session 2019-20 shall be determined for their complete programme/course.

A. Regarding Traditional Courses :

- i) No enhancement shall be made for the students in ongoing programme i.e., students who had been admitted up to the academic session 2018-19 and who shall be seeking admission in 2nd and subsequent years in respective courses.
- ii) The students who shall be seeking admission afresh in 2019-20 (i.e., in the 1st year of respective courses) there shall be an enhancement of Rs.500/- per annum, and thereafter in the subsequent years (i.e. 2020-21 onwards), it shall be enhanced at the rate of 5%, to be rounded off to the next hundred. In order to augment the infrastructure of traditional Departments, development fee of Rs.500/- p.a. shall also be charged from the students.

B. Partially Self Financed Courses:-

- i) No enhancement shall be made for the students in the ongoing complete programme/course i.e., students who had been admitted up to the academic session 2018-19 and who shall be seeking admission in 2nd and subsequent years in respective courses.
- ii) For students seeking admission afresh in 2019-20 (i.e., 1st year of respective course) there shall be an enhancement of 7.5 % (subject to a ceiling of Rs.7500 per annum) and thereafter the fee for the subsequent years (i.e. 2020-2021 onwards) shall be enhanced at the rate of 5% to be rounded off to next hundred. Provided that in no case, the enhancement in any year shall exceed the ceiling of Rs.7500/- per annum.

- C.** The committee did not recommend any enhancement in the fee of the following courses:

1. (M.B.A.) P.U.R.C. Ludhiana
2. U.I.A.M.S. (all courses)
3. P.U. Constituent colleges
 - i) B.C.A.
 - ii) P.G.D.C.A.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- iii) B.A.B.Com
- iv) M.A. Punjabi (Sikhwala college, Sri Muktsar Sahib)

NOTE: A copy of the decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 11.5.2019 was enclosed **(Appendix-IV)**.

Professor Chaman Lal stated that about the fee structure of the University, he has to say two things. About two-three Senate meetings before, it was decided that the FIRs, which had been lodged against the students, when they had agitated against the fee hike, be got quashed. Secondly, a formula had been evolved that they could not jump the fees up. The fees could only be increased if it is absolutely necessary, and that too, not more than 5% and that 5% hike would also be for the new students only. However, for the ongoing students the old fee structure would continue. He has observed that in the case under consideration, the fee hike is more than 5%.

Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out that it related to concession to the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have noted down the point raised by Professor Chaman Lal.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-43** on the agenda, be approved.

XXXIII. The information contained in **Items R-1 to R-10** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

R-1. In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. (Ms.) Reeta Grewal, Professor, Department of History, Panjab University, on contract basis up to 05.12.2023 (i.e. the date of her attaining the age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date she join as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: Academically active report should be submitted by her after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 132 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2016 will be applicable.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 50(iii))

R-2. In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Anupam Sharma, Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University on contract basis up to 07.03.2024 (i.e. the date of his

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date he joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

NOTE: Academically active report should be submitted by him after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 132 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2016 will be applicable.

(Syndicate dated 10. 04.2019 Para 23(i))

R-3. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Manisha Kaushal, Assistant Professor (Temporary CSE), University Institute of Engineering & Technology, w.e.f. 30.11.2018 (A.N.), under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

(Syndicate dated 08.12.2018 Para 16(vi))

R-4. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Sipra Sagarika, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, w.e.f. 30.09.2016 (A.N.), under Regulation 6 at page 118-119 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 10. 04.2019 Para 23(ii))

R-5. That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Amit Katoch, Assistant Professor (Temporary), University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management, P.U. w.e.f. 01.03.2019 with the condition that he will have to deposit the salary for the period of one month of notice period, as he has tendered his resignation without submitting the notice of one month, as required, under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U., Calendar Volume-III, 2016.

(Syndicate dated 10. 04.2019 Para 23(iii))

R-6. That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of following doctors as 'Full-Time Medical Officer' purely on temporary basis in B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. on fixed salary of 45,000/- p.m. initially for period of 89 days as per the recommendations of the Administrative Committee of B.G.J. Institute of Health dated 03.10.2018 and further extension be granted on their satisfactory service, with the term & conditions notified vide advertisement No. 01/2018 dated 11.05.2018:

1. Dr. Kanwal Vilku
2. Dr. Brij Bihari Lala

(Syndicate dated 08.12.2018 Para 16(vii))

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- R-7.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Sumit Kaur, Technical Advisor (Architect), P.U., w.e.f. 22.01.2019.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 35(ii))

- R-8.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has given additional/officiating charge to Dr. Jivesh Bansal, senior-most Deputy Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., for the post of 'Librarian' (with administrative & financial powers) w.e.f. 01.04.2019 to till further orders (after completion of age of 62 years by Ms. Navjeet Kaur on 31.03.2019, present officiating Librarian).

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 22(iv))

Shifted from consideration (Item C-37)

- R-9.** That the –

- (i) minutes of the Committee dated 24.10.2017 with regard to the fee structure for Girls Hostel No. 10, be approved.
- (ii) minutes of the Committee dated 13.11.2017 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to decide the fee structure of hostels for the session 2018-19, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 24.02.2018 Para 10)

Shifted from consideration (Item C-41)

- R-10.** That the minutes dated 09.04.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to finalize the fee structure of Foreign National/PIO/NRI students for the session 2018-2019, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 26.5.2018 Para 38)

XXXIV. The information contained in **Items I-1 to I-51** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

- I-1.** That the Syndicate has felicitated to the following:

- (i) Mr. Shyam, NSS volunteer, a student of BA-III in Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, for participating in the Republic Day Parade held on 26th January, 2019 in New Delhi.
- (ii) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, and Fellow, Panjab University, on his having been bestowed upon with the Fellowship Award 2018 by Indian Pharmaceutical Association.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- (iii) Dr. Neelima Dhingra, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, on her having been conferred upon with “Bharat Ratna Mother Teresa Gold Medal Award 2018” by Global Economic Progress and Research Association, Tamil Nadu.
- (iv) Dr. S.M. Kant, former Director, Youth Welfare, Panjab University, on his having been awarded Lifetime Achievement Award at the 34th North Zone Inter University Youth Festival.
- (v) Professor Jayant N. Pethkar, School of Communication Studies, Panjab University, on his having been awarded Good Teacher Award by the Chandigarh Chapter of Public Relations Society of India.
- (vi) Professor Chaman Lal, Fellow, Panjab University, on his having been appointed as Honorary Advisor of Bhagat Singh Archives and Resource Centre of Delhi Archives of Government of NCT of Delhi.
- (vii) Dr. Dalip Kumar, Fellow, Panjab University, on his having been awarded commendation certificate by Chandigarh Administration for his contribution in the field of higher education.
- (viii) Dr. Manjit Kaur Brar, Principal, Government College of Commerce and Business Administration, Sector-50, Chandigarh, on her having been awarded commendation certificate by Chandigarh Administration for her contribution in the field of higher education.
- (ix) Dr. Prabhdeep Brar, University Institute of Fashion Technology and Vocational Development, Panjab University, on winning the best presentation award for her paper entitled “Observing sustainability: Case studies of Chandigarh boutiques and their textile waste reuse” at the 21st International Conference on sustainability in fashion and textiles’ held in Rome, Italy.
- (x) Dr. Nisha Bhargava, Principal, MCM DAV College for Women, Chandigarh and Fellow, Panjab University, on her having been nominated as a Member of the State Legal Services Authority, U.T. Chandigarh for a period of two years.
- (xi) Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma, Fellow, Panjab University on his having been conferred upon Rajdhani Gaurav Award.

- (xii) Professor Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor, Panjab University on his having been appointed a member of Governing Board of Inter-University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 1)

- (xiii) Dr. Santosh Kumar Upadhyay, Assistant Professor, Department of Botany, on his having been awarded the Young Scientist Award by the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences.
- (xiv) Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry, on his having been nominated to the Editorial Advisory Board of “Neurochemistry International”.
- (xv) Dr. Tamanna R. Sahrawat, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bioinformatics, on her being adjudged second with a cash award of Rs.5,000 in the poster competition at Conference of the Society for Vector Ecology (Indian Region), in Goa.
- (xvi) Mrs. Renuka B. Salwan, Director, Public Relations, on her having been conferred with ‘Chanakya’ Award for corporate reputation during 13th Global Communication Conclave 2019 organised by Public Relations Council of India at Jaipur.
- (xvii) team headed by Professor D.K. Dhawan, Department of Biophysics, on being granted Patent No. 306804 on 4th February, 2019 for the research “A radioactive trimer complex for the detection of tumors”.
- (xviii) Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Vice Chancellor, Himachal Pradesh National Law University, Shimla, and former Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, on her having been awarded Amity Academic Excellence Award by Amity University.
- (xix) Professor P.S. Jaswal, Vice Chancellor, Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Patiala, and former Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, on his having been awarded Amity Academic Excellence Award by Amity University.
- (xx) Dr. Dipti Sareen, Department of Biochemistry, on getting a project titled “Structure-activity relationship studies of a novel two-component

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

lantibiotic roseocin” from DST-SERB, Government of India, amount to Rs.19.75 lacs for equipment and Rs.12 lacs for manpower, travel, contingency, etc.

- (xxi) Dr. Kashmir Singh, Department of Biotechnology, on getting a project entitled “Genome-wide identification and functional analysis of long non-coding RNAs associated with biotic stress in vitis (grapevine)” from Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB), New Delhi, amounting to has been sanctioned a grant of Rs.50 lacs.
- (xxii) DAV College, Abohar, on being granted the status of “Star College” under Star College Scheme of Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India.
- (xxiii) MCM DAV College for Women, Sector 36 A, Chandigarh, on winning 3rd Rank in Best Citizen Led Initiative in Swachh Survekshan 2019 under Swachh Bharat Mission.
- (xxiv) Professor Rajeev Patnaik, Chairperson, Department of Geology, Panjab University, on his having been elected Fellow of Indian Academy of Sciences.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 1)**I-2**

That the Syndicate has noted the following:

- (i) Two papers entitled “Alcohol use and burden for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2016: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016” and “Measuring performance on the Healthcare Access and Quality Index for 195 countries and territories and selected subnational locations: A systematic analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016” of Dr. Kewal Krishan, Chairperson, Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, have been published in high impact factor medical journal “**The Lancet**”.
- (ii) Shri Sanjay Tandon, Fellow, Panjab University and President, Balramji Dass Tandon Charitable Foundation, H.No. 1636, Sec. 18-D, Chandigarh, has donated an amount of Rs.10 lac to the University for creating an Endowment Fund for organizing Annual Memorial Lecture in memory of his father late Sh. Balramji Dass Tandon.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- (iii) Professor Harsh Nayyar, Department of Botany, Panjab University, has been sanctioned a grant of 30,000 US Dollars by International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), Morocco, for a 2-Year collaborative research project on "Screening Lentils for Heat Stress under Controlled Conditions".
- (iv) Mr. Akash Rai, a student of the University Business School, Panjab University, has got the highest package of Rs.53 lac p.a. in Tolaram Group in the recent campus placements conducted at UBS.
- (v) Smt. Kirron Kher, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), Chandigarh, has recommended the purchase of one bus and construction (expansion) of community centre for Panjab University, Chandigarh, out of her MP Local Area Development Fund.
- (vi) Panjab University NSS Contingent for the first time got first position in U.T. State Level Republic Parade. Prior to this, the contingent had been getting second position during the last two years.
- (vii) Panjab University successfully conducted the 34th North Zone Inter University Youth Festival from 27-31 December, 2018 in collaboration with Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi. About 36 Universities from northern India participated in this mega festival. It is also a matter of honour that Panjab University, Chandigarh, placed on 2nd runner-up in overall championship of this festival.
- (viii) A research proposal titled "Plasmonic hot electron pockets as exciton luminescence promoters and regioselective chemical triggers" submitted jointly by Dr. Jadab Sharma, Centre for Nanoscience and Nanotechnology, Panjab University, and Dr. Erik Dujardin, CEMES, France, has been approved under CEFIPRA which will be jointly funded by India and France;

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 1 (ii), (v),(viii), (ix), (xii) & (xviii), (xix))

- (ix) Nobel Laureate Professor Bernard Lucas Feringa gave a lecture at Panjab University Law Auditorium and interacted with the students.
- (x) Panjab University Campus has bagged a National Water Award 2018 for being the best in the region and second in India for successful campus

water usage. The award comprising a trophy, citation and cash prize of Rs.1.5 lacs was received by Dr Madhuri S. Rishi, Chairperson, Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, at the National Water Awards 2018 Ceremony organized by the Ministry of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation, on 25th of February, 2019. Shri Nitin Gadkari, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation and Road, Transport & Highways, Shipping, was the Chief Guest and Shri Arjun Ram Meghwal, Hon'ble Minister of State for Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation, Parliamentary Affairs, was guest of honour.

- (xi) Panjab University along with CRIKC organized three-day CHASCON which was attended by over 1200 delegates and more than 1000 papers were presented. It was very nice and luckily the Organizer is here and they must congratulate him for the successfully conducting the activities and attracting the Scientists and Academicians across the States in India.
- (xii) A project titled "Structure-activity relationship studies of a novel two-component lantibiotic roseocin" of Dr. Dipti Sareen, Department of Biochemistry, has been approved for funding by DST-SERB, Government of India. The project carries a grant of Rs.19.75 lacs for equipment and Rs.12 lacs for manpower, travel, contingency, etc.
- (xiii) Dr. Kashmir Singh, Department of Biotechnology, has been sanctioned a grant of Rs.50 lacs by Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB), New Delhi, for the project "Genome-wide identification and functional analysis of long non-coding RNAs associated with biotic stress in vitis (grapevine)".
- (xiv) M/s. Mohan Fiber Private Limited has donated a sum of Rs.14.5 lacs to the Dental Institute for upgradation of the radiographic facilities.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 1 (i), (ii),(iii), (xii), (xiii) & (xvi))

I-3

To note that pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 18.02.2019 (Para 1) the office orders dated 22.03.2019 (**Appendix-V**) have been issued with regard to appointment of Ms. Ranjana Bhandari, as Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutics at University Institute of

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Pharmaceutical Sciences, against the post lying vacant there, purely on temporary basis, for the period of three years, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowance as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 (b) at page 112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2007.

NOTE: The competent authority could assign teaching duties to her in the same subject in other teaching department, P.U. Regional Centres and Institute of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied department(s) at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the UGC norms.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 1)

I-4 That, as recommended by the Academic & Administrative Committees in their joint meeting dated 07.01.2019, Mr. Harsh Tuli, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, for another three years, on the same terms and conditions on which he worked previously, under Regulation 5(b) at page 112 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 10. 4.2019 Para 5)

I-5 That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Ms. Shaffy Girdhar, Assistant Professor in Computer Science, purely on Contract basis, P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. the date she start/started work for the even semester of session 2018-19, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis whichever is earlier, at a fixed salary of Rs.30400/-on the same term and conditions on which she was working earlier for the odd semester of the session 2018-19.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 50(i))

I-6 That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has re-appointed afresh Dr. Ramandeep Kaur Saluja, Associate Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, P.U., purely on temporary basis, w.e.f. 07.01.2019 for 11 months i.e. up to 06.12.2019 with one day break on 05.01.2019 (break day) & 06.01.2019 (Sunday) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 50(ii))

I-7 In pursuance of orders dated 17.10.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 26730 of 2018 (Dr. Alok Srivastava Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. 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

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 12.11.2018, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (a) Dr. Alok Srivastava, Professor, Department of Chemistry, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.12.2018 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 26730 of 2018 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (b) he be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him 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, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(Syndicate dated 8.12.2018 Para 17(i))**I-8**

In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Neera Garg, Professor, Department of Botany, Panjab University on contract basis up to 12.11.2023 (i.e. the date of her attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:** 1. Academically Active Report should be submitted by her after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 132 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 will be applicable.
2. Later on Dr. Neera Garg has been allowed to continue as such pursuant to orders dated 22.11.2018 of Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP 24638 of 2018 filed by her.

(Syndicate dated 8.12.2018 Para 16(v))

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019**I-9**

In pursuance of orders dated 22.11.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.29638 of 2018 (Dr. Neera Garg and Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) in the same terms as CWP No. 26006 of 2017 and CWP No. 26730 of 2018, wherein in pursuance to the orders passed in LPA No. 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioners have been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. 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) was fixed for hearing on 13.12.2018, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Neera Garg, Professor, Department of Botany, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.12.2018, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No.26006 of 2017 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her shall be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.
- (ii) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her 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, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 50(xi))

I-10

In pursuance of orders dated 22.11.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 29638 of 2018 (Dr. Neera Garg and Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA No.1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. 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 pending, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Pankaj Malviya, Professor, Department of Russian, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.01.2019 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 29638 of 2018 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per *pro forma*.

- (ii) he be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her 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, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 50(xii))

I-11 In pursuance of orders dated 18.03.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 7231 of 2019 (Dr. Upinder Sawhney and Anr. Vs Panjab University & others), wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit to continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. 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 pending, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Upinder Sawhney, Professor, Department of Economics, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.04.2019 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 7231 of 2019 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per *pro forma*.
- (ii) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her 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.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 23(i))

I-12 In pursuance of orders dated 18.3.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 7231 of 2019 (Dr. Rajiv Lochan Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. 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

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 15.5.2019, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Rajiv Lochan, Professor, Department of History, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.05.2019 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 7231 of 2019 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per *pro forma*.
- (ii) he be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him 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, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 23(ii))

I-13 That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following persons as Part-time Assistant Professor, P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) for the session 2018-19, w.e.f. the date they start work for the session:

1. Dr. Chander Shekhar Marwaha
2. Ms. Kamyia Rani

(Syndicate dated 8.12.2018 Para 16(ii))

I-14 That the term of appointment of Dr. Ruchi Vashisht, Assistant Professor (Temporary) Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, be extended for one year, under Regulation 5(b) at page 111-112 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 32)

I-15 That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed afresh Dr. Khushwinder Kaur as Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry (purely on temporary basis) for another one year w.e.f. 06.03.2019 with break on 05.03.2019 (break day) or till the post is filled in, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 35(i))

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- I-16** That the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor R.K. Singla, Chairperson, Department of Computer Science & Applications, P.U. as Dean Research with immediate effect, in addition to the his own duties, on an honorarium of Rs.4000/- p.m. till further orders.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 35)

- I-17** That the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor Ashish Jain, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U., as Director of IQAC (additional charge) and Professor Anuradha Sharma, Department of Education & Disability Studies, P.U. as Associate Director/Secretary of IQAC (additional charge) for a period of three years and they be paid an honorarium of Rs.3500/- p.m. and Rs.2500/- p.m. respectively, as per budgeted provision.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 36(iii))

- I-18** That the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor Meena Sharma, University Business School, P.U. as Honorary Director in the Central Placement Cell, P.U. in place of Professor Suresh K. Chadha, UBS and Professor Sarbjeet Singh (Department of Computer Science & Engg.), UIET, P.U. as Associate Director in the Central Placement Cell, P.U. in place of Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U. with immediate effect, till further orders in addition to their own duties. They will be paid honorarium as was paid to earlier Honorary Director & Associate Director.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 36(iv))

- I-19** That the request dated 28.01.2019 of Dr. Ramesh Sahani, Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, seeking permission to contest Lok Sabha Election, 2019, be acceded to.

(Syndicate dated 10.4.2019 Para 20)

- I-20** That the apology dated 31.10.2018 submitted by Dr. B.B. Goyal pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 29.4/26.5.2018 (Para 24), be accepted.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 23)

- I-21** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh the following faculty, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 06.03.2019 for 11 months i.e. up to 05.02.2020 with one day break on 05.03.2019 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Lalit Kumar	Associate Professor
2.	Dr. Shipra Gupta	Associate Professor

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

3.	Dr. Vishakha Grover	Associate Professor
4.	Dr. Puneet	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Poonam Sood	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Sunint Singh	Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Neha Bansal	Assistant Professor
9.	Dr. Rose Kanwal Jeet Kaur	Assistant Professor

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 22(iii))

I-22 That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for one month i.e. upto 31.05.2019 (with one day break i.e. 01.05.2019), on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier as per letter No.5348-49/Estt.-I dated 24.07.2018 & No. 6548/Estt. I dated 05.10.2018, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Gurjit Singh	Punjabi
2.	Mr. Surinder Singh	Political Science
3.	Ms. Seema	Physical Education
4.	Mr. Saumyadeep Bhattacharya	English
5.	Dr. Kamlesh Narwana	History

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 22(vi))

I-23 That –

- (i) Dr. Anish Slath, Assistant Professor, be appointed Director of University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management for a period of three years, under Rule 2.1 (c) pages 695-696, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

NOTE: The Syndicate has also resolved that the whole policy of rotation of headship, be reviewed.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 19)

- (ii) the Vice-Chancellor had designated, Dr. Anish Slath, Assistant Professor as Honorary Director of the University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management with immediate effect, till further order.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 23(iii))

I-24 That recommendations dated 24.01.2019 of the Academic and Administrative Committees (Items I to IV) relating to introduction of PU-CET (PG) for admission in Master of Social Work, increase of students intake, to start Certificate Course in “Social Work & Field Interventions”

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

as also to start Academic & Training Resource Centre with effect from the session 2019-20, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 10.4.2019 Para 2)

I-25 That –

- (i) the recommendation of the Committee dated 12.2.2019 mentioned in Para (A) at page 52 of the appendix regarding additional seats within the existing fee structure, be approved as under:

Sr. No.	Department	Course	Existing Seats	Proposed Seats	Increase in Seats	Tuition Fee (Rs.) P.A.
1.	Microbial Biotechnology	M.Sc.	20+2 NRI	25+2NRI	5	67790
2.	UILS	LL.M (Morning)	40	50	10	90415
		LL.M (Evening)	40	50	10	90415
3.	Centre for Social Works	MSW	30+4 NRI	33+4NRI	3	41020
4.	Police Admn.	M.A.	30+6NRI+10 in-service	33+6NRI+10 in-service	3	34295

- (ii) as recommended by the above said Committee, 50% of seats of UIET in B.E. (Biotechnology) be filled in through PU-CET (UG) to be conducted by Panjab University. The Candidates with medical stream (Physics, Chemistry and Biology) and non-medical (Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics), be allowed to apply for this course;
- (iii) the criteria/rules recommended by the Committee for conducting two Entrance Tests fulfilling the conditions for all Engineering Institutes at PU Campus, including UIET, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology and UIET, Hoshiarpur mentioned at pages 56 and 57 of the appendix be also approved; and
- (iv) the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee to examine and re-submit the proposal at Paras (B), (C) and (D) of the letter dated 3.4.2019.

(Syndicate dated 10.4.2019 Para 9)

I-26 That the students of BDS and MDS courses (admitted in session 2017-18) shall pay the same fee for the 2nd Year which they had paid for the 1st year, i.e., Rs.1,18,532/- and Rs.4,48,327/- respectively.

(Syndicate dated 10.4.2019 Para 10)

I-27 That the Vice-Chancellor has allowed quarterly rate of interest on Contributory Provident Fund and General Provident Fund paid/to be paid, to the employees w.e.f. 01.04.2017 to 31.03.2019, as per rate of

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

interest declared by Government of India Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Budget Division) vide notifications issued from time to time.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 50(xix))

I-28 That. the students admitted in 2014-2015 in B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5-Year Integrated course, having re-appear in their even semester/s, i.e., 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th and 10th semester, be allowed to appear in the re-appear examination with odd semester examination/s as has been allowed to the students of previous batch of 2013-2014.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 8)

I-29 That the Vice-Chancellor has accepted the donation of Rs.10,00,000/- made by Shri Sanjay Tandon, Fellow, P.U. for institution of an Endowment to be named as 'Shri Balramji Dass Tandon Memorial Lecture' for organizing Annual Memorial Lecture in the memory of his father. The investment of Rs. 10,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140 on the following terms and conditions:

1. Endowment fund would be known as Shri Balramji Dass Tandon Memorial Lecture.
2. Given an annual return @7-8% the interest amount would be utilized for the conduct of aforesaid memorial lecture, i.e. TA/DA speaker (if required), hospitality, souvenir or memento for the speaker, other incidental charges, etc.
3. Stay arrangement of the speaker in the University Guest House shall be made by University Administration.
4. Saving, if any of a given year shall be carried forward to next year for utilization.
5. Expenditure on the first memorial lecture shall be made by the donor directly. Exp. For subsequent years shall be made out of the interest income of endowment as explained above.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 50(xx))

I-30 That the Vice-Chancellor has accepted the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram, H.No. 362, Sector-9, Panchkula, be accepted for purchase of books and payment of Scholarship etc. to the poor & needy students out of "Students Aid Fund Account" and Income Tax Exemption Certificate duly signed by the Registrar, P.U. Chandigarh be provided to the donor to avail income tax benefits for the session 2018-19.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 50(xxi))

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

I-31 That the recommendations of the Student Aid Fund Administration Committee dated 28.02.2019, for financial assistance out of Student Aid Fund for the session 2018-19, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 10.04.2019 Para 15)

I-32 To note minutes (Item No.10, 12, 15 and 17) dated 26.02.2019 of the meeting of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

(Syndicate dated 10.04.2019 Para 24(i))

I-33 That, for implementation of the Agreement/MoU executed with SBI for disbursement of pension through SBI, the proposal dated 28.02.2019 of the Finance and Development Officer, P.U. with regard to change in existing procedure (as it would cause addition in Rule 6.1 at page 45 of P.U. Accounts Manual, 2012), be accepted.

(Syndicate dated 10.4.2019 Para 7)

I-34 That –

- (i) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Nottingham Trent University and Panjab University, Chandigarh, be extended w.e.f. December 2018 to December 2023 to explore future collaboration between Nottingham Business School of Nottingham Trent University and University Business School of Panjab University;
- (ii) in future the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed by Panjab University be circulated to all the participating departments and the execution of MoUs be done in ex-officio capacity;
- (iii) a report be submitted by the Dean Research regarding the progress on various MoUs executed by Panjab University; and
- (iv) detailed report be submitted by the Dean Research on the foreign visits carried out by various persons as per terms of agreement of MoUs and the source of funds for such visits.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 39)

I-35 That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), be executed between Panjab University, Chandigarh and The Institute of Vedic and Astrological Sciences, 1109, Sector 123, SAS Nagar, Mohali (Punjab). The Registrar is authorised to modify the language of the MoU, if required.

(Syndicate dated 10.4.2019 Para 17)

I-36 That –

- (1) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), as per Appendix, between Panjab University, Chandigarh, and Punjab Renewable Energy Systems Pvt. Ltd., J-105, Tower No.7, First Floor, CBD Belapur Railway Station-Cum-Commercial Complex, CBD Belapur, Navi Mumbai, for enhancing, within the country, the availability of highly qualified skilled manpower in the fields of engineering, technology, management and Science, be re-examined in the light of the discussion held and, thereafter, placed before the Syndicate again.
- (2) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), as per Appendix, be executed between Panjab University, Chandigarh, and Western Sydney University, Australia, ABN 53014069881, for recognizing the mutual benefits to be gained through a cooperative program promoting scholarly activities and international understanding.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 14)

I-37 That the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Universal Scientific Education and Research Network (USERN) and Panjab University, Chandigarh, has been executed, to expand collaboration on scientific programs, exchanges and training of scientists and researchers, sharing of information and technology in support of educational and research activities, sharing of best practices meetings, workshops and scientific conferences, according to the mutual interests and benefits.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 36(ii))

I-38 That the Vice-Chancellor has executed Deed of Assignment (DOA) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Central Institute of Indian Languages (CIIL), Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India, Hunsur Road, Manasagangotri, Mysuru, for Digital Knowledge Depository and make information/knowledge available in Indian Languages for public good, through 'Project Bharatavani'.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 36(xi))

I-39 That the recommendations dated 12.10.2018 and 07.01.2019 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for finalizing the charges to be collected from the Teaching Department as well as Panjab University Campus students Council on account of cleaning/electricity/generator charges of University Auditorium, be approved with the stipulation that recommendation at 1(b) of the Committee meeting dated 7.1.2019 be read as under:

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

- 1 (b) for the cultural/academic activities of the Panjab University Departments duly recommended by the concerned Chairperson.

(Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 Para 40)

- I-40** That the request of Chairman, Governing Body of Hoshiarpur Professional and Vocational College, Adamwal, Hoshiarpur, for disaffiliation of the College w.e.f. the session 2018-19, be accepted with the condition that the closer of the courses shall be as per Regulation 13.5 at page 161 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and the Chairman should also confirm that the students admitted in the College do not suffer. The Dean, College Development Council, be asked to oversee the whole process and obtain the time-table from the Principal.

(Syndicate dated 8.12.2018 Para 8)

- I-41** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the request dated 09.10.2018 of Ms. Anuradha Makhija, Deputy Registrar, UIET, P.U., for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 08.01.2019 (A.N) from the University service and has sanctioned the following retirement benefits:

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016.

(Syndicate dated 8.12.2018 Para 16(xii))

- I-42** That the recommendation of the Committee dated 01.05.2019 (Appendix) that payment of commutation of pension to Shri P.S. Mehta, be released, as per Pension Regulations of the Panjab University, be approved.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 16)

- I-43** That as recommended by the Administrative and Academic Committee of the P.U.R.C. Kauni in their joint meeting dated 21.12.2018, the seats for the following courses be increased as under with effect from the session 2019-20.

Name of the course	Existing seats	Proposed seats
B.A.I	160	240
B.Com	40	70

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 21)

- I-44** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the minutes dated 21.12.2018 of the Committee,

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to consider the desire of Dr. (Miss) Kulwant Gill, former Professor & Chairperson of the Department of Laws, P.U. to donate Rs.50 lakhs for the construction of Lecture Theatre (s) in the Department of Laws in the sacred memory of her younger brother Late Shri Manjit Singh Gill, Advocate, who was alumnus of the Laws Department.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 35(iii))

- I-45** That the Vice-Chancellor subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has granted temporary extension of affiliation for MBBS Course (100 to 150 seats) to Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, for the session 2019-2020.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 35(vi))

- I-46** That the Institute of Management C/o DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh be asked to comply with the conditions imposed by the Syndicate and Inspection Committee by June 15, 2019, in order to consider the case for temporary extension of affiliation for M.B.A. 1st year Course, for the session 2018-19.

NOTE: That the student of M.B.A. Ist Year (Session 2018-19) has been allowed to appear in the examination to be conducted by the Panjab University.

(Syndicate dated 10.4.2019 Para 19)

- I-47** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the syndicate and Senate has accepted the resignation of Ms. Naveender P.K. Singh, Assistant Professor (Part-Time), Department of Laws, P.U. w.e.f. 14.01.2019, with the condition that she will have to deposit amount in lieu of notice of one month, as she has tendered her resignation without submitting the notice of one month, under Rule 2.5 at page 59 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2016.

(Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 Para 35(vii))

- I-48** Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate decision dated 27.08.2018 (Para 2(vii)) and Senate dated 3.11.2018 (Para IV) Dr. Aditya Kaushik, Assistant Professor, UIET has been promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) vide office order dated 02.11.2018, after excluding the condition imposed by the Syndicate dated 27.08.2018.

- I-49** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council/Syndicate, has approved the recommendation of the Faculty of Arts dated 30.03.2019 (Item No.14) (Appendix), i.e., eligibility conditions, scheme of test regarding the Entrance Test for the admission to M.A. Economics in the Department of Economics, Panjab University from the session 2019-20, with the condition that the question paper will be set in English, Punjabi and Hindi.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 22(v))

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

I-50 Pursuant to decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 30.03/21/29.4.2018 (Para 50), the Affiliation Committee in its various meetings, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses/subjects for the session 2018-2019, as under:

Sr. No.	Date of the meeting of the Committee	Name of the College	Name of the Courses/ subjects
1.		Gujranwala Guru Nanak Khalsa College Civil Lines, Ludhiana	B.Voc. courses (i) Web Technology and Multimedia (ii) E-Commerce and Digital Marketing (iii) Banking and Financial Service (iv) Retail Management (v) Hardware and Networking Maintenance Technology (IT) (vi) Accounting and Taxation (Accountancy and Finance) (vii) Travel and Tourism Management (Tourism)-50 students per course under NSQF scheme of UGC and college shall fulfil the conditions imposed by the inspection committee within two months from the date of dispatch of this letter, under intimation to the university.
2.	29.09.2018	Government College for Girls, Ludhiana	Advance Diploma in Beauty and Wellness-50 seats under NSFQ Scheme of UGC of Community College for the session 2018-2019.
3.	29.08.2018	J.C. D.A.V. College, Dasuya, Distt. Hoshiarpur	B.Voc. Courses (i) Hardware and Networking and (ii) Organic Farming, Further advised to comply with the conditions as imposed by the inspection committee in its report dated 06.10.2018 within two months from the date of dispatch of this letter under intimation to this office.
4.		S.D. College for Women, 3, Jawahar Nagar, Moga (Pb.)-142001	New courses B.Voc.-1 st year in Hospital Administration and Management

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.3/21/29.4.2018 (Para 50) has constituted the following affiliation Committee for the session 2018-2019 regarding affiliation of Colleges pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 21.1.2017 (Para 7,8, & 9):

1. Dr. Satish Sharma, FellowChairperson
2. DCDC
3. Shri Subhash Sharma
4. Principal Anita Kaushal
5. Principal S.S. Sangha
6. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
7. Professor Ameer Sultana

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

8. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
9. Dr. Amit Joshi
10. Shri Ashok Goyal
D.R. (Colleges)Convener

Shifted from consideration (C-26)

I-51. That Gazette Notification of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, received from UGC vide F.No.6-5/2017 (SCT) dated 7th April 2017, as per **Appendix-VI**, be adopted.

NOTE: (i) The Syndicate has also constituted a Committee comprising Professor Rajat Sandhir, Chairperson, Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Jagdeep Kumar be constituted to go through the above said Gazette Notification and suggest amendments to be incorporated in the relevant sections of the Act so that the same could be sent to the Regulations Committee for further necessary action; and

(ii) after finalization, the document be circulated to all the quarters concerned.

(Syndicate dated 11.05.2019 Para 9)

Referring to **Sub-Item I-2**, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Mrs. Kirron Kher, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) has promised that she would provide funds to the University for purchase of a bus. It is a good gesture from Hon'ble Mrs. Kirron Kher. However, since the University has already two buses, which have been provided to P.U.S.S.G. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, and according to his information these buses are not being used much, one of the buses could be requisitioned and used here at University Campus. They might request Mrs. Kirron Kher to sanction funds for some other purpose instead of purchase of bus.

Shri Deepak Kaushik said that, in fact, the University employees had made a request to Hon'ble Mrs. Kirron Kher to sanction funds for purchase of bus two buses of the University has already completed their term of 15 years. That was why, Hon'ble Mrs. Kirron Kher had been requested to provide funds for the bus.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Items I-1 to I-51** on the agenda, be noted.

XXXV. Dr. Subhash Sharma said that Shri Sanjay Tandon has donated a sum of Rs.10 lacs in the memory of his father late Shri Balram Ji Dass Tandon. At least, they must thank him for the donation.

RESOLVED: That thanks of the Senate be conveyed to Shri Sanjay Tandon for donating a sum of Rs.10 lacs in the memory of his father late Shri Balram Ji Dass Tandon.

XXXVI. The Vice-Chancellor said that, now, they should consider an item under any other item and under any other item 2-3 good things have emerged. When the experienced persons are there available in such a good House, good points are bound to come out. Now, they would go ahead on the concept of zero hour as suggested by Shri Satya Pal Jain and others. During the discussion, three things have been

suggested – (i) that there would be no discussion in zero hour, they could only give their input, which would be got noted and later on written information about the same would be provided to them. Only two minutes' time would be given to each member, who wishes to speak during zero hour and for that they have to cooperate with him. Good things come out in the zero hour discussion. The members should not speak unending, which is not good. Since this House comprised of old persons, legal luminaries, Members of Parliament, etc., they should put their views very briefly and take it in true spirit. Whatever has happened here – whether it was good or bad, the same should be forgotten. Now, he would be very strict to zero hour. He is going to implement it from the next meeting of the Syndicate. When Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that in Syndicate, the members should be given four minutes' times during zero hour, the Vice-Chancellor said that not more than two minutes' time would be given. Moreover, they have to give in writing before the meeting that they would like to speak on such and such issue(s). When Principal I.S. Sandhu said that since it is not a Parliament, the existing practice should be allowed to be continued, the Vice Chancellor said that, perhaps, in the Syndicate meetings, there is no provision for zero hour. He would move only in accordance with the provisions of the University Calendar.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta enquired whether there is provision of zero hour discussion.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see it. If there is a provision, only then he would allow zero hour discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he (Vice Chancellor) should not make new laws. If he is talking about the provision, neither the provision for zero hour is in the meetings of the Senate nor in the meetings of the Syndicate, but the University has to go by the time tested traditions. Earlier, here a proposal had come that no item could be discussed in the Syndicate meeting also unless and until it is on the agenda. They could not bind the Syndicate from functioning in accordance with its responsibility unless and until they fix the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor that in case he is supposed to bring an item to the Syndicate for consideration and if he did not bring it to the Syndicate for consideration, what is the remedy with them. Hence, they should not take such harsh decisions in zero hour, that too, without the agenda item. So they should not contradict themselves.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he is totally in agreement with Shri Ashok Goyal ji. If the Syndicate had the prerogative to discuss any issue without the same being on the agenda, deliberate and decide also, then the same prerogative is also with the Senators and they could also discuss any issue without the same being on the agenda, deliberate and take decision on the same. Why should they be deprived of this right? If the Vice Chancellor did not bring an item, what remedy would they have? The 19 members of the Senate gave in writing, the Syndicate did not recommended that, what remedy did they have? They wanted to restrict the Senators that their issue would not be decided. Since the item has been withdrawn and there would be no discussion, what power the Syndicate has under which they could do this? If the Syndicate would do it, then the Senate would also discuss, deliberate and decide; otherwise, the Syndicate would also not do.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh stated that zero hour is a good practice/tradition, the way he (Vice Chancellor) gives the chance to the members. He would like to clarify one thing. Two senior persons were present in the House, who said that whenever any issue is raised during the zero hour, they could not take any decision on the same. He has also seen the functioning of Vidhan Sabha for about 10 years even though he is aware of the functioning of the Parliament, and it is not like that. If an emergent issue is raised

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

during the zero hour, sometime inquiry is ordered and sometime decision is also taken. However, he (Vice Chancellor) could say that they could give their suggestion(s) within a time of two minutes, so that they could give chance to more and more members, and up to this level it is right. However, in technical view, if the authority lay with the Vice Chancellor and if an issue is raised that an injustice has been done to a students in such and such Department, he (Vice Chancellor) could say that he would conduct an inquiry, which is a decision. There are certain issues, as said by the Hon'ble members that they did not have the full facts of the case, in such cases they could not take any decision. Hence, basically it is a matter of discretion.

The Vice Chancellor said that so far as discretion is concerned, he would listen to the suggestions to be given by the members during the zero hour.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he agreed with Dr. Gurmeet Singh ji, but whether it is Assembly or Parliament, he (Dr. Gurmeet Singh) has covered the same for a period of 10 years. If an emergent issue is raised there (in Assemblies or Parliament), on that a Committee could be appointed, an Inquiry could be conducted, but it is not that an emergent issue is raised and on that a decision taken. It never happened.

Dr. Subhash Sharma intervened to say that then it would also be applicable on the Syndicate. It is not that an emergent issue is raised in the Syndicate and decision is taken. How there it could be done? He reiterated that then it is applicable on the Syndicate also. How the Syndicate could do it; rather, they should have appointed a Committee?

Shri Varinder Singh said that then the same is also applicable on the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal is rightly saying and he agreed with him (Shri Ashok Goyal).

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he also agreed with Shri Ashok Goyal, but it would also be applicable on the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that if an emergent issue is raised, an Inquiry Committee could be appointed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then the Syndicate should also appoint a Committee. Why did the Syndicate decide the issue?

The Vice Chancellor said that so far as power of discretion is concerned, at least this power should have with the Chairperson to allow or not allow the discussion after seeing the merit of the issue. Or all the decision would be taken by them (members). If mistake has been done somewhere, let them rectify the same.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that work of the Legal Retainers/Advocates should be got evaluated.

Dr. Subhash Sharma remarked that legal opinion is taken keeping in view the inclination of the Legal Retainer/Advocate. This needed to be evaluated.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that they should assess whether the Advocates do their job assigned to them from time to time or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that secondly they should keep in mind the time factor also. They should also assess as almost an entire day is being wasted because as a Management students he is seeing that they did repetition up to 60% and he (Vice

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Chancellor) interrupted them, they felt very bad. He did not know as to why did they feel bad because it is in the interest of the House? Now, he would allow the members to do repetition irrespective of whether they feel happy or bad. They should tell new things and the same would be appreciated by him. When Dr. Parveen Goyal remarked that it is happening because the meeting is being held after a period of 5 months, the Vice Chancellor said that he would increase the frequency of the meetings provided the financial health of the University is improved. And in that they would tell him as to what would they scarify? How many of them could forgo T.A. and D.A?

Professor Mukesh Arora remarked that if he (Vice Chancellor) left his official car, he would not claim payment of T.A. and D.A.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he has never claimed any T.A. and D.A. from the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a serious matter.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the Vice Chancellor should make the beginning and set an example for others.

The Vice Chancellor said that, now, they should take an item for consideration under any other item, and thereafter, now issue would be allowed to be raised/discussed.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that his requested is that 19 members of the Senate have given in writing and that is a very important issue. When would they resolve that issue?

When Shri Ashok Goyal said something, the Vice Chancellor said, "No". Today, they must discuss that issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No, No". They should take up only those items, which are on the agenda; otherwise, it would be wrong.

At this stage, a din prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma stood up and stated that they are charging. They did not allow the Syndicate to function. In Syndicate meeting, the lunch is delayed, but they held lengthy discussion and got appointed Dean Research. 19 Senators have given in writing and they did not want to discuss the issue. Why are they running away from the discussion? Is this the way?

Shri Varinder Singh said that those who wanted to leave could go. The 19 Senators have given in writing.

Dr. Subhash Sharma remarked that is it a joke. Would the House be run as per the wishes of these persons? Unless and until this issue is resolved, the meeting would not be concluded.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua requested the Vice Chancellor to read out the decision taken by the Syndicate on the issue.

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that either he (Vice Chancellor) should get it resolved that the meeting of the Special Senate would be fixed in the meeting of the Syndicate scheduled for 28th May 2019 or they would deliberate on the issue today itself.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to sit down and take the decision.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that 19 members of the Senate have given in writing and they did not want to discuss that issue. Would the House function as per their will? The issue as to why the Dean Research was appointed would be discussed today.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the decision of the office, which was read out in the meeting of the Syndicate, should be read out to these persons.

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri Varinder Singh said that they did not accept that decision. They would discuss the issue as the Senate is supreme.

A dig again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua requested the Vice Chancellor to at least read out the decision of the Syndicate and the background so that they should know the real issue. At the moment, they did not know as what the issue was.

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri Varinder Singh said that they should be told as to when they are going to hold the special meeting of the Senate. They should hold the meeting of the Senate and deliberate. Why are they afraid of the debate?

Dr. Amit Joshi said that what is issue in fixing the date for the special meeting of the Senate? This in fact is the constitutional right.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice Chancellor should give the reply.

When Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the date of the special meeting should be told to them, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it would not happen. This meant, he (Vice Chancellor) is party to it and taking their side.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua again requested the Vice Chancellor to read out the stand of the office.

At this stage, pandemonium again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma remarked that even when the 19 Fellows have given in writing, they have not bothered.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the Senate is a parent body and the Syndicate is the outcome of the Senate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that this act of the Syndicate is very condemnable. The Syndicate has denied them their right by violating the Calendar.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Neeru Malik enquired whether the application written by 19 Senators fulfilled the condition for calling a special meeting of the Senate. If yes, why the special meeting of the Senate has not been called convened?

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Varinder Singh remarked that he (Vice Chancellor) should himself see as to what types of work these persons have done.

A couple of members jointly requested the Vice Chancellor to fix the date of the next Senate meeting.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are against the decision of the Syndicate and would like to discuss the same here as the Senate is the supreme body. In fact, the decision of the Syndicate is wrong and is violation of the Calendar.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that, in fact, that was not the decision of the Syndicate, but the same was the decision of the Chair.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then the decision of the Chair is also wrong, and they did not accept the same.

Shri Naresh Gaur said, why were they blaming the Syndicate?

At this stage, pandemonium again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to convene the meeting of the Senate and the issue of Dean Research should also be discussed there. He alleged that the appointment of Dean Research has wrongly been made by violating the Calendar.

Shri Prabhjit Singh requested the Vice Chancellor and the Hon'ble members to first sit down and set the House in order, and thereafter, the members should be allowed to express their views.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is unable to understand why they are creating such a bitterness here even though all are here for the betterment of this University. Whatever is to be done, should be done by consensus.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that whatever is written in the Calendar, should be followed in letter and spirit.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said that they are asking for the meeting, the same should be convened and the matter would end.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to speak one by one.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur jointly said that the Vice-Chancellor is showing as if the Syndicate has done something extremely wrong. In fact, that was the decision of the office.

Shri Varinder Singh remarked that Syndicate has got it done wrong.

Dr. Ajay Ranga requested the Vice Chancellor to decide the date for the Senate meeting and the matter would end.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur jointly said that firstly the office viewpoint should be read out.

It was informed that the item was to consider the requisition of 19 Fellows to convene a special meeting of the Senate regarding strict enforcement of Regulation 7 of Chapter VIII(E) at page 172 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I. The information contained in

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

office note supplied by the Colleges Branch was also taken into consideration. The discussion took place and after the discussion, it was RESOLVED: That since there is no violation of the regulations, therefore, there is no need to convene a special meeting of the Senate as requisitioned by the 19 Fellows.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is only said by them (University authority) that no violation has taken place, whereas they are saying that violation has taken place. How could they say that violation has been done, they are the violators?

Professor Mukesh Arora said that how could the Syndicate decide that no violation has taken place.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is to be decided by them (Senate) whether violation has been done or not. They themselves have violated and they themselves have decided that no violation has been done. How had they decided that no violation has been done? This House would decide whether violation has been done or not.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that if violation has not taken place, why the item has been withdrawn from the agenda today.

At this stage, din again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the Syndicate is not competent to discuss this issue. Their decision is wrong and the Vice Chancellor should fix the date for the special meeting of the Senate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma pointed out that as per the Calendar, the Syndicate's job was just to fix the date for the special meeting of the Senate and they could not deliberate on the issue. To deliberate on the issue, is the job of the Senate. They themselves are violating and also taking the decision themselves. They themselves are accused, advocate and Judge also.

At this stage, din again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the re-employment of Principals in affiliated Colleges is against the regulations; hence, it should not be allowed. He (Vice Chancellor) should tell them as to when the discussion on the issue would be held. Certain people have played mischief and framed a rule only to give benefits to certain persons. The said rule is a violation of UGC Regulations as also a violation of the University Calendar and this House rejects the said rule, and they could hold the voting on this right now.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the status of Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma, who was Principal of GGSD College, Sector 32, Chandigarh, should be told. Whether violation has not been done?

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the extension given to Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma is wrong.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that when the issue had come in the Syndicate, they have asked the Vice Chancellor whether the item should have come to the Syndicate or not. Second question they posed to him was the office should tell them whether the regulation, which has been quoted by them, has been violated or not. The office, including him (Vice Chancellor) had replied that no regulation has been violated. Where is the Syndicate in the picture? The item has been brought by the office and all the members of the Syndicate are present here and anybody could tell whether he is

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

saying wrong. The office had brought the item and had also given the reply that none of the regulation has been violated. Where is the Syndicate in the picture? He is saying this that it is not a Syndicate decision, and in fact, that was the decision of the office. Now, the office should protect its own decision. They should not rest the onus on the Syndicate.

Professor Mukesh Arora enquired is the office above the Senate. The Senate is saying that the regulation is being violated, whereas they (Syndicate) is saying that the regulations is not being violated.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they did not know anything. They should hold the meeting again.

At this stage, pandemonium again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma alleged that on the basis of the rule framed by the Syndicate, people had taken the benefit of lacs of rupees, even though they were not eligible. Up to when they would deny the rights to eligible persons.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they are denying their due rights. It is their right to hold a meeting of the Senate as 19 Fellows had given in writing for holding a special meeting of the Senate. In fact, they had big agenda/purpose behind this and they deliberately not allowing to happen this. They are twisting the issue.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that the Syndicate was of the view that in the requisition, which has come from the 19 Fellows, they have to see whether all the supporting documents have been attached. From 2006 to 2018 whichever Committees had been formed, the recommendations of those Committees and how much extension was recommended by them had been mentioned. On this requisition, the decision was taken that, since this did not contradict their regulations, there is no need for holding the meeting.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the rule has been violated and undue benefit of crores of rupees has been given.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they have deliberately violated the rule. It is their right to get meeting convened.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that Shri Satya Pal Jain has himself said that he is an Advocate and he has said that the job of the Syndicate was only to decide the date for the special meeting of the Senate. If he (Shri Satya Pal Jain) has said this, then it has some weight.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then the purpose of requisition is finished, if they say to everything that they would not allow this happen. Then why the provision has been kept.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they are explicitly clear on this issue. Hence, they have given the requisition after well thought. They are deliberately twisting the issue because they wanted to give benefits to certain persons.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua intervened to say that they could also say this.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

At this stage, both Shri Varinder Singh and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua engaged themselves in duet and some other members joined them. Resultantly, a din prevailed.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they are talking about reducing the age of superannuation, with which none would be benefitted. Benefit would only be involved, if they argued for increasing the age of superannuation.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they have certain persons have been deprived of the employment by this benefit of re-employment.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the attack is being made after seeing the person. He said that extension should be given as a policy matter and not on seeing the person involved, i.e., that this person should be given extension and this not.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are not talking about any person. They are, in fact, saying that the rule, which was framed by the Syndicate in 2000, should be struck off. They are talking about the rule and they are not against any person. Actually, they are against the rule.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is so simple that when 19 Fellows have given them in writing, they should convene a special meeting of the Senate. What problem they have in convening the meeting? When there was a minor issue for conferment of Honoris Causa degree and Vigyan Rattan Award, they immediately convened the meeting.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that, in accordance with rule, neither the Vice Chancellor nor the Syndicate is eligible to decide whether the meeting is to be held or not. Syndicate is to decide only and only the date and time for the meeting. The decision taken that there is no violation, could neither be decided by the office of the Vice Chancellor nor the Syndicate. This is the legal status. Arbitrarily, one could do anything and there is no remedy of that. On this very issue, unnecessarily so much discussion is taking place because the Vice Chancellor is also not taking the decision. He (Vice Chancellor) should decide the date and time for the special meeting of the Senate, the matter would end there and then. Since the House is in motion, they could do this.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is reading out the regulation for them, which says "Should the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor or at least 15 members of Senate in a joint requisition signed by all such members consider a special meeting of the Senate to be necessary, he or they shall intimate to the Syndicate the purpose of such a meeting and the Syndicate shall fix a date for the special meeting of the Senate so requisitioned". It is so simple.

At this stage, a din again prevailed as several members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that instead of fixing the date of the meeting, they started deliberating on the purpose as also whether regulation has been violated or not. The job of the Syndicate is to fix the date.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay". Now, let they decide the date for the special meeting of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No Sir", and several members joined him. Thereafter, the members of the other side also started speaking. As such, a din prevailed.

Senate Proceedings dated 26th May, 2019

Shri Varinder Singh said that they themselves should see the reality of these persons.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to stop the people from using un-parliamentary language. Sometimes, they say that these people are burning with fire and sometimes they say they are hurt. Sometimes, they say they are doing bullying/hooliganism and sometimes, they say that they are doing herapheri.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they have nothing to say today, and that was why, they are talking like this. These people change their stand daily.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, could he (Vice Chancellor) stop him from using un-parliamentary and undesirable language.

Shri Varinder Singh alleged that the entire University is going down only because of this person. Hereinafter, a pandemonium prevailed as several members started shouting at one another.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor adjourned the meeting for some time.

When the meeting resumed, the Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to read out the provision of regulation.

It was said by the Registrar that as per the sentiments of the House, the matter is referred to the Syndicate because as per Calendar, the special meeting of the Senate could be fixed through the Syndicate and the meeting of the Syndicate is going to be held day after tomorrow. After following the due procedure necessary action and the special meeting of the Senate would be fixed by the Syndicate.

XXXVII. At this stage, the Senate condoled the sad demise of late Shri Raghbir Dyal, former Fellow and member of Board of Finance, who expired on 27th January 2019, and expressed its sorrow and grief over his passing away 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.

At this stage, Professor Chaman Lal said that he would like to register his strong protest against raising/enhancing the fees by misleading the House.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he has now come to know that after concession they have increased the fees.

The Vice Chancellor said that their viewpoints have been noted.

(Karamjeet Singh)
Registrar

CONFIRMED

(RAJ KUMAR)
VICE-CHANCELLOR