

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 9<sup>th</sup> November 2019** at **03.00 p.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### PRESENT

1. Professor Raj Kumar Vice Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
4. Dr. Harjodh Singh
5. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
6. Ms. Inderjit Kaur
7. Dr. K.K. Sharma
8. Shri Naresh Gaur
9. Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu
10. Professor Navdeep Goyal
11. Professor Rajat Sandhir
12. Dr. (Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
13. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
14. Dr. S.K. Sharma
15. Shri Sandeep Singh
16. Professor Karamjeet Singh Registrar ... (Secretary)

Shri Jagdeep Kumar, Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh and D.P.I. Colleges (Punjab), could not attend the meeting.

At the very outset, while welcoming the members, the Vice Chancellor said that it is the sacred Kartik Month and in this month they are organising various programmes on the birthday of Sri Guru Nanak Dev Ji. The members of the Syndicate are also participating in these programmes. He further hoped that the other members would also participate in the programmes to be held in future. They are preparing a report of all these programmes very carefully in the form of a book and the book would be released in the Syndicate.

**1.** The Vice Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the honourable members of the Syndicate that –

- (i) In the recent days, I had the privilege to visit the University of South Florida, USA and discussions were there to start National Academy of Inventors: PU Chapter and to have a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Incubator at Panjab University and University of South Florida.
- (ii) Dr. Tanzeer Kaur, Assistant Professor, Department of Biophysics, P.U., has been awarded a research grant of Rs.36 lakh by the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR). The project will be co-investigated by Dr. Neelima Dhingra, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), P.U.
- (iii) Prof. Sanjay Chhibber, Department of Microbiology, P.U., was conferred with 'Life Time Devotion Award' by Microbiologists Society of India in a one day symposium on 'Innovative Approaches in Microbiology Biotechnology' organized by the department.
- (iv) Ms. Steffy, Research Scholar, under the supervision of Dr. Naveen Gupta, Assistant Professor, Department of Microbiology, P.U., carried out a

research on novel bacterium producing cocktail. The work was awarded in the 13<sup>th</sup> World Congress on 'Biofuels and Bioenergy 2019' in Vienna, Austria.

- (v) Four of our students and NSS volunteers have been selected for PRE RD Camp at Delhi. They will be representing the University on Republic Day Parade.
- (vi) Professor Meena Sharma & Professor Purva Kansal , UBS have been awarded the reputed research grant of Australia India Council, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2019-20 jointly along with a team of Professors from Western Sydney University, Australia.
- (vii) Dr. Ranjit Singh, a research associate of UIPS has bagged PharmInnova Award 2018-19 instituted by Rajnibhai V Patel Trust under the patronage of DST.

The Vice Chancellor said that he visited two Universities, one is South Florida University and the other is Florida Biotechnic. The Vice Chancellor told Professor S.K. Sharma that there were many people who knew him and they were appreciating him. Though he has seen Incubation Centres at various Universities, but the Incubation Centre at South Florida University is one of the marvellous Centres. This Centre was developed by one Professor Patel from Gujarat, whom the people say that he has received his studies from Panjab University or some college here. He made this Incubation Centre two-three years back with a cost of Rs.60 Crores. He (Vice Chancellor) also wanted to make Incubation Centre at Panjab University by having that model. They have to earmark some money for this Centre from the grant which they have got from RUSA.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that at Sr. No. 5 of the Vice Chancellor's Statement it has been written that 4 of their students and NSS volunteers have been selected for PRE RD Camp. He added that it is a pre-Republic Day Camp at Delhi and these students will be representing the University in the Republic Day Parade.

The Vice Chancellor said that the students have been selected for rehearsal.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that selection for the camp means that final selection is yet to be made. So, it should be written that they have been selected for Pre-Republic Day Camp and are or will be attending Camp for that and will be representing Panjab University. He said that 400 students could be selected for the camp, but only 40 students could be made a part of the parade. Therefore this needs to be corrected.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to confirm about it.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is already confirmed and the students would be sent back after the Pre RD Camp, if not selected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the selection is yet to be made, then it should be written that if finally selected, they would represent the Panjab University and if the selection has been done, then it should be written like that.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal further said that before proceeding further, he would like to make a suggestion, of course, subject to approval of the House that since they are already celebrating 550<sup>th</sup> Birth Anniversary of Shri Guru Nanak Dev Ji, the Punjab Government and Chandigarh Administration have declared Monday i.e. 11<sup>th</sup> November as a holiday in that context. The Panjab University has also declared 11<sup>th</sup> November as a holiday in all institutions of Panjab University and its Regional Centres. He, therefore, requested that it should be declared a holiday in the Colleges situated at Chandigarh.

The Vice Chancellor enquired whether it has been declared a holiday by the UT Administration to which Shri Ashok Goyal answered in the affirmative. The Vice Chancellor said that Punjab Government has declared holiday for 11<sup>th</sup> in all its colleges.

Principal Inderjit Kaur said that holiday on this day has been declared by many States.

Shri Ashok Goyal again urged that they should declare a holiday in Panjab University.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the Panjab University has 170 colleges affiliated to it in Punjab, so they should declare it a holiday.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it does not look nice if holiday is declared in 170 colleges situated in Punjab and not in the Colleges situated at Chandigarh which are also affiliated to Panjab University. This was also endorsed by Shri Naresh Gaur.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members that they should see as to what could be done. Is it under his jurisdiction?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there no question of jurisdiction. The Punjab & Haryana High Court has also declared 11<sup>th</sup> November as holiday.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that as Vice Chancellor, he could declare it a holiday.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that it is for a good cause.

The Vice Chancellor wanted to know from the members as what is the rule in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, had there not been a meeting of the Syndicate today, he would have requested the Vice Chancellor for declaring 11<sup>th</sup> November as the holiday.

Almost all the members requested the Vice Chancellor to declare it a holiday as a lot of discussion has been held on this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has no problem in declaring a holiday, but he would like to say is that there might not be any legal problem.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu and some other members said that there is no legal problem in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if the State Government declares a holiday and the Panjab University does not, then the order of the Panjab University would prevail and vice-versa. They want the Panjab University to become a proud partner in celebrating this great event.

It was finally agreed to that 11<sup>th</sup> November be declared holiday in the colleges situated at Chandigarh on account of 550<sup>th</sup> Birth Anniversary of Shri Guru Nanak Dev Ji.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that many persons have to go to Sultanpur Lodhi on 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> of November, 2019, but the Vice Chancellor has fixed a meeting of Principals for tomorrow (10.11.2019).

The Vice Chancellor clarified that it is not a meeting, rather some of the Principals/Managers have requested to fix some day to listen to them. So this is not a formal meeting. However, anybody could come and meet him.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked if they could also come to him.

The Vice Chancellor told that now the list of 10 persons has been finalised.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua requested that when the next list would be prepared, his name may also be included.

The Vice Chancellor said that the list is prepared by his P.A. and the Dean College Development Council together.

On being asked as to what is meant by Managers, the Vice Chancellor said that it includes the Chairman of the College Managements of their representatives. He used to invite the Principals and the Chairman of the Managements so that the issues could be sorted out by discussing it with them without loss of time.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that any decision could be taken only by the Chairman of the Managing Committee as he has all the powers and not the Principal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the nomenclature is like this: Representative, Chairman/Secretary or Representative of Governing Body of the College. There is no nomenclature with the name Manager.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that if they would call those persons as Managers, they would get annoyed, as they have engaged Managers for different activities. In a way Managers would be their employees.

**RESOLVED:** That –

I. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –

1. Dr. Tanzeer Kaur, Assistant Professor, Department of Biophysics, P.U., on having been awarded a research grant of Rs. 36 lakh by the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR);
2. Professor Sanjay Chhibber, Department of Microbiology, P.U., on having been conferred with 'Life Time Devotion Award' by Microbiologists Society of India;
3. Ms. Steffy, Research Scholar, Department of Microbiology, P.U., on having been awarded in the 13<sup>th</sup> World Congress on 'Biofuels and Bioenergy 2019' in Vienna, Austria for the research work carried out by her on novel bacterium producing cocktail;
4. Professor Meena Sharma & Professor Purva Kansal, University Business School, on having been awarded by the reputed research grant of Australia India Council, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2019-20; and
5. Dr. Ranjit Singh, a research associate of UIPS, on having bagged PharmInnova Award 2018-19 instituted by Rajnibhai V Patel Trust, under the patronage of DST.

- II. the information contained in Vice Chancellor Statement's at Sr. No. 5 be corrected and it be written that if finally selected, they would represent the Panjab University in the Republic Day Parade.
- III. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. 1 and 5 , be noted;
- IV. 11<sup>th</sup> November be declared holiday in the Colleges situated in the Union Territory of Chandigarh on account of 550<sup>th</sup> Birth Anniversary of Shri Guru Nanak Dev Ji.

**2.** Considered recommendation (No.1) of the Committee dated 04.10.2019 (**Appendix-I**), along with modified proposal dated 10.10.2019 (**Appendix-I**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that a new course of MBA (Capital Markets) at UIAMS, be started, from the session 2020-21.

The Vice Chancellor said that with lot of efforts, they have proposed to start some courses and requested the members to look into it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that for MBA (Capital Markets), Course, the Chairperson, UIAMS has requested for sanction of three Assistant Professors for this course on permanent basis.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that now they should approve the starting of the course only, but as far as budge part is concerned, it could be considered by the Budget Committee later on.

The Vice Chancellor said that the budget part could be taken care of by 2-3 members.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they would not approve the budget as such, today they would only approve the courses.

The Vice Chancellor said it is, 'okay'.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are to start only those courses which are viable. Whatever teaching position have been asked for, these could be provided by appointing the persons on contract basis.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know whether it is a self-financing course or partially self-financing course?

The Vice Chancellor said that they run both type of courses in the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had started self-financing courses keeping in view that these courses would be viable and feasible from the financial point of view, but the moment, they found that these courses would not be financially viable any, they started describing them as partially self-financing. So, once these are Partially Self-financing Courses, now they are bringing Self-financing Courses. What would be its status, whether it would be Self-financing Course or Partially Self-financing Courses? They are asking for budget and faculty positions. There is no hurry in this issue. To his mind, this needs to be looked into in its totality, keeping in view the budget provision also. They should think over this issue in consultation with the department.

The Vice Chancellor said, in principle, they would approve to start course, the budget part would be looked into later.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they have to first see the viability, feasibility and desirability of the course. He would like to bring it to the notice of the Vice Chancellor that he is in a hurry in starting courses so that more revenue could be generated for the University. In view of the hurry shown by him, the departments are trying to run with same pace, so they are giving this type of proposals. He (Vice Chancellor) should advise the departments to give such proposals which are foolproof.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would constitute a Committee of who would see to it thoroughly.

Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University Institute of Applied Management Sciences has demanded a sum of Rs.55 lacs per on recurring basis to support the additional requirements for smooth conduct of the new course.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they have also to see up to what time the viability of the course would remain

Shri Ashok Goyal said that viability means that they do not want at any stage that this course would become a burden on the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the thesis about this in his mind is very clear, taking into consideration the example of University Institute of Engineering & Technology, which has now become a white elephant. The Vice Chancellor said according to him, this course would remain self-financing. The day, this course would not remain viable, they would quit from that scheme.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if there is any way to it. He requested the Vice Chancellor to give a signal to quit this type of course.

The Vice Chancellor said, what has happened in the past, they are not to go into it, they should start from now.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that when the University Institute of Engineering & Technology was started, he was the Chairman of the Committee. They prepared the complete project report wherein they had stated that they would have to take a loan of Rs.2 crores from the University. After 4 years they would start earning money and after in 7 years the whole amount would be returned to the University, but this mechanism could not work properly later on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, it seemed to him that they did not work according to that project report.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the expenditure goes on increasing, but the fee could not be enhanced in that proportion.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would stop this course, the day it would not remain viable.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he would like to give example of Kurukshetra University. The Kurukshetra University has not introduced 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission for the self-financing courses so that they may not have to make much expenditure on such courses. It would not be possible to run such courses if the revenue is not brought to that level.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are also going to do the same. As per the UGC, if a course is self-financing, it should work in a self-financing mode. If the course would run, it would be okay, but the University would not own it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, Finance & Development Officer knew it that MHRD had created problem for them at one stage that they are not going to take into consideration the expenditure, they are incurring on self-financing courses. They would not show it in the budgetary provision and they have to keep that thing also in mind.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that he (Vice Chancellor) has just said that when the course would not remain viable, they would immediately quit it. He asked, why is it not applicable on the Colleges? For the colleges, the University impose conditions to appoint permanent teachers. If the course does not run, where they would send the teacher(s)? If the University could adopt this policy for itself, why it is made applicable for the colleges also? Why the Colleges are not allowed to stop a course if it is not viable?

Shri Ashok Goyal said, perhaps, Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan is getting emotional. He informed that the provision for quitting a course by the Colleges is already existing in the Panjab University Calendar.

The Vice Chancellor said that if a course is self-financing, the staff could not be permanent.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan asked, what about those persons who would be appointed on regular basis?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this provision is only to meet that situation. When the course would be discontinued, the whole staff would go, so there is no question of permanent.

The Vice Chancellor also supported the view point expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they want to close a course, there is a provision in the Calendar that one year before the academic session, they have to make a request to the University in this regard.

Principal Rakesh Kumar Mahajan suggested, then why they should not wait and see for three years to know if a course could run, and allowed to make temporary appointments. If a course is in a position to run further, then the temporary staff could be made permanent. Why they should appoint the staff initially on permanent basis when they are unaware whether the course is viable or not? As he (Vice Chancellor) has just talked about the Capital Markets course. He has said that they would quit, the day they would find that the course is not viable. He requested that they should provide such a provision to the colleges also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all the provisions for the colleges are also available.

The Vice Chancellor said that the provisions are there in this regard, so they should see to those provisions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if those provisions are followed properly, whatever Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan is saying, that would come true.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan is saying something else. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan is saying, as the Vice Chancellor has said that they would appoint temporary staff for the Capital Market Course, in the same way the colleges should also be allowed to do the same.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the letter annexed to Item No. 2 (page 10 or the agenda), it has been written that the faculty requested for sanction of additional posts of three Assistant Professors (on permanent basis).

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that in the letter, the posts are asked for on permanent basis and here they are asking to sanction the posts on temporary basis.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in this the Vice Chancellor has given his own idea. Has it been passed by the Syndicate?

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that the Vice Chancellor has stated that they would quit if the course would not be in a position to run, so the colleges should also be allowed on the same pattern.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it is right to follow the same pattern. They would also follow the same pattern which is being followed in the colleges.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that they want that they should be allowed to appoint the staff on temporary basis for three years if they want to start a new course. This may be kept in mind when the Affiliation Committee would go to visit the College next time.

Dr. K.K. Sharma asked if the Inspection Committee would also visit the department for which the proposal for introducing Capital Markets course is being considered. Would the Inspection Committee ensure whether all the requirements necessary for starting the course are there in the department as is being checked in the college? He further asked if any conditions would be imposed on the department as are being imposed in the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said not to mix this issue with the colleges as they cannot bring complete similarity in this issue. They should say only that much, which they could do. However, they could think over what Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan has said.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that a Committee should be formed to look into the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thinks that they are confused as the item is something else and they are considering something else. They are taking it towards the point that the Inspection Committee be asked to appointed temporary faculty for new courses to be started. He is saying that there is a specific provision in the Calendar as to how to take care of permanent faculty in case they want to close the course.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said, it is okay, then the same conditions should also be imposed here.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this what he is saying.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that the Vice Chancellor is saying something else.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to impose the same conditions here in this case also, because in the letter the Department has asked for the permanent faculty.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that usually, the decision is taken according to what is being transpired among them here.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no decision has been taken so far.

Principal Inderjeet Kaur also added that the Syndicate has not taken any decision in this regard.



Professor Rajesh Gill said that if they are not sure whether the course would run or not, then to begin with, why not to use the existing faculty, rather than recruiting faculty. They should recruit the faculty only if the course is viable to run.

The Vice Chancellor said that these things needed to be discussed and requested Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Rajat Sandhir to look in into the issue in its totality.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu asked as to what is being recorded on this issue.

It was informed that the decision is that, in principle, the introduction of course (MBA Capital Markets) at UIAMS is approved. However, so far as budgetary part, sanction of posts, feasibility of course, etc. is concerned, the same would be taken care of by a Committee to be constituted.

On being asked by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma whether the Assistant Professors sought by the Institute would be appointed on regular basis, Professor Rajesh Gill said that it would be looked into by the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, they are saying, that the proposal to start a new course is approved, in principal and nothing has been considered. A Committee would be constituted to look into this from all aspects, e.g. when to start the course, appointment of faculty whether on temporary or regular basis, feasibility, desirability, viability etc.

**RESOLVED:** That the proposal to start a new course of MBA (Capital Markets) at UIAMS, from the session 2020-21, be approved, in principle. However, a Committee be constituted to look into the aspects, e.g., budgetary provision for starting the course, feasibility, desirability, viability, etc., as also whether the faculty would be appointed on temporary or regular basis.

- 3.** Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 18.07.2019 (**Appendix-II**) constituted by Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of the decision of the Syndicate dated 18.02.2019 (Para 36 & 37) (**Appendix-II**) that base laboratory at DIHAR, Chandigarh, be recognized as a research centre affiliated to Panjab University for pursuing research work in the subjects of Biotechnology, Botany, Chemistry, Microbiology, Zoology and University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), leading to the award of Ph.D. degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2019 (Paras 36 & 37) had considered the issue with regard to recognition of DIHAR as Research Centre of Panjab University for Pursuing Research Work leading to Ph.D. Degree in the subject of Botany and Microbiology and it was resolved that the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute a committee to look into the issue of recognition in totality of Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab., Chandigarh, as Research Centre of Panjab University.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the National Laboratories with whom they are doing MoUs, they are taking a fee of Rs.5,000/- from the students. He has raised this issue earlier also and nothing has been done and the MoU has again been placed before the Syndicate in the same format. The National Agri-food Biotechnology Institute (NABI) has also executed an MoU with the Institute of Department of Biotechnology (BDT) within the same Government for which they are charging Rs.10 lacs. Although, they are providing so many facilities, including conduct of viva, still they are charging a meagre fee of Rs.5,000/- only. Secondly, these institutes are charging an annual fee, whereas the University is not. He suggested that the MoU to be executive between affiliated colleges and National Laboratories, should be segregated for Research Centres.

According to him, Laboratories could pay more money. A fee of Rs.5,000/- is just a joke as this fee might have fixed 15 years ago.

Professor S.K. Sharma while endorsing the view point expressed by Professor Rajat Sandhir said that this should have been done by the Committee constituted for this purpose.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that at page 12 of the agenda papers in the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18.7.2019, it has been written, the Committee further suggested that a MoU should be signed between the two institutes which should include the following points. She read out point No. (ii) which says, "The pre-Ph.D. course work will be offered by the Panjab University and the Scientists from DIHAR can participate in the teaching programme" and point No. (iii) says, "A supervisor from the respective department/institute from University is mandatory". This has been recommended by the Committee for DIHAR lab. There are so many other research institutes which carried research in Social Sciences, where the supervisor would be from the institute itself and the pre-Ph.D. Course Work would also be done there. As such, uniformity is not there, whereas they needed to have uniformity.

Professor Rajat Sandhir pointed out that it is also not ascertained whether the supervisor is eligible for guiding the Ph.D. students or not.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the institutes are saying that they would do everything relating to Ph.D., including pre-Ph.D. Course Work, Synopsis, hold the meeting of Research Degree Committee and the University should be least concern about these activities. For this, they needed to look into the UGC Regulations – whether they permit or not. At least they have to bring uniformity in the Research Institutes. She, however; suggested that DIHAR should be allowed, in principle, so that a research Centre is created at DIHAR, but other modalities are looked into.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Professor Rajesh Gill has given a very good input. Actually, they had started the concept of creating a Research Centres in the affiliated Colleges during the last 4-5 years before and Research Centres have been created in several Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor enquired could anybody tell him as to how many Research Centres have hitherto been created.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the number of Research Centres vary from subject to subject.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the maximum number of Research Centres is about 50.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that a Committee should be constituted so that uniformity could be maintained.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is good that they had created a Research Centres in the affiliated Colleges and National Labs. had also been involved, which are carrying out quality research. However, what Professor Rajesh Gill has pointed out is also correct that the rules for every Research Centre are different, whereas uniformity is required; otherwise, everyone is working in accordance with his/her will. They have also to ensure quality. He is not saying that quality is not taken care of; rather, it is taken care of at several places. He suggested that a Committee should be constituted to see as to what rules are required to be framed as the rules for all the courses are different. They could have 4-5 sets of rules and from best rules should be chosen for adoption for all the Centres. He added that the fee for the Research Centre needed to be on the higher side.

Professor Rajat Sandhir pointed out that it had been recorded that they are not charging any fee. It meant, nobody is looking as to what is happening.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this exercise has to be done in view of UGC and DST guidelines.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they could have different sets for affiliated Colleges, i.e., Government Institutes and private Institutes.

Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out that he had already suggested this, but still it has not been implemented.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are a little bit problems. Although a High Powered Committee had been constituted, through an oversight, he presumed, none of the people from the Syndicate and Senate except Professor Rajat Sandhir had been included in the Committee.

Professor Rajat Sandhir clarified that he had attended the meeting of the Committee as member of the Selection Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why it had not been mentioned in the minutes. If he (Professor Rajat Sandhir) was there, he should have said this in the meeting of the Committee.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he had said this in the meeting of the Committee several times.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he meant to say is that it should have been there that the fee should be increased because the fee for everything is very old, and when the fee of the students comes, they more often than not revised the same, but they had never revised this type of fee. The suggested that they must increase the fee(s), which is/are continuing as such for the last so many years.

Concluding the discussion, the Vice Chancellor said that they would definitely revise these types of fees. Secondly, they are, in principle, agreeing to the proposal. Thirdly, so far as fee is concerned, the same would be looked into. Fourthly, the uniformity in the Regulations/Rules would also ascertained in consonance with the Regulations/Rules/Guidelines of UGC, MHRD and other regulatory bodies.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that the Regulations/Rules of Indian Institute of Technology (IITs) should also be kept in view.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Rajat Sandhir that the Regulations/Rules of Indian Institute of Technology (IITs) and Indian Institute of Science should also be kept in view while framing the uniform Regulations/Rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that National Agri-Food Biotechnology Institute (NABI) should also be kept in view while framing the uniform Regulations/Rules.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Committee dated 18.07.2019, be approved, in principle.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

- (1) uniform Regulations/Rules be framed in consonance with the UGC, MHRD, DST and in view of the Regulations of IITs, NABI, etc.;
- (2) the issue relating to enhancement of fees, etc., of Research Centre be also looked into.

- 4.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 19.06.2019 (**Appendix-III**), constituted by the worthy Vice-Chancellor, to look into the matter of payment of honorarium to the Guest Faculty working at other Institutes as Temporary/Contract/Guest Faculty/Visiting Faculty.

**NOTE:** A copy of revised guidelines dated 28.01.2019 for enhancement of the Rates of Honorarium of Guest Faculty is enclosed (**Appendix-III**).

Initiating discussion, Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he had also suggested earlier that the new Regulations/Rules of the UGC relating to guest faculty should be adopted. Today, papers relating to that had also been appended with the item under consideration. However, they had not been able to bring the said regulations/rules for consideration of the Syndicate since February 2019. The UGC itself is saying that they must adopt the new regulations for guest faculty. In any case, they are not paying attention to what the UGC is saying regarding appointment of guest faculty and how to pay them. He did not know as to why they are ignoring it for the last eight months. Could they not want to consider these regulations?

The Vice Chancellor said that they had done a lot of work on this. Problem is that it is linked with the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.

To this, Professor Rajat Sandhir enquired had not got the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission approved from the Syndicate and Senate?

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be implemented as and when the grant is received.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that it should be approved.

On a point raised by Professor Rajat Sandhir, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission had been approved by the Board of Finance not once but twice. In fact, once it had been approved and at second time, the same had been reiterated. Since the minutes of Board of Finance had been approved by the Syndicate, it meant the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission had been approved.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they had already done a big thing and now only a smaller one (guest faculty) is left and they are delaying it for the last more than 10 months. He is saying that even the money should not be paid in accordance with the new regulations/rules, at least they should implement the new regulations/rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at the moment, they should implement the new UGC regulations/rules relating to guest faculty without enhanced honorarium.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not know whether they could do this or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that 13 faculty members had retired in his own Department during the last three years. They are offering two full-five year courses. The situation is so bad that he had to request for 9 guest faculty and the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor had permitted the same. When they invited applications, only 9 applications were received. He had to appoint even a fresh M.Sc. to look after the practical. The guest faculty members, who have been assigned the theory also, are not able to cope as he had to intervene almost every day as quality is not available with whatever conditions they had imposed. Why he was talking about the money because there is another facility in it that the guest faculty is allowed at least up to 70 years of age. He added a couple of retired teachers had offered him to teach even without any honorarium. As such, at least they should approve this and the financial aspect could be seen later on.

It was clarified that they could not adopt the policy of pick and choose. They could not do that certain portion is adopted from the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission and certain another from the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. Whatever regulations/rules for guest faculty are there, they have to adopt them in toto.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, the old rules for guest faculty are not of the Pay Commission; rather, they had been framed by the University itself. What would be the position, if they amend their rules today?

It was clarified that they make the appointment of guest faculty in accordance with the procedure, but they had made certain amendments at their own level. Citing an example, it was told that as per the rules/regulations of the UGC, only one guest faculty could be appointed against a position, but they had relaxed it to that they could appointment more than one against a position depending upon the availability of the budgetary provision.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he knew that they had made several amendments.

Professor Rajat Sandhir apprehended that if tomorrow, the Audit raised any objection that they are appointing guest faculty in accordance with the old regulations/rules, why they are not following the new UGC regulations/rules. Tomorrow, there might be problem of payment of salary to the guest faculty. Citing an example, he said that even if they did not implement the guidelines for promotion, etc., they always these guidelines are effective from the date of issuance. Even if they did not approve those guidelines, they always implement them from the retrospective effect. Hence, they should do it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a Committee should be constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee would be constituted.

When Shri Ashok Goyal said that he should also be made to understand as to what the issue is, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are facing problem with regard to guest faculty. Earlier, there were 3-4 provision and some of them were deleted/amended by them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that where is the problem in the recommendation of the Committee?

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the Committee has recommended, "Regular faculty member, working anywhere, cannot be appointed as Guest Faculty. In order to utilize his/her expertise in the subject, he can be invited to deliver special lecture(s), as per requirement. However, in case, they are willing, they can be considered for appointment as Guest Faculty without any honorarium, as per system being followed in Panjab University." Earlier, they were paying honorarium, and now they are not. Since earlier there was provision, whenever they faced in problem, they were able to find someone from within the system. Secondly, the retired teachers are allowed up to the age of 65 years, but problem is that the teachers are here in the University up to 65 years of age, but certain persons have crossed the age of 65 years. Now, the problem is that they are not able to get qualified/appropriate guest faculty to teach the students because the salary is merely a sum of Rs.25,000/- p.m. and a condition is also there that the person should not be teaching anywhere and person should also not be beyond the age of 65 years. As such, they are not able to find appropriate persons. If someone, who is fresh M.Sc. and have qualified NET, applied, they have no alternative, but to appoint him/her, for whom it is very difficult to teach the students of B.Sc. and B.Sc. (Honours School).

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is not true that the guest faculty could not teach anywhere else. In fact, the minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 3.5.2019 had not been appended. If they could get a copy of those minutes, it would come to their notice that this condition had already been removed by the Committee. They had recommended that even if somebody is teaching somewhere else, he/she could be appointed guest faculty in the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that Professor Rajesh Gill, Professor Rajat Sandhir and he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) should be included in the Committee proposed to be constituted to consider this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is amply clear that Professor Rajesh Gill is referring to the minutes of the Committee dated 3.5.2019. Actually, this Committee, the recommendations of which are under consideration, has overruled the recommendations of the Committee dated 3.5.2019, because she (Professor Rajesh Gill) says that there was no bar as per recommendations of the Committee dated 3.5.2019, but this Committee says to fix the honorarium for temporary/contract/guest faculty/visiting faculty. Meaning thereby, only these persons could be appointed as guest faculty. And in the next page the first para says, "Regular faculty members, working anywhere, cannot be appointed as guest faculty. In order to utilise his/her expertise in the subject, he can be invited to deliver special lecture(s), as per requirement". As such, with one stroke they have overruled what was done by the Committee in its meeting dated 3.5.2019, which actually could not be done unless and until the same is the mandate. A decision has been taken that those who are working somewhere else could not be appointed as guest faculty. However, he (Vice Chancellor) had said that those, who are working within the university system, would not claim honorarium, but if somebody is working outside and if he could not be appointed as guest faculty, that is not the situation. He remembered that in one such case, of course, under the *bona fide* belief that the UGC debarred that anybody, who is employed as even part-time teacher. Naturally regular teacher could be part-time as well as full-time. A part-time teacher, who is allowed by the same institution, to work anywhere else in the next half, but in their University a decision was taken that he/she could not be appointed as guest faculty because regularly appointed teacher could not be allowed. As such, this needed to be relooked into keeping in view the minutes of this Committee as also of the Committee of May and besides that these three people should be associated with the Committee.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that it is happening again and again that sometime a decision is taken in a Committee and the same is misplaced. Thereafter, a new Committee is constituted and when they asked for the minutes, the same are not provided to them and they never knew as to where those minutes had gone.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that only one honourable member is present here, who could explain as to what is the background of this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that when they have decided to re-examine the entire issue, then why should they waste more time? To the point raised by Professor Rajesh Gill that whenever the Committee is replaced, the minutes of the previous Committee are not placed before the new Committee, the Vice Chancellor said that all the relevant documents as well as the minutes of the previous Committee should be made available to the members of the new Committee and the members should look into the recommendations of the previous Committee sincerely and should not overrule the recommendations at the first instance.

**RESOLVED:** That the whole issue of appointment of guest faculty, appointment on temporary/contract/visiting faculty as well as payment of honorarium to them, be re-examined by the same Committee. However, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Rajat Sandhir, be included in the Committee.

**5.**

Considered if, Certificate course in Vedic Studies, in the Department of Dayanand Chair for Vedic Studies, be introduced w.e.f. the academic session 2020-21 instead of 2019-20 as per request dated 10.10.2019 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Chairperson, Dayanand Chair For Vedic Studies and fee structure, objective, Rules and Regulations for the said course, be also approved, as recommended by the Academic Council in its meeting dated 25.05.2019 (Item XIII) (**Appendix-IV**).

- NOTE:**
1. The Faculty of Languages in its meeting dated 30.03.2019 (Item No. 6) (**Appendix-IV**) considered the recommendations of the Board of Control in Dayanand Chair for Vedic Studies dated 25.02.2019 and resolved that the new course namely Certificate course in Vedic Studies be introduced in the Department of Dayanand Chair for Vedic Studies and the outlines of tests, syllabi, courses of reading, Fee structure, Objective and rules and regulations for Certificate course in Vedic Studies w.e.f. 2020-2021, be approved.
  2. The Board of Control of Dayanand Chair for Vedic Studies in its meeting dated 06.05.2019 considered the matter and further recommended that the Certificate course in Vedic Studies, be introduced from the coming session i.e. 2019-2020 instead of 2020-2021.
  3. The Academic Council in its meeting dated 25.05.2019 (Para XIII) considered the recommendations of the Faculty of Languages dated 30.03.2019 (Item No. 6) (**Appendix-IV**) and resolved that new course namely Certificate course in Vedic Studies w.e.f. 2019-2020 and the outlines of tests, syllabi, courses of reading, Fee structure, Objective and rules and regulations for the said course, be approved.

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this needed to be examined only from one point of view that it had been mentioned at page 37 of the Appendix, "the student should be exempted from the paying tuition fee as in the case of students of Department of Sanskrit". It meant, they are not charging any tuition fee from the students of Department of Sanskrit. He remarked that it is very astonishing and is added knowledge to them, which even he did not have before. Hence, it should be again referred back.

The Vice Chancellor said that they might have taken the decision to promote Sanskrit language. Now, they are saying that if Sanskrit could be exempted, why not Vedic Studies?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter should be got re-examined. He added that there are several mistakes, but he would not like to point out them, because once they had taken a decision to re-examine from all points of view. Though they are not against it, it needed to be re-examined in a proper way. Secondly, it would also come as to under what background they had exempted the students of Department of Sanskrit from payment of tuition fee.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to what they should resolve. Should they approve the introduction of the course, in principle?

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what would be the advantage if they approve the introduction of the course, in principle, as the course is to be introduced from the academic session 2020-21?

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee would be constituted to look into the whole issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that Professor Rajesh Gill must be included in the Committee proposed to be constituted.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma pointed out that the Punjab Government also not charge tuition fee from the students who opted for Sanskrit studies.

Dr. Harjodh Singh pointed out that the Punjab Government is also not charging any fee from the students, who opted for the study of Urdu and the Government is doing it for the last so many years.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that Punjab Government had a lot of funds, but the University did not have.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee of Syndics, be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the whole issue and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**The Vice Chancellor said that Item C-6 on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn, viz. –**

**6.** To considered if, post-facto approval, be granted to Shaheed Udham Singh, Panjab University Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur, to operate Amalgamated Fund and Library Security Account with HDFC Bank, Guru Har Sahai Branch instead of SBI to get rid of heavy traffic of SBI and for convenient to the staff of the College, as per request dated 16.07.2019 of the Principal of the College.

**NOTE:** An office note was also enclosed.

**7.** Considered if, extension of affiliation earlier granted to M.A. (Punjabi) and M.Sc. (I.T.) to National College for Women, Machhiwara, District Ludhiana, be discontinued from the academic session 2019-20 in a phased manner as mentioned in Regulations 13.2, 13.4 & 13.5. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-V**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 13.2-13.5 at page 161 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reproduced as under:

“13.2. If the Governing Body of a College proposes to discontinue the college, it shall seek the prior permission of the University.

13.4(a) in either of the case falling under Regulation 13.2 or 13.3, an application for the required permission shall be made at least one academic year in advance with detailed reasons in support of the proposal, to the Registrar;

(b) in the case of discontinuation of the College, it shall be incumbent upon the Governing Body of the Institution concerned to give a notice of one year to its employees regarding termination of their services, which will take effect only if and



when the permission is granted by the University and subject to the conditions, if any, imposed by it

13.5 the discontinuation in respect of each integrated course of study/subject for which it is affiliated shall be in stages as under:

- (i) In the first year, admissions to Part I classes will be discontinued and admissions to Part II/III will continue;
- (ii) In the 2<sup>nd</sup> year, admission to Part II classes will discontinue and class for Part III, if any, will continue;
- (iii) In the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, there may be no admission.

Explanation: The students concerned who have already taken up the course/subject shall be allowed to complete the course/subject concerned. This will not, however, cover the failure in a class.”

2. A copy of letter No.NCM/4130 dated 24.08.2018, NCM/4929 dated 24.07.2019 & NCM/4948 dated 19.08.2019 received from Principal, National College for Women, Machhiwara, Ludhiana, enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that for discontinuation of a course/subject, permission of the University is required at least one year before, whereas the College is seeking permission now, that too, with effect from the current session, i.e., 2019-20. He suggested that they should send a Committee comprising 1-2 members to the College to ascertain/evaluate whether retrenchment of teachers is not there, although the College had given in writing that “No teacher will be affected at present”. However, they had experienced problem in several cases as the College(s) discontinued admissions at their own level.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is very difficult to accept that they did not find students for courses like M.A. (Punjabi) and M.Sc. (I.T.), but if it is really so, it is very bad.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and a few other members jointly said that the students are really not coming.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that since the students get admission to B.Tech. easily and thereafter, they took admission to M.Tech., they did not prefer these traditional courses.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should include contents in the courses of reading keeping in view the changes taking place on day-to-day basis and make them professional and commercial ones.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that as per the existing eligibility conditions, the candidates, who have studied B.C.A., could take admission to M.Sc. (I.T.). Why should a candidate, who has done B.Sc. (I.T.), do M.Sc. (I.T.) and instead he/she would prefer to do M.Tech. in Punjab Technical University.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma remarked that they have received request only from a single College. Next year, they would receive 10 or more such requests.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to do something to promote these courses. If they continued to teach old and outdated things, such requests are bound to come as there would not be any job prospective and professionalism. If they did not find the students for the courses like M.Sc. (IT) and M.A. (Punjabi), that too in Punjab, then it is very unfortunate. Hence, they have to see these courses from this perspective.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu and Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan pleaded that they should amend the eligibility conditions of M.Sc. (IT) keeping in view the present scenario.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the students are not opting to any of the courses being offered by the University, as well as the affiliated College of the University, it did not mean that the proposal is made here and the same is approved spontaneously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not looking it from the grass root level.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu requested the Vice Chancellor to direct the Controller of Examinations to see the return of the students belonging to the affiliated Colleges to verify and ensure that the strength of students in M.Sc. (IT) Course is really has depleted.

The Vice Chancellor said that before discontinuing the courses, they should restructure these courses and try to bring in professionalism in them. So far as discontinuation is concerned, the same could be done, even next year.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that as per the provision of the Calendar, they have to allow them to discontinue these courses.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if the course is a porcelain course, why should anybody come to join the same? If they go to Sector 34, they would find that they take the students who have done simple B.A. and after doing the professional course offered by them, the students gets salaries in lacs of Rupees because they are giving courses in artificial intelligence, analytics, big data, SQL, etc. If they offered 4<sup>th</sup> grade courses, who would opt for them? He remarked that they did not modify the courses, which are offered in the Colleges. Secondly, the affiliated Colleges have engaged unqualified faculty.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should now be cautious because the New Education Policy Draft, which was of 550 pages, had been summarised by them in 55 to 65 page. It would be placed before the competent body for consideration and implementation from the next academic session and it would be implemented on war footing. The most important component of this policy is to give more autonomy to the colleges and to convert some of them in Constituent Colleges and thereafter, get them grant given by the RUSA. Such facilities would be recommended by the Vice Chancellor, but they (Colleges) should have number of courses in their basket. If they discontinued courses like this, they would be weakening themselves. If they run away from the courses at this time, they would have to seek again all such courses which they are discontinuing.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Committee, which had already been constituted by the Vice Chancellor, had met once and would again be meeting soon. When the suggestions from the Committee in respect to courses like Artificial Intelligence, Analytic, etc. would come, the same would be considered by the competent bodies.

Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out that the College, which is seeking discontinuation of these two courses, is situated in an interior area. Moreover, none of the teachers had got salary for the last 9 months. This is a College, which is being taken up by the Government. The College would save Rs.4 lac after discontinuing these courses, which would be distributed amongst the teachers for payment of salary.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to tell as to what is to be done in the case under consideration.

Dr. K.K. Sharma suggested that M.Sc. (IT) Course should be allowed to be discontinued. However, so far as M.A. (Punjabi) Course concerned, the opinion of Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma should be sought.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that they are suggesting closure of M.Sc. (IT) Course in the era of Information Technology.

To this, Dr. K.K. Sharma said that they are closing this course because the Government is not taking it up. The Government is taking over only courses offered under the Arts and Science streams. In fact, the Government is taking M.Sc. (IT) as a self-financing course.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is of the considered opinion that first they should see the New Education Policy and then take a final decision on the issue. They should not take any decision in haste.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that PUTA is holding a seminar on New Education Policy on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2019.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they should relax the eligibility conditions so that, in future, such courses did not get closed/discontinued. If they did so, they would have a large pool of candidates.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what they are considering. They are considering discontinuation of the courses from the session 2019-20 today in the month of November. In fact, the prospectus of every College is supposed to be available with the University before the admissions are made. It did not matter whether they give the permission to the College or not because if the course(s) is/are not mentioned in the prospectus, wherefrom the students would come. Actually, the Colleges started discontinuing the courses at their own level. There are certain Colleges, which offered the courses and when the students are admitted in those courses, they told them (students) that this course has been discontinued and they also showed the letter written to the University, and in this way the students are forced to take admission in other course(s). That was why, they had made the provision that if the College is to discontinue any course, it has to apply for the same in the year preceding the year they wanted to discontinue. As said by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua that they have to check and verify as to whether the reason is the same under which the College has recommended discontinuation of the courses. It should be seen by a Committee whether the course(s) is/are not being discontinued to remove the teachers from the service. The Endowment Fund is created only to ensure that the teachers, who are removed from the services, are paid salary be made from the Endowment Fund. In fact, they did not follow the University Calendar. He is in agreement with Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma that the Calendar should be followed in true letter and spirit. Could they discontinue the course(s) from the session 2019-20 today in accordance with the Calendar? As such, a Committee comprising 2 members be formed and sent to the College to ascertain/evaluate whether discontinuation of course is justified, and if everything found to be in order, the courses should be allowed to be discontinued from the session 2020-21.

The Vice Chancellor said that the suggestions, which were being given by the members for restructuring the courses, should also be looked into.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu suggested that the issue relating to improving the course structure of M.Sc. (IT) should be referred to the concerned department so that they could improve the course structure as also change the eligibility conditions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to make a request through the Vice Chancellor to all the Hon'ble members of the Syndicate that, of course, he would also contribute if he could, to come out with the suggestions as to which new courses could be started, which actually are attractive and need of the Society as on date. There are so many courses as told by Professor S.K. Sharma and for that he would also like to give some resolution to introduce the courses at the University campus as well as affiliated Colleges, if feasible and possible.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma to expedite the matter.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that a meeting of the Committee had been held and another meeting is needed to be held to finalise the issue, and the same would be convened at the earliest.

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee comprising 2 members be formed and sent to the College to ascertain/evaluate whether discontinuation of courses (M.Sc. (IT) and M.A. (Punjabi)) is justified, and if everything found to be in order, the courses be allowed to be discontinued from the session 2020-21.

**RESOLVED FURTEHR:** That the issue relating to improving the course structure of M.Sc. (IT), be referred to Board of Studies in Computer Science and Applications for improving the course structure of M.Sc. (IT) as also for changing the eligibility conditions.

**8.**

Committee if, permanent affiliation for M.A. (History)- One Unit and M.A. (Punjabi) – One Unit, be granted to M.M.D. DAV College, Giddarbaha, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, as recommended by the Inspection Committee dated 12.05.2018 (**Appendix-VI**). Information contained in office note (**Appendix-VI**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** The above matter was placed before the Syndicate in its **meeting dated 07.07.2018 as consideration** Item No.39, but no business took place.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has an observation to make on this item. He did not know as to how the Committee has been constituted in which Deputy Registrar (Colleges) has been appointed as a member of the Committee and instead of attending the meeting of the Committee by herself, she sent one of her superintendents to attend the meeting, which according to him is not proper.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that so far as grant of permanent to this College is concerned, nobody is disputing. The question is only about the propriety of the Committee, which had been constituted where the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) had been made a member of the Committee and in place of Deputy Registrar one of the superintendents had gone; and in the Inspection Committee, he had signed on behalf of the Deputy Registrar. This should be taken care of as it is a *bona fide* mistake through an oversight. He added that it had been told that Deputy Registrar (Colleges) goes with the Inspection Committee along with the relevant record, but they have to see whether a person, who is supposed to go with the Committee along with the record, could become a member of the Committee.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that, in future, such things should be taken care of it.

**RESOLVED:** That, as recommended by the Inspection Committee dated 12.05.2018 (**Appendix-VI**), permanent affiliation be granted to M.M.D. DAV College, Giddarbaha, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, for M.A. (History) – One Unit and M.A. (Punjabi) – One Unit.

**9.**

Considered if temporary extension of affiliation be granted for M.B.A 1<sup>st</sup> year to the Institute of Management C/o D.A.V. College, Sector-10, Chandigarh for the session 2019-2020, pursuant to comprehensive supplementary objections submitted by the Institute of Management vide letter dated 22.10.2019 in response to Inspection Committee report dated 24.09.2019, in compliance with the orders dated 18.10.2019 of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court passed in CWP No. 22449 of 2019.

- NOTE:**
1. An office note containing the history of the case along with observation made by the Inspection Committee, compliance given by the Institute and the office comments, enclosed.
  2. On the office note, Shri Subhash Ahuja, University Counsel in CWP No.22449/2019 titled DAV Institute of Management Chandigarh Vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh, has observed as under:

“The Institute has not been granted any ‘lease’ by Chandigarh Administration. The lease has to be granted by the owner of the land. The reliance on a Resolution dated 24.04.2010, ANNEXURE-25) passed by Governing Body, DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh with regard to possession and use of certain area exclusively by the Institute is untenable because it does not satisfy the requirement of ‘lease’ in favour of Institute by competent authority i.e. owner of the land i.e. Chandigarh Administration. The ‘lease’ has to be in favour of Governing Body of the Institute constituted as per provisions of the UGC (Affiliation) Regulations/AICTE Regulations because the word used in the Act/Rules/Regulations is ‘lease’ which cannot be substituted to a ‘sub-lease’ OR ‘mere permission by a lessee for “exclusive use and possession” and as such requirement of ‘lease’ by competent authority has also not been satisfied by the Institute so far. Since MBA is not a ‘technical education’ permission from AICTE is not significant and compliance of all parameters laid down by UGC/AICTE are to be seen by the University.”

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor to initiate discussion on the item, Professor Rajat Sandhir said it would be better if someone could brief the members on the issue.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean College Development Council to brief the members.

It was informed (by the Dean College Development Council) that the case of Institute of Management has already come to the Syndicate many times. The inspections were being done and the MBA Course had been running there for the last

two years subject to fulfilment of some condition. But, ultimately, the Institute went to the Punjab & Haryana High Court for not granting them affiliation. However, the Court directed them to place their case before the Syndicate which is the Executive Government of the University. He further said that the latest Inspection Committee consisting three members from the University Business School, went there and the report of the Committee is attached here. In its report, the Committee did not recommend for the grant of affiliation to this Institution. So, the case is before the Syndicate now.

The Vice Chancellor, while reiterating the version of Dean College Development, told the members that in the report, the Inspection Committee has not recommended for the grant of affiliation to this Institute.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Institute has also given a reply on the queries/points raised by the Committee.

It was informed that the Institute had given reply earlier also, but the answer is more or less the same.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that in the year 2017, an Inspection Committee had gone to the Institute for the first time and Professor Anupama Bawa was a member of the Committee. She was also in the Committee as Chairperson in the year 2019.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan not to mention any person by name.

Continuing, Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan stated that when the inspection was done in the year 2017, (report of which is attached at Pages 89-90 of the agenda papers), the Madam who was a member of the Committee in the year 2017, said that "I do not recommend that Panjab University grant affiliation for the MBA Programme to the Institute of Management". No problem, Madam and other members did not recommend for grant of affiliation to the Institute. But in 2019, the Madam again went for inspection to the Institute as the Chairperson, in spite of the fact that she did not recommend grant of affiliation in the year 2017. In the year 2019, the compliance report dated 22.10.2019, which was also submitted in the Court, (available at page 71 of the agenda papers), has been placed before the Syndicate. He would like to say something about that report. The first Observation of the Inspection Committee at Sr. 'A' says, 'the building in which the Institute is housed is not an independent building, that is separated from the building of the D.A.V. College and used exclusively by the Institute of Management'. In this connection, he would like to say that in 2017 a Survey Committee (Page 91 of the agenda papers) visited the Institute in which Col. G.S. Chadha, Registrar and Shri R.K. Rai, XEN, were also the members. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor, not to name the persons, he said that he would like to emphasize that there were expert members also on the Survey Committee. The report of the Survey Committee is available at page 92 of the agenda papers. At Sr. No.1, it says, "That Institute has deed of conveyance, site measuring 4687.05 Sq.yrd, Sector 10, Chandigarh, has been allocated for expansion of new Institute. The conveyance deed is available at page 105-113/C. The Institute earmarked 0.75 acres of Land for the proposed Institute. It is pertinent to mention here that as per the norms and land requirement and space for technical Institutions issued by AICTE to run the Management Course in urban area, 0.50 acre of land is required. Copy of the AICTE instructions is placed at page 114 & 115/C/". At Sr. No. 2, it says, "The Chandigarh Administration has granted NOC to the new Institution for running MBA Programme from the session 2017-18 with the condition that no additional staff or any kind of financial aid will be provided for the same". He said that the Chandigarh Administration has granted NOC to run this programme, a copy of which is available with him. The Survey Committee had imposed two conditions in 2017, one, to make a ramp for disabled friendly and the other was to make provision of WC in the boys' toilets. He informed that both these condition have

been met with. If the issue of land was okay with the Committee in the year 2017, why the same dispute arose in the year 2019? Then they (Inspection Committee) talked about the Entrance Gate. Two gates are there and anybody could go and check it. One Gate is for the DAV College and the other for Institute of Management. They could get it checked by sending a team. In reply to the query, it has been written that Entrance Gate is exclusively reserved for the students of DAV Institute of Management. However, access provision does not pose any limitation or safety or security of the entrance. The question is to promote the Institution. Sometime back, while discussing another item, they all were talking about as to why a course is being stopped, it should be continued, its viability should be seen etc. etc. But in the case of Institute of Management, instead of looking at the quality, they are raising questions regarding non-availability of ramp or that the doors are made of metal. He informed that the Institute of Management is having such type of software which are not available even with the University and the University students used to use those software at the Institute of Management. Do Inspection Committee members are required to see that the ramp is not properly made or the doors are made of metal? The Chairperson of the Committee was requested to see those things for which they have come. They were requested to get the videography done for which they refused. Thereafter, the Chairperson of the Committee said that she wants to meet the President of the DAV College Union. He asked whether the Committee had gone there to inspect the Institute of Management or to meet the President of the DAV College Union? However, she met the President of the DAV College Union. He asked, what is the purpose of that? Have they gone there for the Inspection of Institute of Management or the Inspection of DAV College, Chandigarh? Everything has been written at point No. A(4). He read out the relevant portion which says that the "Inspection Committee was also requested by us to have the Complete videography as well as photography of the Inspection of DAV Institute of Management. Our Institute Videographer was available during inspection. But it was bluntly refused by the Inspection Committee Members. The Institute has also given an Affidavit to the Hon'ble Court to mention that no other class is held in this building, except DAV Institute of Management. It is further submitted to your kind self that the Chairperson was insisting us to meet the DAV College Teachers' Union President, Members as well as Principal to flare up the matter to which we did not agree". He again asked whether the Inspection Committee had gone there to conduct Inspection of Institute of Management or to meet the President of the Teachers' University of DAV College. As regard the appointment of Director of the Institute or teachers, the panel is sent by the University, which is held up here, but the blame is put on the Institute. If the panel is not provided, how they could appoint the Director? If they appoint the Director of their own, the University says that the appointments are made without having panel from the University and refuse to approve it. He requested that they should not be held responsible for all the things which have not been done. He further said that some conditions were imposed on them for the appointment of teachers and non-teaching staff. They have three teachers, i.e., two Assistant Professors, one Associate Professor and one Director. They have been requesting the University again and again for grant of affiliation for the session 2019-20. The teachers who have been appointed, they are paid salary as per the UGC norms. Many other conditions have also been imposed. But they are not sure whether the course would run or not. If more persons are appointed, how they would pay salary to them. There are no students for this year. They have already given an advertisement for the appointment of one teacher who would be appointed very shortly. As soon as they would get nod from the University, they would appoint all the teachers on regular basis. As talked by him in the beginning, he asked, do they need permanent faculty to start a course? When they were discussing the first item of the agenda, they are themselves saying that they need time to start a course. The University imposes the conditions for appointment of regular staff if a course is in a position to run. Thereafter, all the conditions put by the AICTE are also met with. Now, they have permission from the AICTE and Local Administration, copies of these letters are available with him. The College has also received a letter from the Home Secretary, Chandigarh which says, "Reference to letter No. so and so the proposal contained in your memo has been considered by the Chandigarh Administration and agreed to. According to the Administration, it has no objection to start MBA programme for this

session, subject to the approval of AICTE and affiliating University. Now, they have permission from all quarters and land issue is also clear.

Shri Ashok Goyal demanded a copy of the above said letter which was shown to him by Principal R.K. Mahajan. After having a look on the letter, Shri Ashok Goyal asked Principal Mahajan to see as to whom the letter has been addressed. Shri Goyal then told Principal Mahajan that the said letter is addressed to the Principal of DAV College and not to the Institute. The MBA Course is to be started by the Institute of Management.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that whatever Shri Ashok Goyal is saying, is alright. When the issue of starting of the Institute was being discussed, the name of the Institute was also changed and finally, it was named as Institute of Management. He said that they are very liberal in supporting the other courses, but, why they are so rigid, specifically for this course.

Shri Sandeep Singh enquired from Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan whether the course is running and the students studying there?

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that if the course would run for the session 2019-20, the students would come, however, old students are there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they had discussed this issue in the month of April also. He would not agree with Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan that the University has not done anything to run this course. The University had helped them by allowing them to transfer some teachers from the DAV College to run this Institute. This course was started two years back. They were allowed to run the course in 2017-18, but even after the elapse of one year, not even a single teacher was appointed. They did not ask for any panel and no interview was held, this can be verified from the record. Though there was delay, but the delay was not on the part of the University. Rather, the Institute was given extra time in April to fulfil the conditions so that they could allow the students of 2018-19 to accept their return and to allow them to appear in the examination. Therefore, it is wrong to blame the University for the delay as it was not on the part of the University. Whatever process was started for the appointment of Director, it was started after a year or so. There is still an issue in the appointment of teachers due to which the approval could not be given. The delay was there and because of that delay, the appointments could not be made. As per the regulations, they allow the course to run for a year subject to the conditions, but for the next year they cannot allow the inspection until the previous conditions are fulfilled. So, where is the fault of the University? Some lapses are there on the part of the Institute and because of those lapses, the delay has occurred. He vividly remembered that they have allowed the affiliation for the session 2018-19 subject to some condition. However, they had said that they would not allow affiliation for the session 2019-20, until and unless the conditions imposed on the Institute are fulfilled. But, in spite of giving so much time, he thinks that those conditions are not met even till today. At least these conditions should have been met with so far. The lapse is not on the part of the University, but the Institute could not fulfil the conditions. It may be true that the Institute might have done something good with regard to procuring a good software and also good infrastructure, but as regards the appointment of all teachers, the same has not been done even till today.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that as regards the appointment of teachers, four teachers have to be appointed out of which three are already working and advertisement for filling up the remaining teacher of Finance is already given. Now they are paying salary to three teachers and they have to pay the salary to the fourth teacher also, even when the course has not started.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that as far as the appointment of Director is concerned, the delay was on the part of the University. Professor Rajat Sandhir was a



member of the Selection Committee for the post of Director, but the interview has to be postponed twice. It could be checked from the record after how many reminders and after how many months, the panel for the appointment of Director was made available to the Institute. Many people who refused to go to Delhi have to be changed. Thereafter, the Model Code of Conduct was imposed for three months. The panel was then got revalidated. So, the delay was there, either it was on the part of the University or on the part of the Institute. He specifically said that the delay was also on the part of the University. They have sent a letter to the University for providing a panel for the appointment of one more teacher for which advertisement has already been given, but the same is still awaited. He wanted to know as to why the panel has not been provided so far to the Institute. Secondly, as regards the appointment of non-teaching staff, the approval has been received and the advertisement for their appointment has been given. He informed that the DAV Management has given its approval for the appointment of four teachers including a Librarian on permanent basis. All of them knew that it is very difficult to make appointments immediately, as it takes time to get approvals, etc. from different quarters. Therefore, the question is that of intention. Their intention is very clear that this Institute should run. The Vice Chancellor may or may not agree to it that people went for inspection with pre-meditated mind who have thought that they would not allow to run this course outside the Campus. They might be thinking that with the start of this Institute, the University Business School would close down.

At this point of time, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he takes strong exception for this kind of remarks and urged the Vice Chancellor to refrain him (Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma) from passing such remarks or he should establish what he is saying.

Continuing, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that one person has said that this course should not run outside. This is on record. To his mind, the conditions are already fulfilled and if there is any condition which has not been filled, the same should be told to them. As regards the land issue, they have approval from the AICTE, they have NOC from the Chandigarh Administration. He asked, do the University go for CLU, if they have to start a new Institute in the University? He urged that if they want to promote the Colleges, they have to give at least this much flexibility. They have proper space and proper infrastructure. What remains there to be done?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it has become a trend that as and when an Inspection Committee goes for Inspection to a College, if the Committee recommends for the grant of affiliation, it is okay, but if the Committee does not recommend, fingers are raised on the members. He desired that they should talk only on the report. The first point of the report is that the building in which the Institute is housed is not an independent building. But in the reply, they do not straight away say whether the Institute is housed in an independent building or not, rather they say that these cannot be the basis for stopping the affiliation on the grounds that pointed out by the Inspection Committee. While referring to pages 72-73 of the agenda papers at Sr. No. 'B', it had been observed by the Committee that "the Institute of Management was not able to convince the Inspection Committee with regard to transfer of land, on which they are situated to them by the Estate Office/Chandigarh Administration. In their reply they have not mentioned whether the Estate Office has given them the clearance or not, rather they have written in the minutes of the meeting of Survey Committee report that it was cleared in the Syndicate meeting held on 23.7.2017 vide paragraph 21. The Institute, instead of providing a copy of the Land Use Certificate issued by the Chandigarh Administration, mentioned the Para of the Syndicate. Further, in the same para, they have written that this was also resolved in the Syndicate/Senate meeting. They are talking about the land, but they (Institute of Management) are not going towards that. If an old Inspection Team is visiting a College to which they think has biased mind, they should write about it. The report is of 22.10.2019. So, they should immediately write on 23.10.2019 that they have some objection on this Committee. If somebody is deputed to inspect a College and to enforce the provisions of the University Calendar, a big question mark on his integrity is put on him. He is of the view that the Committee which was sent by the University, the

University should stand by it, and if the University cannot stand it, there is no use of sending the Committee. The Institute should submit the documents relating to the points raised by the Committee. The Committee is asking for something, and they are writing something else, which is wrong. If such a thing is received, not only from this Management, but even from any other Managements, they should be snubbed. They should be told to stop such type of things and told to give the reply clearly point-wise.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, on a point of order, asked Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua to tell him that in the Affiliation Committee, whatever had been written by the Inspection Committee, have they honoured it?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that whatever points were raised by the Inspection Committee, they did not come on the back-foot; rather, they read it thoroughly and if something has been left by the Inspection Committee and came to their knowledge, they had implemented it. They did not delete any point from the report. He could say with authority that nothing of this sort happened.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Inspection Committee in its report, in respect of DAV College for Girls, Garhshankar, had written the word 'contractual' but Affiliation Committee have changed to make appointment on permanent basis.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have added something and not deleted. They had asked to appoint permanent teacher as per the provision of the Calendar and on their insistence a permanent teacher was appointed.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that his point is that they did some ifs and buts and he was a part of that Committee.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that when they were talking about honouring a Committee, then they should also honour the Inspection Committee. Whatever decision was taken by that Committee, that should be taken as final. On the one hand, they are talking to honour the Committee and on the other hand they are making changes of their own in the recommendations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it is very painful about which some members have talked, but it is okay. But, he would like to say is that an allegation could be imposed on him that he is against the opening of this Institution from the very beginning. It would be a good thing if this allegation is not imposed on him, but if this allegation is imposed on him, he does not have any objection to it. He would like to talk on the basis of the documents available here. In 2017, affiliation was granted to this Institute. The decision of the Syndicate being referred to, and claimed that the clearance for affiliation was given, may be requisitioned and seen, on what conditions the clearance was given. That affiliation was granted for the session 2017-18. The conditions for the session 2017-18 were imposed by the Survey Committee, Inspection Committee and Syndicate. Then, again conditions were imposed by one Inspection Committee and then by same Inspection Committee in their second visit and thereafter by the same Inspection Committee in their third visit for the session 2018-19. To his mind that Inspection Committee imposed conditions 3-4 times. He thinks, this is the only Institute in the history of Panjab University where one Inspection Committee has visited the Institute for 4-5 times.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan, a few minutes before, had said that the software, which is not even available with the Panjab University, is available with DAV Institute of Management. He (Professor Sandhir) has taken this statement as a pinch of salt and it is not good that the software, which is not available with the University, is available with other Institution. If this is true, they must do something in this regard. He did not know much about it and Professor Navdeep Goyal could enlighten them on the issue.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they should drag the issue hither and thither and they have this and that and they have done this and that. Principal Mahajan is saying that the task should be done. They should suggest the ways and means as to how it could be done. They are members of a family and should not allow the students to suffer, though the students had suffered for a year. The conditions, which are required to be met, should be told explicitly, so that they (Institute) could fulfil the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, from the day it has come to his notice, none of the affiliated Colleges except this Institute has ever inspected by the same Inspection Committee for 3-4 times in a year for a particular course. From this, it could be gauged that had this College ever been given VIP status? In fact, the VIP status had always been given to this College (D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh) because this one of the most prestigious Colleges affiliated to this University and the liberty and the concessions had always been given by the University, which it duly deserve, but not as a matter of compulsion. However, he would like to tell them another story in this Syndicate only. He was accused by one of the Directors of the D.A.V. Colleges that this man speaks against the D.A.V. Colleges Managing Committee because he is a product of Government College. Had he been a student of D.A.V. College, he would have known as to what the culture of D.A.V. Colleges is. He spoke for 45 minutes and 45 minutes, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) only clarified, "Sir, I am a product of D.A.V. and you should feel acknowledged". So when one felt that he/she has to find out the reasons why somebody is speaking against somebody and saying that somebody is biased, he thought that they would not reach at the right decision. In 2017-18, the Survey Committee, the Inspection Committee, and the Syndicate knowing fully-well that these people could not fulfil the conditions, which they are laying down, but to give them a chance to start the course, they gave the permission to start the course. Then came 2018-19, when the Committee visited 3-4 times of which the present Registrar was also a member as well as the present Dean, College Development Council. The only person, who was not there at that time, is the present Vice Chancellor, Professor Raj Kumar, who has constituted the present Inspection Committee, which went for inspection and allegations have been levelled against those people, who had been sent as members of the Inspection Committee by the Vice Chancellor, which is very unfortunate. That was why, he said that he took strong exception to any kind of allegation. Not that whatever the Inspection Committee did is final for them, not that they could not commit any mistake, not that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) could not commit any mistake, but when they discuss, they should discuss the things with open mind and also keeping in mind that nobody is biased against anyone and nobody is unnecessarily favouring anyone. Unfortunately, the Chairman of the Affiliation Committee in 2018-19 had to go out of the country for about one and a half months, who gave an opportunity that they should go and inspect again. In fact, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) had to act as Chairman. So he said alright as they ask for time, he told them to go because the Institute is just two kilometres away from the University campus. He told them to go and inspect the Institute. Although they went to inspect the Institute, the Institute refused to get the inspection done by requested that they might be given this much more time. The Affiliation Committee acceded to that request also. The Inspection Committee, which comprised these hon'ble Professors of the University, did inspected the Institute and submitted the report that they have not moved even an inch forward from where they were in 2017-18. Finally, the Affiliation Committee declined them the affiliation for 2018-19. After the decline was sent to the Institute and after the same was intimated to them through an e-mail that no students are to be admitted, just next day after receiving the e-mail, they (Institute) admitted the students, which is a part of record. This is how they bother about the University. This is how, he could say that they damn care about the instructions of the University. They admitted the students and after the students were admitted, they were called to explain, they told that they have not received the letter and they simply forgot that the intimation was not sent to them through a letter, but through an e-mail, to which they could not deny that they did not receive. Anyway, as Shri Sandeep Singh has rightly put that since the students were admitted, again the same sentiments came that the students should not be allowed to suffer. In the meantime, the regular Chairman returned to India, he chaired the meeting and the said Committee also accepted that they are yet to

remove the deficiencies as pointed out by the Inspection Committee, but in the interest of the students as well as of the Institution, three more months time was given to remove the deficiencies. He thought that, that time was somewhere up to April or May 2019 and the same might be known to the present Dean, College Development Council and he had taken over Dean, College Development Council at that time. On the completion of exactly 90 or 91 days, i.e., after three months, an e-mail was sent to them that there is no compliance about the removal of the deficiencies by their Institute, including the appointment of teachers as well as Director. Next day itself or maybe the same day after 5 o'clock, they came and submitted some compliance. Obviously, affiliation was given for 2018-19, which was given provisionally by giving three months time and subject to the conditions as laid down by the Inspection Committee. So the issue of granting permission for 2018-19 is still pending with the Syndicate as the same has not been given and that is what the subject matter of the writ petition also filed by this Institution is there and they have prayed two things – (i) that affiliation for 2018-19 be granted to them, which has not been granted by the Syndicate so far; and (ii) for 2019-20, their application for affiliation has also not been accepted by the University. However, they went to the Court and said that they should be given affiliation for 2019-20. He did not know under what circumstances and under whose instructions, the Counsel of the University made the statement, because there is no such part of the record where the Court has ordered, that they want to inspect the Institute. The fact of the matter is for 2019-20, there was no application, which was accepted by the University and he made the statement that they wanted to inspect the Institute. Probably, the Counsel said that they wanted to inspect the Institute to see whether the deficiencies pointed out by the Inspection Committee for grant of affiliation for 2018-19 have been removed or not, but it took the case for 2018-19 and 2019-20. Unfortunately, in that case, he thought that the Registrar was also summoned by the Court to appear in person, where it was clarified that power to take the decision about the affiliation is vested with the Syndicate, which is the competent authority and that was how the Court had ordered that let the meeting of the Syndicate be convened to consider the issue of grant of affiliation to the Institute. Probably, 15<sup>th</sup> is the date when the decision of the Syndicate is to be placed before the Court. Now, first he said that he (Vice Chancellor) should see/refer to the decision, which was taken by the Syndicate in 2017 and the same could be seen on the basis of record whether the same has been implemented or not. Whether the Institute has taken some steps to abide by what the Inspection Committee had pointed out. As Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua has pointed out that it is as per the liberty given by the High Court that whatever objections against the Inspection Committee are to be raised, the Institute is at liberty to submit the same to the University. The first point raised by Dr. Dua was that the building is not an independent building and they (Institute) said that this could not be the basis for stopping the affiliation, while the fact is that the first and the foremost condition is that it (building) has to be an independent and separate building. According to the Inspection Committee, they (Institute) needed to have a separate building, but according to the Institute where they had responded, they said that this could not be the basis for stoppage of the Institute. Secondly, they wrote (see the second part) “The Entrance Gate of the Institute is used even by the students of D.A.V. College and the drive way outside the entrance door is used as thoroughfare by the D.A.V. College students”. This was the objection raised by the Inspection Committee and they would be astonished to see the reply, which is “The Entrance Gate is exclusively reserved for the students of D.A.V. Institute of Management. However, access provision does not pose any limitation or safety or security of the entrance”. As if separate entrance is required to overcome the safety or security of the entrance, which is nowhere mentioned. Indirectly, they are confessing that yes, there is a common entrance, which could not be the case as per the AICTE norms also. In A-(2), the Inspection Committee says “The building of the Institute is contiguous with the building of the D.A.V. College .....”, and they say “the contiguity of the building in no way affects or violates the academic environment of the Institute”. Meaning thereby, whatever objections are to be raised by the University as per its Regulations and Rules as well as per the Regulations and Rules of AICTE, they have to interpret, No, no, this is also flimsy and this is also flimsy and that is also flimsy. He wondered, why should they blame the Inspection Committee, which is inspecting only from the parameters told to them? In

A(3), the Inspection Committee says that the metal doors leading to the ramp were closed, which is meant for handicapped students and they (Institute) have confessed themselves that the ramp is common for D.A.V. College students as well as students of Institute of Management, but on the day of the visit of the Inspection Committee, they said that the doors were closed and they have themselves admitted in writing on page 72-A(3) that Yes, they were temporarily closed. They say, "Since they are meant for handicapped persons, they were temporarily closed. Meaning thereby, if a handicapped person is to come, he/she has to come only after making an announcement in advance that he/she is coming, please open the doors. He did not know whether such a provision could be there in any public building or not. Thereafter, in A(4), the Inspection says "The class rooms on the top floor of the building of the Institute of Management are being used as class rooms by the Commerce Department of the D.A.V. College...". It could be misunderstood, it could be miscalculated, it could be error on the part of the Committee, which he could understand, but to say, "This observation is purely based on hearsay and hypothetical". Meaning thereby, that they are challenging the observation of the Inspection Committee also, which visited and inspected the building physically, and whom they had themselves requested that let it be photographed or videographed. Since the Committee did not come across any Commerce Class; hence, only frivolous comments are being imposed by the Inspection Committee. They could themselves see the wording used by the Institute. Could the Syndicate accept such words to be used by a College or an Institute, which is yet to be granted affiliation, simply because they enjoyed the VIP status in the books of the University? That was how, they could afford to use such language, even in writing, and that too, against a Committee, which has duly been constituted by the Vice Chancellor. The Committee wanted to meet the Principal, the President of the Teachers' Union of D.A.V. College and also the students of the College and they themselves admit that they refused that to this they did not agree. He could have understood, had they given reason(s) as to why they did not agree? Where was the problem in case they (Inspection Committee) wanted to meet the Principal of D.A.V. College? There must be something. Even now, the objection has been raised that they had gone for the inspection of an Institute, why should they meet anybody else? He (Vice Chancellor) had gone for Youth Festival and he went to various places in different context, but if he wanted to meet the management of a College or Principal or other people around, could somebody say that he could not go there and come back from there only? Since it happened to be one of the affiliated Colleges and the Inspection Committee observed that the classes of Commerce in D.A.V. College are being conducted in these classrooms, they should tell him which was the via media to find out whether what the Inspection Committee has observed is right or wrong, except to meeting the Principal, President of the College Teachers' Union, the teachers of the College and the students? However, they were denied such a meeting. So whatever they found, they gave the findings. Thereafter, the objection is, "The Institute of Management was not able to convince the Inspection Committee with regard to the transfer of land". Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua has already said that they had not been able to give any such clarification, but he (Shri Ashok Goyal) just wanted to give them the clarification that D.A.V. College in the name of D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, was allotted the land in the year 1972. He could confess that there is no need of Change of Land Use (CLU) as the same is not required because D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, is being used for education purposes and in D.A.V. Institute of Management also, they have to impart education, so there is no need of CLU. However, what they wanted for the purpose of and a condition was also laid in the Syndicate and also by the Survey Committee that they should get the land separated from the Revenue/concerned Authorities, and for that they applied and he thought that a letter is already there. He would have been happy, had Principal Mahajan referred to that letter. The letter said that no action is called for as the land was allocated in 1972 in the name of D.A.V. College. Now, the title of the Institute is "D.A.V. Institute of Management care of D.A.V. College, Sector 10". Could by any stretch of imagination, they say that they are not part and parcel of D.A.V. College? Could by any stretch of imagination, they (University) accept this to be situated on separate land or separate building? As such, they themselves are admitting that they are care of. Thereafter, when the Inspection Committee went for affiliation for 2019-20, they had only raised the objection about

'what they were show, but they could not comment on what they were not shown', whereas their duty was actually to see, which they did not see or could not see, whatever was the case. He would say that the Committee actually, if he wanted to (or they know) blame, favoured them by not taking into consideration all the aspects. The first thing, which the Committee was supposed to see was whether they have the faculty in place, but they have not taken into consideration this. He would like to ask the Dean, College Development Council through him (Vice Chancellor) that the three teachers, which they claimed have been appointed, has their appointment been approved by the University? Even today, they are claiming that three are there and fourth position they have advertised. When disapproval or denial of approval of those three teachers had been sent, instead of taking remedial steps, they requested the University to approve those only, in spite of the fact that when their selection was made, even the quorum of the Selection Committee was not complete and this fact was brought to the notice of the Affiliation Committee in 2018 itself. At that time also, it was told that they should take the corrective measures. Probably, it had happened for the first time in the history of the University that the same Selection Committee proceedings were actually tempered with and submitted in the University. In the earlier Selection Committee proceedings, there were only three signatures, but subsequently, the same Selection Committee proceedings were submitted in the University with an additional signature. He is sure and he wanted to presume, but they must please confirm that both the proceedings of the Selection Committee for selecting the same person(s) are in the possession of the University. When he asked are those there, it was replied in affirmative. However, no action had been taken because they (DAV College) enjoy the VIP status in the books of the University. To say that this College is being discriminated against or this Institution is being discriminated against, he thought that they should acknowledge that yes, for Panjab University, D.A.V. is one of the most prestigious Institutions, to which they gave full regard. When the Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to summarize, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that summarize is that in view of this, they should not, they could not grant affiliation to D.A.V. Institute of Management for MBA course, what to talk of 2019-20, where fortunately students have not been admitted and no student's career is at stake. For 2018-29, those students, who were admitted, they had already taken a lenient view for them. A separate agenda, if brought, with whatever deficiencies pointed out by the Inspection Committee, they have complied with, they could consider, but 2019-20, he thought that they should not grant affiliation to D.A.V. Institute of Management for MBA programme. For this, whatever he had spoken, why he is saying please don't ask him to summarize, because they have to pass a speaking order giving all these reasons and by referring to all the documents on record and by contradicting what they say and by appreciating also what they say, and by supporting what the Inspection Committee says and by supporting the decision of the Syndicate by way of document(s), which are already in record starting from 2017. That is sufficient and he thought that they should not grant affiliation to D.A.V. Institute of Management for MBA programme.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he would again want to reiterate that the students should not be put to any loss.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no loss to the students at all.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that, in fact, he is not talking about the loss of students; rather he is saying that they (Institute) should be told the way out, so that they could follow that path and get the affiliation because this agenda had come to the Syndicate for several times.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had been told the way out not once, twice and so on, but at least 10 times. However, they (Institute) said that they are not going to follow this path.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like only to say that whatever decision this August House would like to take, would be the final and they have to submit the

entire documents in Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. However, he would like to put on record one thing that the decision should be crystal clear and not that since this came several times, they have to dispose off because they knew very well that they have to place the entire issue before the Court. They should be careful that it might not become a joke if a clarification is sought from the opposite party or from the University. As such, they have to take the decision in a crystal clear way.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he fully agreed because the issue is before the Court and they did not want that displeasure of the Court is shown/conveyed to the Syndicate.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that a Committee of 2-3 Syndics be constituted to take decision on the issue, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he was the Chairman of the first Committee, which inspected this Institute for grant of affiliation for MBA programme. They laid down explicit conditions, which are to be complied with by the Institute. He thought that this was in the year 2011, but still the same situation is prevailing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they (the Committee head by Professor S.K. Sharma) had written that they were ready to request them with folded hands, which is below their dignity, but they were not prepared to go to jail. At that time, a newsclipping remained in his purse to show that such and such Chairman and Vice Chairman had been imprisoned.

Shri Naresh Gaur stated that there is a report of the Inspection Committee dated 22.10.2019 and they could not go beyond the report of the Committee. If they go beyond the report of the Committee, which they themselves had constituted, then none would be ready to become a member of the Committee(s). Secondly, so far as MBA course is concerned, in fact, he was saying earlier also that MBA is a very prestigious course. At that time in the Senate, he had a view that MBA course should not be in the Colleges as other ordinary courses, i.e., like mushrooming. If they set aside this report of the Committee and gave affiliation to D.A.V. Institute of Management for MBA Programme, it would be a separate issue, then naturally several Colleges would apply for this course. If they did not follow this report, the other Colleges would definitely say that when they had given this to D.A.V. Institute of Management, why it is not being given to them. When the mushrooming of this course would be there, the career of students would be at stake and the reputation of MBA course would also be tarnished. According to him, they should go by the report of the Committee and unless and until the deficiencies are not fulfilled, they should not grant affiliation for this course to the Institute.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma stated that it is on record that the building is separate and the gate is also separate. Anybody could go and verify this. So far as the argument that the classes of Commerce are held there is concerned, it is merely a speculation. So far as the plea of the Union is concerned, since it was already in the newspapers that the Unions were opposing the establishment of this Institute. That was why, they wanted to meet the members of the Unions and Principal of the College. Even if the classes of Commerce are held there, what is the harm as the Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD) itself says that there should be optimum use of the building and the classes should be held both in the morning and evening, and this is on record. In fact, these are the instructions of the MHRD. If a class is held, should they go to each and every College with a stick and act like the policemen. There are Institutes in Ludhiana, where the Colleges affiliated to Punjab Technical University (PTU) had been opened. They should measure the land of such Colleges and they would not be able to find even 5 acres of land available with them. He could also disclose the names of such Colleges.

To this, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that he would also disclose two names.

Continuing, Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that the second is that metal doors had been fixed there. In fact, these are the minor things. The things, which had just been pointed out, are nothing. So far as transfer of land is concerned, it is lengthy procedure and the file would go to the level of Administrator. When a resolution has been passed by D.A.V. Management and it had been mentioned therein that this land has been earmarked, it serve the purpose. The file would go to the Governor, which is a technical issue and would take at least 6 months or a year. It is a technical issue and it could not be done in such a short period. They could say that they (Institute) could take a time of six months and get the land separated by the commencement of next session. To say that the appointment of staff is not approved, there are several cases of the affiliated Colleges with the University, which are pending for the last 2-3 years, but the teachers are continuing. They are making representations again and again for approval and he (Vice Chancellor) has also constituted a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal. Still 40-50 cases are pending for approval, which are technically needed to be scrutinized. So they are fully qualified and their appointments had been recommended by the duly constituted Selection Committees. He would like to bring one more thing to their notice that there is a provision of quorum for the Selection Committee meant for the University, and Dean, College Development Council, should tell him the page the quorum for the Selection Committees for affiliated Colleges existed. It is on record that where there were only three members, selections had been made and the approval had also been given by the University. It is just to deny the affiliation on technical basis that this and that was not available there. It was asked as to who was present there and they told that the person, who was Director designate, was also present. The person, who was appointed as Director, was made to sit in the selection and they did not know that the person would not join and his selection would be made at NIT. As such, nothing has been done with bad intentions and ulterior motive was also not behind it. According to him, these are minor things and they could tell them that they should fulfil these things. The things, which are major, e.g., appointment of Director, the Director has been appointed and the teachers have also been appointed. So far as infrastructure is concerned, the entire infrastructure is available with them. There is no deficiency at all. Hence, approval for 2018-19 and 2019-20 should be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he just wanted to add two lines. He is very happy that there is some admission on the papers also, but now the same has been reiterated that the person, who was selected as Director, though sat in the Interview Committee, had not joined as Director. It is also part of the record of the University that under the signatures of the same person, in one letter he says that she joined and resigned next day and subsequently the same person wrote that she was selected, but did not join. Those two letters were also there and those were place the Affiliation Committee. Was it not misleading? So far as building part is concerned, he would like to draw their attention towards page 157, wherein the Chandigarh Administration had clearly the building belonged to whom. In fact, they wanted a Land Occupancy Certificate in the name of D.A.V. Institute of Management and that was what they required. If they are unable to demarcate, at least bring a Certificate that this is occupied by the D.A.V. Institute of Management. In the last Para 4, the letter says, "Copy of letter dated 11.2.1972 (copy enclosed) issued by the Estate Officer, Chandigarh Administration regarding grant of permission for the occupation of building of DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh". He wondered, how could they say no problem and they must note this also? Now, what he wanted to propose, as he had already suggested that no affiliation could be granted, should be granted. He simply wanted to propose that let there be a surprise inspection of D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, vis-a-vis the courses which they had granted to them and the infrastructure they had acquired. They would come to know whether they had sufficient infrastructure even for their own courses, which had been granted by the University. What to talk of the courses being offered by the D.A.V. Institute of Management? The things would be clear.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that since the matter would go to the Court, he would like to say one thing. In fact, he is reading Regulation 5.1 at page 159 of Panjab



University Calendar, Volume I, 2007, and the Regulations says, "The affiliated College may apply for grant of extension of affiliation, if it has already complied with all the conditions imposed for its affiliation". When they had given affiliation for 2017-18, it was given with certain conditions and it was made abundantly clear that before applying for affiliation for 2018-19, not even a single condition had been fulfilled. The University at that time also considered their request sympathetically and sent Inspection Committee 3-4 times. As such, when the issue came in the month of April, they told that until these conditions are met, application for affiliation for next year would not be entertained because Regulation 5.1 is explicit. Therefore, the application of the Institute for the session 2019-20 had rightly been not entertained. Actually, the Inspection Committee was not sent by the University as told by him that the advocate made a statement in the Court and University had to send the Inspection Committee under compulsion. However, if they refer to Regulation 5.1, the application for grant of affiliation for next session could not be considered.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that, in fact, the University had not received any application from the Institute for extension of affiliation for the year 2019-20 because the decision was taken in the Syndicate that the application for 2019-20 would not be accepted. Whether the Institute had applied or not, he was not sure?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he has a query to the Vice Chancellor that there are about 200 affiliated Colleges and the Dean, College Development Council, should give a reply that the applications for extension of affiliation of all the Colleges are accepted/considered only after clearance under Regulation 5.1 and only then they send the Inspection Committees. The reply to this should be given to him by the Dean, College Development Council and it should be on record as the matter would go to the Court. Either the reply should be given by the Vice Chancellor or the Dean, College Development Council that whether they check that clause or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that in the last meeting they had clearly mentioned that it is to be checked that if the conditions imposed for earlier affiliation are fulfilled, only then the request for next session would be considered, and it has been mentioned in the proceedings.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be recorded whether they check provision mentioned in Regulation 5.1 or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, the para of the Syndicate had been mentioned in this as well. The first condition, which was laid by the Syndicate in 2017, to which they say, it was cleared. They say, "As far as land is concerned, it was cleared by the Syndicate". It says, it was granted subject to fulfilment of the following conditions. What is the first condition? The first condition is that the requirement of land for the proposed Institute be got separated from the Master Plan of Land allotted to D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh. They applied accordingly and they said, no once it has been allotted for educational purposes to D.A.V. College, Sector 10, Chandigarh in Master Plan, it could not be....

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma intervened to say that they could start any course.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that yes, D.A.V. College could start any course and he is the one, who is with him (Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma). However, either they should accept that it is D.A.V. College, which has started or the Institute.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that first they raised objection, why care of D.A.V. College. When the name had been got separated, now this objection had been raised.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to ask Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma whether this course (MBA) had been started by D.A.V. College. Then he would say whether D.A.V. College could start this course or not. Or this course has been started by the Institute of Management. Then he would tell them whether it could be called D.A.V. Institute of Management or not. Both these two things are entirely different. So anyway, keeping in view the legal nitygrities; otherwise, be prepared to open all such Institutes in all the affiliated Colleges and he is telling them today. And they admitted that they had appointed the non-teaching staff through the Contractor. In their reply starting from page 71 to 73 of the appendix, they should show him one pair of para, which has not been admitted by the Institute. Whatever the Inspection Committee had observed, they (Institute) had admitted, though they had raised the objection that it is hardly mattered, this should not be the ground for stoppage, this should not be bothered, it did not compromise the safety, it is not required. However, they had admitted everything, except one thing, which has not been pointed out. He enquired from the Dean, College Development Council, through the Vice Chancellor whether the approval to the appointment of three teachers had been given by the University or not.

The reply to this was given in negative.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Institute had again made a representation to the University in this regard. They should convene the meeting to consider the issue and decide.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that so far as approvals are concerned, the same are received very late. The Colleges, which approached the University time and again, got the approvals, and the others could not.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that a separate item relating this issue should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua also suggested that an item should be brought so that everybody come to know as to the signatures had been changed later on.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that since the examinations would commence in the first week of December, is there any advantage of this entire discussion. At this belated stage, even if the affiliation is granted, how would the examination of the students be conducted?

When a couple of members suggested that affiliation from the next session could be granted, Shri Ashok Goyal said that affiliation even from the next session could not be granted in this manner, and the same could only be granted after the compliance of conditions.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that examinations of the students, who had been admitted by the Institute, had already been conducted. If the Institute is to be run by them, they have to comply with/fulfil the conditions. Shri Ashok Goyal is absolutely right that compliance has to be submitted to the University as they had granted the affiliation provisionally only. Final affiliation was not granted because it would have looked very strange.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for 2018-19, they (Institute) have to submit the compliance. For 2019-20, whether they bring the compliance or they do not bring the compliance, does not matter because affiliation could not be granted for 2019-20. Why he is saying compliance for 2018-19, because if they applied for 2020-21 (as and when they apply), they again have to see the things in view of Regulation 5.1 referred to above.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that what about the students, who are in the final year.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the students have already appeared in the examination.

Dr. K.K. Sharma remarked that whenever an Institution is started, it is in inception and certain mistakes are bound to occur. And sometime, conditions are not fully met. Whatever deficiencies they had fulfilled are well and good and the deficiencies, which are pending, would be got fulfilled. There is a year's gap and thereafter, the Institution could resume.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that he fully agreed. One of his senior colleagues has said that for competing for 2018-19, they have to comply with conditions and it is absolutely correct, but issue is about 2019-20 as they had already appointed teachers and the Director has also been appointed and they have to incur expenditure of lacs of rupees on payment of salaries to them every month. Resultantly, there would be gap in the compliance. The Institute is thinking for appointing the non-teaching staff on regular basis, which would add to the expenditure.

The Vice Chancellor said that he agreed that they are paying so much of money, but now since the examinations are to commence shortly, how could they be able to manage?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, that was why, he is saying that affiliation for 2019-20 could not be granted at this belated stage.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that it is a matter of one year. Earlier also, the date sheet was postponed in exceptional cases.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that conditions imposed for 2018-19 have yet to be fulfilled, and if they granted affiliation for 2019-20, what would happen. They could not conduct the examinations so late.

At this stage, it was clarified that Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma had pointed out that the Institute had requested for a panel on 17<sup>th</sup> September and the same had not been received by them. It was informed that the panel had not been provided to them because there was a discrepancy in their request itself. The University office had written to the Institute pointing out that there is no clause of reservation, which is compulsory. At least, they should give an undertaking that they would make the appointment in accordance with the reservation clause. Secondly, earlier they had never sought any panel. Both these things are absolutely necessary and they have received reply only to one query and reply to the second query is still pending. As soon as reply to the second query is received, panel would be given by the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the panel had been given when the selection of three teachers was made.

It was clarified that it is another panel.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Institute be asked to fulfil the conditions for grant of affiliation for the session 2018-19, and so far as affiliation/extension of affiliation for the session 2019-20 is concerned, it could not be granted. The Institute should expedite the fulfilment of conditions so that the matter could be settled and affiliation/extension of affiliation could be granted in future.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) keeping in view the interest of the students already admitted at D.A.V. Institute of Management to MBA Programme, the provisional extension of affiliation already granted to it for the session 2018-

19, be reiterated, subject to fulfilment of the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee; and

- (2) affiliation/extension of affiliation to D.A.V. Institute of Management for MBA Programme for the session 2019-20, be **not** granted.

The following persons recorded their dissent:

1. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
2. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
3. Shri Sandeep Singh.

**10.** Considered –

- (i) Enquiry Report submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Office against Shri Yogesh, Clerk, Department of English (now Senior Assistant, Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies & Development), Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted.
- (ii) If the above enquiry Report is accepted the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent official- Shri Yogesh, Clerk, Department of English (now Senior Assistant, Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies & Development), so that he be asked to explain his position in the event of imposing penalty (if any) under Rule at page 119 of P.U. Calendar, Volume- III, 2016.

- NOTE:**
1. As per Regulation 3.1 appearing at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Syndicate is the appointing authority of Class 'B' employees belonging to the category of Assistants.
  2. Regulation 3.3 appearing at page 119 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 speaks that the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.
  3. The minor and major penalties stand defined under rule 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
  4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.07.2019 (Para 19) considered the enquiry report submitted by P.L. Ahuja against Shri Yogesh, Clerk, Department of English and it was resolved that the Item on the agenda, be kept pending.
  5. A detailed office note enclosed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, before discussing the Item, he would like to point out that there is a technical difficulty, that on one side, disciplinary action was initiated against a person, and on the other side, pending disciplinary action, the person (Shri Yogesh, Clerk, has been promoted as Senior Assistant. Hence, they should not discuss it and instead let them thrash it thoroughly first whether they had not gone wrong technically.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Right".

**RESOLVED:** That in the light of the above discussion, the consideration of Item 10 on the agenda, be deferred.

**11.** Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 08.11.2019 that (i) the proposal dated 30.09.2019 submitted by the Chairperson, USOL, for starting of PG Diploma in Photography, from the session 2020-21, be approved, (ii) fee structure and Rules and Regulations for the same, be also approved.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that since they have not gone through the table agenda, these items should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting. Moreover, this item related to the next year.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to have a look at the table agenda. He said that certain courses are selected ones and they have to start them. Firstly, they should listen to Professor Rajat Sandhir viewpoints. However, if they suggested modifications/corrections, the same would be taken care of. At the moment, the budget provisions related to this item, would not be considered.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that since it has come through a Committee, the introduction of the course should be approved. However, the other modalities would be considered/taken care of later on.

One of the members pointed out that since it has not come through the Faculty and Academic Council, approval should not be granted.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to approve the introduction of this course, in principle.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired has it gone to the Faculty or the Academic Council?

Professor Rajat Sandhir replied that it has hitherto not gone to the Faculty and the Academic Council.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the members not to do this. If it has not gone to the Faculty and the Academic Council, its introduction should not be approved. Moreover, if it has not gone to the Faculty and the Academic Council, why it has come to the Syndicate directly.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it has to be routed through the Academic Council.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that first it would go to the Faculty concerned and then to the Academic Council. The meetings of the Faculties would be held in the month of December.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever procedure has been laid down, the same should be followed.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that he (Professor Rajat Sandhir) was in the Committee and he knew the procedure, why the matter has directly been placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that, in fact, he (Vice Chancellor) has created so much excitement in the University for introducing new courses, and owing to that excitement, Professor Rajat Sandhir got more excited for introducing the courses.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not for surpassing any laid down procedure.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since an item relating to University School of Open Learning had been placed before the Syndicate, she would like to point out that in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, she had requested that the provision for e-lessons should be enhanced appropriately. She pleaded that the provision for e-lessons should not be restricted to only Rs.40 lacs; otherwise, the system would be derailed. She suggested that the said provision should be raised to Rs.2 crore. When it was told that it is not possible at this stage and; however, it could be done next year, she said how the lessons would be provided to the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would try their level best to take of it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the salary of 27 posts, which is being paid from the University School of Open Learning, and she had pointed out his in the previous meeting of the Syndicate also. She enquired as to what has been done in this regard. She requested that the Registrar should tell them the action taken on the issue.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Rajesh Gill to raise this issue during the general discussion.

**RESOLVED:** That the Item be placed before the Syndicate again after following the laid down procedure.

**12.** Considered if, the following Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), be executed between:

1. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Government of Assam (**Appendix-VII**) to extend the study and research on Sankardev, his teaching and the Bhakti Movement beyond the borders of Assam and India.
2. Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, between AIGen Therapeutics Pvt., Suite 501, NCR Biotech Science Cluster, 3<sup>rd</sup> Milestone, Faridabad-Gurgaon Expressway, Faridabad-121001 (**Appendix-VII**), intend to form a nucleus for promoting translational research, the culture of innovation, technology developments and transfers in the field of Life Sciences and Biotechnology with special emphasis on artificial intelligence designed protein-based medicines.
3. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Synergy University, Moscow, Russia (**Appendix-VII**) for:
  - a. promoting cultural and academic exchange for the students by a short/medium and long term student exchange programmes/summer schools in various faculties run by the respective University.
  - b. Promoting faculty exchange for better academic understanding and advancement.
  - c. Involving faculty from both the institutions in preparing curriculum and imparting instructions in the newly established programmes and arranged for the participation of faculties/students in seminars and conferences organized by the respective institutions.
  - d. Involving faculties and students from both the institutions in preparing case studies relevant to the contemporary international business environment.

- e. Exploring possibilities of offering joint degrees for bachelor's/Master's level programme in management, leadership and hospitality.
  - f. Encouraging student exchanges at under/post graduate levels: Exchanging academic and technical information of mutual interest and identifying opportunities in joint research and development in specific disciplines of interest.
4. Panjab University, Chandigarh and The Bonch-Bruevich Saint-Petersburg State University of Telecommunication (Russia) (**Appendix-VII**), for:
- a. To develop the academic mobility of teaching staff and students.
  - b. To facilitate the organization of internship for teaching staff, students, under graduates and doctoral candidates of Ph.D.
  - c. To organize summer schools.
  - d. Organizations of joint conferences, workshops and schools.
  - e. Creation of a joint program to develop innovations and discoveries for large scale applications.
5. University Institute of Pharmaceutical Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh with Dr. Vandita Kakkar, Assistant Professor of Pharmaceutical, UIPS and Hitech Formulations Pvt. Ltd., 213, Industrial Area, Phase-1, Chandigarh (**Appendix-VII**).

- NOTE:**
- 1. A copy of letter No.1194/Dean Research dated 06.09.2019 enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).
  - 2. Observation of Dr. Vandita Kakkar, Assistant Professor of Pharmaceutical, UIPS, on the above issue enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).

6. Nottingham Trent University and Panjab University, to establish an NTU sponsored NTU-PU Science and Technology Partnership Centre (STPC) at UIET through a collaborative arrangement between NTU's College of Science and Technology (CTS) and PU's University Institute of Engineering & Technology (**Appendix-VII**).

- NOTE:** A copy of letter No.1210/Dean Research dated 18.09.2019 enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that only the MoUs, which are of urgent nature, have been placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Rajat Sandhir that in case there is any mistake or correction(s) is/are required to be made, the same should be seen and got incorporated in consultation with Dean Research.

**RESOLVED:** That the following Memorandum of Understandings (MoUs), be executed between:

- 1. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Government of Assam (**Appendix-VII**) to extend the study and research on Sankardev, his teaching and the Bhakti Movement beyond the borders of Assam and India.

2. Department of Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, between AIGen Therapeutics Pvt., Suite 501, NCR Biotech Science Cluster, 3<sup>rd</sup> Milestone, Faridabad-Gurgaon Expressway, Faridabad-121001 (**Appendix-VII**), intend to form a nucleus for promoting translational research, the culture of innovation, technology developments and transfers in the field of Life Sciences and Biotechnology with special emphasis on artificial intelligence designed protein-based medicines.
3. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Synergy University, Moscow, Russia (**Appendix-VII**) for:
  - a. promoting cultural and academic exchange for the students by a short/medium and long term student exchange programmes/ summer schools in various faculties run by the respective University.
  - b. Promoting faculty exchange for better academic understanding and advancement.
  - c. Involving faculty from both the institutions in preparing curriculum and imparting instructions in the newly established programmes and arranged for the participation of faculties/ students in seminars and conferences organized by the respective institutions.
  - d. Involving faculties and students from both the institutions in preparing case studies relevant to the contemporary international business environment.
  - e. Exploring possibilities of offering joint degrees for bachelor's/ Master's level programme in management, leadership and hospitality.
  - f. Encouraging student exchanges at under/post graduate levels: Exchanging academic and technical information of mutual interest and identifying opportunities in joint research and development in specific disciplines of interest.
4. Panjab University, Chandigarh and The Bonch-Bruевич Saint-Petersburg State University of Telecommunication (Russia) (**Appendix-VII**), for:
  - a. To develop the academic mobility of teaching staff and students.
  - b. To facilitate the organization of internship for teaching staff, students, under graduates and doctoral candidates of Ph.D.
  - c. To organize summer schools.
  - d. Organizations of joint conferences, workshops and schools.
  - e. Creation of a joint program to develop innovations and discoveries for large scale applications.
5. University Institute of Pharmaceutical Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh with Dr. Vandita Kakkar, Assistant Professor of Pharmaceutical, UIPS and Hitech Formulations Pvt. Ltd., 213, Industrial Area, Phase-1, Chandigarh (**Appendix-VII**).
6. Nottingham Trent University and Panjab University, to establish an NTU sponsored NTU-PU Science and Technology Partnership Centre (STPC) at



UIET through a collaborative arrangement between NTU's College of Science and Technology (CTS) and PU's University Institute of Engineering & Technology (**Appendix-VII**).

**13.** The information contained in Items **R-(1)** to **R-(2)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**R-1.** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Dr. Nainy Puri D/o Shri Parminder Pal Puri as full Time Medical Officer purely on contract basis on consolidated salary of Rs.62738/- at B.G.J. Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh, initially for the period of one year w.e.f. the date she reports for duty and further extendable on yearly basis or as per any amended University rules, on the recommendation of the Administrative Committee of B.G.J. Institute of Health on her satisfactory services, with the terms and conditions as notified by the C.M.O. vide Notice No.23-31/HC dated 04.07.2019.

**NOTE:** 1. A copy of office order No.13626-29/Estt.III, dated 30/07/2019 enclosed (**Appendix-VIII**).

2. A copy of letter dated 12.07.2019 sent to Professor Rajnish Jain, Secretary & CVO, University Grant Commission, New Delhi, vide which it has been requested to accord necessary concurrence to fill up two posts of full time Medical Officer purely on contract basis at fixed salary of Rs.45000/- p.m. enclosed (**Appendix-VIII**), but the reply is awaited.

**R-2.** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed the Project leader BioNest:

1. to open a separate bank account in the name of BioNEST-PU in SBI, in which all the incomes pertaining to BioNEST-PU shall be deposited such as rentals from the starts up to use its space and infrastructure, testing Charges, Lab usage Charges, consultancy etc.
2. for such account the Project Leader BioNEST will act as drawing and Disbursing Officer and will operate the Bank Accounts for its defined purposes.
3. all expenditure out of such account shall be made strictly as per the procedure/rules provided in PU accounts Manual as amended from time to time for following purposes;

**Recurring Expenditure:** Electricity, Maintenance of Labs, Annual Maintenance Contract of Equipments, Travel (National & International of BioNEST staff, Projects collaboration staff and senior functionaries of the University), Manpower, Books, Journals and Magazines, Other Contingencies etc.

**Non-recurring:** Purchase of Equipment, Fabrication of Chambers if required etc.

4. the Project Leader BioNEST shall be responsible to maintain proper books of account i.e. cash books, ledgers, budget registers and other subsidiary registers as per the provisions of PU Account Manual.
5. all the expenditure from this account shall be pre-audited by the office of ACLA as per the provisions of PU Accounts Manual.
6. the above account pertains to a Government sponsored Project i.e. BioNEST-Panjab University, therefore, at the year-end, the balance of this project shall be reflected under schedule 3-A of PU's Financial statement.
7. in case of closure of this account (for any reason) the unspent balance amount of this account shall be credited to PU's main Accounts for final disposal as per the decision of competent authority.

**NOTE:** A copy of letter dated 01/10/2019 enclosed.

**Referring to Sub-Item R-1,** Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he has some reservation on this. An appointment of a Doctor has been made at B.G.J. Institute of Health. However, from the office order, it looked as if only one candidate had appeared in the interview and he/she has been selected. They could not make more comments as the proceedings of the Selection Committee and copy of the advertisement, etc. have not been enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said though the appointment has been made properly by the Vice Chancellor, in the absence of proper documents, it seemed that the appointment has been done just by the Vice Chancellor himself.

**Referring to Sub-Item R-2,** Professor Rajesh Gill said that several teachers had approached her it should not be singled out and instead all should be permitted to open separate Bank Account.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this is something wrong and it had never happened in this University. This would start financial anarchy.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it is wrong and if allowed everybody would open separate Bank Account.

Professor Rajat Sandhir pointed out that they had stopped hostels to open separate Bank Accounts.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that they would not allow a particular person/Department to open a separate Bank Account. Either all would be allowed or none.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that he had also run the Energy Centre and everything was got pre-audited.

Professor Navdeep Goyal remarked that if they did not permit this, they would not be able to execute/carry out the projects.

Professor Rajat Sandhir and Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that then they would not require Finance and Development Officer and the Grants and Planning Section would be out of job.

The Vice Chancellor said that he knew that sometimes when there is a clause for separate entity, as he is bringing an Information Cell, there would be a separate Bank Account for that and without that they would not be able to function. However, they would get the approval of the Syndicate and other authorities for the purpose.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that it should be a University account and pre-audit should be got done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, on the surface of it, it seemed to be a very good proposal, but it has not been mentioned anywhere as to wherefrom and when the project had been sanctioned to them. If the project had come about 6 months or 8 months or 1 year before, what problem they had faced now.

It was clarified that this project had come to them about a year ago. Under this Leader BioNEST project, an Incubator had been sanctioned to the University, and in that certain powers had been delegated by the Ministry that the Incubator would invite proposal(s) for the start-up on its own behalf, and a grant of Rs.50 lacs would be given for a start-up. Whichever start-ups would come, they in turn would give rental and other services. As such, out of this project, some income for the University would be generated. The Project has also a time limit and there are certain requirements, e.g., Centre should be sustainable, to skill-up it up. For that, there was a proposal that whatever income is generated from this Project, a separate Bank Account be opened for that. However, everything would be got pre-audited and the entire other procedure would be followed, but the account would be operated by the Coordinator.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that almost all the funding agencies desired that the Projects should be independent. Maybe, the Finance and Development Officer would endorse his viewpoint, so that its interest is also calculated separately, but they are not doing this and they are not maintaining a separate ledger for that. If this is their purpose, it should be operated through the Finance and Development Officer as being done earlier. If the single person would operate the account, tomorrow he/she might face problem. However, if they still wanted to do it, he did not have any problem and they should ease out the things for everybody.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that it should be same for all, but none should be singled out.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever work they are doing, they are doing keeping in view 2022 mission. They should not say no on any the parameter and they have to liberal on almost all. It is the mandate of the Government that they should raise the funds and they have to ease out the system for raising the funds, but not by surpassing the procedure laid down by the University. However, they have to facilitate a little bit. Further, the check and balances and the procedure of finance would be followed under all circumstances, but at the same time, they have to do these things for the purpose of generation of funds as well as for the Centre of Incubator, which he is bringing for the University. The Government is also giving funds for this to the University directly. If they explore the good ideas, the Government could give them funds between Rs.50,000/- and Rs.1 lac. As such, if any proposal came for these purposes, though they should check the thoroughly, but they should come out of the compartment tight structure. They have to generate the funds under any circumstances.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she is unable to understand that there would be pre-audit and at the same time they would also go by the Accounts Manual. How it could be done?

It was suggested that it could be changed. There was a proposal that the Account would be operated by them, but the account could also be opened in the name of the Registrar.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the University is also making the investment and is spending about Rs.1 crore annually. As such, the University should also look at the return. He thought that actually it is the University money, which is being invested. Therefore, they needed to examine as to where the hurdles and what the problems are.

It was clarified that this Project had different branches, but BioNEST is a separate one. In fact, what he (the Hon'ble member) is talking about, it is an umbrella and it is not this specific project; rather it is an umbrella type of scheme. Here they have committed that they would contribute for this for five years.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if it is an umbrella and there are 20 branches in the umbrella, then they have to open 20 separate Bank Accounts.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that they should look at it.

The Vice Chancellor said that let it be re-examined as he himself is not clear as to what it is.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have already done and it has come to the Syndicate for ratification. As such, it could not be taken so lightly. The Syndicate could not ratify it as such. Let it go to the old system and after examining it from all the angles, they would see as to what is the need. He requested the Finance and Development Officer through him (Vice Chancellor) that, in future, if any such proposal is placed before the Syndicate, the same should be completely supported by the rationale and reasoning as to why it is being proposed. However, Sub-Item R-2 is not ratified and it should be taken back to the old system.

Professor Rajat Sandhir pointed out that they were talking about the bank account and the University has issued a letter that the opening of Bank Account has been approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Bank Account, which has been opened, has to be closed immediately.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Item 13-(R-1)** on the agenda, be ratified. However, the information contained in **Item 13-R-(2)**, be **not** ratified.

**14.** The information contained in Items **I-(1)** to **I-(13)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**I-1.** In pursuance of orders dated 30.08.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 23543 of 2019 (titled Dr. Mohan Lal Garg & Ors. Vs. Panjab University, Chandigarh vide which following faculty members have been granted same relief as in CWP No. 26006 of 2017 and CWP No. 26730 of 2018, wherein in pursuance to the orders passed in LPA No. 1505 of 2016, they have been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case:

Sr. No.	Name of Faculty members	Department	Date of superannuation	w.e.f. the date they continue in service as per interim orders
1.	Dr. Sanjiv Kumar Soni,	Microbiology	30.09.2019	01.10.2019

	Professor			
2.	Dr. Mohan Lal Garg, Professor	Biophysics	31.10.2019	01.11.2019

The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 14.11.2019, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) The above faculty members be considered to continue in service w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, 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 they were drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filled by them. The payment to them will be adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit the undertaking as per Performa.
- (ii) They be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

**I-2.** In pursuance of orders dated 30.08.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 23543 of 2019 (Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh Vs. Panjab University & others tagged with LPA No.1505 of 2016, wherein in 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 now fixed for hearing on 14.11.2019, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. Devendra Kumar Singh, Associate Professor, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.10.2019, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No.23543 of 2019 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filled by him. The payment to him will be adjustable against the final dues to them for which he should submit the undertaking as per *pro forma*.

**NOTE:** A copy of the office order No.9107-15/Estt-I dated 04.10.2019 enclosed (**Appendix-IX**).

**I-3.** In pursuance of orders dated 14.10.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 29355 of 2019 (Dr. Cecilia Antony 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. Cecilia Antony, Professor, Department of French, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.11.2019 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject

matter of CWP No. 29355 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.

**I-4.** The Vice-Chancellor has disqualified Mr. Khalil Ali Khel (foreign student of USOL) for three years, as he has submitted forged/tempered documents of M.A. Political Science 1<sup>st</sup> semester, for taking the admission in M.A. (Political Science 3<sup>rd</sup> Sem.) for the session 2019-20.

**NOTE:** A copy of letter No.1464-65/CPO/USOL I dated 04.10.2019 enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

**I-5.** The Vice-Chancellor has allowed that the Assistant Registrar (Accounts) shall verify and sign the summary of salary bills and the individuals deduction vouchers shall be signed by the office superintendent (Accounts).

**NOTE:** As per the provision of Chapter VI of Panjab University Accounts Manual, the individual salary bills are to be verified by the office Superintendent. However, as per Chapter V of Accounts Manual, the bills are to be drawn by at least at the level of Assistant Registrar.

In order to comply with both the provisions, it has been decided that the Assistant Registrar (Accounts) shall verify and sign the summary of salary bills and the individual deduction vouchers shall be signed by the office superintendent (Accounts).

**I-6.** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Committee dated 04.09.2019 (**Appendix-XI**), has approved following additional rules for PUMEET Exams:

1. for the migrated candidates who have not undertaken a pre-requisite course/s (as decided by branch) of the program of their admission, then candidate will be offered guided course/s by the concerned branch.
2. total credits for each program shall be fixed and any candidate securing above this number shall also be eligible for award of degree for that course.
3. the University medal/merit shall be decided from CGPA evaluated by considering total credits secured by the candidate in that program.

**NOTE:** A copy of circular No.3693-3699/ UIET dated 31.10.2019 enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

**I-7.** The Vice-Chancellor has allowed the payment of festival advance of Rs.8000/- to all 'B' & 'C' Class employees as per past precedent/practice and the recovery will be made from their salary in four equal instalments @ Rs.2000/- p.m. starting from November, 2019 to February, 2020.

**I-8.** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to the dependents of Late Dr. Kuldeep Kumar, Assistant Professor, who expired on 10.06.2018, as per Legal Heir Certificate dated 22.06.2018 issued by Naib Tehsildar, Kangoo (ST), District Hamirpur (H.P.):

- (i) Gratuity (in the event of death while in service): Regulation 4.4 at page 186 & 15.1 at page 131 Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
- (ii) Ex-gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019.
- (iii) Encashment of Earned Leave up to the prescribed limit, under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019.

**I-9.** The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
Dr. Cecilia Antony Professor Department of French	25.02.1987	31.10.2019	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.  (ii) Furlough as admissible under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 121 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.  (iii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India

**NOTE:** The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

- I-10.** The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Mrs. Neelam Jethi nee Neelam Kapoor Deputy Registrar UMC Branch	19.02.1982	30.11.2019	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
2.	Sh. Vijay Kumar Rana Assistant Registrar Accounts Branch	20.05.1983	30.11.2019	
3.	Mrs. Bhima Vati Superintendent Department of Physics	11.10.1988	30.11.2019	
4.	Mrs. Ruby Dua Stenographer Centre for Human Rights & Duties, P.U.	01.07.1987	30.11.2019	

**NOTE:** The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

- I-11.** To note the Action Taken with regard to E-Rickshaw problem at the P.U. Campus.

**I-12** The Vice-Chancellor has approved that:

- (i) Shri Narinder Kumar (senior-most J.E./A.E. & presently holding the current duty charge as SDE (without any financial benefits), be promoted as 'Sub Divisional Engineer' against vacant post of S.D.E. in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- (Initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) w.e.f. the date he joins as such and his pay will be fixed as per University rules, under 50% promotional quota, in terms of the recommendations of the Committee meetings dated 01.09.1993, 06.12.1993 & 22.09.1994 duly approved by the Syndicate meeting dated 25.02.1995 and as per latest decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 18.02.2019 (Para 41).
- (ii) Shri Anil K. Behal, senior most J.E./A.E. & presently holding the current duty charge as SDE (without any financial benefits) be promoted as 'Sub Divisional Engineer' against vacant post of S.D.E. in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- (Initial pay of Rs.21,000), w.e.f. the date he joins as such and his pay will be fixed as per University rules, under 50% promotional quota, in terms of the recommendations of the Committee meetings dated 01.09.1993, 06.12.1993 & 22.09.1994 duly approved by the Syndicate meeting dated 25.02.1995 and as per latest decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 18.02.2019 (Para 41), subject to the final outcome of the Court case



(CWP No. 7831 of 2016) filed by Shri Anil K. Behal in the Hon'ble High Court.

- (iii) Shri Vinay K. Lalia (currently holding the current duty charge as SDE (without any financial benefits), be allowed to officiate as 'Sub Divisional Engineer' against vacant post of selection in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- (Initial pay of Rs.21,000/-), w.e.f. the date he joins as such and his pay will be fixed as per University rules, till further orders or till the post of Sub Divisional Engineer is filled in, through Direct Recruitment, under 50% Open Selection quota, whichever is earlier, subject to the condition that his service will not be counted for seniority as S.D.E.

**I-13.** To note the Interim Report dated 06.11.2019 (**Appendix-XII**), submitted by the Committee, re-constituted by the Vice-Chancellor on the complaint made by Shri Jagdeep Kumar, Fellow and Dr. K.K. Sharma, Fellow, Panjab University regarding victimization and suspension of teachers by the re-employed Principal of Guru Nanak Girls College, Ludhiana.

**NOTE:** The Principal, Guru Nanak Girls College, Model Town, Ludhiana has been requested to furnish certain information/ documents latest by 13.11.2019, vide letter dated 08.11.2019 (**Appendix-XII**).

**Referring to Sub-Item I-11**, Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that one set of minutes had been circulated to them earlier and now another set of minutes have been circulated to them. In fact, it (E-Rickshaw Contract) had been a scam in the University, and she had made a complaint even to the office of Prime Minister. The University had also received a communication regarding the above said complaint from the Administrator, U.T., Chandigarh, as she had also sent a copy of the report to the Vice President and Chancellor, Panjab University. Though even minor MoU's/MoA's were placed before the Syndicate, the MoA relating to E-Rickshaw had not been placed before the Syndicate whereas it had financial liability. Secondly, it was an agreement which was absolutely void *ab initio*. In fact, there was no consideration of the agreement, which is mentioned in the agreement itself. Thirdly, they took legal opinion from the Senior Law Officer (SLO) even in minor cases, whereas no opinion had been taken from the SLO in this case. Why the opinion of SLO had not been taken? The former Registrar had done a scandal in this case, but the University always put such scandals under the carpet. She requested the members to go through the minutes of the Committee dated 6.8.2019 and drew their attention towards Para 3, which says "The Committee also strongly felt that while framing the tender and contract appropriate procedure of E-Rickshaw has not been followed. The MoU is completely one sided to the advantage of the company and to the disadvantage of Panjab University. The responsibility of entering into such a lopsided agreement, which was also without any consideration, must be fixed. The then Registrar rushed through the whole process not following the established procedure of Panjab University and without getting it approved from the Syndicate/Senate executed it. A *mala fide* is evident and he is solely responsible for the fraud committed in the University. As a result, the University is now facing a great difficulty in deciding the facts of this contract, so much so it is now under severe constraint to terminate this unilateral contract. The contractor has now been given a termination notice of 90 days". She added that this is an important issue whereas certain persons are of the view that since it is a minor issue, it should be filed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to add an supplement that the minutes of the Committee, which are being referred to by Professor Rajesh Gill, are

dated 6.8.2019 which were probably, finalized in the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of September 2019 because some of the signatories were outside. As he was also a member of the Committee, he knew that a very serious view was taken by the Committee, which was Chaired by Professor S.K. Sharma and he was referring to these minutes in the last meeting also, but the Vice Chancellor had pointed out that the issue was being raised by the e-rickshaw drivers and a lot of problem is being faced. Then Professor S.K. Sharma had said that they had already given their recommendations for terminating the contract. Notwithstanding the recommendations already submitted to the University, probably in his wisdom, the Vice Chancellor appointed another Committee to take care of the problem and the meeting of the Committee was held on 10.10.2019. Had that Committee taken into consideration the minutes of this Committee, probably, they should not have recommended like this, e.g., in the end it has been written, "since it is a legal issue, the Committee is of the unanimous opinion that a legal notice may be issued to the Contractor by the University and a Lawyer be engaged by the University to draft a legal notice as per terms and conditions of the contract and legal procedure". This is the stage they have reached that they did not have a single person in the University, who could at least prepare a notice, which could be got vetted from the Law Officer or Senior Law Officer or University Counsel or the Legal Retainer of the University. They had said that the notice should be issued and for issuing the legal notice when they have in principle decided to terminate the agreement, they needed the services of Legal Retainer or the Advocate, but while entering into such an agreement unauthorizedly, illegally, without jurisdiction, no such services were ever taken from any of them, including SLO. Professor Rajesh Gill had said that ultimately, there has to be some provision for initiating action against somebody even if he/she ceased to be holding the position. As to whether he was authorised to entering to such an agreement putting the University into trouble for all times to come and they are facing the trouble now. He did not know why this was not taken into consideration. Though he guessed, he had doubt that the contractor probably came to know what the Committee chaired by Professor S.K. Sharma had recommended because they had called the representative of the contractor also and interacted with him. Probably, he came to know that they had made such recommendations. And to they know to retaliate against that, maybe he also increased the rent, etc., and perhaps, they faced such a problem last time. The problem, which had arisen and for which a Committee was constituted that such problem is being faced, the recommendation of that Committee had been put in a cold storage, and the recommendations of another Committee had been brought to them saying that they had now got the issue resolved and the Contractor had also to be given a notice. At the moment, he did not know whether the Contractor had been issued the notice of 90 days about the termination of his contract or not.

It was informed that the notice, which is to be issued to the Contractor, is being got legally vetted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then that should be expedited and it should also be got legally examined as to what action could be taken against those, who had crossed their jurisdiction while entering into such an agreement, and that too, without the approval/permission of the Syndicate and Senate. When the contract is to be terminated, the matter is being placed before the Syndicate and Senate, but when the agreement/contract was to be signed, it was not done.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that almost three years had elapsed when the Committee had recommended that the contract/agreement should be got registered. Why the registration of the agreement has not been got done? What secret is there in the contract? It was also told that two serious gap rape cases had taken place in Chandigarh and in both the cases the culprit(s) were auto rickshaw drivers and they were not the owners of the auto rickshaws. At that time, the Committee had asked them were they waiting for such a crime? Their young daughters hired the e-rickshaws, but neither they knew anything about the drivers as they did not have identity proofs nor the e-rickshaws had been registered.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that it is a serious issue because they could not get it insured. If any accident took place, they would not be able to get any claim.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they even could not get the FIR registered.

It was clarified that they are getting the legal notice vetted for terminating his (Contractor) contract. Of course, it would be expedited. So far as the recommendations of the Committee headed by Professor S.K. Sharma are concerned, they would get legal opinion as to what could be done and what procedure is to be followed.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that the Hon'ble Prime Minister is fighting against the corruption and he always said that they should raise their voice against the corruption. However, if somebody raised the voice, heed is not paid. She would like to ask from the Syndicate up to when they would like to keep quiet.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired are the e-rickshaws still operating and the reply to this was given in affirmative. Unfortunately, if any mis-happening took, who would be responsible? He added that they had recommended in the month of September that they did not want to create any problem, which could not be handled. They had suggested in September that a way out should be found after talking to the students, so neither the safety of the students is compromised nor the authority of the University and the drivers of the e-rickshaws or the Contractor could not commit any excesses. What they are going to do in this regard?

Professor S.K. Sharma said that, in fact, it was apprehended in that meeting that this is what is going to happen.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that they (drivers) had also politicized the students on this issue. In fact, they (University authorities) needed to talk to the students and tell them this is the real issue.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that at least up to the notice period, they have to ensure the safety and security of the students.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that they should at least take into confidence the office bearers of the Panjab University Campus Students' Council.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the last recommendation of the Committee was, "It is further suggested that an appropriate Committee should be constituted involving the Student Council Representative and the Department Heads to deliberate the future course of action of environment friendly internal transportation system". He has another suggestion to make that he (Vice Chancellor) is always in a hurry to get solution to any problem and in the process sometimes through an oversight even if a Committee is looking into something, a new Committee is constituted. His request is that the multiplicity of Committees on the same issue, and if this could be avoided, should be avoided. He also requested that let Professor Rajesh Gill be included in this Committee also. This should be done in consultation with the Registrar at the earliest. The recommendation of the Committee is that the representative of the students should be called.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would take care of this.

**Referring to Sub-Item I-13**, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, it should have been brought to the Syndicate as an item for consideration. A much problem is there in the College and the report is also saying so. Moreover, the College has also terminated the services of certain teachers without following the laid down procedure and without giving them any notice. Earlier, when such an issue was discussed, it was observed that the Registrar could always interfere and quash the orders of the College. He suggested that this must be done.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he also supplemented the viewpoints expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal. As pointed out by Professor Navdeep Goyal, earlier perhaps, the Registrar had interfered in such a case relating to Mahilpur College. If the teacher placed under suspension by Mahilpur College could be reinstated, why could not the teachers placed under suspension by this College be not reinstated?

Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out though they have to communicate with the Principal of the College only, whereas a Trust of the Management Committee existed in this College, which said that the University should communicate to them. They should insist that the Registrar would communicate only to the Principal of the College and this is the rule also.

Shri Naresh Gaur pointed out that they had constituted a Committee and the Committee had also submitted its report. The Committee has recommended that the teachers should be got reinstated and now the Registrar should use his powers and get the teachers reinstated. The Committee not only recommended the reinstatement of the teachers, but has also pointed out so many shortcomings of the College. Now, it is their responsibility to remove those shortcomings also. In the end, he requested that all the teachers, who had been placed under suspension by the College, should be immediately got reinstated.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that whatever action was taken by the Registrar in the case of Mahilpur College, the same should be initiated in the case of this College. Secondly, they (he and Shri Jagdeep Kumar) sent an e.mail on 1<sup>st</sup> of September that there is a lot of victimization of the teachers in this College. Earlier, two teachers were placed under suspension and now five more teachers have been placed under suspension. The Committee has also pointed out that the management usually adopted coercive methods against the teachers. He suggested that on the basis of this interim report, the Registrar should be authorized to revoke the suspension of the teachers and further the same Committee should also look into all aspects concerning the College. The position in this College so bad that the former Principal namely Mrs. Mahil has not vacated the room, which was officially allocated to her, even after attaining 65 years age and the Officiating Principal is taking the classes in her room. Presently also, whichever notices are issued they are issued under the signatures of Mrs. Mahil. Is the Director authorised to communicate with the employees?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that in the last meeting of the Syndicate also, they had decided that the teachers, who have been placed under suspension, would be got reinstated. What happened is that he (Vice Chancellor) got the Item(s) bound up in a hurry, but no concrete action is taken. At the moment, the situation is if earlier four teachers were placed under suspension, now three more teachers have been placed under suspension. Though they had received an interim report from the Committee, still they are thinking about get the same examined from someone.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that they would definitely take action.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they should have full confidence on the Committee, which is sent by the University to the Colleges. If somebody raised any objection to any of the members of the Committee, he/she should not be replaced. Citing an example, he said that he had come to know that Dr. K.K. Sharma's name had come in the Committee and owing to one reason or the other, somebody raised objection to his name and he (Vice Chancellor) replaced him. This is not appropriate. In fact, the Committee is not acceptable to any of the affiliated Colleges. He urged the Vice Chancellor to see that six-seven teachers, who have been placed under suspension, should be got reinstated immediately. If the College did not join them, they should take decision today itself that the Examination Centre be not created in that College. What happened is that whosoever is being reinstated by the University, the Colleges are not allowing them to join.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that 5000 students, who are studying in the Colleges, their aspect should also be kept in view and also as to where they would go.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this decision, irrespective of whether it is Mahilpur College or any other, should be taken, so that the decision of the University is respected by one and all. If the Colleges did not implement the decision of the University regarding the reinstatement of the teachers, they would not going to tolerate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as what decision has been taken on the issue.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the affect of the Syndicate is that if earlier two teachers were placed under suspension, now five more teachers have been placed under suspension. This is the affect of the Syndicate. Similarly, a lot of hue and cry was made about SDP College, but when they talk about action to be taken against that College, they plead that the decision of the Court is awaited. If they have to wait for the decision of the Court, they should not discuss the issue here in the Syndicate; otherwise, it is nothing but unnecessarily wastage of their valuable time. If no action is to be taken against them, then what is use of discussing the issue? He requested that such issues should be taken seriously. He added that last time, a Committee was constituted to consider the entire issue relating to post-matric scholarship. He urged the Vice Chancellor to disclose the names of the persons, who have been included in the Committee. Has the issue been settled and the Detailed-Marks-Cards been sent to the students?

When a couple of members enquired as to what has been done in regard to this item, the Vice Chancellor said that they are taking the action. However, if someone has to say on this issue, he could do so.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is a very serious issue; rather, it is one of the most serious issues because the families of 7 teachers are on the road. It had not happened for the first time. They are habitual of offenders and they knew very well that in University they would take time. He was very thankful to the Committee, which had submitted this report and he was very thankful to the Registrar also who has serious note of it. However, despite all this, probably none of the members of the Syndicate knew as to what they are doing. Even if they took the decision in principle that they are going to take action in terms of Regulations, they are not sure that they would follow the decision. It had also been pointed out by a couple of members that there is nothing like Principal in the College as the College had only a Director. Since it had been brought to their notice, immediate cognizance be taken and the College be immediately instructed that such and such had been reported so please do the needful and confirm that it only the Officiating Principal, who is to administer the College and none else. Secondly, whatever action the University took in terms of the regulations – whether they reinstate the teachers or whatever is deemed fit by the competent authority, i.e., the Registrar in this case. At the same time, it should also be ensured that it is implemented because they knew that they are likely to go to the Court against the Services Security Act, etc. However, as a University, they had the power to withhold the roll numbers of the students. Let they go to the Court and get the roll numbers of the students on the orders of the Court. Such decisions are to be taken here in the Syndicate, so that they knew that the University is serious and they could not play with the career of the teachers like this, who had been thrown out even if they had the service of more than 15-20 years. They have to send a strong signal. They are already late as he knew that he had been listening to this for the last 2-3 months.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that the rules/regulations are there and everything has been well written in the books. What he was contemplating was that 2-3 of them should rigor it and follow it up. He urged the members to support the system of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) meant to say that they should help the Registrar on the issue. He had no problem in doing that. He added that he just wanted to make them cautious that all the people belonging to the Management of the Colleges are influential. They try to get benefit(s) from the new Vice Chancellor. They usually explain to the Vice Chancellor the things in an exaggerated way. The Vice Chancellor thinks that they should also be listened and in the process, the persons, who do not approach the Vice Chancellor, are unable get even the genuine things done. None says that first they should reinstate these teachers, only then they would talk to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was why, he is meeting the Principals tomorrow. He would ask them to expedite the process. Secondly, he would take input from the Principals as well the Managing Committee members.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that the Managing Committee members would explain to him (Vice Chancellor) that a lot of injustice is being meted out to them and he would feel that the person seemed to be innocent. He suggested that the Vice Chancellor should impress upon them that first they should follow the decision of the University, only then he would talk to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was why, he is meeting them directly. He would meet them and then 2-3 of them (Syndics) should sit together and facilitate the Registrar as well as the Dean, College Development Council. If the members had any input or information at that point of time, they could give the same to him even on phone.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should adopt such a mechanism wherein the Management Committee members say that they wanted to meet the Vice Chancellor. However, from the proposed meeting of the Vice Chancellor, it seemed as if the Vice Chancellor wanted to meet them. If they (Managing Committee members) are not keen, why should they meet them and instead, they should follow the books.

Shri Naresh Gaur remarks that when they would be strict, they (Colleges) would definitely follow the regulations, rules, guidelines, norms, instructions, etc. of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that then they (College people) would definitely come to the University authority.

The Vice Chancellor said that, in the first hand, he would like to understand as to what problem they (Colleges) are facing. When he would meet them, he would be aware of all their problems.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would tell them as to what problems they (Colleges) had. In fact, their problem is P.U. Calendar. What would they do?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that when he (Vice Chancellor) held a meeting the people of the Colleges, it would be effective only if he (Vice Chancellor) is aware of the entire history because they would try to convince him (Vice Chancellor). She added that during the tenure of former Vice Chancellor, first of all, the report was not allowed to be prepared, but when the report was prepared and submitted, the same was lost.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that, in fact, Professor Rajesh Gill was a member of one of the Committees, and that was why, she knew this.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that 2-3 Syndics, who are required, should be chosen right now and their names should be noted down.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not do that. Whosoever's services would be required, he/she would be requested.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Item 14-(I-1 to I-13)** on the agenda, be noted.

**When the discussion on agenda items was over, the members started general discussion.**

1. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that in the Syndicate meeting of February or March, there was an item relating to NSS contribution. All the members of the Syndicate had unanimously decided that the NSS contribution of Rs.10/- be charged only from those students who opt for it. This practice is being followed for the last 10-15 years. But, this time the University has sent a letter to the colleges that NSS contribution be got collected from the students. He, therefore, requested that NSS contribution of Rs.10/- be collected only from the students who opt for it and it should be made a part of the resolve part so that action could be taken on this.

The Vice Chancellor directed Finance and Development Officer to look into the case.

2. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan further said that Controller of Examinations and Finance & Development Officer had made a Committee which prepared a bill regarding payment of practical examinations to be made to the teaching and non-teaching employees. He said that the bill is ready and he requested the Vice Chancellor to approve the bill and it be made applicable from the ensuing examinations.
3. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that he had requested in the last Syndicate meeting regarding non-declaration of result of B.P.Ed. (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Semesters).

It was clarified that that the issue has been sent for legal opinion and the report of the legal Retainer would be received in 2-3 day and the issue would be resolved accordingly.

4. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that in the year 2012, the earned leave of teachers was enhanced from 8 to 12. He informed that the Principals are considered as non-vocational staff, they are also availing leaves as is being given to the teachers of affiliated Colleges. He requested that they should also be given leave as applicable to the non-vocational staff, as mentioned in the P.U. Calendar.

The Vice Chancellor directed Dean, College Development Council, to look into the case.

5. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they are celebrating 550<sup>th</sup> Prakash Utsav of Sri Guru Nanak Dev Ji in India. The Government of India as well as the Government of Pakistan have promised to release the prisoners. The Panjab University has been allowing Golden Chance for various examinations. This time he would request the chair to announce Golden Chance for B.A. improvement. He submitted a written request of the student for the same.

The Vice Chancellor directed Controller of Examination to look into the case

6. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there are around 6-7 Colleges, which have not complied with conditions for grant of affiliation. These Colleges might also be allowed to submit their Registration Returns and the Colleges be asked to comply with conditions imposed before 31<sup>st</sup> of March 2020, failing which no Inspection Committee be sent for Grant of affiliation of Courses for new session.

The Vice Chancellor directed Dean, College Development Council, to look into the case.

7. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma further said that next issue he would like to discuss about the constituent Colleges and Regional Centres where the fee structure applicable is not automatically updated by the portal offering scholarship for SC students. This is required to be checked up as this may create a problem in claiming the scholarship by SC students. There will be agitation in case there is delay in disbursement of scholarship.

The Vice Chancellor directed Finance and Development Officer and Coordinator SC/ST to look into the case.

8. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma further said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate he told that the payment of honorarium to Controller of Examination will be brought to the next meeting of the Syndicate the same may kindly be looked into.

9. Professor Rajat Sandhir said that a letter has been issued by the Establishment Branch to the Chairpersons of the departments wherein it has been desired that those teachers who have attained the age of 65 years be relieved. It has happened for the first time that a global letter has been sent to relieve the teachers, who have attained the age of 65 years. There should be a special letter written to the teacher to relieve him. It is very insulting for the department to ask this to a teacher.

Professor Navdeep Goyal added that since they are not releasing the retirement benefits to these teachers, it is a great problem.

Continuing, Professor Rajat Sandhir said that that it is very insulting for a Chairman to ask that such and such teacher be relieved. There should be a system for it and a global letter should not be issued like this.

10. Professor Rajat Sandhir further said that he had been talking about the seniority issue of teachers in the last 3-4 Syndicate meetings. He thinks that they are not serious about it. They could not get the lists approved, which had been prepared a year ago. How much time they would need to do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be done soon.

At this stage, Professor Rajat Sandhir raised certain points relating **Item 13-(R-1) and R-2**, which have been shifted to Item 13-(R-1).

11. Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out that due to one or the other reason the approvals of certain teachers are pending. A Committee is usually formed to consider the grant of approval. He requested that since the term of the earlier Committee has expired, a new Committee be constituted to clear the cases as the teachers are facing a lot of problems.



The Vice Chancellor directed Dean, College Development Council to look into the case file.

12. Dr. K.K. Sharma said last time the issue of teachers and Principals of Education Colleges, who could not become the Principals of Degree Colleges and were restrained for the time being, was discussed. The case was to be examined. He wanted to know the update on the issue as the case was to come up to the Syndicate again.

The Vice Chancellor said that since clarification from the UGC was required, the same may have been sent to the UGC.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that perhaps it was not sent to the UGC so far.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members, if it has not been sent, should he send it now, to which the members said in the affirmative. The Vice Chancellor directed to Dean, College Development Council for update on the issue.

13. Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said, it has come to his notice that Students' Returns of some of the College which were sent to the University have been returned to the Colleges. There are two types of colleges, one those where the Students Return of the ongoing classes has been returned, which should not have been sent back. There may be one class in whose case the conditions have not been fulfilled, but the Students Return should not be done in the case of ongoing classes. There are other Colleges where Return of all the students has been sent back. Do they consider that the College has been disaffiliated? He requested the Vice Chancellor to look into it so that the students be not put to any loss.

14. Shri Naresh Gaur said that he has two issues. In the last meeting when the issue of Principals of Arya Colleges came up, where their transfer was cancelled. A Committee was made constituted which was later on disbanded. It was decided that a Committee of the Syndicate members be constituted to re-examine the issue. Till date no Committee has been formed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the minutes have not been approved so far.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if the minutes are not approved for three months, how the matter would be taken care of.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested to get the minutes approved at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor directed Dean, College Development Council, to look into the case

15. Shri Naresh Gaur further said that 4-5 months back they had discussed the case of S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana, Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana and Shree Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana. The in respect of S.D.P. College for Women was different and the decision with regard to Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, and Shree Atam Vallabh Jain College was different.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that Committee for each case has been made.

16. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he would like to talk about the Gurpurb Celebrations which the University is celebrating. About 10 months back, he has given a proposal to form a Committee for this purpose because their University is a role model for other Universities. This is not enough to hold a small seminar in a department or organise a guest lecture, rather, all the colleges and schools, irrespective of the religion they belong to, are doing this, because it was the philosophy of Shri Guru Nanak Dev Ji. Shri Guru Nanak Dev Ji was such a personality for whom there was no limitation of borders. He visited to many countries. The Ambassadors of those countries are there, their communities are here. They could invite the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of those countries

The Vice Chancellor informed that 20 Volumes on Guru Nanak Dev Ji are coming and many more publications would come up in future. He said that they could give him a list as to whom they would like to invite.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they are also going to print a book.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that their work was two steps ahead what the others are doing. The way which is opening towards South Asia, a University is coming up there. They people on that side has said that Shri Guru Nanak Dev Ji is their 'Baba' which means that their elder. He is their Guru. It is the first University which is being named as Baba Guru Nanak Dev University. There is no such example in the world and they could have research tie up with them. The colleges are doing much more than the University in this regard, whereas the University was supposed to lead and do much as entire country was looking at them might surprise as to how the work of the University is much more than them. He felt that they are a bit behind in this endeavour. Had they invited the dignitaries of the world, including the parliamentarians, bureaucrats of the country at the forum of the University, it would have a very good impact on the entire community. Their communities such as Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Christians, they are sitting on the other side of the country, what is their role there and what they are contributing here. With this the reflection goes to the whole world about their contribution. They come to know as to why Shri Guru Nanak Dev is revered by all of them. Therefore, still the whole year is there and they could think to do something in this regard.

17. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Inspection Committees or the Selection Committees which have been formed, there are some names, due to any reason, are being repeated. Some persons are put on these Committees only 2 times whereas the others are put 25 times, thus the difference is too much. If someone is academically much strong, it is okay; otherwise, there is no reason to repeat a person. To request by someone for himself to put on the Inspection Committee or the Selection Committee, is a different thing, but there should not be so selectivity. Therefore, this needs to be taken care of. He requested that in the next meeting of the Syndicate, it should be brought to the notice of the Syndicate members as to how many times a person has gone for Inspections and Selections and at which colleges, in the previous year.

19. Shri Ashok Goyal said that the PUCASH is a statutory Committee. He wanted to know as to what is the position of this Committee. He has come to know that he (Vice Chancellor) has extended the term of the PUCASH till further order to which the Vice Chancellor said, 'yes' he has extended its term till further order. Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) cannot do so. But if done, that should have been brought immediately to the Syndicate, but it has not been brought. There are UGC regulations of 2015 about sexual harassment which were notified in 2016, those regulations have not been brought so far to the Syndicate. Those regulations have not been adopted by the Syndicate. He said that those regulations should also be brought to the Syndicate to which the Vice Chancellor said 'okay'.

20. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that their whole concern and concentration remains always on the teachers, but it does not mean that they should forget the non-teaching staff. Last time it was talked about that the process for appointment of regular non-teaching staff be started in the Constituent Colleges and it be brought to the next meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that meetings have been held and it would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

21. Shri Ashok Goyal said, supplement to what Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua has stated, he wants to be specific. He does not want to go into the constitution of Inspection Committees or Selection Committees, but he has very-very serious concern about the appointment of Vice Chancellor's Nominees which are appointed only by the Vice Chancellor. There also a particular person is being appointed as Vice Chancellor's nominee time and again and others are left for all times to come. He wanted to know as to how the Vice Chancellor could check it as it would not be possible for him to remember who was appointed earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said that now an excel sheet is being prepared, not only for Inspection Committee or Selection Committees but also for the Flying Squads.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said if some of the persons have completed their quota, they should be given some rest and the others be appointed on these Committees.

22. Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to tell about the importance of the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay commission. Last month, she went to Kurukshetra University to attend a meeting. At the time of paying TA/DA, they asked her whether she has been given pay according to 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission or the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. If it is paid according to 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, then they would pay her @ Rs.10 per Km. and if she was being paid salary as per the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, then they would pay her TA @ Rs.16 per Km. It was humiliating for them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have increased it as per the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.

Dr. K.K. Sharma and some other members said that they did not receive orders in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per government rules, TA is paid as per the basic pay of a person. Naturally, if TA is paid as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, it would be less and more if paid as per the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.

Professor Rajesh Gill said it very humiliating if one teacher is paid more and the other less for the same distance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the mistake is on their part because they should pay as per the designation of a person.

23. Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Selection Committees which were held on 28<sup>th</sup> September could not be approved and the teachers are feeling very restless. She requested to get it done at the earliest.

Shri Ashok Goyal further added that some more Selections were left, those should also be added.

24. Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Vice Chancellor has asked to take up the issue of discrepancy of 40 lacs regarding e-lessons in the University School of Open Learning be taken up in the zero hour. She requested that this be got completed.

25. Professor Rajesh Gill further said that they should do some for the 27 posts, which are being charged from the University School of Open Learning. She added that this is within the purview of the Registrar.

26. Professor Rajesh Gill informed that the PUTA is organising a Seminar on National Education Policy on 27<sup>th</sup> November, 2019 and she has sent an invitation to him (Vice Chancellor) also.

27. Principal Inderjit Kaur said that two days ago the Principal, Jagat Sewak Khalsa College for Women, Amargarh Parao, Mehna, Moga, was informed that there would not be Examination Centre for this year. Due to this they are very much upset that at this stage where they would send their students to take their examination. She added that there is no other college in the surrounding area of 25-30 Kms. On the one hand they are allowing those colleges who are not complying with the conditions and other hand they are not allowing examination centre in such colleges which are facing many problems, but even then running. She requested that they should be a bit lenient in the case of such colleges. If there is any problem with the college, the University should write to them, but the University should not close the Examination Centre there.

28. Shri Sandeep Singh said that there was a demand from the students of South Campus that there should be a play ground. There is lot of space, but it only needs to be cleared.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would look into it.

29. Shri Sandeep Singh further requested that a meeting on roster be convened to resolve the issue.

30. Shri Sandeep Singh further requested the Vice Chancellor to write a letter to the Punjab Government that they would not admit SC students under the Post-Matric-Scholarship-Scheme in the next year. Non-payment of Post-Matric-Scholarship creates a lot of problem to the students and the students have to face a lot of problem in getting their results.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would talk to the Punjab Government in this regard.

Karamjeet Singh  
Registrar

Confirmed

RAJ KUMAR  
VICE-CHANCELLOR