

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Wednesday, 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019** at **10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**PRESENT**

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

Professor Rajat Sandhir, Professor S.K. Sharma, DPI (Colleges), Punjab and Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, could not attend the meeting.

**At the very outset, the Vice Chancellor wished good morning to each esteemed member of the Syndicate.**

**Condolence Resolution**

The Vice-Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the honourable members of the Syndicate about the sad demise of –

- i) Dr. Ram Lal Gupta, former Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on 17<sup>th</sup> March, 2019
- ii) Dr. Dharmendra Goel, former Professor, Department of Philosophy, on 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2019
- iii) Sh. D.C. Sharma father of Dr. K.K. Sharma, Fellow, on 28<sup>th</sup> March, 2019
- iv) S. Baljit Singh Sidhu father of Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu, Fellow, on 5<sup>th</sup> April, 2019.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. Ram Lal Gupta, Dr. Dharmendra Goel, Shri D.C. Sharma and S. Baljit Singh Sidhu and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

**Vice-Chancellor's Statement**

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

- (i) Dr. Navneet Arora, Associate Professor of Sociology at University Institute of Legal Studies, has been awarded a grant of Rs.10 lacs to conduct research work under the IMPRESS (Impactful Policy Research in Social Science) Scheme for a project titled "Obsession of children with digi screens: A study into social and health effects of electronic media".
- (ii) Prof. M. Rajivlochan, Department of History, has been appointed as a member of the Senate of Punjab Engineering College (deemed to be University) for a period of two years.
- (iii) Prof. Aneel Raina, Department of English and Cultural Studies, has been nominated as member of the Court of Central University of Tamil Nadu for a period of 3 years.
- (iv) Dr. Kewal Krishan, Department of Anthropology has been nominated to the editorial board of Forensic Science International Journal published from Netherlands.
- (v) Dr. Vishal Sharma, Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, has been nominated to the editorial board of Forensic Science International Journal.
- (vi) Dr. Deepak Salunke, Department of Chemistry has been sanctioned project for Rs.44.4 lacs under the Scheme for Promotion of Academic and Research Collaboration (SPARC), MHRD, Govt. of India.
- (vii) Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa, Fellow, has been elected President of Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association for the year.
- (viii) Dr. Jagdish Prasad Semwal, former Professor, VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur, has been awarded with President's Award carrying a sum of Rs. 5 lacs and Commendation Certificate.
- (ix) Panjab University has got 9<sup>th</sup> position in the first-ever Atal Ranking of Institutions on Innovation Achievements (ARIIA), 2019
- (x) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, has secured 2<sup>nd</sup> place out of 3000 Pharmacy Institutions of the country as per National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), 2019
- (xi) Panjab University has been ranked at 34<sup>th</sup> place in the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), 2019.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma pointed out that certain affiliated Colleges have also been included in the list of 100, the name should also be included and felicitated.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Sure".

Referring to Vice-Chancellor's Statement at serial number 1, Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan pointed out that his College is also receiving grant of Rs.8 lac. under the IMPRESS (Impactful Policy Research in Social Science) Scheme. There are few other Colleges, which are also received grant under the IMPRESS Scheme.

The Vice-Chancellor congratulated Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan for receiving grant under IMPRESS Scheme by his College. The Vice-Chancellor requested other members belonging to the College also to give in writing something about their Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor also extended good wishes for the Navratras and prayed that Goddess Durga would shower Her blessings on them to be healthy. He hoped that with their good wishes and cooperation, the University would achieve new heights.

The members also extended their good wishes to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he would like to tell them something about the ranking system as it is very important. Fortunately, he was present in Delhi on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2019 at 4.30 p.m. along with the Director, IQAC and Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS). One thing has happened very wonderful and it has become possible only with their cooperation. Professor Navdeep Goyal has also extended his cooperation in it. Whatever activities relating to entrepreneurship were being conducted here in the University, all the Principal Investigators (PIs) were involved in them and he has collected seven verticals and prepared an umbrella. With this, they have been able to receive a good amount of money as grant, but it is not connected with each other. All the verticals have been integrated and all are working on the start-ups, innovations, etc. and are doing a very good work. Whatever start-ups, deliverables are there, they come up slowly and steadily. Since he had sensed them much before, i.e., about two years back when he was at his previous Institute, he had thought that if they go like this, their research and innovation would definitely improve. He added that research and innovation is his tag words. He is putting in all his efforts for research and innovation, not only in the University but in affiliated Colleges also. Whenever he expressed his views, they always equally meant for the affiliated Colleges also. Its effect is that the Atal Ranking of Institutions on Innovation Achievements (ARIIA) has been conducted for the first time. They would be surprised to know that Panjab University is the only University, which has been placed at 9<sup>th</sup> position. The other Institutions are only the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs). Even certain IITs have not been able to come into this ranking. It is very-very important to see as to how they could bring the University into image building and seek grant from various funding agencies because it is very difficult to secure a place in the IITs. In Government, national and international perspective, all activities are being done on innovation. He read out the list of Institutes, viz. – (i) Indian Institute of Technology, Madras; (ii) Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai; (iii) Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi; (iv) Indian Institute of Sciences (IISc.) Bangalore; (v) Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur; (vi) ICET, Mumbai; (vii) Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur; (viii) Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkee; and then at 9<sup>th</sup> place is the Panjab University. Thereafter, all the IITs are behind them. Even the IITs and Central Universities have not got place in it, whereas all of them are receiving the bulk of the amount as grant from the Central Government. He added that they (Panjab University) have also got Atal Equivocation Centre. Nobody knows at how many places this type of Centre is functioning. It is really very outstanding achievement on the part of the University, and it is only because of the Scientists and Academicians; rather the entire teaching fraternity, though many of the Departments/Centres/Institutes did not have very good infrastructure at their disposal, but they are putting in their best efforts. Second thing, which he would like to tell them is about the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), which is placed at 2<sup>nd</sup> number and above it is only Hamdard, which is a University. They would be surprised to know that, at the moment, UIPS has only 24 faculty members, whereas Hamdard has 120 faculty members and had more than 300 technical staff members, and only that (Hamdard) is above them. After coming here, he had sensed that if he pushed the UIPS, they would be able to do this. He only extracted the data of the UIPS and started providing the same directly to the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF). So far as Panjab University's

34<sup>th</sup> rank in the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) is concerned, it is true that they have come down a point and they are analysing the reason thereof. They all knew that they did not have sufficient faculty and the perception. They have to focus on these two things and go ahead. He is very sure that very soon they would be able to come out of these difficulties. While receiving the award, he was able to communicate in the presence of Secretaries, Chairman, UGC, Secretary, UGC, Chairman, AICTE, Vice-Chairman, AICTE and Secretary, AICTE, and they were of the opinion that Panjab University should be helped. He has also requested the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD), who is a very important person in the system, that they should be helped because despite so many constraints, they have been able to come to this level. He has been able to communicate this to them and also able to clear the fog, which had collected for the last so many years.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is matter of great satisfaction that in the first ever ranking, i.e., Atal Ranking of Institutions on Innovation Achievements (ARIIA), they have got 9<sup>th</sup> place. Actually, he knew that most of the members might also be knowing about the parameters of this ranking. Secondly, as to what kinds of presentations were made before this agency to get this 9<sup>th</sup> place? Thirdly, which areas actually have enabled them to get this 9<sup>th</sup> place? This is not clear from the Vice-Chancellor's Statement. It is also a matter of great concern that they have slipped one place down in the NIRF ranking. Though both of them have probably been conducted by the MHRD, each one is different from each other. If the people in the House knew, he could be enlightened by them, but should it be presumed that in both the cases the parameters were the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the parameters are different in each case.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is being assumed that the stress has been on innovation, and that was why, IITs are above them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is absolutely correct that innovation was the real focus.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that could they assume that they did not have Institute at par with IITs, except University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET) and Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology (DSSBUICET). Which is the Department on the basis of which, they have been able to obtain this 9<sup>th</sup> position. He requested that at least the data, which had been presented to this agency (A, along with the copy of the presentation must be provided to them, on the basis of which they have got 9<sup>th</sup> position in the ARIIA ranking, only with a view that the people could contribute to make improvement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal has brought to their notice a very good point, and he (Vice-Chancellor) would like to add that they would collect the data as to which Department/Institute/ Centre has contributed how much, and tabulate the same, and only then the same would be provided.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be done so that the other Departments, which are lacking at present, they also get inspired to improve the ranking. From the last three paras, it looked, as a layman what he could make out, as if rather he is sure that the contribution of UIPS seemed to be more so far as enabling them to secure the 9<sup>th</sup> position in the innovation ranking is concerned. That is what, he understood, unless and until it is something else. As such, they must congratulate the UIPS and resolve in the Syndicate that the work being done by the UIPS is appreciated. Had they been provided the data, they would have been able to admire the contribution of other Departments also, if any.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to add that, of course, UIPS needed to be complimented as it has been maintaining this prestigious position consistently for the last many years. However, as he (Vice-Chancellor) has informed, there are only 24 faculty members at UIPS. She is more worried about the other Departments and there are Departments, where the vacant positions are more than 50% and in some every 100%, where there is not even a single faculty member. Hats off to these teachers, who are pulling through! If they had slipped one point, she would say that given the circumstances, even it is a very good position, which was difficult to obtain. Moreover, teaching took away their most of the time. Therefore, the suggestion given by Shri Ashok Goyal would be very useful that they should know the break-up as to how the Departments had paced. Secondly, they badly needed recruitments as without faculty they could not have teaching and research, what to talk about quality teaching and research.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu suggested that it could possibly also be shared with faculty members of all the Departments, so that they could pick up some tips as to where to improve and where they could add something new in the near future.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would take up the affiliated Colleges separately and he is sure that certain Colleges would be ranked in that.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they could do one thing more that whosoever has prepared the presentation, he/she should be asked to prepare the brief and sent to the Principals of the affiliated Colleges. He also suggested that the presentation should also be shown in the next Principals' Conference.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Sure".

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired had they done anything like that, i.e., presentation, data, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the presentation had been made and data had also been sent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the data had been sent, a copy of the same should be provided to them. And if a presentation had been made, a copy of the same should also be provided to them.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Sure".

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it would be better.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that it meant that there is no presentation in it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the presentation is not made in this.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that as it has been done for the first time, they did not know much about it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the data would be made available to them.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it would be better if the in-charge is asked to prepare a brief presentation and it would be quite helpful.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he would address the Principals in the next Conference, he would make a presentation of 8-10 minutes and would also arrange a

session on it. A hard and soft copy of the same would also be provided in the Conference.

The Vice Chancellor said that as per the wish of late Shri Raghbir Dyal, they had for the first time created Examination Centres of CET-UG to be held on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019 at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib and P.U.S.S.G. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

The members appreciated the above decision of the Vice Chancellor and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it would save the time and money of the students of these regions.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Prof. M. Rajivlochan, Dept. of History, on having been appointed as a member of the Senate of Punjab Engineering College (deemed to be University) for a period of two years;
  - (ii) Prof. Aneel Raina, Dept. of English and Cultural Studies, on having been nominated as member of the Court of Central University of Tamil Nadu for a period of 3 years;
  - (iii) Dr. Kewal Krishan, Dept. of Anthropology, on having been nominated to the Editorial Board of Forensic Science International Journal published from Netherlands;
  - (iv) Dr. Vishal Sharma, Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, on having been nominated to the editorial board of Forensic Science International Journal;
  - (v) Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa, Fellow, on having been elected President of Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association for the year;
  - (vi) Dr. Jagdish Prasad Semwal, former Professor, VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur, on having been awarded with President's Award carrying a sum of Rs.5 lacs and Commendation Certificate; and
  - (vii) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, on securing 2<sup>nd</sup> place out of 3000 Pharmacy Institutions of the country as per National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), 2019.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. (1-(i), (vi), (ix), (x), and (xi), be noted; and
3. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 18.2.2019, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

- 2.** Considered minutes (Items I to IV) dated 24.01.2019 (**Appendix-II**) of the Academic and Administrative Committees regarding introduction of PU-CET (PG) for admission to Master of Social Work, increase of total student intake, to start certificate course in “Social Work & Field Interventions” and to start Academic & Training Resource Centre, from the session 2019-20.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of letter dated 06.02.2019 of Chairperson, Centre for Social Work, P.U., was enclosed (**Appendix-II**).
  2. As per Regulation 13 at page 51 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the prescription of minimum qualification for admission to various course fall under the purview of the BOS/Faculties and not under the Academic and Administrative Committee.
  3. Pursuant to the above Regulation, the Chairperson, Centre for Social Work, was requested that the above matter will first be passed through the BOS/Faculties to avoid any complication at a later stage. Accordingly, Chairperson, Centre for Social Work vide letter dated 12.03.2019 has submitted the minutes of BOS dated 12.03.2019 (**Appendix-II**) duly signed by the Dean, Faculty of Arts.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is good that they are introducing the Entrance Test for admission to Master of Social Work and it used to be earlier also. When this course was introduced, the admission to it was based on Entrance Test, and later on, it was discontinued for some reasons. It is good that they are again introducing the Entrance Test. It is also good that they are starting a Certificate Course along with it , but there are only two faculty members in the Centre for Social Work. While introducing the courses, it should be kept in mind that quality teaching is provided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the next strategy should be disclosed to them.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, in fact, they needed recruitments. Moreover, so far as course in Social Work is concerned, 50% is field based.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired, are the students got placed?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the placement is got done, but it depended on their brand. That was why, she says that quality should not be compromised at any cost. If their brand is good, placement would also be good. Teaching should not be compromised at any level. It should not matter as to how many workshops, seminars, conferences, etc. are being conducted, but the number of days should not be less at any cost and quality teaching should be given, so that when their students passed out, their value is there and they get employment easily. If they are producing employable students, they would be got placed.

When the discussion was on with regarding to Item 9, Professor Rajesh Gill, said that she forgot to mention one thing that the pass marks for the Entrance Test are 35. She enquired would they keep it at 35, whereas they are increasing the seats. She enquired, why they are not increasing these pass marks to 50?

Professor Navdeep Goyal, while clarifying it, said that it is right as the admission has to be done on merit to which Professor Rajesh Gill also agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendations dated 24.01.2019 of the Academic and Administrative Committees (Items I to IV) relating to introduction of PU-CET (PG) for admission in Master of Social Work, increase of students intake, to start Certificate Course in “Social Work & Field Interventions” as also to start Academic & Training Resource Centre with effect from the session 2019-20, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**3.** Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Professor Shankarji Jha, Dean University Instruction, be allowed to continue as such and his term be renewed for one year more, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-III**) was also taken into consideration.

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

“The Senate, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, may, from time to time appoint one of the University Professor to hold the office of the Dean of University Instruction. The term of appointment shall be for one year which may be renewed for one year more. The amount and nature of the allowance to be granted to the Dean of University Instruction for performing the duties attached to office shall be as determined by the Syndicate at the time of appointment.”

2. Professor Shankarji Jha, Department of Sanskrit was appointed as Dean University Instruction for a period of one year w.e.f. the date he joins, vide Syndicate/Senate decision dated 30.03.2018 (Para 35) and 27.5.2018 (Para IV), respectively. He joined as DUI on 01.05.2018 and his term will be ending on 30.04.2019.
3. The date of retirement of Professor Shankarji Jha (after completion the age of superannuation, i.e., 60 years) is 31.7.2020.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the absence of the Vice-Chancellor, who has to go out of station on number of occasions, Professor Shankarji Jha has to do a lot of work. In fact, he (Professor Shankarji Jha) has to take charge of 2-3 positions. He, therefore, suggested that the term of Professor Shankarji Jha as Dean of University Instruction should be extended for one more year, as per regulation.

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

**4.** Considered if, Dr. Dhian Kaur, Professor, Department of Geography, be granted half pay leave w.e.f. 01.08.2018 to 28.05.2019 instead of 01.02.2019 to 28.05.2019, to meet with the objection of the audit. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-IV**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. The Chairperson, Department of Geography vide letter dated 01.03.2019 (**Appendix-IV**) has written that when the salary bill of Dr. Dhian Kaur was presented before the Audit, the audit has raised the objection that the entire leave of Dr.



Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

Dhian Kaur w.e.f. 01.08.2018 to 28.05.2019 is required to be passed by the Syndicate.

2. Dr. Dhian Kaur had been granted half pay leave for six months w.e.f. 01.08.2018, under Regulation 11 (e) at page 139 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-1, 2007 vide order No.5363-65/Estt.-I dated 24.07.2018.
3. Dr. Dhian Kaur, Professor, Department of Geography was granted half pay leave to w.e.f. 01.02.2019 to 28.05.2019, subject to CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Bhura Singh Ghuman & Ors. Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) pending in the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court with regard to age of retirement by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.08.2018 (Para 6) (**Appendix-IV**).

**RESOLVED:** That, in order to meet the audit objection, Dr. Dhian Kaur, Professor, Department of Geography, be granted half pay leave w.e.f. **01.08.2018 to 28.05.2019** instead of 01.02.2019 to 28.05.2019.

- 5.** Considered if, Mr. Harsh Tuli, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis), University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, for another three years, as recommended by the Academic & Administrative Committees in their joint meeting dated 07.01.2019 (**Appendix-V**), on the same terms and conditions on which he worked previously, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-V**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 01/15/28 & 29.05.2016 had appointed Mr. Harsh Tuli, Assistant Professor in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6,000/- at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences (UIAMS), Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for a period of 3 years, under Regulation 5(b) at page 111-112 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007. He joined as such on 05.07.2016 and his present term is upto 04.07.2019.
  2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 during general discussion has decided that all the persons working as guest faculty and/or temporary or part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the regular appointees.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recommendation has again come from the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department that Mr. Harsh Tuli be re-appointed as Assistant Professor for another three years. He suggested that it should be approved as it is an appointment on compassionate ground.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that the appointment of Mr. Harsh Tuli be approved, but the term of appointment should only be for one year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that under Regulation 5(b) at page 112, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, the Syndicate is empowered to make emergent temporary appointment for a period exceeding one year. He, therefore, suggested that Mr. Harsh

Tuli should be re-appointed for a period of three year.

The Vice Chancellor said that he agreed with the views expressed by the members. However, if they continued to appoint people like this, it would come to their minds that the university is going to re-appoint them again and again irrespective of whether they discharged their duties properly or not. He would like to bring to their kind notice that there are couple of persons appointed in this manner, who are creating indiscipline/disturbance in their respective Department. Even if somebody is appointed on compassionate ground, he/she should discharge his/her duties properly and if someone is appointed as teacher on compassionate ground, he/she should teach the students, check the assignments of the students, do the research and publish papers. They should be a little bit strict while re-appointing persons on compassionate ground as the departments usually recommended the cases.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is obvious that whenever they approve extension, it is done because there is need and the same is recommended by the Department. Secondly, in other cases (not in compassionate ground cases), if the remove someone, they could not make appointment against the same post as it has been debarred by the Court. It is not that if somebody is creating a problem and the Department could function without him/her, he/she could not be removed from the service.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Navdeep Goyal is right, but perhaps, it is in their minds that they could not be removed from the University service. Secondly, they are also creating disturbance in their respective Department. It is also true that their cases for reappointment are recommended by their respective Department, but the Chairperson and the faculty members are telling him that they have no alternative, but to recommend their cases. He, therefore, suggested that keeping in view quality and standard, their performance evaluation should be got done, so that they should have a little bit fear that if they did not teach properly, do research and publish papers, their re-appointment would be done on the basis of their performance. Otherwise, even if the notices are issued to such persons, what would the Chairperson do against them because it is happening since long?

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if any notice is served and explanation called, the same would come to them along with the item as an appendix.

The Vice Chancellor said that perhaps, it is not being done. Here only the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committees came and nothing else. If the complaint came to the Syndicate, they would immediately scan it and act accordingly. Now, he is contemplating for constituting a Committee comprising the Syndics to evaluate the performance of the persons appointed as teachers on compassionate ground while giving them extension. There would be nothing wrong if this exercise is carried out, although he is not against anyone.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to give a suggestion in this regard. First of all, he would like to tell them that nobody appointed on compassionate ground has got any right for continuation even if it is to be done by the Syndicate. That was why, he had told them that the Syndicate considered any item which is brought to it for consideration as recommendation of the Vice Chancellor. Unfortunately, what happened is that even the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Departments are brought to the Syndicate for consideration. In fact, the Syndicate is not at all to consider the recommendations of the Department. On the basis of the recommendations of the Department, it is the Vice Chancellor, if it is within the powers of the Vice Chancellor, he could do himself, and in case it is to be got done from the Syndicate, then the Vice Chancellor has to recommend. His basis of recommendation could be the recommendation of the Department; or it could be the

feedback got by him from someone regarding the indiscipline or non-suitability. He (Vice Chancellor) is right that if somebody knew that he would continue, whether he/she work or not, whether created indiscipline or contribute or not contribute, it did not matter. If that is the feedback received by the Vice Chancellor, then the Vice Chancellor must take the Syndicate into confidence. If he thought that this item should not even to taken to the Syndicate – where it is mandatory that it has to come to the Syndicate? As such, the solution is inbuilt, but 'Yes' all the members are there to give suggestions. He would not say why because he (Vice Chancellor) himself is very esteemed and seasoned person. The academicians are present here, they could also guide. While taking this decision, nobody would mind if the person, who is not doing his job properly, is not granted extension; rather they are thinking other way round that at least in this way they are able to enhance the faculty strength. However, it meant that one should make value addition, but if something wrong is there, the Vice Chancellor is free to share the same with them.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would suggest that, in future, whenever such a case comes, the achievements made by the concerned person during the last three years must be attached.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, before making recommendations to the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor is empowered to seek more information, if he is not satisfied with the background of the case.

The Vice Chancellor said that according to them it is within the purview of the Vice Chancellor to seek any information, but he was unsure whether he could return the recommendation of the Academic and Administrative Committees. As such, he wanted to review this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this could be done.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that at the first instance the recommendations come to the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the facts did not come to him and only the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committees came to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is very simple and it could be found within a minute – whether the Vice Chancellor is observing it objectively or delaying the case. However, if the objectivity is to be maintained, then he (Vice Chancellor) must be satisfied before the item is placed before the Syndicate. In case the members of the Syndicate and Senate get some feedback that the Vice Chancellor is doing it deliberately, they could approach him to know as to what problem is there.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be seen on these lines.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item under consideration should be approved. However, for future, the matter be seen as suggested by the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be review, a note prepared and the same would be brought to the Syndicate. He is also thinking that if it is satisfactory, he would approve the same at his own level.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that appointment or re-appointment for a period more than one year is to be made by the Syndicate itself.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the appointment for a period more than one year is approved by the Vice Chancellor, the Audit would raise an objection.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

The Vice Chancellor said that then such an item would not be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has to be brought to the Syndicate for consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is of the view that if the case is neat and clean, he could approve the same and report it to the Syndicate.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that, as per the regulations, such a case needed to be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that since there are fifteen members in the Syndicate, it is quite possible that here the Vice Chancellor could get more feedback.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that it has been mentioned that Mr. Harsh Tuli, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis), University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, for another three years, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, whereas it should be under Regulation 5(b) at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since Regulation 5(b) is the bifurcation of Regulation 5, Regulation 5 would serve the purpose. Had it been under Regulation 5(a), problem would have been there.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that if it is mentioned under Regulation 5(b), it would be clearer.

The Vice Chancellor said that he should be told about the difference between Regulation 5(a) and Regulation 5(b).

The members said that the Vice Chancellor is empowered to make appointment for a period less than 1 year, under Regulation 5(a) and the Syndicate is empowered to make appointment for a period more than 1 year, under Regulation 5(b).

The Vice Chancellor said that then, it should be mentioned under Regulation 5(b) at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

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

**6.**

Considered if, Ms. Rajwinder Kaur, Research Scholar, Department of Education, P.U., be allowed to submit her Synopsis/approval of candidacy up to 31.01.2019, by condoning the delay beyond two years, as has been done in the case of Ms. Biney Preet, Research Scholar, UIET. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. Ms. Rajwinder Kaur was enrolled as a Ph.D. candidate on 02.05.2016 in the Faculty of Education. She was required to submit her synopsis/approval of candidacy up to

01.11.2017, but she could not do so and she was granted extension up to 01.05.2018 by the DUI.

2. Request dated 23.11.2018 of Ms. Rajwinder Kaur duly recommended and forwarded by the Chairperson, Department of Education is enclosed. The Chairperson has recommended that the request be treated as a special case.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.11.2018 (Para 14) had considered the request of Ms. Biney Preet Kaur, Research Scholar, UIET and allowed her to submit her synopsis/approval of candidacy by condoning extra ordinary delay of six months.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, as per Regulations, the Vice Chancellor could condone the delay for six months under extreme circumstances beyond the period of two years. However, in the case under consideration, the candidate (Ms. Rajwinder Kaur) has got extension up to a period of two years and beyond two years, for six months she did not do anything. When that period of six months elapsed, the candidate applied that the delay might be condoned. He believed that in the case of submission of synopses, they should not allow this as the provision for enrolment is there and the candidate(s) could get themselves re-enrolled. Why should they go beyond the regulations, if it is not required?

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that they needed to a little bit strict in such cases.

The Vice Chancellor, giving the input, said that in the name of condonation of delay and all this, they are compromising with the quality of research. Moreover, if they allow a case even owing to extreme circumstances beyond the control of a candidate, another candidate them to allow him/her by quotes the precedence, and if not allow, he/she would approach the Court. In the case under consider, Ms. Rajwinder Kaur is also seeking condonation by quoting the precedence of Ms. Biney Preet Kaur. Hence, they should say that to ensure research innovation and high degree of quality, they should be more sensitive. However, if there is a fatal or chronic case, the same should be considered and the cases where the condonation is sought on the basis of precedents, should not be considered. As such, it should be got recorded that the cases where the condonation is sought on the basis of precedence, should not be allowed under any circumstances. It has come to his notice that a number of candidates are seeking condonation every after more than 2½ years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a very simple solution to the problem. In his Department also, the submission of synopsis by a candidate was delayed due to one reason or the other, and they politely asked the candidate concerned to get himself/herself re-enrolled for Ph.D. The candidate was also made to understand that later on he/she would not get sufficient time to write/submit the thesis. If re-enrolment is got done, six years' time would start from the date of re-enrolment. Moreover, there is no loss of the candidate in it at all. He added that it has already been approved by them that if the candidate has once done the Course Work, there is no need to repeat the same as the Course Work done by him/her would be counted.

The Vice Chancellor said that if such types of cases come, the same would be got examined by a Committee, to be constituted by him. It is not that all such cases should be processed and placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that only those cases should be looked which are of exceptional nature.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the delay has been occurred owing to the circumstances are beyond the control of the candidate, and that too, if there is no solution, the case could be considered.

The Vice Chancellor said that the cases, where there is “fatal diseases”, could be considered.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that since there is option for the candidate to get herself re-enrolled and the candidate is also not at loss, the delay should not be condoned.

It was informed that, earlier, they had condoned the delay in the submission of synopsis in the case of Ms. Biney Preet Kaur, a Research Scholar of University Institute of Engineering & Technology. Now, the candidate (Ms. Rajwinder Kaur) is saying that she has been diagnosed with fibroids in uterus. They should now take a decision that after two and half years, they would not condone the delay in the submission of synopses by the candidates under any circumstances, except under extreme circumstances beyond the control of the candidates.

On a query by the Vice Chancellor, the members suggested that the delay beyond two years in the case of submission of synopsis Ms. Rajwinder Kaur, Research Scholar, Department of Education, Panjab University, be not condoned.

The Vice Chancellor said that the cases having fatal diseases would be got reviewed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the position of the Syndicate should not be embarrassed. What happened is that the delay in the submission of synopsis up to two and half years could be condoned by the Vice Chancellor, and the same has neither the condoned nor the candidate did not make the request. When the period of even two and half years is also over and now it is not within the power of anybody (not even within the power of President, Prime Minister and Supreme Court of India), the matter has been placed before the Syndicate. Where it is written that it is within the power of the Syndicate? However, the Syndicate usually says that since the matter has been placed before it, let the delay be condoned. If he asked as to why the matter has been placed before the Syndicate, what would be their reply? Then they might say that since earlier they had condoned the delay in a similar case, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate. Now, she has quoted the precedence and tomorrow, they would condone the delay by quoting this precedence. Hence, they should take care of the academics. These are of the problem of the ladies, but the kind of explanation she had given, he did not want to discuss.

**RESOLVED:** That the request of Ms. Rajwinder Kaur, Research Scholar, Department of Education, P.U., to submit her Synopsis/ approval of candidacy up to 31.01.2019, by condoning the delay beyond two years, be **not** acceded to, and in future, such cases be dealt in accordance with the revised guidelines for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree (which are in conformity with UGC Minimum Standards and Procedures for award of Ph.D. degree).

7. Considered proposal dated 28.02.2019 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Finance and Development Officer, P.U. with regard to change in existing procedure as it would cause addition in Rule 6.1 at page 45 of P.U. Accounts manual, 2012, for implementation of the Agreement/MoU (**Appendix-VI**) executed with SBI for disbursement of pension through SBI.

- NOTE:**
1. As per the provisions of agreement with State Bank of India, the responsibility to check and verify Live Certificate of pensioners, calculations of due Income Tax and deduction of tax at source including issuance of Form 16 under Income Tax Act 1961 rest with the State Bank of India.
  2. The Senate in its meeting dated 10/24/16.09.2017 approved the recommendation of the Board of Finance (Sub-Item 6) regarding disbursement of pension through SBI, the charges for same to be paid on par with the rates prescribed by RBI for disbursal of monthly pension of State/ Central Government pensioners in terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 31.07.2016 and 17.12.2016 vide Para XXII as endorsed by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 10/19.12.2017.
  3. The proposed addition will be added as a separate sub-rule/clause of Rule 6.1 with regard to pension payment only.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that only one issue, i.e., about the payment, needed to be discussed.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to from which budget head the payment of Rs.40/- plus transaction charges would be made.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that there is another issue and perhaps, it was discussed in the previous meeting that they would make a payment of about Rs.12 lac to the Bank for disbursement of pension. At that time also, it was asked as to why they are paying such a huge amount to the Bank.

It was clarified that this agreement has already been approved. Now, it has only come for effecting changes in the procedure. They are making payment to the State Bank of India (SBI) because they are outsourcing the process. The record relating to Pension, which was being maintained by the University, would now be maintained by the SBI. With that, the University would be able to save some manpower. So far as rate is concerned, the same has been approved by the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) as well as by the Government. The Pension of Government is also being disbursed by the SBI on the basis of that this agreement has been executed. Earlier, they used to maintain the record, calculate the pension, etc., but now they did have to sufficient staff to carry out this job. So far as new recruitment is concerned, they are trying their level best, but when they would succeed, nobody knew. Keeping all these things in mind, especially the fact that they would not be able to get more staff, they have gone for this agreement and with this, they would be able to save at least two staff members.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired whether they have prepared some document relating to the amount being paid to the SBI and the expenditure to be incurred on the staff required for this purpose.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that they should be informed as to what amount is to be paid to the SBI and what would be expenditure to be incurred on the staff members to carry out this job.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu enquired as to what would be liability of this.

It was informed that the liability would be around Rs.10 lacs per annum.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to from which Budget Head the liability on this would be met.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that since the amount is too much, it needed to be checked.

It was said that this (agreement, etc.) has already been approved by the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate. When it is to be implemented, they have to modify certain procedures, which have been mentioned in the Accounts Manual, and that was why, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate. So far as budget head is concerned, the expenditure would be met from Revenue Budget Head.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that would they be able to free only two staff members with this.

The reply was given in affirmative.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that are they giving Rs.12 lacs only for saving the services of two staff members.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that they could themselves see that the salary of two persons, appointed on temporary basis, is much less than Rs.12 lacs.

It was informed that the Clerks, who are promoted as Senior Assistant, their salary comes to more than Rs.50,000/- per month.

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

**8.**

Considered if, the following addition, be made in existing admission criteria for M.Sc. (H.S.) Chemistry, appearing at page No.179 of Handbook of Information, 2018, for the session 2019-20, as recommended by the Board of Control in Chemistry in its meeting dated 18.01.2019 (**Appendix-VII**):

<b>Existing (Page No.179, Handbook of Information, 2018)</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
(i) Passed B.Sc. (Hons.) in Chemistry from Department of Chemistry, P.U.	(i) No change
(ii) The admission based on PU-CET (P.G.) for B.Sc. (Pass or Hons.) examination with 50% marks from P.U. or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (a) Chemistry in all the three years/six semesters, and (b) any two science subjects during two years/four semesters during graduation.	(ii) No change



	(iii) B.Sc. (Hons.) in any subject under Choice-based Credit System with 24 Credits in Chemistry as Generic Elective Subject.
--	---

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of letter dated 01.02.2019 of Chairman, Department of Chemistry & CASC is enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).
2. A copy of letter dated 12.03.2019 of Chairperson, Department of Chemistry is enclosed (**Appendix-VII**)

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the certain changes are being made in the regulations keeping in the Choice Based Credit System (CBCS). Since students are coming after doing B.Sc. under the CBCS, they are required to make eligible for M.Sc. (H.S.). Arising out of it, he would like to say that the system has been changed and with that they have to change eligibility of different courses. Citing an example, he said that students, who are doing B.A. (Hons.) in Economics and they study Statistics as one of the subjects and they are fulfilling the requirement of credits in the subject of Statistics also. If they wish to do M.Sc. in Statistics as generally this is allowed at many places. To cover those things, as had been done by the Department of Chemistry, he believed that they should seek feedback from other University Teaching Departments, keeping in view the CBCS, that if certain students obtained requisite credits of certain subjects and wanted to do postgraduate in the said subject(s), they have to make them eligible for those subjects as has been done by the Department of Chemistry. He suggested that the item under consideration should be approved and other University Teaching Departments should also be persuaded to recommend changes in their eligibility conditions for admissions keeping in view the CBCS, so that the students coming from CBCS face any problem or suffer on this account.

It was said that since the Hand Book of Information is to be printed very soon, should they approve the amended eligibility conditions for admissions, recommended by the Departments if any.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in this regard, he would say that keeping in view the anticipated changes in the eligibility conditions for admissions, especially recommended by the Dean of the Faculty concerned, the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to approve the same, on behalf of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment Semester System has been fully implemented in the University. He would like to bring to their kind notice that the Government has full focus on the CBCS. He urged the members to also start orientation on the issue of CBCS. Even the Semester System has also not been implemented at all the places. They have to do it at the earliest as it all affect the rankings, grants, positions and research. So far as innovation is concerned, he would like to bring to their kind notice that if an Institution obtained project(s) and ranked high in the ARIIA ranking, grant is easily made available to it. He urged the members to encourage their colleagues to write projects, etc. Since people did not care for innovation and in this way much time had elapsed, the Government thought as to why it should not be linked with the national ranking. Now, if someone brought project on innovation and start-up, and then it would be seen as where it is ranked, and on the basis of that their grants would be decided and no argument would be taken into consideration on this because the parameters have been evolved. The position with regard to CBCS is also the same that how many facilities are being provided to the students by them. The Chairman of the UGC was talking to the Secretary, MHRD, and saying that if they blocked mobility, it would go against them and their NAAC ranking would go down. Under these circumstances, they have to be progressive so far as

research, semester system, CBCS, are concerned. He had visited certain Colleges and some of the Principals were requesting that the Semester System should be rolled back. He discussed the issue with them and made them to understand the issue and requested them not to insist for this. It is true that there is a shortage of faculty. He asked them to write letters, etc. to the Government for allowing them to fill in the vacant teaching positions. He has also requested the Principals to prepare the draft proposal in this required and submit the same to him. He would submit the said proposal to the Hon'ble Minister, Punjab, personally and copy of the same would be given to His Excellency, Governor of Punjab. Similarly, the issues of Colleges situated in the Union Territory of Chandigarh are being taken care of by the Direction Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh. After compilation the above-said proposal would go to the MHRD. At least the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab should come forward with the proposal. Though he had been successful in sorting out the issue of Ph.D. increments to the faculty members, he had come to know when he visited Pune that there the teachers have not been granted these increments. With the grant of Ph.D. increments, 55,000 teachers have been benefitted, which is a revolution in the history, though some people had expressed resentment that Panjab University has got it done and other Universities, including Delhi University, could not get it done for their teachers. Since now his full focus is on the affiliated Colleges, they should impress upon the College people to go for the Choice Based Credit System, Semester System, move-ability, rankings, etc. He is going to have a separate portal for the affiliated Colleges, where all such information would be made available.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they are unable to give move-ability/flexibility in the CBCS. Hence, it needed to be implemented after proper thought, and it should not be implemented for the same of implementation; rather, it needed a threadbare discussion.

Dr. K.K. Sharma informed that Himachal Pradesh University had also implemented it without having proper discussion/debate and later on, they have to undone it. Though they have adopted CBCS, they have reverted to the Semester System.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are saying that they should get themselves prepared for the CBCS by the commencement of academic session 2020-2021. Since they are respected Principals and members of the Syndicate and Senate of Panjab University, they must impress upon the other people of the affiliated Colleges for such things. They might not go for these things today, tomorrow, day after tomorrow, but they have to go for these things one day and that day is not far away.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Vice-Chancellor is right in say and she also agreed with Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma with the implementation of CBCS, quality would only be there if they had full faculty and the courses are specifically developed for this system, and it is not that any of the existing course is started under the CBCS.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the faculty would be made available. He has been able to communicate to them that despite having so many constraints, they have been able to beat the IITs, NITs, etc., at least now they should be allowed to recruit faculty. He would impress upon them as to why they are not able to implement the CBCS. However, CBCS could be implemented in the affiliated Colleges after a period of two years. If the CBCS is implemented in the University and such and such College(s), at the time of NAAC rating, they would be got benefitted. As has been told by Professor Navdeep Goyal, in future, they have to implement the CBCS, and faculty has also to be appointed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, earlier about 3-4 years, it was also pleaded that they have to do it as the same has been linked to grant. On the same ground, they

had implemented the Semester System. The entire Senate had opposed the implementation of the Semester System because they knew that the University did not have the resources, including the non-teaching staff at its disposal and they would not be able to declare the results in time. Still it has pleaded that since it related to release of grants, it has to be implemented. In fact, the Colleges have not been able to cope up even with the Semester System. Since they have the same resource, including the teachers, their result has gone down more than 50%, whereas it was anticipated that with the implementation of the Semester System, reappears and drop out would be less, but what has happened is reverse to it. Earlier, the students used to study only for 2-3 months and secured pass marks. If they look into the result of the University also, they would find that the students, who used to secure more than 80% marks, are obtaining only even less than 40% marks. Himachal Pradesh University had implemented this system in the similar manner, and they have come back to the previous system. Punjab School Education Board had also implemented the Semester System, and it has also to go back to the Annual System of examination. They are now feeling that if they returned to the Annual System, perhaps their Colleges could survive. Now, the issue of survival of their Colleges is there as they are unable to make admission to the sanctioned seats, and the students, who took admission, are unable to qualify in the examination. Resultantly, 80% of the students are leaving the Colleges in-between (from 1<sup>st</sup> year to 3<sup>rd</sup> year).

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that the strength in the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab has gone down much.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is true that after implementation of the Semester System, they are facing a lot of problems.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Professor Arun Kumar Grover, former Vice-Chancellor, had constituted a Committee in the Senate to find out as to why it is happening. Instead of regularizing the Committee, they have come to the implementation of CBCS. It needed to be looked into as to why they have gone down to such an extent with the implementation of Semester System in place of Annual System. If the Central Government reduced its budget allocation on the education and the Punjab Government is also not giving teaching posts, how would they be able to cope up with the CBCS? Where would they have the flexibility?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that at least bare minimum is required.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that when the Semester System was introduced, it was in their minds that grant from RUSA would come to them. Only because of the grant, Himachal Pradesh University had reverted back to the Annual System. If they talk about the results, Controller of Examination is there, it is here impossible to get results declared in time as there would be different subjects. One year, Himachal Pradesh University was not able to declare the result of final year and the students of final year were unable to seek admission to the postgraduate class. He cautioned that there should not be any hotchpotch.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would not take any hasty decision. He is only saying that they should keep it (CBCS) in one corner of their minds, as it could also be done at one point of time. At the moment, he is not saying they should do it from the next year. Referring to the comment made by Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan about RUSA, the Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to tell them that consideration of cases of Colleges under RUSA has already begun. What to talk of aided Colleges, even the un-aided Colleges are also being considered now.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that, earlier, only Government Colleges, that too 10-20 selected Colleges, had been given grant under the RUSA and even the grant-in-aid Colleges were not given any grant under the RUSA.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is in the consideration now that aided and unaided Colleges should also be given grant under RUSA.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that with the implementation of the Semester System, Government Colleges were given grant under RUSA, why were their Colleges (aided and unaided Colleges) not considered at that time even though the Semester System was adopted by all the Colleges?

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that even if they target grant under RUSA, even then their Colleges would not be able to survive. In fact, the grant under RUSA is for specific purpose(s). Ignoring the prevailing crisis of Colleges and running after the grant under RUSA, the Colleges have gone down. Even if they see the condition of the Government Colleges, which have received grant under RUSA, they would find that the Government Colleges have also left with only 30% faculty and 70% of the faculty positions are lying vacant. At that time what happened was that they had only small target in the minds, i.e., RUSA and the Colleges were asked to target grant under RUSA. Resultantly, there is a backlog of 8-9 months' salary of the College teachers. Before starting discussion on the implementation of CBCS, they should discuss as to how the Semester System could be improved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, being the Chairman of RUSA, Union Territory of Chandigarh, he could say that it is not known to him. At least, it should be on record that there is 80% drop out of the students.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that so far as 80% drop out of the students is concerned, it is not in all the Colleges, it is only in few selected Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 30% to 40% drop out could be in all the Colleges.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they found less than 60% drop out, they could ask him. They could themselves see as to what is the pass percentage of undergraduate courses. In fact, clear pass percentage is not more than 30%. Their pass percentage is higher because they considered reappears as pass.

The Vice-Chancellor said they should sit together and list out their difficulties/points, so that he could put the same before the RUSA and plead that the Colleges, which are associated with Panjab University, are facing these problems. However, unless and until he has any paper from their side, what should he tell them (RUSA)? What happened is that they express their viewpoints here and leave. He was of the view that they should make a small group comprising two-three Principals and associate it with him. He would place the documents relating to the Colleges before the RUSA, which meets once in three months. Who has the courage there not to process the papers submitted by him?

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu remarked that there is a lot of difference between Union Territory of Chandigarh and the State of Punjab as UT has separate allocation and Punjab has separate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Governor is the same and he would plead to the Governor as he is also called by the Governor along with other Vice-Chancellors. As such, he could put their viewpoints before the Governor. He could at least talk about the Colleges, which are affiliated to Panjab University. What he meant to say is that he has nothing documented and unless and until something documented is not with him,

it would not serve the purpose? He remarked that only raising the points here, would not serve any purpose. He wanted to put all these things before the competent authority to get something out of that.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that they have to make a small request to him, he being the member and Chairman of RUSA, that he could plead with the RUSA that when it has given grant to Government Colleges, it should give the same to the aided Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had already requested the RUSA to give grant to the aided Colleges and thereafter, he had also sought grant for the un-aided Colleges from the RUSA. He had put these things on record. Whenever they put certain things on record, it is not that these things are ignored; rather, they come out after filtering out. Earlier, the grant was being given only to the Universities, but not all are on equal footing. For example, they were ten winners, ten were Government funded and ten were privately funded. Hence, the day is not far away, when all funded and non-funded would be got included.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since these are very high things, these are beyond him. What is being considered is that RUSA should be told that Colleges, including aided and unaided, should also be given grant because they had started Semester System. That meant, the aim is to get grants. Were they not supposed to do academic evaluation whether the Semester System is in the interest of the students as they are saying that there is drop-out to such an extent? As a University, first they must think in terms of academics. Secondly, there is a pressure on them from the Government that they should implement the CBCS, and certain members are saying until now they are not able to streamline even the Semester System and these are its after affects, the CBCS should not be implemented, because the same (Semester System) was also implemented on the pressure of the Government. He remembered that here the Vice-Chancellor had said that they did not have any choice and it (Semester System) has to be implemented, and it was implemented. Now, the after affect of the data is that they are feeling that they are facing problem. Now, they are saying that besides Semester System, this (CBCS) is also to be implemented. The way they had implemented the Semester System, i.e., not looking into the difficulties to be faced by the Colleges and the students, they are thinking for implementing the CBCS – whether the teachers are there or not, College could offer the course or not, the University's job is to conduct the examination after six months, the same would be got conducted. If the students got passed or failed, it did not matter to them. He is unable to understand as to why such a feedback is not reaching there that the Semester System or Choice Based Credit System because they are following the best and they have kept this in mind as to how their students would be got adjusted in America. Since everything in America is Choice Based, the same should be here also, but it is not seen under which situation they are passing through. The University has completely surrendered its rights of what kind of system is prevailing here as the same could be different in Bihar and other States of India. There are certain universities here which had copied American system and introduced the same, but they had reverted back from the trimester system because the scheme, which is successful in America, could not be successful here. He is saying that if the semester system has created problem for them and their colleges are at the verge of closer, and if it is true and the dropout rate is 80% or even if it is 40%, is it not very-very alarming for the University? Could it be covered by way of giving a casual statement that because of this the dropout rate is this? He could vouch this that either because of this or something else the admissions in the Colleges, especially in the State of Punjab have drastically gone down. This also needed to be evaluated whether it has not happened owing to this. Hence, instead of coming under the pressure of Government for implementing CBCS or Semester System or for running after the grants because the grants would only be utilised if the Colleges survived, they should discuss the pros and cons of these systems. Now the Colleges, including unaided Colleges,

which had nothing to do with the grants, are saying that they should also be given grants and the Vice Chancellor has told them he had pleaded for grants to the unaided Colleges also. The day the unaided Colleges got grant from the Government even if it is Rs.1 lac, they would be got covered for so many other things. As such, it has many implications. His suggestion is that first of all the interests of the students should be watched, then interests of the Colleges and thereafter, the interests of the teachers, and based on these three interests whichever is found better, that should be done instead of running after the grants.

It was clarified that for admission to M.Sc. (Hons. School), all the students, who have done B.Sc. (Hons. School), are eligible. Now, those students, who have studied Chemistry as one of the subjects at B.Sc. level (in all semesters), are being made eligible for admission to M.Sc. (Hons. School) and the proposed regulation (iii) related to it. However, the candidates have to qualify in the Entrance Test conducted for the purpose. In fact, it should not be (iii); rather, now the proposed regulations should read as “(i) No Change, (ii)(a) No Change and (ii)(b) B.Sc. (Hons.) in any subject under Choice Based Credit System with 24 credits in Chemistry as Generic Elective Subject”.

Shri Naresh Gaur, referring to the issue being discussed by Shri Ashok Goyal, said that it has come into discussion that the dropout rate in Colleges existed owing to this. According to him, a Committee should be constituted to analyse whether the dropout is owing to this reason or some other reason, so that before shifting/switching over to other system, they should have the merit and demerits of the system.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she agreed with Shri Naresh Gaur. She suggested that not only this alone, it should also be analyzed as to why the Semester System is not successful. Even though CBCS is a good system, they are not able to implement the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment they should focus on the Semester System only. So far as CBCS is concerned, they would see to it when the same would be implemented.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that CBCS is also needed to be seen along with the Semester System.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that CBCS is also very important as the same had already been implemented in several Universities/Institutes. If they did not implement CBCS, their students might face problems at the time of taking admission in those institutions where CBCS has already been implemented.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been told that the Semester System is a complete failure but unless and until the reasons for the failure are not found and those reasons are not removed, they would not succeed.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that certain things are decided at national level and the Universities and Colleges are asked to implement the same. Citing an example, MOOC consists of credits and credits are only possible if CBCS is there. However, they are not able to implement the CBCS as they had problems, which are genuine ones. Therefore, they have to analyze as to why they are not successful in the Semester System, what are the problems, how the problems could be solved, whether they should continue with the Semester System, whether the CBCS is a good system and it needed to be implemented, etc.

It was informed that with regard to the Semester System a meeting of MHRD comprising Vice Chancellor's of various Universities had taken place at all India level on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2018. The agenda of the meeting was as to why the CBCS is not

implemented in the Colleges. The representatives of the States were of the view that the CBCS could not be implemented, but the CBCS was the mandate of the UGC. The Vice Chancellor had sent Controller of Examinations to attend the above said meeting on his behalf. The paper was prepared on the basis of the information available on the University website. Proceedings of the meeting are also available on the UGC Website, which included the issues raised by the members. They had conveyed in the meeting that they are the real users of the semester system and they are the sufferers also because the opinion/views of the Colleges were not taken into consideration; rather, the system had been enforced on them by the higher authorities (UGC/MHRD). The meeting was attended by the Hon'ble Minister Human Resource and Development, Chairman, UGC, Secretary, UGC and Secretary, MHRD. The first session was about the things to be done and the literature about the same was provided to them. The points which were discussed in the meeting are still available with them in the form of CD. However, as per the dictate, they were not allowed to give suggestions. Each participant was given ten minutes to speak. Being the administrator, they are facing so many problems. It is not that they have not implemented the Semester System but it is the College colleagues and the Principals who are facing a lot of difficulties in the Semester System. But the real cause was not conveyed to them. Their focus was that the next NAAC rating and grant would be link to it. As such, it was at a transitory stage. They had requested them to give them a window in the proposed draft. At first stage the real sufferers are the students and they should take feedback from them. Thereafter, they should take feedback from the teachers and then from the Principals and Universities. They had not called anyone, who is representing the teachers' community. They should keep it on hold; otherwise, they had decided to start it from 27<sup>th</sup> September 2018, but till date that is not implemented. For implementing the CBCS, a thorough discussion is required. They had received an e-mail day before yesterday stating that they are nor formalizing the proceedings and saying that they are circulating it to all the stakeholders, which is a good sign. As being said by Shri Ashok Goyal and other Hon'ble members, they would be getting time and by that time, the worthy Vice Chancellor would also appoint the Committee so that it could synchronize. Their input specifying as to where they had failed and why there is dropout of students, should be made a part of the proceedings, which should go to the MHRD and UGC. In fact, it is affecting the Northern Universities and not the Southern Universities.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would prepare this and brought to the Syndicate.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma pointed out that the representation of College Principals and teachers in the Committee appointed by the Vice Chancellor for CBCS is very less. Their representation is absolutely necessary as the same is to be implemented by the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that in such issues, the Committee should comprised persons only from the Colleges as the same is to be implemented by them. Instead of this, they are not taken into confidence, whereas they should be the decision makers keeping in mind what practical difficulties they are facing.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma pointed out that the members of the Committee, who had initially worked a lot in this Committee and framed the mechanism, have now been removed from the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be seen and majority of the persons in the Committee would be included from the Colleges.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the Registrar might be remembering that they had evolved a very good mechanism for Commerce. However, they are not part of the new Committee even though they had done an exhaustive exercise.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

The Vice Chancellor said that he would do that. He directed the Dean, College Development Council, to consult him on the issue.

**RESOLVED:** That the proposed admission criteria for M.Sc. (H.S.) Chemistry to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information, for the session 2019-20, as recommended by the Board of Control in Chemistry, be approved, with the following changes:

Existing (Page No.179, Handbook of Information, 2018)	Proposed
(i) Passed B.Sc. (Hons.) in Chemistry from Department of Chemistry, P.U.  (ii) The admission based on PU-CET (P.G.) as for B.Sc. (Pass or Hons.) examination with 50% marks from P.U. or any other University recognized as equivalent thereto with (a) Chemistry in all the three years/six semesters, and (b) any two science subjects during two years/four semesters during graduation.	(i) No change  <b>(ii) may be treated as (ii)(a)</b>  OR  (ii) (b) The admission based on PU-CET (PG) for B.Sc. (Hons.) in any subject under Choice-based Credit System with 24 Credits in Chemistry as Generic Elective Subject.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to approve the changes, in eligibility conditions duly recommended by the Dean of the Faculty, on the recommendations of respective Board of Studies, if any, for admission to various courses for the session 2019-20.

**9.**

Considered deferred Item No. 29 of the Syndicate meeting dated 16.03.2019 relating to the minutes dated 12.02.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to increase in number of seats/additional/New courses in various Departments along with minutes dated 14.03.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**), for the session 2019-2020. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-VIII**) dated 14.03.2019 and 27.03.2019 submitted by DUI was also taken into consideration

**NOTE:** The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.03.2019 (Para 29) and it was resolved that consideration of Item C-29, be deferred.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that firstly these are very lengthy recommendations and secondly, it has been divided into several parts. If they look into it they would find that it has been done in several ways and one of them is that there is no requirement of additional infrastructure/faculty for these increased components of seats. Thereafter, there is category 'A' under which they had sought additional seats within the existing fee structure and the Departments/Institutes,



include Department of Microbial Biotechnology, University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS), Centre for Social Works and Police Administration. These are those Departments/Institutes, which are either self-financing or partially self-financing. If they are talking about the LL.M. course, though the increase is a little bit more, the teacher could easily handle the large class also. As such, it would not make any difference. However, if they look at the other proposals mentioned in Part-B "List of Departments with suggested increase in seats in 'in-service category', they would find it a new thing. Though he had said in the meeting also, he is repeating it again that they have to see whether they could create such types of categories or could they determine 3-4 fee structures for a course? This is what, which needed to be looked into. Similarly, if they talk about category 'C', here though they did not give the name of 'in-service category', they categorized it self-financing category. These are those Departments, where the fee is very reasonable. However, they have recommended increase in certain seats, which have been named as fully self-financing. It meant, they are talking about two fee structures. It needed to be looked into whether they could do this. Thereafter, the other proposals are for new courses.

It was clarified that only Part-A, Part-B and Part-C of the recommendations mentioned at pages 52 to 53 are to be taken into consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that so far as Part-B and Part-C are concerned, they are talking about two fee structures, and it needed to be looked into whether it is legally tenable.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, as pointed out by Professor Navdeep Goyal, they have given certain additional seats to the Departments/Institutes. She would again reiterate that department-wise existing faculty must be seen. She pointed out that the Department of Defence and National Security Studies has asked for 10 more seats, whereas there is only 1 faculty member in that Department. She suggested that adequate faculty must be provided to the Teaching Departments, where the increase in number of seats/additional/New courses has been desired.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is going to give faculty on contract basis. He added that, in fact, a very exhaustive exercise has been done by a group of faculty members, which included Professor Navdeep Goyal, and the exercise was started in the month of September/October 2018. When Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he could not participate in this exercise much, the Vice Chancellor that it could be possible that the issue might not have been thoroughly discussed with him (Professor Navdeep Goyal) and Professor Rajesh Gill. However, they have to hold several meetings with the concerned Chairpersons and it has come after thorough deliberations at the level of Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department. Where there was no consensus, he discussed the issue with them and made them the position understood. Only after doing this exercise, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate. These things have been recommended only in those Departments/Institutes where adequate infrastructure and faculty is available.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there are certain Departments/Institutes, e.g., University Institute of Legal Studies where the NRI seats have been increased from 40 to 60, i.e., 20 seats and similar is the position of Department of Evening and Multidisciplinary Research Centre. It seemed as if the NRI seats have been increased by 50%. It should be assessed that the increase of NRI seats should be in consonance with the faculty available, so that the faculty is not overburdened.

The Vice Chancellor said that this exercise has already been undertaken and the business model has been given as to what would be the expenditure and how much revenue would be generated.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the long term impact of this should also be seen as salary and number of faculty would also be got increased as tomorrow the situation might completely change.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they would think twice before increasing the number of NRI seats to such an extent. He suggested that they should not increase the NRI seats in such a hurry. Let it be postponed for one/two years and discuss it thoroughly because to his mind, to increase the number of seats to such an extent is quite high.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she fully agreed with Shri Harpreet Singh Dua that they should not increase the number of NRI seats in such a hurry.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the University has also issued a letter to the affiliated Colleges regarding enhancement of seats.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a separate issue as the same related to 10% increase in seats.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the same could not be done like this unless the faculty, room capacity, etc. is assessed.

The Vice Chancellor said that until they did not have all these things, how would they get this done? The Government has also written them to give the estimates. If they did not have faculty, rooms, infrastructure, etc., how would they do this?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Shri Naresh Gaur jointly said that it is a very big exercise.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that already a large number of seats are lying vacant in the Colleges as the students are not coming, and if the seats are increased, from where the students would come.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that then the stock taking required to be done.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he would like to inform them that this issue has been discussed with many people especially where the workload on the faculty members is get enhanced by increasing the seats of NRI. This exercise is imperative for the academic, research and financial health of the University. Whatever work he is doing or they are supposed to do, is a very structured framework and they knew as to where they stood. Everything relating to their deficit had been fixed in the year 2010-2011. He has tried his level best at every level and it got through at several place. Ultimately, a communication was received that they should meet all their expenses in accordance with the decision of the Ministry of such and such year. This meant, they are supposed to work and meet their expenses in accordance with the fixed grant, which they received from the Government. Secondly, there is nothing in it in the name of development grant and only 6% enhancement is allowed to the salary budget. Though there is a deficit of Rs.30 crore, for the time being, they are able to recoup Rs.20 crore from certain sources, but they have to generate income of at least Rs.10 crore per year. Thus, they have to generate an additional income of Rs.10 crore annually as they did not have any other source of income. However, they way they are moving, they might reach to a comfortable position in the years to come. Hence, he is not foreseeing any other source to generate income except to enhance the fees. Up to now, 350-375 non-teaching staff members have retired. They are managing the faculty as the teachers could be re-employed up to the age of 65 years, though they are facing problem in few Departments. The condition of the buildings at the campus is pitiable. Similar is the position of the hostel buildings. The condition of roads is also very bad, especially the roads which leads to the colonies where 'C' class employees lived. The

infrastructure is so bad that they could not even enter the room. He has visited certain places and seen that walls are falling at some places and somewhere plaster from roofs is falling and seepage was also seen in certain houses. Even the barbed wire, which had been fixed on the boundary wall, has also been cut at several places. This is the position of their physical infrastructure. Certain contractual employees are working in the University on the fixed emoluments for more than 5 years. On few occasions, when he went outside in the winter season, he had seen sweepers on duty in slippers (hawai chappals). This showed that they are committed to their work. They could never forget the commitment put in by such people. They should think about them so that they (lower categories staff members) could live a comfortable life. He asked the members to think about them and see as to what minimum could be given to them.

A couple of members said that such persons could be given basic plus Dearness Allowance.

The Vice Chancellor said that even the uniform and shoes are not being given to these persons.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they could give them minimum wages approved by the Central Government.

The Vice Chancellor said that they needed to think in an integrated way as they could not ignore anyone. However, all these things get stuck when the matter comes to money. Whatever fees of the affiliated Colleges have been increased, the same has been done with their consent. Thirdly, the persons, who are working on contract basis, should also be given the minimum wages.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that at least D.C. rates should be given to the contractual employees.

The Vice Chancellor said that since they did not have money, from where they should pay them the salary in accordance with the D.C. rates. Secondly, they should think seriously whether they could not extend medical facility to the contractual employees, and they are doing an exercise in this regard. This is also becoming a huge amount.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan suggested that the contractual employees could be asked to take the ESI Scheme for which only a small amount is to be deducted from the emoluments.

The Vice Chancellor said that since they are already being given very less salary, how would they be able to subscribe for the ESI Scheme? All such employees are residing in rented accommodation, how would they be able to survive? It is very difficult for them even to give Rs.20/- per month. First, they have to do something for them; otherwise, several Government scheme, e.g., Medical Insurance, ESI, etc. are there. Problem is from where such categories of employees would be able to pay. There are several women such employees. One of the women employees is working for the last 20 years and is not able to properly see, but she is doing her duty very faithfully and efficiently. Sometimes, he took pity on them, but could not do anything in view of the shortage of funds. Some of them had informed him that when they suffered from fever, they have to consult the doctor outside the campus, pay him/her consultation fee and purchase medicines. They are living in such pitiable conditions and they are watching these lopsided affairs. Here the students are pleading that their fees should not be enhanced even though the commitment has been made.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired whether adequate number of teachers are there in the Teaching Departments, where the increase in number of seats/additional/New courses has been desired to be sought.

The Vice Chancellor said that the faculty members of the University, especially the group which included Professor Navdeep Goyal, had started this exercise from the month of September/October 2018. When Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he could not participate in this exercise much, the Vice Chancellor that it could be possible that the issue might not have been thoroughly discussed with Professor Navdeep Goyal. However, they have to hold several meetings with the concerned Chairpersons and it has come after thorough deliberations at the level of Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department. Where there was no consensus, he discussed the issue with them and made the position understood. Only after doing this exercise, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate. These things have been recommended only in those Departments/Institutes where adequate infrastructure and faculty is available.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there are certain Departments/Institutes, e.g., University Institute of Legal Studies where the NRI seats have been increased from 40 to 60, i.e., 20 seats and similar is the position of Department of Evening and Multidisciplinary Research Centre. It seemed as if the NRI seats have been increased by 50%. It should be assessed that the increase of NRI seats should be in consonance with the faculty available, so that the faculty is not overburdened.

The Vice Chancellor said that this exercise has already been undertaken and the business model has been given as to what would be the expenditure and how much revenue would be generated.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the long term impact of this should also be seen as salary and number of faculty would also be got increased as tomorrow the situation might completely change.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they would think twice before increasing the number of NRI seats to such an extent. He suggested that they should not increase the NRI seats in such a hurry. Let it be postponed for one/two years and discuss it thoroughly because to his mind, to increase the number of seats to such an extent is quite high.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she fully agreed with Shri Harpreet Singh Dua that they should not increase the number of NRI seats in such a hurry.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the University has also issued a letter to the affiliated Colleges regarding enhancement of seats.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a separate issue as the same related to 10% increase in seats.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the same could not be done like this unless the faculty, room capacity, etc. is assessed.

The Vice Chancellor said that until they did not have all these things, how would they get this done? The Government has also written them to give the estimates. If they did not have faculty, rooms, infrastructure, etc., how would they do this?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Shri Naresh Gaur jointly said that it is a very big exercise.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that already a large number of seats are lying vacant in the Colleges as the students are not coming, and if the seats are increased, from where the students would come.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that then the stock taking needed to be done.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he would like to inform them that this issue has been discussed with many people especially where the workload on the faculty members is get enhanced by increasing the seats of NRI. This exercise is imperative for the academic, research and financial health of the University. Whatever work he is doing or they are supposed to do, is a very structured framework and they knew as to where they stood. Everything relating to their deficit had been fixed in the year 2010-2011. He has tried his level best at every level and it got through at several place. Ultimately, a communication was received that they should meet all their expenses in accordance with the decision of the Ministry of such and such year. This meant, they are supposed to work and meet their expenses in accordance with the fixed grant, which they received from the Government. Secondly, there is nothing in it in the name of development grant and only 6% enhancement is allowed to the salary budget. Though there is a deficit of Rs.30 crore, for the time being, they are able to recoup Rs.20 crore from certain sources, but they have to generate income of at least Rs.10 crore per year. Thus, they have to generate an additional income of Rs.10 crore annually as they did not have any other source of income. However, they way they are moving, they might reach to a comfortable position in the years to come. Hence, he is not foreseeing any other source to generate income except to enhance the fees. Up to now, 350-375 non-teaching staff members have retired. They are managing the faculty as the teachers could be re-employed up to the age of 65 years, though they are facing problem in few Departments. The condition of the buildings at the campus is pitiable. Similar is the position of the hostel buildings. The condition of roads is also very bad, especially the roads which leads to the colonies where 'C' class employees lived. The infrastructure is so bad that they could not even enter the room. He has visited certain places and seen that walls are falling at some places and somewhere plaster from roofs is falling and seepage was also seen in certain houses. Even the barbed wire, which had been fixed on the boundary wall, has also been cut at several places. This is the position of their physical infrastructure. Certain contractual employees are working in the University on the fixed emoluments for more than 5 years. On few occasions, when he went outside in the winter season, he had sweepers on duty in slippers (hawai chappals). This showed that they are committed to their work. They could never forget the commitment put in by such people. They should think about them so that they (lower categories staff members) could live a comfortable life. He asked the members to think about them and see as to what minimum could be given to them.

A couple of members said that such persons could be given basic plus Dearness Allowance.

The Vice Chancellor said that even the uniform and shoes are not being given to these persons.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they could give them minimum wages approved by the Central Government.

The Vice Chancellor said that they needed to think in an integrated way as they could not ignore anyone. However, all these things get stuck when the matter comes to money. Whatever fees of the affiliated Colleges have been increased, the same has been done with their consent. Thirdly, the persons, who are working on contract basis, should also be given the minimum wages.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that at least D.C. rates should be given to the contractual employees.

The Vice Chancellor said that since they did not have money, from where they should pay them the salary in accordance with the D.C. rates. Secondly, they should think seriously whether they could not extend medical facility to the contractual

employees, and they are doing an exercise in this regard. This is also becoming a huge amount.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan suggested that the contractual employees could be asked to take the ESI Scheme for which only a small amount is to be deducted from the emoluments.

The Vice Chancellor said that since they are already being given very less salary, how would they be able to subscribe for the ESI Scheme? All such employees are residing in rented accommodation, how would they be able to survive? It is very difficult for them even to give Rs.20/- per month. First, they have to do something for them; otherwise, several Government scheme, e.g., Medical Insurance, ESI, etc. are there. Problem is from where such categories of employees would be able to pay. There are several women such employees. One of the women employees is working for the last 20 years and is not able to properly see, but she is doing her duty very faithfully and efficiently. Sometimes, he took pity on them, but could not do anything in view of the shortage of funds. Some of them had informed him that when they suffered from fever, they have to consult the doctor outside the campus, pay him/her consultation fee and purchase medicines. They are living in such pitiable conditions and they are watching these lopsided affairs. On the other side, the students are pleading that their fees should not be enhanced as Panjab University is a public Institution even though the commitment has been made. Whatever they had evolved, they should move ahead in accordance with that slowly and steadily. With this they would be gaining strength and the day is not far away when everything would be uplifted. At the moment, they would make certain appointments of faculty on contract basis and certain appointments on regular basis. The laboratories of the University have become outdated. Now, they would receive some funds from the laboratories and they have to give only 2-3 technical staff members. The Library of the University remained open for 24 hours. The way the non-teaching staff members are retiring, it would be become very difficult to keep library functioning. Every day pressure is there as to from where the funds would come. The position of security is also very bad. Recently, he personally took interest and provided them the uniforms. The financial position is such that they are not in position to provide them even uniform, shoes, caps, etc. It has come to his notice that the quality of the uniform, which has not been provided to the security personnel is not good. This is the position. The security personnel are being asked to perform duties for than 8 hours and sometimes even for 12-18 hours because 84 security positions are lying vacant. They are writing again and again to the MHRD for allowing them to fill up the vacant positions, and the MHRD is asking them to fill up the vacant positions and pay them salaries from their own sources and sometimes they asked them to outsource the job. So far as outsource is concerned, though they are paying Rs.16,000/- p.m. each, and the new person, who would come under the outsource scheme, would be paid Rs.22,000/- to Rs.24,000/- p.m. each. The Government is ready to allow them to pay Rs.24,000/- p.m. each under the outsource scheme, but is not allowing them to recruit people on a monthly salary of Rs.16,000/-. This is the constraint. Earlier, the faculty members, who besides their own teaching workload, if taught in other Department(s), they would paid honorarium, but the same had been discontinued. If a teacher is assisting in another Department, if he/she is paid some honorarium, what is wrong in that? In this way, they are trying to make the University function by pooling the resource as also making contractual appointments. He is placing these things at appropriate places. With this, the image of the University is improving up to some extent. On that also, 4-5 Secretaries were saying that the University is working constantly. The challenge before them is that they have to become excellence. He is taking with 129<sup>th</sup> year of heritage of the University and full value of the University. Secondly, their ranking should also be better. On the basis of ranking, he had gone there to receive the award; otherwise, thousands of Universities are there and none care for them. When he among other 9 persons had stood before the President to receive the award, he was representing the Panjab University. IITs is

watching the Panjab University and feeling that they could not reach there. Even the Central Universities could not come within 10. Now, he has started outsourcing of laboratories, and outsourcing in the sense that they are allowing lab. facilities to the outsiders on nominal charges. Students are coming to meet him in the group of 10 and telling that they did not have chemicals, instruments have broken and the same are not being got repaired. When he looked into the matter, he found that there are no funds for the purpose as the funds, which were allocated have already exhausted. The condition of basic laboratories is very bad. The research laboratories are being kept in good condition, but with the grants received from the funding agencies, but the condition of M.Sc. and B.Sc. laboratories is pitiable. From where the funds for this purpose would come and from where the chemicals would come? Similarly, from where the instruments/equipments would come? He is thinking as to how it could be done. He is also thinking as to how the teachers could be given incentives though they are little bit motivated with the grant of Ph.D. increments. The retired teachers could be associated with innovation, start-up, etc. by giving them some seed money. Holistically, they need money for all these things. For recurring and development purposes, they did need money and there is no doubt about it. None of the undergraduate laboratories of the University is up to the mark. In humanities, even chairs are not available and somewhere even space for sitting and building is not there. Keeping all these things in mind, they have recommended this increase in NRI seats, and the same is very reasonable. They have come to this decision after a long deliberation. He is ready to provide faculty on contract basis immediately, and thereafter, the technicians would also be provided. He is also proposing to do human resource exercise and wherever the staff (non-teaching, including technical) is more, the additional staff members would be shifted from there and post where the workload is more. They are also going to do space audit and he is hopeful that they would get certain rooms. They are taking a very holistic view taking into consideration that they have to uplift all these things. He has only three agenda items and one is to get Rs.1,000/- crore for which everybody is running after and with God's grace he has bring this amount. He is putting in all his efforts. Second item is implementation of recommendations of 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. Their ratings, rankings, etc. somewhere affect their work. He has listened very responsible and very competent people saying that injustice is being meted out to them and injustice is being done with the Panjab University as well and funds should be given to Panjab University. Being the Chairman of RUSA, he is able to fetch some grant. Earlier, a sum of Rs.50 crore was shown on the net, but later on, the same disappeared. Now, none has the courage to take away the same. Third is that the University should be kept away from this confusion and it should be a status of heritage so that, in future, there is no confusion – whether it is a Central University or a State University or a Inter-State Body Corporate. They should continue to defining this, but full grant should be given to them and all the restrictions (1326 positions, grant of Rs.206 crore and 6% annual increase), which have been imposed on them, should be lifted. It is surprising that no development grant is being given to the University. They should now tell him how they could run the University under these circumstances. They have to take the University forward. Whatever they have recommended is a very judicious decision and he has personally looked into it. They would keep on evaluate it and wherever it would be felt that there is something wrong, he would review it as he would never compromise with quality. He has come from a system, where only quality, values, infrastructure, etc. is discussed. If any problem is faced, he would come to the Syndicate, which the Governing Body of the University. He would tell that they are not able to do this only because of them even though all the respected members are with him. Despite this, they are helping them (University) and see they are dropping it and this is all because of their laziness and inactive attitude towards Panjab University. This is all what he has to say under the present scenario because there is no alternative. However, he is fully sure about it. It is being done and after this a lot more is to be done. He knew that they did not have much confidence on him, but he takes risk. So far as fee is concerned, he would like to categorically inform them that two M.C.A. programmes are being offered to two different classes (morning and evening) and

different fee is being charged from the two classes. Let it be set aside, but they are charging two types of fees from the students of the same class being taught by the same teacher(s), and it is MBA (regular fee) and MBA (self-financing). In BHU, they charge same fee, i.e., Rs.44,000/- and in another case (NRI – 5 seats) they charge a fee of Rs.1.75 lacs. He has identified in similar way here and come to the Syndicate. In Himachal Pradesh, they took higher fee from the student sitting in the same class saying that it is their paid seat and this fee is for in-service category. From where the resources could be generated? He forgot to tell that people are waiting for such types of seats. In UIPS, people are ready pay a sum of Rs.1 lac for doing Ph.D. and with their consent he is earmarking certain seats in Ph.D. for them in UIPS. He has also seen the legality involved in it. Somewhere illegality was involved, he immediately discontinued the process.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to how the Ph.D. seats have been created/increased in UIPS.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, M.Sc. seats have been increased in UIPS.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the proposal of UIPS for Ph.D. was being discussed, but it needed to be further worked out in detail and the same was related to industry people. However, the same has not yet come.

The Vice-Chancellor said that though it is like a hot cake, it has not yet come.

When Shri Naresh Gaur requested the members to look at page 54/57, it was said that only first three pages are for consideration of the House.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a big shock to them that Rs.2 crores have been deducted by the Punjab Government from the last instalment, which they released to the University recently. Secondly, they are facing a lot of difficulty so far as post-matric scholarship to SC/ST students is concerned and up to the year 2018-19, the amount has become Rs.15 crores. Still it is being said that the benefits should be given to the students. He is saying that they could forego the penalty. The Government is saying that they are imposing the penalty, but he is telling them that they could forego the penalty even though it is Syndicate matter, but at least the principle amount should be given to them. He is sending three Officers of the University to request the Punjab Government to get the money released. On the one hand, the figure has reach at Rs.15 crore, and on the other hand, the students are demanding release of certificates to them. When they would get the Detailed-Marks-Certificates, who would care for the University? It is being told that the Hon'ble Minister concerned has released all the grant to the Punjab Government, but he did not know as to what the real position is. On the one side, the arrear of post-matric scholarship on the part of Punjab Government has reached at Rs.15 crore, and on the other side, the Punjab Government has deducted a sum of Rs.2 crore from the grant, which was due to the University.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the Punjab Government owes between Rs.3 crore and Rs.4 crore to every College.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this is one of the reasons owing to which the financial position of the Colleges is bad.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is what he is telling them. Now, this is the only via-media.

When the Vice-Chancellor said that they have to do something in this regard, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is waiting for his turn, if the emotional speech of the Vice-Chancellor is over.



The Vice-Chancellor said that he is emotional because the University is his and he is emotional attached to the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he felt that the Vice-Chancellor has got emotional and they are also getting emotional with him. What actually happened is that sometimes they took decision after getting emotional for which they have to repent after several years and they had repent it when they gave in writing in 2010-11 and that was an emotional decision on the plea that since they are getting so much, their signatures could be obtained anywhere. They had cut their hands and in the year 2019, Professor Raj Kumar is saying that what should they do now? In the year 2016 or perhaps 2017, they were meeting in similar manner and it was a historical step in the University, when the students were butchered by increasing examination fee by several hundred percent. The situation was presented in such a manner that they did not have any alternative and they have to come to them to take a decision, but to take approval from them forcefully and they approved the same. However, it did not come in anybody's mind as to which civilization they belonged to. It pained him when they forget that they are part of the Indian civilization. Did he (Vice-Chancellor) remembered as to who was Bhisham Pitamah, who is also known as Ganga Putra. Where did he get education in the first 16 years of his life? From where did he get training? In fact, he got education and training direct under the control of Lord Brahma and after coming back he told that he came at the age of 16, for whom the Indian society talk proudly. He had said that Lord Brahma had taught him three things, i.e., free education to all, free health facility and free food to needy. But by taking money, anybody could provide these things. Here they are talking to empty the pockets of the students because they have to give relief to the government as the government is pulling its hands. While sitting in the Syndicate and Senate, they should not forget that they are not under pressure of the government. They have the power to pressurise the government. Why they should not take into consideration that they support all political parties. Let them pose them what happened in 2011, if their signatures were got under compulsion. Have they put the money in their own pockets? They are running the Panjab University which is the national heritage. It is not his personal property. By imparting education, they are helping for the welfare of the society and the students. They are imparting education to the poor students. It is very painful when they present a dismal picture of the University by saying that they are helpless to do anything. But under such emotions, they should also not forget that whatever money they are receiving, are they using it properly. They should see that it may not be so that they are spending the money like anything. He would like to give one example about the issue which is being discussed in the University. There are crores of rupees under TEQIP. Do they know how that money is being used and whose responsibility it is? They took a decision under emotions that the funds of the TEQIP would not be subject to the regular audit and these could be audited from a Chartered Accountant. It was the impression in their mind that the University function might not stop and the audit is to stop the functioning. This money is coming for the development of the University. But the way this money is being wasted, have they given any heed to it. How much, the laboratories and equipment was improved. He has said many times in the Syndicate that at least its audit should be got done. Some equipments were purchased 2-3 years ago, but these are still lying sealed. Their warranty/guarantee period is now over. These equipments were not even installed. Who is responsible for that? Are the students responsible for that? That is why he had said that when they talk about increasing the revenue, they should also talk about saving the money because every penny saved is penny earned. This is what he used to say. Either the Vice Chancellor or the Finance & Development Officer should tell him out of which head they had spent even a single penny less. They are saying that the expenditure is increasing. They could pose another question to him (Shri Ashok Goyal) that the expenditure could not be curtailed and he should tell how it could be curtailed. He could tell, how the expenditure could be minimized, but it is not their intention to do, because they have got a very easy path that if they are pay salary or develop the infrastructure, they could tax the students. Then, what the students

would do. They would either agitate or shout slogans. They could try to pacify them, but if they could not do so, then as has been said by him (Vice Chancellor), that people are ready to give money. If they would not give money, they would bring the rich people for whom the seats are being created. Actually, he thought that Item No. 9 relating to additional seats is being considered. But he (Vice Chancellor) has taken this to some other side. The proposal which has been received for these seats, to him, it seems, perhaps they would like to meet the financial requirements by creating these seats. They should also keep one thing in mind that the academic excellence is the most important aim in the minds of the University. At the cost of academic Excellency, if they do something, they would be doing disservice to the society, government and to everybody and to the most to the University. The things which they are doing bring more money that a person who has not qualified or those who could not compete with others should be admitted. He feels that to bring such an item is wrong. He had been observing the members. Almost all the members are feeling that this item should not be approved. But after that when he (Vice Chancellor) talked emotionally, then he (Shri Ashok Goyal) felt that all the members have gone under emotions and felt that there is no way out. He would like to tell that they have become fool. They should not forget that from 2006 to 2012, not even a single penny of fee was increased and during those six years, the University did not face any financial problem because the then Vice Chancellor acted professionally. He went from table to table, whether it is Delhi or Chandigarh. He went everywhere. He said that he would not increase fee at all and at the same time he would also need grant for the University. He thinks, that was the golden period in this era. Without increasing a single penny, they were having surplus money. He does not say that they could do it today also, but if they have the intention to do it, there is no reason that they would fail in it. Today they talk of nationalism. This University was started by the Britishers. The Britishers had never said that they would not give money to the University. What is happening in the name of education? He feels that instead of looking towards to pockets of the students, they should look towards the government. They are giving money to the government in the shape of tax. What for the tax is being given to the government. It has been given in the Congress manifesto that they would earmark 6% of the GDP for education. He does not know what the BJP has said in this regard. In a country where 6% is not spent on education, such things would happen there. Why the colleges or the semester system has failed? Why they can't introduce Choice Based Credit System? They knew it that adequate faculty is not available there. There is dearth of faculty in the colleges because the colleges are not in a position pay for them. It pains when it is said that there is no faculty in the University to introduce a new course. As per the recommendations of the Committee, some of the departments have given in writing that they do not need any additional infrastructure and faculty to run a new course. There are also such departments who have asked for additional faculty and infrastructure. Now there are two types of recommendations, one those who have asked for additional infrastructure and faculty and the other who did not ask for it. Those who have not demanded the faculty and infrastructure, they should be permitted to start a new course and those who have demanded the faculty and infrastructure, they were asked to re-submit their proposal with viability, how it would be run *etcetera*. This has a very dangerous meaning. Those who are saying that they do not need any additional infrastructure and faculty, if they talk about faculty, it means that the teachers of that department are under-loaded. They are not doing as much work as they should have to do. If they would do more to what they are doing, would the efficiency be not compromised? As far as the infrastructure is concerned, which some departments do not demand, is the infrastructure prevailing there is under-utilized? These are those departments which have demanded more space and faculty. But when they come to start a new course, they say they do not require anything. It is very clear from it that just to score points to become good, they have been asked to give all these things in writing. Everybody, including himself, is ready to increase the income of the University, but without thinking as to what would be its fate, they are ready to give everything in writing. If they have seen the period of 2006 to 2012, they have also seen the period from 2012 to

2018 which was a very painful period where they have just put burden on the students. He thinks that everybody has the right that if one was a fool yesterday, he could be a wiser today. They should always keep in mind the interest of the students and encroach upon their pockets only when the disease became incurable. But they think even before the disease that this medicine would be required and the money be extracted from the pocket of the students. The same thing is happening in the Colleges also. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) asks himself from his soul whether they are really serving the society or the University. The Vice Chancellor has said that there is no way out to generate revenue except to enhance the fee. It has become their mindset that there is not anything with them to increase the revenue except to increase the fee. When they have themselves thought it that there are no resources to increase revenue, except to enhance the fee, he should be told from where they would generate revenue from industrial consultancy, how they would generate revenue by organising Development Management Programmes. The Vice Chancellor is a man of finance and Management, has the University thought on these lines? The people from their University provide consultancy for outside institutes/organizations as they have the expertise, but they do not use this expertise for their own University. If they start the courses in such a situation, then, at least, he would not sleep in the night. He listened to his (Vice Chancellor) whole version that the situation is very critical and that they do not have any alternative. As far as legal point is concerned, his version could be hundred per cent right because he has not much legal knowledge. But he has seen it that the admission on NRI seats is being done. In their University, the NRI admissions were being done, but those were illegal and they were not aware of it. Till the time the strictures were not passed by the High Court and also till then the Supreme Court passes orders that it could not be done. He requested that the issue should be got legally examined. Secondly, it has nowhere written that if they do it, this much revenue would be generated. It has also not been written that the things which he (Vice Chancellor) has talked about laboratory, library, security, uniforms, minimum wages, total expenditure would come out to be Rs.10/- crores and with this exercise, they would get Rs.12/- crores. But if with this exercise, they would be able to get only one crore, where from would they meet the expenditure of Rs.10 Crores? They should also evaluate as to what type of criticism they would have to face after incurring this expenditure. That is why, he used to say that whenever they bring any proposal, its financial module must be made, what would be its benefit and loss. Where they want to increase the seats, they should also see whether the seats already existing there are filled or not. If those seats remain unfilled, then why they are proposing to increase the seats. As has been said by Professor Rajesh Gill that in some of the departments, there is only one teacher. If they increase 10 seats there, what type of justice they are delivering.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there was a department where not a single teacher was there.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not an issue of discussion because he (Vice Chancellor) must be knowing about many such things, about which he might think that they do not know about them. They also pose to be like this as if they do not know anything, but they knew each and everything. He (Vice Chancellor) has come to this university recently, it may be possible that he may not be aware of many things. So, it is their duty to bring it to his knowledge.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is aware of many things, but at the same time, it is also not so that he knows each and everything.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the way he (Vice Chancellor) talks about various issues, he has understood many issues in a very short time. That is why they get encouraged to tell those things about which he (vice Chancellor) is not aware of.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a very good thing and he must express his thanks to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal urged the Vice Chancellor that keeping in view the rational sentiments in the minds of the members, at least Item No.9 should not be approved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as has been said by Shri Ashok Goyal, he considers himself a culprit as far as the examination fee is concerned and he would tell the reason for it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not say it, but he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) has confessed it himself which is a good thing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he was the Chairperson of this Committee. It was being discussed that Rs.35-40 crores are required and how it has to be procured. Then a Committee was formed and it was discussed that they have to generate the revenue, otherwise it would be difficult to pay salary. It was then thought that it would be difficult if the whole burden is put on the University. It was then decided that this burden should be shared both between the University and the colleges. They took a decision and the examination fee was doubled, rather it was four times because the semester system also started the same year.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that with this the students have to suffer.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as a result of this, the students strength in the colleges reduced drastically. When they saw the results of that decision, only then they came to know about the consequences of this decision. Along with some other problems, the revenue has also started reducing. He has also calculated that from all the three categories mentioned in the minutes of the Committee meeting, they would only generate Rs. One crores, that also if all the seats are filled and if only for this amount, they have to face so much criticism, it is not worth doing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice Chancellor has any concern, he would discuss it with the faculty or the Syndicate. He would not keep the things hide in his mind. But they were taken aback in the Senate that without taking anybody into confidence, the Chairperson of the meeting was making a statement that from January, the University would close down. At least, he should have shared it with all the stakeholders. That statement became the bone of contention in the eyes of Hon'ble High Court and they are facing the problem even today.

The Vice Chancellor said, as has been told by him (Shri Ashok Goyal) had it not happened, this period would have also been the golden period of this University. The bottleneck had created from there itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they go to the Ministry of Human Resource Development and the Secretary or the Joint Secretary did not respect him (Vice Chancellor), he would feel more pain than the happiness for getting the money from the MHRD. Rather one should respect him that the person has come from Panjab University, but the image of Panjab University had been tarnished. Now, even if the Vice Chancellor goes to the MHRD, they do not care for him. What type service they are giving to the society.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that now the Item has been decided, but she would like to record certain things. He (Vice Chancellor) is a person of management and he could understand the whole thing. Since the last six year, there is hue and cry about financial crunch in the University. There is financial management and also financial mismanagement. It is very surprising that they discuss all issues, except the one, and that is corruption. They do not talk about it. There had been pension scam in the

University, they did not do anything and forgot it. The fire incident also took place here and records burnt selectively. Only the record relating to 50% pension burnt and the rest remained intact. They did not look back as they think that they are very great persons and have open heart. Thereafter, the University did not fix the responsibility of anyone in this case. Now the Vice Chancellor has constituted a Committee. In the very first meeting of that Committee, they have come to know as to what has happened in this University, what to talk of outsiders. If the problem is in their own house, on whom they would raise their finger. Who will do it? Why they do not talk about it? If they are themselves thieves and the problem is in themselves only, why should they point out fingers at others? Do they do such financial management in their homes? In their homes, they account for every penny. Did they not feel any pain? They did not look back, they did not ask for any investigation. Some people had gone on foreign tours. Their former Registrar, who was a retired army officer, she felt ashamed in saying that he was an army officer. His salary was fixed in violation of rules and regulations. The whole Senate tried its best, she cannot say anything about the Syndicate as it has a different shape, but he was paid salary. Who has got him paid the salary? The then Vice Chancellor got him paid the salary who was saying that the University would be locked. He was given the salary of a Professor. She said, she could not get the salary of a Professor, though she had become Professor in 2004 in open selection. She was not given that pay-scale which was given to him with increments. Is it not corruption? Is it not tyranny? They say, that they would not say anything because they have not to go backward. They cannot meet up the expenditure by increasing the fee. Here the students come even from the slums to study. This is not the solution. She does not know as to how much money they have wasted. In his last week of his term, the (then) Registrar took the files in suitcase. Did someone stop him? She asked for the video. She is having some footage of it. Does she lodge an FIR? He (Vice Chancellor) and the highest officers are aware of it. Would they just go on facing all this? Then they are talking about the financial crunch. This is not fair. There is lot of dirt here. Visiting and Honorary Professors were appointed. A Visiting Professor was being given Rs.40,000/- p.m. She went to the R.A.O. and asked if he was getting bills of Visiting Professor every month. The Visiting Professor is a retired General of the Army. Do they work for Rs.40,000/- a month? Such bills are being passed by the audit. They come and request to arrange for a lecture. What they are doing? They say that the University has a brand, but they know that it is nothing. They may get pride from the outside society, but this is a pity. She said that the disease has to be removed from its roots, the treatment cannot be symptomatic. They are just playing with the symptoms. They do not uncover anything out of fear that something may not come out of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they should have remorse for such things and in order to have repentance, he would bring a resolution that the examination fee which they had increased, it should be reduced. They should send a message to the society that they are work on merit.

The members appreciated it by thumping table.

Principal Narinder Sidhu said that he has raised this issue in the Senate time and again.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that when they started semester system, at that time also, they have said that the examination fee should not be doubled, but even then it was done.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the examination fee is not only doubled, but it is enhanced four times now.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this is the major reason for the decline of students' strength in colleges.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that at that time sedition charges were imposed on the students, their career was spoiled and the case is still going on.

Principal Narinder Sidhu pointed out that the college which teaches the students, it takes a fee of Rs.14 to 15 thousands, but the University conducts examination only for some days takes examination fee to the tune of Rs.6000/-.

Dr. Harjosh Singh said that he stayed in the Guest House for the first time today and paid rent of Rs.700/- for my stay. He thinks that if all of them do like this and pay the rent etc honestly, they would be able to save the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a good thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, in a lighter vein that he was not supposed to pay the rent.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the examiners who had been coming to conduct the examinations, they were not made payment even up to three years. They also used to go the other Universities, but they never charged any money for their stay and food. But, their University does not do so because there is a financial crunch in the University. They are very selective as to where the money is to be spent and where it is not to be spent.

Principal Rakesh Kumar Mahajan said that they take fee from the students to the tune of Rs.15,000/- to Rs.16,000/-, out of which the examination fee is Rs.6000/- per examination. Thus, an amount of Rs.9,000/- remains with the College. He urged that the examination fee be reviewed properly.

The Vice Chancellor said that that they all are sitting here. If any injustice has been done, that has to be seen, though he is not aware of many things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not so that they did something wrong, but such conditions were created, they have to do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not talk about the circumstances.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they were explained to increase in fee.

The Vice Chancellor said that to explain the things in any way does not make any difference.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they were just asked if they could increase the fee more than what was proposed. But, they increased very less.

The Vice Chancellor said that when some decision is taken, it is taken on the facts and figures and such decision are taken by applying the mind and not by heart. When they take a decision with mind, it is hoped that the decision would be right.

Professor Rajesh Gill; however, said that they cannot exclude heart while taking a decision and ethics should be there. Brain had been used very much in the last six years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they were made to understand at the official platform i.e. in the Senate meeting that the fee to be charged from the students should be calculated in accordance with the price index inflation. The fee was calculated as

per the salary which one was getting at the time of previous revision some years ago and the salary which one is getting today. He remarked that the intelligent person could take them anywhere, but it is so that they are not intelligent. They also knew all this, but they use both mind and heart. They are not like those who only use their mind.

The Vice Chancellor said that he felt that, perhaps, Professor Rajesh Gill had lost her patience. She might have been thinking that they are only discussing the issue with mind and perhaps, they are not listening to their heart. He would like to say that facts and figures are derived by mind, but the decisions are based on both, i.e., mind and heart. It is true that their major concern is to serve the society and not to earn profit. The basic thing is that they should arrive at a decision only after exhausting all alternatives. However, they should not take decision to increase fee exorbitantly as it would erode rationality. Earlier the fee was increased exorbitantly and the same was imposed on all the students without taking into consideration their economic position. The third thing is that there are several confusions. For example, sometimes when 10% increase in fees is made in medical courses is done, but thereafter that it is told that they are not to pay this for this year. People say that they have got their ward admitted by seeing in the prospectus that the fee is Rs.2,50,000/-, but now they are charging Rs.3,50,000/-. This is a very big confusion. He does agree that such mistakes have occurred. There is one thing which is his concern and he has started work on it. He is working on the basis of facts and a Committee is working on the issue of Rs.12 crore. There are many other issues also. He is focusing on all these things as to how the money would be realised. As has been told by the Registrar, they have been able to recover about Rs.70 lacs within ten days. He does not think that such a big amount had ever been realised. They must be aware of it as they have been serving the university since a very-very long time. It was a very risky job because the people might go to High Court immediately as it situated just very close to the University. They might say how they have deducted the amount and how they have encroached upon their fundamental rights etc.etc. But, he must appreciate the Registrar and other officials have been able to realise Rs.70 lacs. Everything happens at the proper time. He believes in spirituality. The time period changes after 10 years. He is hopeful that the situation would change towards improvement.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that Professor Rajesh Gill has raised a very valid point that whenever something wrong is done, responsibility should also be fixed.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever they have been telling about the fire incident, work on it is also going on. He does not know whether the record has burnt or it has been got burnt.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that when they speak something after thought, they speak a wrong thing, what when something is spoken emotionally and spontaneously, that is correct.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever has happened, work is going on it. Secondly, she is talking about the pension issue. He is not just sitting on it, but he has a different nature. He put the things before them only after doing something in the matter. He would place the things before them when he would receive it with the rough estimates. They are talking about economy also. They have taken many decisions. They have earmarked Rs.40 lacs for beautification. He is Vice Chancellor of this University, so he should not say this as to what beautification could be done with Rs.40 lacs. But in spite of knowing everything, he has kept his eyes closed. He asked the F.D.O., what beautification could be done with such a meagre amount.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what beautification has to be done.

It was informed that there is a plan to beautify the green belt beginning from Indian Theatre Department to Student Centre.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is a very big amount. They are not issuing the degrees of the students, but they are spending this huge amount on development/beautification of the area.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is published in the newspapers the degrees of the students are not being issued and due to this the image of Panjab University has maligned very badly.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not so that he is not looking into that issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is only because of this fact, they are sharing the various issues with him.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that today on this platform, they have shown their outburst thinking that he (Vice Chancellor) listens to them seriously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said both of them (members and the Vice Chancellor) are here to listen to each other, and with this dialogue they would achieve something.

The Vice Chancellor said that in order to take economy measures, he has stopped printing of Annual Report containing 400-500 pages with a very decent paper.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to how much amount is spent on the Court cases.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would tell about the money spent on Court cases also. The list has been prepared after thorough checking. He would place that list before the Syndicate, they could then see as to how much expenditure has been done on Court cases. He would come with each and every item. They are also looking into the expenditure being incurred in other areas. He does each and everything in consultation with the concerned people. He has visited almost all the Ministries to get something for the University. In management, they keep many verticals open. If one thing is not working, the other would be tried.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is a problem regarding grants, but they were having high hopes, if he (Vice Chancellor) could see his earlier speeches, he has encouraged the faculty very much to bring Projects, so that money would flow in the University system. But to his mind, no money has come. He (Vice Chancellor) had said that within six months he would fill the coffers of the University to which the Vice Chancellor said, perhaps, he might not have said like this. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he might have said it by getting over excited. He has also talked to him about his target of six months. The amount has not yet been received, but it might be in the pipeline. But they are not so big hearted because they got disappointed just within six months that the money has not come. He would like to tell one thing that they are not in a position to generate revenue from the students and if due to this, any government or society raises a finger on him, they would stand by him. They have to do everything collectively and put pressures on the government to give money to run the University. The students who used to indulge in stones pelting would be with them in that endeavour.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is true that it could be done with joint efforts only.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they have high hopes on him (Vice Chancellor).



Shri Ashok Goyal said that the persons who have submitted Project, they are getting disappointed.

The Vice Chancellor said they should not get disappointed. If they are not able to get funds from one agency, they should send their Project to the other one. There is no need to get disappointed. He (Vice Chancellor) has to make strenuous efforts for getting these things done at the UGC, MHRD and the DST.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that only yesterday, they have received a grant of Rs.1.75 Crores for a Project.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the Project are joint Projects with the University, so this is not so easy, but at the same time this is also not impossible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they know that it is not so easy, but with his (Vice Chancellor) joining the University as Vice Chancellor, their hopes have increased with the view that he (Vice Chancellor) would get the things easy.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is neither difficult nor impossible. If they are not able to get funds from one agency, they would try at some other place. The teachers were not able to get increments for Ph.D. for the last 12 years, so it was looking impossible, but it has been done.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should see the breakup of seats in three parts, i.e., A, B and C. He wants they should approve at least for one year as an experiment. If this model proves to be successful, they would do it, otherwise they would do away with it. They should see to it and get it recorded that they are approving it for this year subject to its appraisal. He would also like to tell that it would not be able to fit themselves in the old scenario, though they are putting pressure on the government.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu enquired as to how much revenue would be generated out of it. To his mind it would not more than the expenditure to be incurred on the infrastructure.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would tell about it as he was in the Committee. He informed that about Rs.45 lacs would be generated from the additional seats as mentioned in Part-A.

Shri Naresh Gaur intervened to say that the total revenue to be generated would be to the tune of Rs.1 crore.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is a simple logic. In majority of the departments in mentioned in the Tables, there is no adequate faculty. As stated by him (Vice Chancellor) if contractual teachers are appointed, it would involve expenditure. It is not clear as to how many students would join the courses. She doubts, whether the existing seats are being filled completely or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that in Part-A, there is much surety that all the seats would be filled.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the additional seats mentioned under Part-A, they are not increasing the classes. In Microbial Biotechnology, there are 20 seats which otherwise are less for any class. For Police Administration, they are increasing only three seats which are not much.

The Vice Chancellor said in this they have just to add the seats and no faculty or infrastructure needed to be added.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said for UILS, they are increasing 20 seats, but since it is a theory class, it would cause any problem. Some infrastructure has to be added and nothing else.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu enquired if they could pull on with the existing infrastructure and faculty, the Vice Chancellor said, 'yes' it would be done with the existing infrastructure and faculty.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in Part-A, fee has not been changed, only the seats have been changed. The old fee would be charges as it is already a self-financing course.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no need of additional infrastructure and faculty and also there is no change in the fee structure.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to how they arrived at the figure of increasing the number of seats, e.g., 20 seats.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier these departments were situated in CIL Building where the laboratories were small. Now they have shifted to the new building.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked that the things which Professor Navdeep Goyal is telling now, why these were not mentioned here. How would they come to know about it? The things which Professor Navdeep Goyal is telling now, gives the impression that the Committee which has deliberated on the issue, thinks that the Syndicate does not apply its mind.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has already agreed that there is some problem. Actually, he attended the Committee meeting only for a short while.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, what Professor Navdeep Goyal is saying, should it not have been mentioned in the documents presented to them? As regards Table, he had said that if they want to generate revenue, where admission on NRI could be made, that should be placed before the Syndicate. It was said in the last meeting also, but it was not brought. He asked as to how many NRI seats are there in the Laws Department and the UILS.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that with such an endeavour, if they are able to increase the revenue, the Syndicate and Senate would always remain in its favour.

The Vice Chancellor asked, as to how it could be done. The Vice Chancellor also requested the members to see Item 12.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should be informed as to how many seats are there.

It was informed that in Item 12 which related to LL.M. self-financing course (under the Faculty of Law), there are only 4 NRI seats. On being asked, it was informed that there is no NRI seat in LL.B. Course.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked why there are no NRI seats in LL.B. Course where as this was discussed in the last meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they had said in the last meeting that NRI seats be created in LL.B. Course, but these seats would be convertible. Clarifying further, he said if they are not able to get the NRI seats filled, these seats could be converted as the general category seats.

The Vice Chancellor said that it must have done with great care, but there may be some constraint for creation of NRI seats in LL.B. Course.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the only constrains in it is that they cannot increase the seats over and above the sanctioned strength. But there is solution to that problem also as has been stated by Shri Ashok Goyal. They would increase the NRI seats within the sanctioned strength. Therefore, if they could not fill the NRI seats, those could be converted in general category seats. By making some seats as NRI seats, they would get additional fee and at the same time they would not face any problem.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired if there could any problem from the Dental Council of India (DCI).

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified it that there would no problem from the DCI because the DCI says that if there is a Unit of 60 students, it would remain same and they cannot increase it even to 61.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that it means they could designate NRI seats within the sanctioned strength only.

When a clarification was tried to be given, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was also discussed in the last meeting and it was told that next time full information would be supplied, but now it is being said that the Departments were asked to supply the information. Is it the will of the department(s) to do everything on their own will. Were they not to take any decision at the level of the University? As far as the reservation in NRI seats is concerned, they are governed by Dental Council of India and Dental College. Suppose, they are having 100 seats. They cannot make it 101. But out of 100 seats, they have reserved 15 seats for NRI. Similarly, in Laws Department and UILS, to his knowledge, 46% seats are already reserved. They can go upto 50%. So, they could reserve the 4% seats for NRI. If they are able to fill the NRI seats, it would create revenue. However, if they could not fill these seats, they could fill them under general category like the other seats. Now the problem is, perhaps, as and when he speaks in the Syndicate, he could not make his version understand. He cannot say that the other is not understanding it. Since, he could not make them understand, that is why the issue remains stuck at the same place. Now, for example, if there are 300 seats in the Department of Laws, 12 seats could be reserved for NRI. These seats would be convertible to general category.

The Vice Chancellor said that his apprehension is that whether there could be any objection to the regulatory bodies as to how they have changed it without their permission.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Ashok Goyal said that they only talk of the Units which have been sanctioned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are certain other courses which are not regulated by the Regulatory Bodies. To take a decision in such courses is in their hands. They do not reserve any NRI seats in total strength, rather these are created in supernumerary capacity. The supernumerary seats are not convertible. But the item which they have brought here, they have converted by the supernumerary seats. Therefore, this is not legally sound. In Microbial Technology, two NRI seats have been kept, but as per his knowledge these seats always remained unfilled. If these seats

remain unfilled, then why they are creating two NRI seats? Now they should come to the UILS. What is explanation in this case because no building has changed there? In UILS, they have been increasing the seats from 40 to 60 which is a substantial increase.

The Vice Chancellor said, perhaps, it might not have any impact as the teacher has to teach the class only. They have not to use any laboratory.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that even at the school level, the Unit of 60 students is being reduced to 35 students, whereas they are increasing the seats from 40 to 60 and that also in the professional courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they may have a class of 100 students. He (Vice Chancellor) could ask the Registrar as to how many seats were there in M.B.A. and B.Com. They should see from where they have reached at which place, just by saying this that it does not make any difference whether the number of students is 40 or 60. Till the time Professor T.N. Kapur remained Head of this department, he did not allow to increase even a single seat because he said that he is not bothered about the quantity, rather he is worried about the quality. He (Vice Chancellor) could compare the quality of teaching of that time and today's. Though he did not say it is inferior, but if they keep the number of students limited, they could produce better quality students. If there are 60 students in M.B.A., he does not know how they could deliver justice to the students. Now they should come to the LL.M. degree. The LL.M. is a Master Degree in Law. If 40 students would sit in LL.B. class, it would be difficult for the teachers to teach such a big number of students. It would not be difficult only to the teachers, but it would be difficult to the students also. But here, they have increased the seats in LL.M. from 40 to 60. It seems that they have become over excited and increased the seats in such a number. It looked as if they giving a bid of seats. They should at least take care of the academics also. He did not know as to what the department is thinking about it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the department has the same thinking.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he knows what the department is thinking. The Department is just thinking as to how they could get more funds. They may be right, but they should not forget that in excitement, they should also not to think about the quality and that their main objective is academics. Now if they come to the MBA (Retail Management), in Part-B, the seats have been increased from 45 to 67. If these are to be increased one and half times, then it should have been 68. They should treat 22½ seats as 23 and the number should have been fixed as 68. It was not pointed out by anyone. So, they should not do like this. He pointed out that there is dissertation also in LL.M.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is adequate faculty in the Department of Law.

There are two different places for law, one is Department of Law and the other University Institute of Legal Studies. He was surprised to see that both of them have separate Board of Studies.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Board of Studies of both the departments are separate because one is running B.A. LL.B. Course and the other LL.B. Course.

Shri Ashok Goyal said can the Law Department persons not take care of the Board of Studies in UILS. They can put some more persons in the same Board of Studies belonging to the B.A. subjects. If they separate the Board of Studies of both the departments, the same thing would happen as the UBS has been separated from UIAMS.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that some of the private Universities has lifted this bar on the seats and they doubled the number of seats, but their academic standard has gone very down. He would like to say that these courses are their brand. It may not happen that they would meet the same fate as that of the colleges. They could increase the seats from 40 to 42 or at the most 45, but it is not fair to enhance the seats from 40 to 60.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they should undertake one exercise. The courses in which they would like to increase the seats, they should collect the data as to how many seats were filled in the last 3-4 years, what was the number of dropouts from first to second year.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have already collected this data and there is no such lacuna.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they could enhance 25% seats of the seats.

The Vice Chancellor said it is okay.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that this increase of 25% should for the seats mentioned under Part-A only on test basis. However, Shri Naresh Gaur again said that they should increase the number of seats from 40 to 45.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should increase at least 10 seats in each course.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when he has said 25, the idea in his mind was to increase seats by 10%, but simultaneously there was concession of 10%, which came to 4 seats, which ultimately comes to 25%.

The Vice Chancellor said that 10 seats should be increased in each course.

Shri Ashok Goyal and some other members said, let they increase 10 seats in each course.

The Vice Chancellor said that the proposal for the building has been sanctioned, but they are short of some amount.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they could construct the building, but the person who would be given the charge, it would be his responsibility that the design of the building should be proper and good material should be used. It may not be like that of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan. In that building the water of washrooms flows towards the doors.

The Vice Chancellor said that the two buildings which are being constructed, the user of one of them is the Director, Human Resource Development Centre, Panjab University. He has been visiting the construction work after every 2-3 days and giving him (Vice Chancellor) report every week.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested an undertaken should be taken from the concerned person. He requested that they should also be given the chance to see that the work is being done properly.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members to see Part-B and requested if any of the point could be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it has been seen, but it needed to be considered properly. He (Vice Chancellor) should not think that they are not willing, they could approve the whole proposal, but it is not in the interest of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not ask to approve the whole proposal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should not approve it in such a way as more details are needed. In this proposal, it is not clear as to how the reservation would be given.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Ashok Goyal also suggested that first the more details should be called for, thereafter, it could be considered properly.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is okay, the proposal would be brought again with full details.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the proposal be brought with full details, but not keeping in view that it would definitely be approved.

The Vice Chancellor said that only that would be done which would be approved by them even today. He is giving this responsibility to Professor Navdeep Goyal. He could seek input from PUTA President, Shri Ashok Goyal or any other person. The Vice Chancellor also requested the members to see Part-C of the minutes.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they should also see Part-C, as some major courses are there in it.

Professor Rajesh Goyal asked if there is anything special in Part-C.

The Vice Chancellor said, yes, that is why he is saying to see Part-C also.

Shri Sandeep Singh said if there are something special, they should see to it.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that since there are major courses in Part-C, they should see to it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they cannot comment unless and until and unless they get the complete details.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not get hesitant about the legal aspect as they have already taken precautions.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should bring this proposal after having legal vetting.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have already done legal vetting informally. However, they could get it done formally.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that legal vetting is necessary, otherwise people would say that the Syndicate has done it so.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that they could approve the item subject to legal vetting.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested the issue under reference be sent to the same Committee which has already deliberated upon it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that matter is not so easy. They have to see the list of departments running partial self-financing courses. One - they are running regular courses which are also called subsidised courses and the others are the self-financing courses. After starting the self-financing courses, it was observed that these courses are not being self-financed, then they changed their name to 'Partial Self-financed courses'. Now it is being mentioned that the list of departments running 'Partial Self-financed courses' with suggested additional seats in Self-Financed Category. What does it mean? It means that these courses are Self Financed Courses, but they have made another category of Partial Self-Financed Courses. It is a very-very ticklish issue so it cannot be approved under any subjection.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while explaining as to from where the word 'partial self-financing course' crept into, said that they started certain courses in the name of self-financing courses. In the self-financing courses, the government was not supposed to give any grant. If they talk of the courses running in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology and Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, it would not be possible to run these courses with grant from the government. In order to cover up this, the nomenclature of the Self-financed Courses was changed to Partially Self-financed Courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that perhaps Professor Navdeep Goyal did not know the earlier background. When these courses were started, an impression was given that these courses would serve the whole University as they would get lot of money from these courses. However, he, at that time, had said that these courses would eat up the resources of the University and one day these courses would become the white elephants for the University. It was not told to them at that time that there was a need of 100 bedded hospital for the Dental Institute and the item was got approved. Thereafter, it was told that there is condition of Dental Council of India to have a 100 bedded hospital attached to this Institute. It was said that there is no way out and they have to make a 100 bedded hospital otherwise the Institute would close down etc.etc. Then it came to his (Shri Ashok Goyal) mind if it was a mandatory condition, how this Institute had been running for the last 5-6 years. He thought there is something wrong. He, then got it enquired and it was told that it is not necessary to have a 100 bedded hospital. Rather the actual position was that either they should have a 100 bedded hospital or they should have a tie up with some hospital within 10 Kms. periphery. When he enquired about it, he was told that they have tie-up with Government Medical College, Sector-32, Chandigarh. So, it was not necessary to have 100 bedded hospital, rather it was the agenda of someone to make a 100 bedded hospital. He said that the University is unable to bear the expenditure of this Institute, how it would bear the expenditure to be incurred on the 100 bedded hospital? When asked from the persons who did it, they said that they did not do it, it was done by the Syndicate and the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should keep this thing in mind so that it may not be done by him as he has no hidden agenda.

Referring to Part-B, Point III at page 55 of the agenda papers, it was informed that the 15 seats under NRI seats are not supernumerary seats. There is a proposal from Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital that 10 seats out of the 15 under NRI category for BDS courses be converted to Self-Financing Seats. The remaining 5 seats in the NRI Category, if any seat/s is/are left vacant after first counselling, these will be converted to Self-Financing Category. The unfilled seats be filled out of general merit list, but the fee structure for these would be the same as in the Self Financing Dental Colleges of the State of Punjab.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should not decrease the number of 15 NRI seats. However, they could say that the unfilled seats could be converted to General Category seats.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not do it like this. First they should see it properly.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they should see the old data with regard to filling of these seats.

It was informed that these seats are not being filled. However, if these seats are not filled, these are converted to general category.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu enquired as to how many NRI seats are filled and how many remain unfilled. He was of the opinion that at least 3-4 seats must be filled.

It was informed that not more than 3 NRI seats are filled. The other seats are filled put in the general category where the fee is normal. The proposal of Dr. HSJIDS is that out of 15 NRI seats, 10 seats should be converted to Self Financing and the remaining 5 seats should remain as NRI seats.

The Vice Chancellor it would also help the students as some of the students come late for admission.

Shri Sandeep Singh said it would not do any welfare of the students, only the University would be benefitted from it. If the seat is converted to general category, a student has to pay normal fee, but if they convert some seats in self financing category, the students would have to pay more fee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if they really want welfare of the students, they should have the data for the last three years and see as to how many NRI seats are filled and the remaining seats should be converted in the General Category seats. What they are actually doing is that they charging fee from the students as partially self-financing course. The courses at the Institute were started as self-financing courses, but were given new nomenclature as partially self-financing courses. Now, for a particular number, they are again coming to self-financing. The government says that since their courses are self-financial, they cannot take them into consideration for the purpose of grant. If they make sub-categories, how they would deal with them, so that issue would also be there. In addition to this, within a category they are creating a sub-category i.e. with self-financing category, they are creating partially self financing category. The simple solution to this is that if the NRI seats remain unfilled, they could charge more fees from them as compared to the other 85 students. In practical terms, let they say that they would charge from them in dollars which would be more in Indian rupees. Let they should approve, accede, accept and confess that they selling the seats. Earlier they were selling these seats to the NRI students, when they failed in it, they started selling these seats here. He feels that they are going away from the social responsibility.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said, he doubts, if they could do it as there is ruling of the Supreme Court that they cannot reserve seats for NRI category.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are supernumerary seats and they are not snatching away the right of any one.



Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, however, said that this is not question of whether these are supernumerary seats or not, even otherwise, perhaps they cannot do it as there is a ruling of the Supreme Court. He suggested to check it legally.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the judgement of Supreme Court is different and not related to NRI seats. The Supreme Court says that they cannot fill the NRI seats by taking an equivalent fee from the Indian students in Indian rupees. They are saying that the NRI seats, if not filled, be filled by way of self-financed seats. If they say whether it is legally tenable or not, the vetting has to be got done from the person who has been representing Panjab University in the cases of NRI. Once they were trapped in such a case, but Shri Anupam Gupta, Senior Advocate saved them.

The Vice Chancellor said that this would also be seen by Professor Navdeep Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor taken a very good initiative, but it would be better if they work on strong footing.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would never compromise. They would evaluate this every year and find out the hitches. If, they are successful in this endeavour, they would drop it from the next year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they would like to earn money from the Dental Colleges by doing so, they could do so. They could earn and also save money from the Dental College.

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue of promotion in the University is now over. Now, they have to see the issues of Dental College. That has to be done on top priority.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is talking about the expenditure and not the promotion policy.

A reference was also made regarding Point No. 1 at page 56 regarding Migration Entrance in Engineering Test.

When the Vice Chancellor talked regarding maintaining protocol by the officials, Shri Ashok Goyal said, perhaps, he had talked to the Vice Chancellor as to how the committees are constituted. He could say with surety that he (Vice Chancellor) himself did not constitute the Committees. Someone guides him (Vice Chancellor) and in that guidance lot of politics is involved, which might not be his will, but it does involve.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not guided by anyone. However, it may have happened by chance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice Chancellor is not guided by anyone even then such Committees are constituted, it is very serious.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that there was a Committee where Professor S.K. Sharma and he himself were the members. However, a very junior Professor amongst themselves was made the Chairperson of that Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor S.K. Sharma, perhaps, may not have been made Chairperson of the Committee being a superannuated person.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Professor S.K. Sharma is a Syndicate member and hence there is no question of his being superannuated or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had talked about this issue earlier also in the House In any Committee where protocol has not been maintained, he would not attend its meeting. But, in spite of this, the Committee was constituted in the same way. A meeting of that Committee was held, but he (Shri Ashok Goyal) did not attend the meeting. If that Committee has been constituted by the Vice Chancellor himself it means, the Committee has been made keeping in view the shade of the member, which is not fair.

The Vice Chancellor said that he should share all such things with him and he would also like to underline the fact that there is nothing like that he is guided by someone, though he listens to everyone.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that a correction needed to be incorporated at page 56 of the agenda in the proposal from University Institute of Engineering and Technology. They have mentioned Medical Stream only, but they should also mentioned the Non-Medical Stream i.e. PCM.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that here the University Institute of Engineering & Technology has made a mistake. They have mentioned only the Medical Stream whereas Non-Medical Stream students are already eligible to apply.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if the Non-Medical Stream students are eligible to which Professor said, 'yes' they are already eligible. Shri Ashok Goyal said, it meant that the Medical Stream students are also eligible to apply, so they should add the word 'also' in the proposal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that either they should use the word 'also' or they should mention both i.e. Medical and Non-Medical stream.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they should mention both the stream to be eligible to apply for this course. This was also endorsed by Professor Navdeep Goyal.

It was agreed to that the students of both streams i.e. Medical and Non-medical would be eligible to apply.

**RESOLVED:** That

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

Sr. No.	Department	Course	Existing Seats	Seats after increase	Increase in Seats	Tuition Fee in Rupees p.a.
1.	Microbial Biotechnology	M.Sc.	20+2 NRI	25+2NRI	5	67790
2.	UILS	LL.M (Morning)	40	50	10	90415
		LL.M (Evening)	40	50	10	90415
3.	Centre for	MSW	30+4 NRI	33+4NRI	3	41020

	Social Works					
4.	Police Admn.	M.A.	30+6NRI+10 in-service	33+6NRI+10 in-service	3	34295

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

**10.**

Considered minutes dated 21.01.2019 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to resolve the issue of increased fee for BDS/MDS students of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 06.05.2018 (Para IV) (**Appendix-IX**) had read out the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 30.03/21.04/ 29.04.2018 (Para 21) and approved with the modification that the other charges from the existing students be hiked by 5%. The examination fee be hiked by Rs.75/- per semester and the fee for the newly introduced courses especially Masters Program in Governance and Leadership be not hiked for three years.
2. The FDO has written that the expected shortfall shall be Rs.4.21 lac for BDS and Rs.5.72 lac for MDS during 2018-19.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the fee was printed wrongly in the prospectus. He had enquired about it as to why this fee was mentioned when the fee was increased. The accounts section also said that whatever fee has been printed in the prospectus, it should be charged from the students. The fee was charged from the students as was printed in the prospectus. The amount of fee which was printed is less than what they had charged from the students in 1<sup>st</sup> year. It is right if they charge old fee plus the additional fee of Rs.5000/-. But, it would not be fair if they ask the students, at once, to pay an additional fee of Rs.50,000/-. It has come to his knowledge that they have sent a proposal, (Appendix IX) and, they are ready to pay as per the proposal. He further said that at page 67 of the agenda papers, it has been written under Point 1 that the M.D.S. 2<sup>nd</sup> year students may also be counselled to pay at least the amount they paid in 1<sup>st</sup> year i.e. Rs.4,48,327/-, which is wrong. They should not write the word 'counselled' rather the students should be asked to pay the amount.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as this is concerned, it is a blanket permission that after counselling, they should get the money where from they could get. Now, it

has to be seen, if they could charge more fee from the students after publishing less fee inadvertently.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this mistake has occurred twice and not once.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal asked as why the mistake occurred in the prospectus and at which level the prospectus is printed. Could the Finance & Development Officer tell something about it?

It was informed that the printing work of the Hand Book of Information is started and finalized in the months of March/April, but the fee was approved later on. The fee which has been printed in the Prospectus relate to the session 2016-17. Now they have written to the Dean of University Instruction Office that either they would not mention the fee in the Hand Book of Information for this year or if it is to be written, it would be written when finalized.

Shri Ashok Goyal said this is how the seriousness is added to this. Whosoever this Committee was, the Finance & Development Officer was also a member, but now he is telling here, is not revealed from the minutes of the meeting. Here, it has been written that it has been published inadvertently. Inadvertently means, there may be a typing mistake or something else was asked to write, but something else has been written. The fact of the matter is that whatever was printed, it was correct, but the decision was changed thereafter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said what is not looking him correct is that the fee which has to be paid in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year, has been published even less to what they have paid in the 1<sup>st</sup> year, whereas the decision to increase the fee was already taken.

It was clarified that these things go side by side. They determine the fee for each session. They do not determine the fee of the students for the whole course at once. They determine fee for each year afresh for ongoing students as well as the fresh entrants. Due to that, the students of the session 2016-17, who have to step-in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year, the same problem occurred in their case also. So, basically, it was an issue of timings.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if the students are ready to pay the enhanced fee.

It was informed that the students are ready to pay with 5% increase of the fee which they paid for the session 2016-17.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, at least, they have to write as to what the Syndicate has decided in this matter. They could charge the same fee which was charged from them in the previous year.

The Vice Chancellor said that the students had a meeting with the faculty and they have given something in writing. On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal if the students are ready to pay the fee, the Vice Chancellor said that they are ready.

It was requested that the minutes of the meeting dated 21.1.2019 should be approved to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the recommendations of the Committee it has been written that the MDS 2<sup>nd</sup> Year students may also be counselled to pay at least the amount they paid in 1<sup>st</sup> Year i.e. Rs. 4,48,327/-, which is not correct because they are not to counsel the students.

It was clarified that the word 'counselled' has been written because when this Committee was constituted, at that time, there was no idea to place the proceedings of this Committee before the Syndicate. This Committee was constituted at the time when

this situation had arisen, and the Institute was asked to counsel the students to pay at least the fee which they had paid in the last year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this item has been placed before the Syndicate to consider the minutes of this Committee. Since they have written that the students be counselled, so they cannot approve this.

It was requested that the operative part of the proposal should be approved.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu asked as to what they would like to get approved from the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the students are ready to pay the fee and the University is ready to take that fee from them, then where is the problem.

It was informed that the fee was approved by the Senate, but now since they have to charge less fee, it would need the approval.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that they have brought something else in the item, but they would like to get approved something else. He suggested that they should write that, in view of the confusion because of the amount published in the Hand Book of Information and the actual fee which was supposed to be charged, it is resolved that such and such amount be charged from the students. So that it is regularised before the matter is placed to the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is giving this responsibility to Professor Navdeep Goyal to do it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the issue has been resolved and the amount to be charged would be given by the Finance & Development Officer.

Shri Ashok Goyal reiterated that the resolved part should be written as that the difference of amount which was published in the Hand Book of Information....

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor intervened to say that since the Registrar would like to say something, they should also listen to him.

It was informed that the students of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital were also present in the meeting and they told that their fee has been enhanced exorbitantly. The faculty of Dental Institute pointed out that due to exorbitant fee hike, many seats remained unfilled.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, what is the link of this issue with that of the earlier issue.

Professor Rajesh Gill said the two proceedings of the Committee have been attached here with the agenda papers and both the proceedings relate to different cases.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a Committee should be constituted to look into this issue i.e. exorbitant fee hike, as raised by the students. The other issue has already been resolved.

It was informed that there is no need of a separate Committee as the fee structure Committee could look into it.

The Vice Chancellor said that this issue would also be given to the same Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the resolved part it could be written that, the difference of amount between the fee to be charged actually and that published in the Hand Book of Information, be recovered from the students.

It was informed that they are not to recover the actual difference, but have to recover some amount.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever amount they have to recover, that should be mentioned.

It was informed that the resolved part which was got recorded earlier, has been recorded.

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

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the issue raised by BDS/MDS students of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh regarding exorbitant fee hike, be given to the same Committee already constituted to consider the issue under the Chairmanship of Dean University Instruction.

- 11.** Considered the requisition (**Appendix-X**) of 19 Fellows to convene a special meeting of the Senate, regarding strict enforcement of Regulation 7 of Chapter VIII (E) at page 172 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-X**) supplied by the College branch was also taken into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a very ticklish issue to convene the special meeting of the Syndicate under Regulation 7 at page 28 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. In the last meeting it was said that an office note should be prepared and brought to the Syndicate wherein they should mention whether the regulation in question has been violated or not. The question of convening the special meeting arises, only if their contention is that the regulation has been violated. In spite of saying this in the last meeting, as to where the regulation has been violated, there is not even a single point mentioned in that regard. If the regulation has not been violated, what is the relevance of the requisition given by the Fellow? He would like to give an example, if some 15 people give in writing that the Ph.D. Degree of Shri Ashok Goyal be withdrawn. Would they not first confirm it whether he holds a Ph.D. Degree or not or they would straightaway call a meeting? Would they tell in the meeting that Shri Ashok Goyal has not been awarded Ph.D. degree, then where is the question to withdraw it? So, the office should, at least, confirm if the said regulation has been violated. If the regulation has not been violated, then what for the meeting would be convened. He requested the Vice Chancellor that before he allows the discussion, he is simply posing a question that, can the office say that the regulation, which has been referred to, has been violated in any way, only then the issue should come up for discussion. If the answer is 'no' then no discussion, if the answer is 'yes' then, of course, they have to discuss it.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that he would like to submit, is it in the jurisdiction of the Syndicate to check its viability? He has a copy of the regulation 7, where it is specifically written about convening the special meeting of the Senate. It says, that the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor or at least fifteen members of the Senate could ask for a special meeting of the Senate and the Syndicate shall fix a date for special meeting of

Senate. Where is it written that the viability of requisition of the meeting should be checked before giving the date for holding the Senate meeting? So, they have to give the date, otherwise the members of the Syndicate are also the members of the Senate and let the discussion be carried out there. The 19 Senate members, who have given in writing, are not mad, they are members of the parent Body and it is their democratic right. They have been fighting for this issue since 2006, but the extension/reemployment is given for different periods. The Syndicate is a child and the Senate is the Supreme Body. If the Senate has been given the right under the regulation to ask for a special meeting, why are they depriving them of their right? Since the Syndicate members are also the members of the Senate, they could check it there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he has not been answered whether the regulation has been violated or not. It may be possible that the regulation might not have been violated, but by agreeing to what Dr. K.K. Sharma has said that it is the unfettered right of the Senate members for calling a Special meeting, they should at least be told whether the regulation has been violated.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said the regulations have been violated because the Fellows have written that all decisions are inconsistent with the Regulation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Regulation 7, talks of the retirement age of teachers. They could meet after lunch and the office may verify and confirm whether any Principal or any teacher in any affiliated college, in violation of the regulation, has been allowed to continue in service, beyond the age of 60 years which is the age of superannuation. If 'yes' the regulation has been violated, if 'not' there is no violation. Though he did not use such words for any Syndicate or Senate members, he used the words for himself that he is a fool. He accepts that he is fool and mad, but he has never uttered any word against the dignity of anyone. He is not saying that those 19 people are mad, rather those 19 people are wise people, it is only he, who is otherwise, but they are wise. At the same time, he has the right to ask, if some unimaginable thing comes which has not happened, he tried to read in between the lines that why it needs to be intimated to the Syndicate. Is the Syndicate a Post Office to fix the date, why it cannot be fixed by the Vice Chancellor, because the Syndicate is to take into consideration the issue? Why, because, that is followed by another provision that in a special meeting of the Senate, only that item would be discussed which is in the terms of the reference of the requisition and there could not be any other item. That is thing which they have to discuss, but if the Senate meeting, office says that there was no violation, what would they discuss.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said, how he (Shri Ashok Goyal) could say that the violation has not been done? The violation did occur because nobody could go beyond the age of 60 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he is saying is that the office should tell about it.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that he (Dr. K.K. Sharma) may be right, but let the office say this that regulation has been violated.

It was informed that about the convening of special meeting of the Senate, it has been written that he/they shall intimate to the Syndicate the purpose of such a meeting. The office has given the purpose. Regulation 7 of Chapter VIII (E) at page 172 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, says "All whole-time teachers in Non-Govt. Colleges affiliated to the University, shall retire on attaining the age of 60 years and thereafter no extension in service shall be granted..." As such, which ever record is available with them, there is no violation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he (Registrar) is saying is hundred percent correct, but if it is presumed that he is correct, then he should tell them, what the Syndicate would do. Would they resolve to call the meeting of the Senate just to tell them that no violation has been done? The purpose of bringing this item to the Syndicate is that the Syndicate should see as to for what purpose, the meeting of the Senate is needed to called, because only this issue would be discussed in the Senate meeting and not anything else.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that, as has been read out, there could be no extension beyond the age of 60 years to any whole-time teacher, and a Principal is basically a teacher also, then why extension in service beyond the age of 60 years be given to a Principal?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this is not extension as a person retires at the age of 60 years, rather this is re-employment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that there are several implications and ramifications which he did not want to discuss. He understands and respects the sentiments and views expressed by Dr. K.K. Sharma also. But when they start seeing the things only from one particular angle in mind, probably, they tend to forget so many other angles which they should consider. Why he is not discussing because that discussion would start only once the office confirms that there is violation. But if the violation is not there, and 'yes' they may differ with the office. The office may either say that there is no violation or say that violation has occurred. However, the office said that there is no violation.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the office has not said so. The Registrar has read out the Regulation wherein it is written that a teacher cannot go beyond the age of 60 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Registrar) should tell the name of any person who has retired even one day after attaining the age of superannuation, i.e., 60 years. He was not aware whether Principal Sidhu would also speak in favour of the issue as he is one of those 19 Senators, who have signed for requisitioning of the meeting. But, he thinks that Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu has understood that there is no violation of the regulation to which Principal Sidhu said he has understood it.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members whether anybody would like to give any input as this matter related to the Colleges.

It was informed that as per their version, there is no violation and the Registrar has also explained about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he could say with hundred percent surety that there is not even a single case where anybody has been allowed to continue, in his capacity as teacher or Principal, and has served even for a day more beyond the age of superannuation, i.e., 60 years. The office was asked to prepare a note if the regulation has been violated, but it has given a different story.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to why the office has not prepared the note. Was the office not having more facts with them about it?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever input the office has placed before them, it did not relate to the violation of regulation.



Shri Naresh Gaur said that when the office has accepted that there is no violation, why should they discuss this issue, and as such, there is no need to ask the members about it again and again. This was also endorsed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Dr. K.K. Sharma asked, is the re-appointment of Principals justified?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on this issue, except Dr. K.K. Sharma whose view is as important as that of others. The view of other members is that this special meeting of the Senate could not be convened, and thus, the matter is over.

The Vice Chancellor said that he respects and honour each and every member, but if somebody would like to speak, they should listen to him also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is nothing wrong in listening to the members if someone wants to say something, but, what he is saying is that, when someone is not speaking, he (Vice Chancellor) is asking them again and again to speak on the issue.

Dr. K.K. Sharma requested that his dissent be recorded. He wants that special meeting of the Senate should be held because 19 Fellows of the parent Body has given in writing and there is also provision in the regulations. They should not be deprived of the provisions available in their democratic set up. Since he is not being heard, his dissent be recorded.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. K.K. Sharma has asked that his dissent be noted, but what has been resolved?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the office has informed about no violation of the regulation has taken place, there is no need of convening any special meeting of the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor asked, why?

Shri Ashok Goyal said, because of the explanation given by the office that there is no violation of the Regulation 7, as claimed by the requisitionists.

It was informed that whatever provision was there in the Calendar and relevant documents have been given to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the question, whether the violation was done or not, was asked last time.

It was informed that there is no violation, on record with them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is what he is saying.

It was said that they (members) should not say that no regulation has been violated, in fact, it was said that there was no violation on record.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, alright, then he (Registrar) should say that there is no violation of the regulation.

Shri Sandeep Singh said there are two things. Either they should say that the regulation has been violated or the regulation has not been violated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, he (Registrar) is saying that they have not said it that violation has been done. Now, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying, that he (Registrar) should say that violation has not been done. Or he should say that he does not know

about it. At least, he should say something. In the last meeting, he has said to bring an office note.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. K.K. Sharma is saying that his dissent should be recorded. There should be some consensus.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his (Dr. K.K. Sharma) dissent is alright. Had he been at his place, he would get his dissent recorded in more nice words.

**RESOLVED:** That since there is no violation of the regulation, therefore, there is no need to convene a special meeting of the Senate as requisitioned by 19 Fellows.

Dr. K.K. Sharma got his dissent recorded.

**12.** Considered the matter relating to NRI fee structure along with NRI seats, to be sanctioned, in each course, for the session 2019-20. Information contained in the office note was also taken for consideration.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.03.2019 (Para 30) while approving the minutes dated 12.03.2019 has also resolved that the matter relating to the NRI Fee Structure along with number of NRI seats to be sanctioned in each Course, be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when this item was referred back last time, the main reason was the issue of seats of Department of Laws.

Some more documents relating to the items were shown to Professor Navdeep Goyal. He then suggested that a photocopy of these documents be got done and circulated to the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said this is a very ticklish issue. How could they consider the item without having proper documents?

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that first they should finish the agenda and then could take up this item.

As desired by some members, the Vice Chancellor said that this item would be taken up for consideration later on.

However, the item was not taken up for consideration later on.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of Item 12, be deferred.

**13.** Considered deferred Item No. 24 (A) of the Syndicate meeting dated 16.03.2019, regarding co-education status of National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, as forwarded by the affiliation Committee dated 07.09.2018. Information contained in office note containing brief history of the case was also taken into consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a report of the Committee with regard to this issue was placed before the Syndicate and the same was accepted. If they read that report carefully, they would found that it had been made very clear to the College that they would not be granted co-education status. This step was taken when the fact came to fore that the students are just admitted in the College, but they do not attend the classes. After 1½ years, when they were even aware that a Committee is visiting

the College, the situation remained the same. The situation owing to which they were not granted co-education status, is still continuing. These things have been very clearly mentioned in the report of the Committee. He, therefore, was the opinion that their request for grant of co-education status be not acceded to.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is a technical issue in it. They have said that they cannot change the name as they have to take NOC from the Punjab Government. Therefore, they again brought NOC from the Punjab Government. Now, if the University has not to grant them co-education status, then they have to get the NOC withdrawn by the Punjab Government. This is the technical point involved in it. The Co-education status has been withdrawn by the Affiliation Committee, which is working on behalf of the Syndicate.

It was informed that the Punjab Government had given NOC to the National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, for conversion into a Co-education College and this decision of Punjab Government was ratified by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 27.11.2016. Thereafter, the Affiliation Committee visited the College on 5.5.2017 and this Committee recommended that the College be re-converted into a Girls College. On 25.6.2018, the College again represented that the College be allowed to function as a co-education college. The Affiliation Committee in its meeting held on 20.7.2018 decided that the College should admit only girl students. Therefore, the status is the same as it was earlier. As regards the NOC given in the year 2016 by the Punjab Government, it has not been repudiated and the same is still continuing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after the issuance of NOC, the final decision is to be taken by the Syndicate.

It was informed that a decision in this regard was taken in the year 2017.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, can the Syndicate not change its decision? When they came to know that the College is not working as per the prescribed norms, only then the Syndicate changed its decision and the College was asked to revert to Girls College.

The Vice Chancellor asked would there not be any problem as the Government has already given them NOC.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that after the issuance of the NOC by the Punjab Government, the Governing Body has to take the decision. They took a decision and allowed them, but when they allowed them, at that time the strength of the girl students was about 400-500. Thereafter, they admitted 1200 students who were not attending the classes. They were just admitted and fee collected from them with the assurance that they would be got passed and awarded degrees. The students were also not required to come to the college and the requirement of 75% attendance is meaningless for them. When in the next year, the Affiliation Committee visited the College, it was observed by the Committee that there are some problems. The problem was discussed in the Affiliation Committee meeting which is working on behalf of the Syndicate. It was discussed and observed in the meeting that the reason for enhancement of students' strength from 500 to 1200 or 1500 was that they admitted non-attending students. In fact, only 100 students remained present in the college at a time. At least, this should be stopped. It is not fair to sell degrees of Panjab University to the students in such a manner. The decision, which they took, was conveyed late to the College. Rather, the University regularised the students admitted by them till the decision was conveyed to them. But after that, they were not supposed to admit any boy student.

It was informed that their dilemma is that the Affiliation Committee on 5.10.2018 has decided that the Co-education status has been taken back by the Syndicate. This issue is lingering on for the last 5 months, so it was requested that some concrete decision, either this way or that way, should be taken in this regard.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Syndicate had accepted the report, but, what action had been taken on it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is the action.

Before leaving for lunch, it was informed that the resolved part would be that the report of the Committee is not accepted and the co-education status is not to be granted to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, the discussion would continue after lunch.

Some discussion relating to Item 13 took place after Item 22 and the same has been brought here.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that what would happen to the teachers who had been placed under suspension or terminated or dismissed from the service.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that action on report which has already been accepted must be taken.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one of the issues in the report related to non-attending students, on the basis of which action has already been taken. The other issued related to the removal of teachers. The report in respect of this college was placed before the Syndicate and some decisions were taken on the basis of that report.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, it was decided that reply be sought from the College by the Dean College Development Council.

Shri Sandeep Singh enquired if a letter has been sent to the College as decided by the Syndicate and if so, whether any reply has been received.

It was informed that letter was written to all the three Colleges; however, reply from two them has been received. Reply from the third Colleges is expected to be received within a 2-3 days. On being asked by Shri Sandeep Singh, it was informed that reply from National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, has not been received so far.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma wanted to know whether letter to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, was written or not?

Shri Sandeep Singh requested the Vice Chancellor to get it checked whether the letter has been written to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, or not. However, as per his (Shri Sandeep Singh) the letter has not reached the college.

It was informed that case had also come from the Grievance Committee, which could be got enquired from the office. It was further informed that the Para of the last meeting of Syndicate relating to the issue, has been received only yesterday. However, as had been directed specifically, letter to the three colleges were written by him (Dean College Development) and he vividly remember it. On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal, it was replied that he could not say with surety that replies from all the colleges have been received.

When a few members suggested now items for Ratification and Information should taken up, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what has been decided on the issue under consideration.

It was replied that since he (Dean College Development Council) was specifically instructed to note down to write to three colleges of Ludhiana, letter were sent to them without waiting for the minutes of the Syndicate and their replies have also been received. However, so far as National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, is concerned, it could not be written to as the minutes of the previous meeting of the Syndicate were received only yesterday.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, were they continued waiting for the minutes of the Syndicate?

It was said that for the three colleges of Ludhiana, he was specifically asked to write to the colleges immediately without waiting for the minutes of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, it was decided that the college be written to reinstate the teachers, who were placed under suspension, terminated and dismissed from the service with immediate effect. He enquired whether the teachers concerned have been reinstated by the College.

To this, a couple of members said that even the letter has not been sent to the College.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if any such report is received by the Vice Chancellor or Registrar or Dean College Development Council, are they supposed to act as per the provisions of the University regulations or would they wait for the Syndicate to take a decision? The College had removed some teachers from the service and their representation was received by the University, but the College did not intimate the University about removal of the teachers. He enquired, had they taken appropriate action as per the regulations of the University. Is there any person to help the teacher who have lost their job and are on the roads? It meant that they would wait for the Syndicate meeting and then for the minutes and by that time some bad news might come. In the last meeting of the Syndicate, it was specifically decided that the College (National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka) be asked to immediately reinstate the teachers and consideration of the rest of the item was deferred. To say that they were not specifically asked to do this or that they were waiting for the minutes, are meaningless.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that, in fact, decision was taken in respect of National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, and it was suggested that a letter be also written to three colleges of Ludhiana without waiting for the resolved part.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Dean College Development Council) has not so far written letter to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka. Now, the Syndicate does not have the documents on the basis of which the college could be written to. They have no material as to on what basis the teachers have been placed under suspension, terminated and dismissed from the service or whether they have been served notices, whether salary has been given in lieu of notice etc.

It was informed that they had just received representation from the teachers who had been removed from the service.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, at least the representation of the teachers could have been sent to the college for comments.

It was said that he (Dean College Development Council) would come back to them with full information.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to inform them that these teachers are, perhaps, on the road for the last more than six months as they have not been paid salary. If the teachers have been removed, the college would not intimate this to the University, but the University could act on the representation of the teachers. As such, their representation could have been sent to the College for comments, so that they are able to proceed in the matter.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that they have fixed the inspection of the College (National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka) for 16<sup>th</sup> April 2019, and he is also a member of the Inspection Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired, are they going to inspect the College on 16<sup>th</sup> April? But what is to be inspected is not known.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that the previous case(s) of this College is/are yet to be finalised.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that, that was what, he is saying that everything about the College is in hotchpotch. However, it should be told as to what is to be inspected? The report, which is submitted by the Inspection Committee, is very good.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired that in which term of reference the report is submitted by Inspection Committee.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the inspection report is based on the routine inspection only.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired, then how did they apply?

It was said that the problem is on what basis could they stop the Inspection of the Colleges? There are three Colleges in Ludhiana which are going to be inspected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a simple formula to this problem and there is no need to look into these cases. Let the office put up the note to Dean, College Development Council, to the effect that it is certified that the College concerned has complied with all the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee for the affiliation granted last year. If they are satisfied, then they would form the Inspection Committee; otherwise not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this (suggestion made by Shri Ashok Goyal) should be standardized.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as is being done, while giving panel for the Selection Committees, it is got certified from the College concerned that there are no dues pending against it, the same should also be included in the Inspection Committees. When it would be included in the Inspection, the Colleges would automatically fulfil the conditions.

It was said that whatever would be decided by the Syndicate, the same would be implemented by the office. The problem is not only of these three Colleges. In fact, the problem existed in several Colleges. If they got it certified from the colleges concerned that there are no dues pending against it, half of the Colleges would not be able to get affiliation.

The Vice Chancellor said that one of the rules of the University says that if the non-compliance is 50% or more, the college concerned could not be given affiliation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the compliance reports from the colleges would only come if the same are followed by the office. That was why, the system of obtaining certificate to the effect that no dues are pending against the College has also been ignored. The sanctity of the Inspection Committee report is not there, but it is not his (Professor Sanjay Kaushik, Dean, College Development Council) fault as this system is prevailing for the last several years. Even if they ignore the previous practice, they needed to correct the system for future.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, since all the relevant papers and the report of the Committee were available with them, a decision was taken and the same was dictated by Shri Ashok Goyal and it was desired that the College be written to on these lines by tomorrow, but they could not recall right now as to what was the decision actually taken at that time.

It was said that the record would be checked and if it is found that the College has not been written to, a communication would be sent to the College by tomorrow.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that perhaps, one teacher has been suspended, one terminated and one dismissed from the service.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the past be buried. He requested the Hon'ble members to suggest as to what should be done now. Could they write to the college to send entire information relating to this case?

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the comments of the College needed to be obtained.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would seek the comments from the College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be written to the College that, in view of the contents of the complaint, *prima facie* it seems as if the whole exercise has been done without following the laid down procedure. In view of this, they (College) are directed to reinstate them with immediate effect.

**RESOLVED:** That the co-education status to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, be **not** granted.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, be written to that, in view of the contents of the complaint, *prima facie*, it seems as if the whole exercise has been done without following the laid down procedure. In view of this, the College Management is directed to reinstate the teachers, who have been removed from service, with immediate effect.

- 14.** Considered request dated 05.02.2019 of the Officiating Principal, Sant Baba Hari Singh Memorial Khalsa College of Education, Mahilpur, for waiving off the late fee of SC students who applied late for the Post Matric Scholarship 2017.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this related to SC students. The Government is not releasing the grant to the College, which would go to the College directly. This is the reason they are unable to do it. Moreover, if they permit this single College, it would be wrong and it would create an odd situation for others. Hence, they have to take a comprehensive decision in this regard. The decision could be, that the fee is to be taken, but the late fee/penalty could be waived off. Either

the comprehensive issue should be placed before the Syndicate, or the Vice Chancellor himself should take a decision on all such cases

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that in this issue, they are facing different types of situations in the Colleges, e.g., certain Colleges are taking tuition fees from the SC students and asking them to deposit the examination fee there, and certain Colleges did not take the fees from the SC students, but are paying the same from their own sources. Similarly, there are certain Colleges, which neither took the fees from the students nor paying the same to the University. If they allow this College, the other Colleges would also get an option not to deposit the fees of the SC students. They would plead that since such and such College was exempted, they did not need to deposit the fees of the SC students. As such, they have to take the decision keeping in view all these things and it would also open a Pandora's box.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that then, in future, the Colleges would also not send the fees to the University.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they have to take the fees of the SC students from the Colleges, but this issue related only to the late fee, which they had imposed. They should resolve that the late fee be not taken; otherwise, it would create a big problem as they could not charge the late fee. Once the Punjab Government had decided that they (Colleges) should not even pay the fees of SC students to the University.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that second issue is, how could they take the late fee from those SC students, who have already been exempted from the fee by the Government? The problem is also there as to from where the College would pay the late fee. Moreover, these are the students who could deposit their fees. Had they been in that capacity, they could have deposited the fee earlier.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired, had they resolved that the late fee be charged? Yes, it is correct that the fee is to be taken so that the University is not put to a loss.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma is correct, but it should not happen in future that paying of fee to the University is totally stopped. They might plead that the fee would be deposited with the University as and when it would be received from the Government.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this issue related to this year only. Punjab Government has now taken a final decision that, in future, the money would be sent to the accounts of the students directly.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to how much delay is there in the payment of examination fee in the case of these students because it has been written that "now they have deposited the pending amount of scholarship of May 2017", whereas in the above para they are talking about April 2018. He enquired whether the fee of May 2017 has also not been received.

It was clarified that the fees of the May 2017 was also the same.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to how much delay is there.

It was informed that the detail is available in the file, but the late fee is imposed in accordance with the number of days. The College deposited the fee even after the elapse of last date with maximum fine. In fact, the late fee has been imposed in accordance with the slabs fixed for payment with late fee.



Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the College could not pay the fee as the mistake is not on its part and the students did not have money to pay.

It was said that some of the Hon'ble members have stressed that this is not the single case and it is true as there are so many such Colleges. The examination fee is pending from 18 affiliated Colleges, which is to the tune of Rs.1.67 crore and on the basis this, the late fee which has been imposed is to the tune of about Rs.1.50 crore. In addition to this, there are 57 affiliated Colleges, which have claimed benefit for EWS, the examination fee for whom is less and they deposited the same, but they did not attach the supporting documents meant for the purpose. The amount of such cases came to Rs.48 lacs and a fine on such cases has also been imposed. Now, it would depend on case to case whether they had the supporting documents, but they could not submit the same or they might not have the documents to submit. While taking decision in such cases, they have to see, in principle, as to what decision could be taken. However, substantial number of Colleges had paid the fees. There are only 18 such Colleges, which include Babe ke College of Education, Mudke, Ferozepur, Baba Kundan Singh College, Mohal, MGKM Shai Sports College of Physical Education, Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Abohar, M.R. Government College, Fazilka, R.S.D. College, Malwa College, Bondli, Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur Cantt., Government College, Zira, DAV College, Abohar, Gobindgarh Public College, Alore, Khanna, GGS Century College, Jalalabad, Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, DAV Postgraduate College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, MCM DAV College for Women, Sector 36, Chandigarh, GGS College, Chandigarh, Government College of Education, Sector 20, Chandigarh, Maharaja Ranjit College, Malout, SGGGS College, Sector 26, Chandigarh, Dashmesh Girls College, Badal, DAV College, Malout, Government College, Sri Muktsar Sahib, and there are certain other such College. Only summarized figure has been given to them. In certain cases, they had already paid the fees and only the late fine is pending. Until decision on late fine is taken, they have to keep it as such. 18 Colleges are of separate nature and 57 of separate nature. If they wanted, the list of the 57 Colleges could be read out. 18 Colleges are such which comprised SC/ST cases and out of them certain Colleges had paid the fee and only late fine is pending. In the case of certain other Colleges fees as well as late fine is pending. Cases of 57 Colleges are pending owing to other reasons, but their amount is less.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this issue has been raised by him because they would not bring all 57 cases. Whatever is to be decided, they would decide in one go.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that, this fine is not desirable/legitimate, and the reason for this is that when the admissions of candidate, who fell under the post-matric scholarship scheme, were asked by him College (Government College, Hoshiarpur) to deposit the fee. On this, the candidates and their parents staged dharna and the Deputy Commissioner himself came and directed that no fee should be taken from the SC/ST candidates and the candidates got admissions. Instead of imposing fine, in accordance with the slabs, they should look into the root cause of the problem, and should take decision keeping in view the status of the candidates/students. They have prepared the slabs for imposition of fines for paying fees late, but none bothered to see whether the College concerned is in a position to pay the fees of such students, especially when the Government says that the students, who took admission, under the post-matric scholarship scheme, no fees should be taken from them, how the College could take the fees forcibly. Secondly, how the College would pay the fees to the University? Moreover, the University had also imposed fine for late payment of fees, whereas they are not even able to pay the fees. He added that here when the students, who had taken admission under post-matric scholarship scheme, had protested recently, the Dean Student Welfare made a statement that they would neither take any fee from such students nor would withhold their DMCs/degrees. However, the DMCs

and degrees of such students of the affiliated Colleges of Punjab are lying in the office of the University. They are talking about the fine, but they are facing the problem of non-release of grant by the Government for this purpose. Whenever they stepped out of the homes, students try to stage dharnas before them and enquired as to what is the position and why their University is withholding the certificates of the students, and they did not have words to give reply to them, except to sneak. Sometimes, he told them that if they wanted to burn the effigy of Vice Chancellor or Chancellor or Chief Minister or Prime Minister, he is with them. He pleaded that fine should not be imposed at all. He enquired, in what way, they held the College responsible. When the College could not pay the fee, how it could pay the fine?

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that a letter had gone to the Colleges on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2019 regarding late fee for the years 2016 and 2017. Is the audit not done every year to see whether the fees for the year have come or not? The fees had not come in the years 2016 and 2017 and they wrote letter to them in 2019 in the month of February.

It was informed that, earlier also, letters had been written in this regard. Only the latest letter has been appended with the agenda. In fact, they had been writing letters continuously. The procedure is that the Fee Checking Section checked the fees of all the affiliated Colleges and wherever fee default is detected, the cases are reported to the Examination Branch. Then rest is the responsibility of the Examination Branch to see as to what is to be done, i.e., whether amount is to be recovered and sometimes they withheld the result also. However, in no such case, the result has been withheld. The Accounts Branch only wrote the letters. Since this issue had been lingering on for quite some time, last two letters were written under the signature of Finance and Development Officer; otherwise, usually such letters are written under the signatures of Assistant Registrar. They tried to sort out the issue keeping in view as to how long it could be kept pending because such cases were not experienced earlier. These are being experienced only after the introduction of post-matric scholarship scheme, EWS, etc. Earlier, the fee default cases were very rare. Such types of cases are of only 2-3 years old.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, it meant that only one letter has been appended and the previous correspondence is in the file.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these are not such persons on whom fine could be imposed over and above because they have not done this themselves. Hence, fine is not desirable. They could decide the issue of fine even today. However, in future, it should not be done and he is saying so because if they allow them as a rule, in future, the fee would not be received.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma intervened to say that, in future, the Colleges have to take the fees even from the students admitted under the post-matric scholarship scheme.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should take a decision in one go that they would not take fine from these students from whom the fees have not been received. However, it should be made clear that if fees are not received by such and such date, fine has to be paid.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu suggested that first of all, they should check whether all these are SC/ST cases or others also. If these are SC/ST cases, then fine is not to be imposed, but if there are other cases, then it is legitimate to take fine.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that even in the case of EWS also, the Syndicate and Senate had already taken a decision that no fine is to be taken as there was

confusion about the documentation and other things. Therefore, even in the cases of EWS, the imposition of fine would be wrong.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that, it meant, there are three categories, i.e., SC/ST, EWS and one other. According to him, no fine should be taken from SC/ST and EWS categories and from others, the fine should be taken, if it is legitimate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for those, who have not yet paid the fees, it should be made time bound if they are not willing to pay the fine.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that if in spite of writing so many letters, the fees are not being received from 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19, should they go on like this. What would be the end point?

The Vice Chancellor said that it is matter of great concern.

It was informed that besides three categories, there is another category, i.e., Government Colleges of Chandigarh, which could not pay the fees, as the Treasury of Chandigarh was closed from 1<sup>st</sup> March to 16<sup>th</sup> March and last date of the University for paying fees was 8<sup>th</sup> March. As such, the payment of fees from the Government Colleges of Chandigarh was received late and the matter had been brought to the notice of the Finance and Development Officer. In their case also, fine is not proper/legitimate.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that there is another issue related to this. For example, if the last date is 5<sup>th</sup> and the student concerned get the RTGS done on 5<sup>th</sup> and the slip is not issued on 5<sup>th</sup> the College concerned is imposed a fine. When the RTGS is done, the slip always comes next day and if the next day is holiday, it would come next to next day. One category is of such cases. There is another category. Suppose the draft is prepared on 27<sup>th</sup>, and 28<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup> are holidays, and the draft is submitted in the University on 30<sup>th</sup>, such students have also been fined.

It was clarified that the date of UTR would suffice purpose.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu to bring all such issues to the notices of College people and give the same to the University in writing, so that those could be examined separately.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is multi-facet issue. In this, they have to keep in mind – whether they have not to seek fees from them and fine is also not taken from them. It is desirable also and a very good thing, and at the same time, they have also to keep in mind as to how the University would be run. It is being argued that it has been directed by the Government that no fee is to be paid by the SC/ST students. Is the University bound to be governed by the Government? Shri Sandeep Singh ji had been raising the issue in the previous two meetings of the Syndicate that DMCs and degrees of the students have been withheld. After getting the matter clarified, the Syndicate took a conscious decision that since this much amount is pending, what should they do? So it is being done, in spite of protest by the members that they could not do this and this is their pressure on the Government. The Government would itself release the money to the College. Shri Sandeep Singh has told them that the Dean Student Welfare has given the statement that nothing to worry as they have not withheld anything and the DMCs would be issued by the University soon. That meant, they were waiting for the students to come, agitate, make hue and cry and then they made a statement. The concern shown by the members of the Syndicate did not make any impact. Secondly, he has never seen such type of letters. Letter has been written on a personal letter-head. It is Panjab University, and if the letter is to be written on personal letter-head, a D.O. letter should be written in the name of the Principals. In fact, the letter should have been written on the letter-head of Panjab University and if thereafter, FDO had

been written, it would have meant FDO of Panjab University. Thirdly, the letter had gone from the office of the Finance and Development Officer as it has been said that several letters were written and ultimately the letter had to be written under the signatures of FDO, but there is no reference in the letter that despite their repeated letters/reminders dated so and so, no response has been received. From this, it looked as if they are writing this for the first time. From this, it is not being revealed that the issue is going on for the last more than two years. D.O. letter is always written in the extreme situation, especially when the official communication did not bring the desired results just to bring the personal attention of the concerned person. According to him, this is the job of the Examination Branch, where the fee is accounted for, and it is for the Examination Branch to see whether the roll number or the result is to be withheld. The Accounts Branch is just to bring to the notice of the Examination Branch that such and such students are the defaulters. Hence, it is for the Examination Branch to correspond with the students to pay their fee, and that was why, the response had been received by the Controller of Examinations, as for them, the nodal point is the Controller of Examinations. This letter had gone as a warrant and they immediately approached the Controller of Examinations saying that they are unable to pay this amount. They have given two components of fees, i.e., examination fee and late fee. According to him, this should have been left to the Examination Branch. The Accounts Branch should only write to the Examination Branch that such and such fees are pending from such and such students, and then the Examination Branch should take up the matter with the concerned students/Colleges because the Accounts Branch did not have any authority, which is otherwise vested with the Examination Branch as it could either withhold the roll number or the result of the concerned students. The Accounts Branch could just write a letter and nothing else, but the Examination Branch could say that there is a lot of pressure on it and it would not declare the result, withhold the DMCs, etc. However, when the students would protest, Dean Student Welfare would give the statement that the DMCs, Degrees, etc. would be released shortly and no approval of the Syndicate and Senate is required for this purpose.

Professor Navdeep Goyal enquired had he (Dean Student Welfare) actually made this statement.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the statement had appeared in different newspapers.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when he had met the Dean Student Welfare, he had told him that it is about the University Campus only as there was no issue of the University Campus.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they did not know as to what was said by the Dean Student Welfare, but what was published in the newspapers was something else. Now, there are two issues – (i) the money of the University which is outstanding, for which they are directly taking up with the Government; and (ii) the money outstanding on the part of the affiliated Colleges. To recover the money of the Colleges from the Government is neither the job of the University nor the *locus standi* of the University. As University, they would ask the Colleges to pay the outstanding amount and the Colleges would say that they would not pay the same. One of the members has told that some of the Colleges had paid the fees of such students from their own sources. The Colleges, which had deposited the money of the students from their own sources and the others, who have not paid any amount, would be at par when they would come to know that late fee would not be levied. If it came to their (students/Colleges) knowledge that there would no late fee, why should they deposit the fee? However, here the item has been brought in such a manner as if they are to consider the request of this College (Sant Baba Hari Singh Memorial Khalsa College of Education, Mahilpur). Fact is that this item is not to consider the request of this College. As such, the item has been framed wrongly. In the end, it has been written by the Registrar that the matter be placed before the competent authority to frame a policy. Whenever they

would frame the policy, they would say that the entire data/information (how many such Colleges are there, how much amount is outstanding, if they took fine, how much it is, what is the amount of fee, if they decide that the fine would not be taken, what would they lose, if they decide to take fine, from where it would be taken and from the Colleges would pay – whether they would collect the same from the students, etc., etc.) should be prepared and placed before them. Only then policy decision could be taken. From here, it is being observed that a College has sought the waiver and the matter has been placed before the Syndicate, whereas it is being told that there are 18 such Colleges. They are also being told that there are other types of Colleges also, but this letter has gone to all the Colleges irrespective of whether the outstanding amount related to post-matric scholarship scheme or EWS or general category, or aided College or Government College. They have just picked up their books and on whose part the outstanding amount found, and issued the letter. They had also been told that certain Government Colleges could not deposit the amount of fees within stipulated date, as during that period the treasury of the Government was closed, but it is not known to the Finance and Development Officer, who has written the letter. This only known to the Examination Branch because it is the nodal point. Had it been in the notice of the Finance and Development Officer, perhaps he might not have written/issued the letter to those Colleges? Similarly, a case had earlier come from a College of Punjab saying that it did not have DDO powers, and nobody is to give money from his/her own pocket and naturally it has also to be taken care of. The money was to be transferred from the Treasury to the University directly, but the Treasury was closed during that period. They have submitted the certificate to this effect. The College had the intention to pay the fees, but the University says that it is not concerned with their problem, but since the payment has come late, they have to pay the late fee accordingly. At this stage when the examinations for the last three years have been conducted, they could not do anything. Had they the guts/power, they could have stopped them in the first year itself saying that since their fees had not come, they would not allow their students to sit in the examination(s)? Some other pressure might have come at that time. Or they should have told that unless and until they deposit the late fee with the University, they would not allow the students to appear in the examination(s). The students have qualified the examinations after studying for three years and they withheld their DMCs or Degrees only owing to this. Now, the statements have started coming in the newspapers that it is highhandedness on the part of Panjab University. It is also not justified on the part of Punjab Government not to release the funds and people started saying like this. And a statement came from one of the functionaries of the University that nothing like is there, they are releasing the certificates of the students shortly. Now, the process of elections is underway and all are playing politics. They are saying that they would take the decision in the meeting of the Syndicate, but who cared for them. See, they have got the item approved. Their only concern was, perhaps under this pressure, the amount which is due from the Punjab Government (Rs.15 crore), could be got released. They are discussing the issue since morning and saying that the situation is very bad. If the amount of Rs.15 crore, which is pending, on the part of Punjab Government, is received, the situation would automatically improve.

The Vice Chancellor said that if this amount is received from the Punjab Government, they would not be required to get projects, etc., for which they are trying their level best. The golden period, which he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was telling, would return, if this amount is received.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he (Vice Chancellor) is talking about the returning of golden period, but statement had appeared in the newspapers that everything is settled with the Punjab Government and they are now releasing the DMCs, degrees, etc.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had gone through the news and found that they have written about the Panjab University Campus only. The news contained the statement of the Registrar as well as of the Dean Student Welfare.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if the DMCs, Degrees, etc. of the students, who had studied from the Campus, had not been withheld, how could they withhold the DMCs, Degrees, etc. of the students, who had studied from the affiliated Colleges? Are they step-sons? Moreover, Dean Student Welfare is not only for the Campus; rather, he is the Dean Student Welfare of the whole University, including the affiliated Colleges. He suggested that this case should be withdrawn. To take a policy decision, all such cases should be brought together. In the meantime, they should put pressure on the Punjab Government pleading that, in this manner, the University would not be able to function. Pressure is exerted on the Syndicate that they could not impose the fine and pressure is also exerted on the Syndicate even not to take the money from the Colleges relating to fees of SC/ST students admitted by them, because they did not have money. On the other hand, the Government is not paying any heed to their requests for release of money. If this situation continued, the University would be at the verge of closure. The Punjab Government had already deducted a sum of about Rs.2 crore from the last instalment of grant given to them. So this is the only way. However, he felt that if they stick to this that they would take the outstanding amount as well as the fine, until the money is received from the Punjab Government. He thought that it would like this that they would not be able to recover the amount and instead would earn a bad name because the issue is so much sensitive.

The Vice Chancellor said that indeed the issue is sensitive and everybody is willing to help.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No". They are not helping them; rather, they are finding a safe way for themselves.

The Vice Chancellor said that ultimately, the losers are the students and the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at the time of taking the policy decision, they would ask the Colleges not to make admission until the students are paid the fees.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not do this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then what could they do?

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not prevent anyone.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the students have to be admitted against fees. When Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this decision has not now come from the Punjab Government, Shri Ashok Goyal it is not so. In fact, the Punjab Government had passed orders that now the money would be sent directly to the accounts of the students concerned, whereas earlier the money was to be sent to the accounts of the Colleges concerned. They should be honest to themselves and if they could not do anything, they should not try do anything. If they could do, they should decide that this and this should be done. If they are sure that "All that glitters is not gold", they should adopt this policy. However, it could only be done, if all the details, including as to how much amount is pending from the Punjab Government and these are the after affects as the Registrar has suggested in the note, is brought to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is correct. They would be bringing a consolidated document as suggested by the members. In the meanwhile, could they write a letter to the Colleges, because several Colleges have already deposited the amount?

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they write the letter, it would be known to everyone that such and such Colleges are the defaulters. However, at the moment, none knew as to which College is the defaulter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) is not talking about issuing a circular; rather, he is suggesting writing of letters to the individual Colleges, who have not deposited the fees of the students.

It was informed that majority of the Colleges out of the 18 have deposited the fees. A message would go that at least the examination fee, which is due, should be deposited with the University. So far as the issue of late fee/fine is concerned, the same would be tackled later on.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua astonished to know that even the examination fee has also not deposited.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that instead of writing an individual letter, they should make phone calls to the Principals of the concerned Colleges.

It was said that an observation had come that Finance and Development Officer should not be writing to the Principals of the affiliated Colleges. In fact, the responses started coming only when the Finance and Development Officer wrote to the Colleges concerned. Earlier, he was not used to write to the affiliated Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not have any objection in writing by the Finance and Development Officer. What he is saying is that for effective monitoring, the communication should go from the Examination Branch or the Controller of Examinations.

It was informed that whenever any letter was written by the Finance and Development Officer, a copy of the same was always sent to the Controller of Examinations.

Summarizing the discussion, the Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, they would come to the Syndicate with the consolidated information/proposal for taking a policy decision. In the meanwhile, the Controller of Examinations, Finance and Development Officer and Dean, College Development Council, would pursue this matter with the Principals of the Colleges, which have not deposited the fees of the SC/ST students admitted under the post-matric scholarship scheme, and persuade them to deposit the same at the earliest.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is correct that when one knew that since he/she is studying, he/she has to pay the fees. In this, neither the University is at fault nor the Colleges because the Government has framed such a policy. Under the policy of the Government, neither the University could do anything nor the Colleges and what could the students do?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though so much mockery of the University has been made, none praised the University for allowing the students to appear in the examinations and declaring their results in spite of the fact that the fees had been not received for the two years. However, people starting criticizing the University for withholding the DMCS, Degrees, etc. In the meantime, none put pressure on the Government saying that it looked very bad for them as they themselves felt that fees was required to be paid to the University. Whom the Government was supposed to pay? The Government was supposed pay the amount to the Colleges. What pressure the Colleges exerted on the Government? The Principals of Colleges affiliated to Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, held a Press Conference in Jalandhar about two

months ago and they had threatened the Punjab Government. They should tell him as what the Principals of the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University have done.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they had 190 Colleges and the problem is only about 18 Colleges. All others had paid or are paying the fees. All the affiliated Colleges have admitted SC/ST students. Certain Colleges had attracted the SC/ST students to get admissions so that their maximum seats are filled up. They (Colleges) should have asked the SC/ST students to pay at least the examination fee. They needed to look into the issue from this perspective also.

**RESOLVED:** That the request of the College is deferred for the time being and in order to take a comprehensive policy decision, a detailed report regarding issue be placed before the Syndicate. In the meantime, the Controller of Examination and Dean College Development Council shall obtain the list of defaulters from the office of the Finance Development Officer and pursue the concerned College(s) to remit the examination fee and/or late fee.

- 15.** Considered minutes dated 28.02.2019 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Student Aid Fund Administration Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider the applications received from the students of teaching departments/VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur, and USOL for financial assistance out of Student Aid Fund for the session 2018-19.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Student Aid Fund Administration Committee dated 28.02.2019, for financial assistance out of Student Aid Fund for the session 2018-19, **as per appendix**, be approved.

- 16.** Considered request dated 29.03.2019 of Ms. Madhu Kataria, A.T.O., G-II, Department of Botany for grant of extension in service for 2 years after attaining the age of 60 years, pursuant to the judgement dated 03.08.2016 of Punjab & Haryana High Court, in CWP No.25972 of 2015- titled as Jagiwan Singh Vs State of Punjab & Others and orders issued by Superintendent, Department of Higher Education, Education Branch I, Govt. of Punjab vide Memo No. 5/16/2016-2/1194014/1 dated 22.03.2018 and Memo No. 5/16/2018-2/1440004/1 dated 14.03.2019. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. Board of Finance in its meeting dated 28.11.2017 (Item No.3) considered the representation of Professor Vijay Nagpal, Department of Laws, for enhancement in age of retirement by two years on account of P.H./disability giving reference of Judgement of Hon'ble High Court in CWP No. 7233 of 2010, GOI Office memorandum dated 31.03.2014 and circular dated 11.12.2014 issued by Chandigarh Administration which referred to Punjab Government circular 17/20/2010-2PP2/132 dated 19.11.2014. After a great deal of discussion and the comments of MHRD/UGC, it was decided that the matter be referred to the Regulations Committee to make necessary amendment in the relevant Regulations to give effect to the provisions of Punjab Government rules governing retirement age of a physically handicapped person.
  2. The Regulations Committee in its meeting dated 20.04.2018 (item 35) considered the recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 28.11.2017 with regard to enhancement in



age of retirement for two years in respect of Physically Handicapped/Disability employees and it was resolved that the item be referred back to the D.R. (Estt.) with the following observation:

**The Committee observed that as per Punjab Govt. letter No. 10/80/2016-3FP.2/210 dated 22.5.2017, the Punjab Government employees who have been appointed under Physically Handicapped category and whose retirements age has already been 60 years, cannot avail two years optional enhancement. The instructions in no way can be interpreted as retirement age of handicapped category upto 62 years.**

3. After the receipt of the observation from the D.R. (Estt.) the matter was again placed before the Regulations Committee in its meeting dated 26.10.2018 (Item 26) wherein the Committee noted that Regulation 17.3 under Chapter 'condition of service of University employees' appearing at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, would remain the same as the then Vice-Chancellor had passed orders that **"Not permissible to extend to 62 years"**
4. After having a perusal of the papers available in the personal file of Ms. Madhu Kataria, it reveals that her appointment has not been made against the post reserved for PWD. Her request for want of conveyance allowance on account of 100% deafness was not acceded to by the University.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that Ms. Madhu Kataria is a physically handicapped employee. Earlier also, this case had come to the Syndicate and was sent to the Regulations Committee. At that time, a notification of Punjab Government was attached with it, in which it was written that extension in service for two years, i.e., from 58 years to 60 years, is to be given to these persons (physically handicapped). People represented and after getting it processed, ultimately it was decided that it be sent to the Regulations Committee for framing of regulation, because if they talk about retirement age, it is a regulation. So when it went to the Regulations Committee, it was observed that extension in service is to be given for two years, i.e., from 58 years to 60 years, whereas in the University the retirement age is already 60 years. A lot of discussion took place in the meeting of the Regulations Committee on the issue whether they could give further extension for two years, i.e., beyond the age of 60 years. Ultimately, it was sent back. Then the people might have represented again and when the file went to the Vice Chancellor again, he wrote "It is not tenable up to 62 years". However, now there are certain documents, which were not there at that time wherein, they are talking about a Court case and the Court has clearly said that it is for two years and it should be given from 60 years to 62 years and on the basis of this, Punjab Government has also allowed extension in service beyond the age of 60 years, i.e., 60 years to 62 years. Keeping in view this that the things, which were not in their knowledge earlier, have come to their knowledge now, they have to take a final decision as to what could be given to Physically Handicapped persons. At the moment, in principle, no such policy has been framed in the University. He believed that it must go for framing the policy. Second issue is, as to what should they do to this individual case?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Punjab Government and Court has allowed extension in service for two years (from 60 years to 62 years) to Physically Handicapped persons.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they like to cover it under a policy, it could only be done as a rule. If they cover it under regulation, then they have to seek the approval of Government of India. He believed that there would be no harm if they cover it under a policy by framing a rule as had been done in the case of Principals of affiliated Colleges. They would remain in service but would not get any increment and remain separate to the regular service.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be done as has been done by the Punjab Government.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that after retirement only extension in service for two years could be allowed.

The Vice Chancellor enquired should they now give extension in service for two years to Ms. Madhu Kataria, A.T.O., G-II, Department of Botany? Since they did not have policy, how could it be done without the policy?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first, they should frame the policy.

The Vice Chancellor said that first the policy is to be framed and only then this case could be considered.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is policy of the Punjab Government, is it applicable to the faculty members of the University? For framing the policy, a Committee could either be appointed by the Vice Chancellor himself or the Syndicate.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that it would take time to frame the policy, but what would happen to this case?

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to cooperate as he would be appointing a Committee under his (Shri Ashok Goyal) Chairmanship and he could take couple of other persons in the Committee to frame the policy at the earliest.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that even if the policy is framed by tomorrow, the same would be applicable prospectively and not retrospectively. However, the concern of all of them is as to what could be done to the case under consideration. Whenever they take into consideration individual cases, they land into problem. What happened is that Professor Navdeep Goyal is saying that whatever policy is to be framed, it should be separate from the Regulations or it could be framed by amending the relevant Regulations and there is no other alternative. If the policy is to be framed after amending the Regulations, it is long drawn process. If after framing the policy, they want to make it a part of rule, then it would not be as per Punjab Government, which they want to follow. This is to be kept in mind that then extension could not be done; rather, re-employment is to be made, whereas earlier, he was also of the same view, but then the views of Dr. K.K. Sharma came to his mind. If they have to amend the regulations, they have to await approval of the Government of India. However, if they framed the rules, it would not be inconsonance with Punjab Government. He is telling them these things because if he put these things in the Committee, they might not say that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) kept quiet in the Syndicate meeting and in the meeting of the Committee, he is talking in another way. Earlier also, such issues had come to the Syndicate. Since perhaps at that time the candidates were the teachers, they left the issue in between as the teachers could be re-employed up to the age of 60 years. Had they taken up this issue seriously and pursued it with the Punjab Government, they

might have reached at a positive conclusion and the non-teachers would have got benefitted. In the end, he said that in view of the instant Regulations, it could not be done even though it related to deaf and dumb.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are two ways – (i) amendment of Regulations for giving extension in service for two years beyond the age of 60 years which is a long process; and (ii) they should see as to what could be done for them as a special case.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since the Syndicate is empowered to frame rules, rules for giving extension in service for two years beyond the age of 60 years should be framed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not complicate the issue more. Sometimes they take decision emotionally. He is one with all who say that Regulations and Rules of Punjab Government are applicable to the non-teaching employees of the University. Should they make the retirement of non-teaching employees 58 years as retirement age of employees of Punjab Government is 58 years. People go where they are benefitted more. He, therefore, suggested that they should take a conscious decision with a view to help maximum people, avoiding any kind of embarrassment to the university also so that nobody can raise a finger. According to instant Regulations, the case of Dr. Madhu Kataria could not be covered. If they want to frame the rules, as a rule making body, they must take into consideration what the Punjab Government says. However, as per the Act, they could frame their own rule stating that they (Deaf and Dumb persons) could be given re-employment for two years (one year at a time) or re-employment for two years in one go.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he wanted to bring to their kind notice the case of P.P. Sharda vs. State of Punjab. In Punjab Government, the retirement age is 58 years and it allowed extension in service for two years, i.e., up to the age of 60 years. Thereafter, a representation came and the extension of P.P. Sharda was objected to by the Audit and his extension was got rejected. After rejection, he approached the Court and the Court granted him stay on the plea that extension in service for two years is for all, but for the handicapped, two years are more and the same should be given to him. He urged that the said case should be studied.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, the case referred to by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, has been appended with the agenda item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are of the view that this case should be done, but the problem is how it could be done because if the regulations are to be amended, it is a long drawn process. Therefore, it could only be done by framing the rule(s). If the Punjab Government is giving the benefit, it should be given to the University employees.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to what would happen to Dr. Madhu Kataria.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be covered in the policy, which they would frame.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the policy should be framed at the earliest possible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in view of the instant regulations, the request of Dr. Madhu Kataria, A.T.O., G-II, Department of Botany, could not be acceded to.

**RESOLVED:** That the request dated 29.03.2019 of Ms. Madhu Kataria, A.T.O., G-II, Department of Botany, for grant of extension in service for 2 years after attaining the age of 60 years, be **not** accepted.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to frame policy for grant of extension in service, to the Physically Handicapped/Disability employees, after attaining the age of superannuation.

- 17.** Considered if Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XII**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and The Institute of Vedic and Astrological Sciences, 1109, Sector 123, SAS Nagar, Mohali (Punjab), be executed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that particulars of the party/institution with which this MoU is being executed have not been given. They must know that the Institution with which they are signing an MoU is engaged in teaching and research. Secondly, it has been written at page 205 of the appendix that “Provided that in no case share of Party 2 shall exceed 40% of the fee of these courses”. Till date, perhaps they have not entered into any agreement with any society/party regarding sharing of fee. Instead of sharing fee, they could invite the faculty for delivering lectures and make more payment to them for this purpose, etc. These kinds of benefit could be given but the fees cannot be shared. Though they are executing the MoU with them, they did not know the credentials of the party – whether it is a Society or Institution. Otherwise, they authorised the Vice Chancellor to execute the MoU after taking care of the points raised by him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that here if his help is felt, he should be called at any time. According to him, the MoU, which is under consideration, has been poorly drafted. From it, it could not be known as to which party it belonged to. He suggested that it should be got corrected.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Okay”.

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

- 18.** Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 05.04.2019 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that:

- (i) LLD degree (*Honoris Causa*) be conferred on Dr. Sudha N. Murthy, Trustee, Infosys Foundation, Bangalore.

**NOTE:** 1. The Section 23 of the PU Act at page 9, P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“Where the Vice-Chancellor and not less than two-thirds of the other members of the Syndicate recommend that an honorary degree be conferred on any person on the ground that he is, in their opinion, by reason of eminent position and attainments, a fit and proper person to receive such a degree and where their recommendation is supported by not less than two-thirds of the Fellows present at a meeting of the Senate and is confirmed by the Chancellor, the Senate may confer on such person the honorary degree so recommended

without requiring him to undergo any examination.”

2. Bio-Data of Dr. Sudha N. Murthy enclosed.

- (ii) Dr. K. Sivan, Chairman, ISRO & Secretary, Department of Space, Bangalore, be awarded Vigyan Rattan, for the year 2019.

**NOTE:** Bio-data of Dr. K. Sivan enclosed.

Keeping in view the technicality involved and to fulfil the requirement of Regulations, the members were of the unanimous view that special meetings of the Syndicate and the Senate should be convened to consider the issue of conferment of *Honoris Causa* Degree on Dr. Sudha N. Murthy and Vigyan Rattan on Dr. K. Sivan.

The Syndicate approved, in principle, subject to the laid down procedure, to award *honoris causa* degree on Dr. Sudha N. Murthy, Trustee, Infosys Foundation, Bangalore and Vigyan Rattan on Dr. K. Sivan. It was also resolved on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor that no cash payment will be made on various awards to be conferred on eminent persons in their fields.

**RESOLVED:** That, in view of the requirement of Section 23 of the PU Act 1947, afresh proposal be submitted.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That special meeting of the Senate in this regard will be held on April 21, 2019.

**19.**

Considered if, the temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to the Institute of Management C/o DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh, under (DAV College Management, New Delhi) for M.B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> year Course, for the session 2018-19.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 21) (**Appendix-XIII**) considered the temporary affiliation, to newly proposed Institute namely – Institute of Management, C/o DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh, under (DAV College Management, New Delhi), for M.B.A. course -1<sup>st</sup> year (60 seats), for the session 2017-18 and it was resolved that temporary affiliation to newly proposed Institute, namely, Institute of Management, DAV College Campus, Sector-10, Chandigarh, (under DAV College Management, New Delhi), for M.B.A. course -1<sup>st</sup> year (60 seats), for the session 2017-18, as recommended by the affiliation Committee dated 17.07.2017 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor as authorized by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9) be granted subject to the fulfilment of the following conditions:

- (i) the requirement of land for the proposed Institute be got separated from the master plan of land allotted to DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh;
- (ii) that for the current session the admissions be made on the basis of CAT score;

- (iii) the four teachers transferred from the DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh to the proposed Institute be treated on deputation for a period of six months;
  - (iv) the process for appointment of required faculty be initiated.
2. The affiliation Committee in its meeting dated 13.07.2018 decided that no admission be made in M.B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> year until and unless the institute comply with the conditions.
  3. The Director/Principal, Institute of Management has been informed vide letter dated 06.04.2019 (**Appendix-XIII**) that no process of admission for M.B.A. course for the session 2019-20 be undertaken till the decision for extension of affiliation for M.B.A. course for the session 2018-19 is taken by the competent authority of P.U.
  4. An office note along with date wise sequence of events regarding extension of affiliation for the session 2018-19 is enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua requested that they should be briefed about the item as well as of the sequence of events.

It was informed that the item is to consider if, the temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to the Institute of Management C/o DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh, under (DAV College Management, New Delhi) for M.B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> year Course, for the session 2018-19 and at page 19 of the Appendix, the sequence of events regarding extension of affiliation for MBA to Institute of Management, C/o DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh, for the session 2018-19 have been given and a note mentioning events chronologically has also been appended with the item at the end. The brief summary is that first of all an Inspection Committee visited the College and thereafter, the Survey Committee. The Inspection Committee pointed out certain deficiencies in its report and recommended that the Institute be given 3 months' time to meet the deficiencies. After six months, when the report was obtained on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2018, the situation remained unchanged. On the basis of that, now the item has come that the situation had not changed since the start of the Institute and now, what is to be done so far as affiliation to the Institute is concerned.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan stated that the Dean, College Development Council has informed that the Inspection Committees had visited the College and imposed certain conditions. So far as condition with regard to appointment of teachers is concerned, the salary to the teachers is being paid as per the UGC grades and the same is sent to their respective accounts. So far as land is concerned, they have specifically showed the land in the map that this is the land for the Institute. They have also obtained approval from the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE). First the NOC was obtained from the Chandigarh Administration and, thereafter, the entire process was started. A list of Vice-Chancellor's nominees was sent by the University, the candidates are applying and everything was being done, but the Vice-Chancellor's nominee(s) is/are not reporting. When the Vice-Chancellor's nominee did not report, it delayed the conduct of interview at least by 3-4 months. Then they have to seek another panel, which took time and then it also took time to fix the interview. These are the things due to which the delay is occurring. He further stated that if they talk about the students and their careers, session 2018-19 is almost at the

stage of completion, and if they talk about the future of the students, the result is appended in the end. If they see the merit, four students of the Institute are in the merit of the University in the 1<sup>st</sup> Semester and 5 students are in the merit of 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester. Similarly, if they talked about placement, the first batch which is out, almost 30 plus students out of 40 students have been placed in good companies on handsome packages. He, therefore, would like to make a humble request that keeping in view the careers of the students, the case of the Institute should be seen optimistically.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the process of affiliation is going on for the last about two years. The Inspection Committee had imposed certain conditions and the report of the Inspection Committee was placed before the Syndicate. Since new Institution was to be established, it was decided that the final decision should be taken by the Syndicate. The conditions had also been mentioned in the Syndicate decision. One of the important issues was that the Institution was started by getting the faculty members transferred from DAV College, and they had told them that 'No', they should be sent back to their previous Institution, and they should recruit new faculty for this Institute. Second issue was that if it is an Institute, Director must be there. Thereafter, certain deficiencies in infrastructure were pointed out. He did not think those deficiencies would be still there, and if those are still there, it could be known to the Dean, College Development Council. So far as Director is concerned, it is true that they had appointed the Director once, but the person concerned did not join. Then they re-advertised the post of Director and, thereafter, whatever happened is known to everyone, but they should not enter into any kind of blame game. It had also happened few times that the Institute did not consult the Vice-Chancellor's nominee(s). Generally, it is always written while sending the panel that the date of interview should be fixed in consultation with the Vice-Chancellor's nominee(s) and here the mistake is on the part of DAV Management. However, they should not enter into the blame game. Somehow, the matter got delayed. Once the interview was fixed even in consultation with the Vice-Chancellor's nominee, but then the other experts did not go. This problem persisted there. Finally, the panel has been given by the University and interview was also being fixed in consultation with the Vice-Chancellor's nominee(s), but then the elections were announced and once the elections are announced, the Vice-Chancellor's nominee(s) could not commit mistake on his (Vice Chancellor) behalf to conduct the interview during the time when the model code of conduct is in force. Obviously, whatever interview(s) would be conducted, those would be after the completion of the election to the Parliament. Or the DAV Management would take permission of the Election Commission. He did not know whether they have written in this respect or not. In fact, there were two issues and the other was with respect to the faculty. The Institute had appointed the faculty, but there was issue of quorum and perhaps, correspondence is going on between the office of the Dean, College Development Council and DAV Management in this regard. Obviously, they are getting letter that quorum was not there in the meeting of the Selection Committee and when the quorum is not there, approval could not be granted by the University. When the approval could not be granted, they have to redo whole process again. He could not say whether approval could be given or not because if it could be done, the issue of faculty would be solved. Thirdly, since almost two years have completed and Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan has talked about the first year. Placement of students might have been made and the students would join their respective companies later on as they have yet to pass the examination. It seemed that the placements are good. Since they always keep the careers of the students in view, they should ask the Institute to fulfil/comply with the conditions. If they approved it today, then it would become a precedent that even though the conditions were not fulfilled/complied with, the Syndicate gave approval. However, since the conditions are such, those could not be fulfilled before 15<sup>th</sup> of June 2019. Hence, they should permit them to allow the students to appear in the University examination. They should not do something owing to which the students face problem, but the final approval should be given only after

verifying that the Institute has fulfilled/complied with all the conditions as far as 2018-19 is concerned. This is his opinion. Obviously, if they fulfilled/complied with the conditions, there would not be any problem while giving affiliation for next year, i.e., 2019-20. However, if they still did not fulfil/comply with the conditions, approval could not be given even for next year also. They could not give message from here that whether one fulfilled/complied with the conditions or not, but they allowed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would only like to make the House aware. In fact, he thought that the subject would be introduced by the Vice-Chancellor because in this a lot of correspondence had taken place and every day it is appearing in the newspapers. Their own members of the Senate are also writing strong worded letters on the issue. Hence, he was feeling that perhaps, the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor would introduce this subject as to what the actual issue is. He is observing that several things are going on in his (Vice-Chancellor) mind, but he did not know why he did not want to share those things with the House.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "No". Nothing such thing is there. The position is, what has been disclosed by the Dean, College Development Council.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever decision they take, but at least the facts should be known to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that only those facts, which have been told by them, are known to him and nothing more than that. As had been told that no informal talks took place, he is not happy with that.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not informal, it is formal as they have to formally consult the Vice-Chancellor's nominee(s) and fix the date for the interview, which generally is the system. However, they (DAV Management) generally did not consult the Vice-Chancellor's nominee(s) and fix the date of interview at their own. He felt that perhaps once the Vice-Chancellor's nominee had gone there and as per the Vice-Chancellor's nominee, the screening was not in accordance with the regulations/rules/procedures and he did not approve that. Again, the Vice-Chancellor's nominee had gone, but the other experts did not come and the quorum could not be completed. Twice the Vice-Chancellor's nominee had gone, but got conducted the interview without the quorum. The proceedings of the Selection Committee were submitted in the office of the University and at least four members were required to sign the proceedings, but signatures of only three members were there. Though four names have been mentioned, the proceedings have been signed by only three members. One of the Vice-Chancellor's nominees had even written that though so and so who was selected as Director, has refused to join, and has also refused to sign, as he did not join. How he was allowed to sit in the interview? He had talked to the Vice-Chancellor's nominee, who told him how did he know if he (Director) has joined or not? They told him, he is the Director and he (Vice-Chancellor's nominee) said right. However, when the turn to sign came, he (person, who was appointed as Director) said he could not sign, because he has not joined. Then he recorded those facts on the proceedings of the Selection Committee, but the other Vice-Chancellor's nominee did not record even that. Those selection proceedings had been submitted in the University office, but it is the discretion of the dealing official as to when to start the process. Usually, they kept such things pending with them. Since he was also a member of the Affiliation Committee, in the absence of Chairman of the Affiliation Committee, namely, Dr. Satish Sharma, he happened to preside over some of the meetings of the Affiliation Committee. In one such meeting or maybe two such meetings, this case also came up for consideration. The Affiliation Committee had given time twice or thrice to this College to remove the deficiencies and requested the same Inspection Committee to visit the College again. The Inspection Committee visited the College, but they were asked to come after three weeks. The Inspection Committee



again went to the College exactly after three weeks and reported here that the situation is not good there. Hence, the Affiliation Committee declined the affiliation to the Institute. However, before declining affiliation by the Affiliation Committee, an intimation was sent to the College that they should not make admission to the course for the session 2018-19 till all the deficiencies are removed. The very next day of the writing of the letter by the University, they started making admissions to the course in violation of the instructions of the University. When asked, they told that that they did not receive any letter. It should not be taken otherwise. He knew this because the Colleges always say that they did not receive this letter. However, they did not know that it is known to him (Shri Ashok Goyal) that they had not sent the letter through post, but through e-mail. How it could not be received; rather the same would have been received within few seconds/minutes. Because it was received, they started admissions to the course from the next day. Moreover, this fact was also brought to the notice of the Affiliation Committee that the teachers, who they are claiming, the quorum was not complete in the case of their selection. Third fact is that the Vice-Chancellor's nominee had given in writing that the person, who was appointed as Director, refused to join, but the Honorary Director gave in writing to the University that the Director had joined, and resigned next day. On the one side, it is being said that the Director did not join, and on the other side, they are giving in writing that the Director had joined and resigned next day. After three days, another letter came stating that the Director did not join. A letter gone from the University to inform whether the Director had joined or not and his joining and resignation letter should be sent, but till date no reply to that has been received. Considering all these things, the Affiliation Committee declined the affiliation to the Institute on that date. Thereafter, they represented, the regular Chairman of the Affiliation Committee came and presided over the meeting of the Affiliation Committee and that Committee in its wisdom again gave them three months time to remove the deficiencies. The idea was as to how much session would be left after three months. Now, it has come to his notice from the office note that they had themselves disclosed so many things. For example, regarding the directive of the Inspection Committee for appointment of non-teaching staff, they have themselves said that they have outsourced it and appointed persons on contract basis. They have not provided several other things. Inspection Committee had also pointed out that they are not paying salary to the teachers, who alleged to have been appointed by them, as per the University/UGC regulations/rules. When Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that he had the documents, which showed that they are paying salary to the teachers, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they might have started paying salary to the teachers now. In fact, he himself was going to say that Principal Mahajan has told that now they are paying the salary to the teachers. It meant, they accept that they were not paying salary during the previous two years. The documents regarding payment of salary, which Principal Mahajan is talking about, are of present period, whereas he is seeking documents for the months September/October 2018 or when the Inspection Committee had visited the Institute because he could not doubt the findings of the Inspection Committee, which told that the salaries are not being paid to the teachers. It is good that they have now corrected. Their basic purpose is not to close down any course; rather to put them on right track. Now, the item, which has come, is for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2018-19. As told by Professor Navdeep Goyal, one year is going to be completed and degree of the first batch students is going to be completed. The students, who have completed one year, could not be left in-between. Whatever position is, they should ask them that the degree of such students should be got completed, but it is not in the item because the item is relating to grant of temporary extension of affiliation only for the session 2018-19 as it has been written "to consider if, the temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to the Institute of Management C/o DAV College, Sector-10, Chandigarh, under (DAV College Management, New Delhi) for M.B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> year Course, for the session 2018-19". For the session 2018-19, it is only a *fait accompli* as they could not do anything. They have to allow the students to complete their degree. Let them not go into the reasons as to why they have given affiliation to the Institute late, but they have to be very-very conscious

about the future that such things are not repeated. Professor Navdeep Goyal has told that a decision was taken by the Syndicate in which four conditions were imposed and one of the conditions was that the teachers, who have been sent there, would be treated on deputation. Another condition was that they would get the land, on which the Institute has been started, separated. For that, the College has replied that they have prepared the map and shown separate land for the Institution. They have shown the land separate in the map, which is objectionable. To show separate land in the map and have separate land for the Institute are entirely two different things. Separate land meant, to get the land separated in the revenue record of the concerned authority and this was the report of the Survey Committee. He has seen such an Institution for the first time where the Inspection Committee visited before the Survey Committee, whereas the Survey Committee usually visits the Institution/College before the Inspection Committee. However, in this case the Survey Committee visited the Institution after four days of the visit of the Inspection Committee. Not only this, the Inspection Committee, except one of the members, had even recommended grant of affiliation to the Institution before the visit of the Survey Committee. It seemed to him that perhaps this institute knew whether it did something or not, nobody could stop the grant of affiliation to the institution. The decision which they took in this case was termed by some people as if they are against the institution. It is very unfortunate that whenever he raise/discuss any issue objectively about any institution, certain people felt as if he is against them, whereas he did not have any intention to close down any Institution/College. However, one thing he would like to tell is that if the affiliation is related to the session 2018-19, i.e., for the students who had studied in 1<sup>st</sup> year in 2018-19 and would now go to the 2<sup>nd</sup> year in 2019-20 (as per this agenda item), then they have to take a decision for them separately. But if they asked them to fulfil the conditions for the session 2019-20 by such and such date, it would probably be wrong. Perhaps, the Dean, College Development Council did not know about the facts of the case and he thought that even some of the members might also not be aware of the fact that if they did not fulfil the conditions for affiliation for the last year, they are not eligible to apply for affiliation for next year. But what is happening in the University is that about 50-70 per cent Colleges did not fulfil the conditions, even then they are applying for grant of affiliation for the next year. Not only this, they are applying for new courses as well. Perhaps, Professor Navdeep Goyal might be remembering that in the year 2016 they had decided that if any College did not fulfil the condition laid down in the previous year, they would not entertain their case for grant of affiliation. Hence, this case should have been halted at the level of the Dean, College Development Council. Had their application been not entertained, the Inspection Committee might not have visited the Institute? He is saying all this on the strength of regulations relating to affiliation, which are there in the Calendar. Keeping this in mind, as to how they have to satisfy their Fellows that there is no favouritism and no policy of pick and choose has been adopted, though an impression is being given in the news appearing in the newspapers, which is objectionable also that though the affiliation to the Institute for the session 2018-19 is not yet regularized as they have not fulfilled the conditions for affiliation, they are giving the notice in the newspapers for admission to the session 2019-20, under the nose of the University. He is sorry to point out that though the notice for admission for the session 2019-20 has appeared in the newspapers, the University is sitting silently. They have claimed in the notice that the Institute is affiliated to Panjab University. Had he been working in the University, he would have given the same size of rebuttal in the next day's newspapers at the cost of the University that the claim made by the Institute that this Institute is affiliated to Panjab University, is misleading? The Institute should not have done this; rather it should have waited for some time. First, they should have got letter for grant of affiliation for the session 2018-19, and thereafter, they should have talked for affiliation for 2019-20 instead they had issued the notice for admission for the session 2019-20. Then it has happened that they are doing their own job and the University is doing its own job, and none should listen to each other. However, for the session 2019-20, they have to give a chance to the students of the session 2018-19. So far as 2019-20 is concerned, if they

(Institute) have applied for affiliation and their application is pending in the University office, they could entertain the same as per the regulations/rules. However, if it is not lying in the office of the University, they should not give concessions after concession.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council to clarify whether any notice has been served on the Institute regarding the notice issued by the Institute for admission to the session 2019-20?

It was clarified that they have already sent the notice to the Institute.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to ask as to when the Institute had issued the notice for admission and when the University directed the Institute not to go ahead with the admissions. When the Dean, College Development Council, was not able to explain, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the facts which are not known to him (Dean, College Development Council) are known to him (Shri Ashok Goyal). In fact, the letter which had been issued to the Institute, had been issued on his advice. He had asked the Dean, College Development Council to do so, so that tomorrow none could raise a finger towards the University. He had told him (Dean, College Development Council) that the Institute had issued the advertisement and the same had been issued several days before. When he read this in the newspaper, he checked and told the Dean, College Development Council that the letter sent by him, is not correct, at least they should keep their hands clean.

The Vice Chancellor said one thing he would like to tell them very clearly that let they cooperate and help each other. The friendship should not be at the cost of Panjab University. The people, wherever they are, should discharge their responsibilities. When it was not done, they should not have advertised it. This is their failure. They hope that only the Vice Chancellor, Syndicate or the Senate should solve all the problems. Fortunately, there are more than 50% teachers from the Colleges. He is very proud of it that they are the respected members from the colleges. The biggest problems are that of the Colleges only. Everything relating to Ministry of Human Resource Development, Chancellor's office, Women Commission and Women Empowerment are placed here. He could say that most of the respected members from the Colleges are very alert.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that whatever has been said by Shri Ashok Goyal is correct. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) is a very respected member of the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor knew it that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has full knowledge of this case, not only this case but also all the other cases. But, besides this, he would like to say something. First of all, Management is very serious to run this Institute. Secondly, in the last Syndicate meeting, he had requested to fix the meeting of the Selection Committee for appointment of Director. This meeting had to be held. This time that mistake did not occur which Shri Ashok Goyal is saying. The Management talked to Professor Rajat Sandhir, Vice Chancellor's nominee, for fixing the meeting, but the other members refused to attend the meeting on that day. Nearly after one month, the members, who have refused, were changed by him (Vice Chancellor). But, thereafter, the Code of Conduct got imposed. However, they have been asked to seek special permission from the Election Committee for holding the meeting of the Selection Committee for appointment of Director of the Institute so that condition imposed by the University is met with. The selection of three Assistant Professors and one Associate Professor was done, but the persons who were appointed were not at all aware whether there is any procedural lapse, so they are not at fault. They fulfil all the educational qualifications and other conditions. But whatever problem has been told by Shri Ashok Goyal, that is there. He would like to add one thing that in the University, there is proper column for quorum for holding the meeting of the Selection Committee, but for the meetings in the Colleges, they do not know about it and it is also not intimated by the University. Normally, the Vice Chancellor's nominee ensures that the quorum is

complete because he represents the Vice Chancellor. The Assistant Professors who were appointed had completed one year's service. He requested the Vice Chancellor that their appointment be approved, but it should not be quoted as precedent. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor whether the procedure was completed, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma replied in the affirmative. The interview for the post of Director would be held. As regards the issue relating to land for the Institute, the AICTE has agreed to it, but if it is to be changed in the revenue record, it is a bit long procedure, so they should give sometime to the Management and they should be specifically told that the MBA Institute should be separate to that of DAV College. As rightly said by Shri Ashok Goyal, the issue regarding paying of salary of Rs. 15600/- or 21600/- p.m. was underway. When the University wrote a letter, then they, after holding the meeting of the Management, resolved the issue. He informed that in that Institute, there is a software costing Rs.5 lacs, which is not there even in their University Business School. The students of UBS used to go to this Institute or to GGSD College to use that software. This shows that their intention is to run the Institute, so they should give them sometime. They would not intend to dilute any rules/regulations; rather, they would get the rules and regulations followed by the Institute. He reiterated his request to approve the appointments of the faculty and as regards the other five conditions imposed on them, a letter might be written to them to comply with the conditions. He requested that they should be given sometime and he is very sure that they would comply with the conditions. If they did not comply with the conditions, the Syndicate is there.

The Vice Chancellor wanted to know from the members as to what could be done with regard to the approval of faculty as requested by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they cannot do anything about it, but if there is any way, he (Vice Chancellor) could do it. However, in his opinion, there is no such way, because if the Selection Committee is faulty, the whole process becomes vitiated.

The Vice Chancellor said, perhaps, the quorum was not complete.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if there is anything with the Dean College Development Council with regard to the quorum for the meeting of the Selection Committee in Colleges and whether it is intimated, he should explain about it.

It was informed that the selection in question were made one year ago and what was done at that time, he did not know about it, but as per the P.U. Calendar, four member are required to complete the quorum.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this quorum is for the Selection Committees conducted by the University, but no mention is there with regard to the quorum for the Selection Committees conducted by the Colleges.

It was informed that it is not known whether there is any quorum or not, but the minutes of the Selection Committee which were received on 28<sup>th</sup> August, bear the names of four experts, but signatures of only three persons were there, which was shocking. Had there been no question of quorum, there would have been no need to mention the names of the experts and they could have just written the name of the Chairman of the Committee, Vice Chancellor's Nominee and name of the expert. When this was sent back for clarification, they did not respond. That is still on record, which cannot be withdrawn/quashed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he wanted to supplement it, they do commit mistakes. They adopted UGC regulations and started following those regulations for making Selection Committees, where the University has to provide five experts and the

college has to invite two experts out of those five experts. That is not a part of their Calendar, but it is part of UGC Regulations, which they have adopted. The UGC has clearly mentioned that at least four persons would constitute the quorum. But he is sorry to say that when this is asked from the office, the office is not able to give a pinpoint reply, i.e., whether the quorum is required or not, or as to how many members would be required to complete the quorum. In such a situation, what the Vice Chancellor or Vice Chancellor's nominee could do. They have taken the decisions themselves and these are followed in other colleges. How could they accept that it is not known to anybody in such a big institute? The other thing, which he does not like to tell, in order to set that thing right, the three persons who have signed on the Selection Committee proceedings, when it was pointed out and, perhaps the approval was declined by the University. Thereafter, the fourth member also signed on that proceedings of that Selection Committee and with his name it was written 'Director (Designate)'. It means, he is Director (Designate) for whole life to come and his signatures could be obtained at any time. As on date, there are two Selection Committee proceedings lying in the University for one Selection. One has signatures of three members and other has signatures of four members. If tomorrow, someone asked for the proceedings of this Committee under R.T.I., they have to give both the proceedings. If both the proceedings were given, what would be the plight of Panjab University?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she is not speaking about this particular case only, though it is very important. But during last some time she has come across such cases of the colleges wherein the situation is very pitiable. The affiliated colleges are having their own way of doing everything and they say that they damn bother about the University. There are such things which the colleges have to send the University on yearly basis, but they did not receive any notice from the University, even 10-15 year old colleges are violating it. They say that they have not received any notice from the University. So, they have to streamline themselves first.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what has been summarised.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are talking about the session 2018-19. They (Institute) could be given time to complete the conditions for 2018-19. To his mind, the prime condition is with regard to the appointment of Director and approval of appointment of faculty. If the approval of appointment could be given, it is okay; otherwise, they have to hold the interview again.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the teachers, who were selected, have no fault of their own because they are not aware as to what should have been the quorum.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the members sitting here are well educated, but the impression, he has got is that, in this case, the procedure has not been properly followed. Then how they could help them, and they should also think on this point also. He would like to say that he is not against anyone. One thing is that the quorum was not complete in the Selection Committee. Secondly, there are two Selection Committee proceedings for the one selection, which is another problem. They should not do something, which might create another problem for them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, that is why, he is saying to conduct the interview afresh.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be better to hold the interview afresh, after all Panjab University has a name. Why should they plunge into such things unnecessarily?

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that he also agreed to what Professor Navdeep Goyal has said.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the situation under which they are passing through, inspections are being done in all the Colleges and they thought that the Syndicate would discuss about it. After viewing this position, do they think that they should conduct more inspections or would these inspections yield any fruit? Whether the conditions are imposed or not, it does not make any difference? Despite their writing a letter not to make admission, they did it. This makes no difference whether the teachers are there or not. Now they say they should approve the appointment of teachers for the sake of students. They have admitted the students when they were asked not to do so. So, who has done fraud, the University or the College? This College (DAV College) is a very big body. Had this been done by a small college, then what would have been their decision?

The Vice Chancellor said that now the students of 2018-19 session are studying and, thereafter, the 2019-20 session would study. In such a situation one option is that the whole fee of the students should be deposited with the University and the teachers here would teach the students.

It was informed that such a thing was done earlier also.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that it should not happen that someone is committing the mistake and the University's image is maligned. The Vice Chancellor reiterated that one could keep friendly relations, but not at the cost of the University. People are taking it granted that they would get the things done, as has been stated by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it may be checked that with the presence of three members in the Selection Committee, many appointments had been approved in the past.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not like to get it checked. Let they should summarise it as to what is to be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should give them time to comply with the deficiencies. If they approve it, it would mean that they have approved it without any condition. It would be right to get the conditions fulfilled by 15<sup>th</sup> of June, 2019.

The Vice Chancellor asked why do they not seek permission from the Election Commission to allow them to start the process for filling up the positions?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that they are trying to get permission and hopefully it would be granted.

Shri Sandeep Singh said it is also not known whether the permission would be granted or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the University should render every help to complete the process at the earliest, e.g., to approve the panel at the earliest so that they could advertise the posts and conduct the interviews, including for the post of Director.

The Vice Chancellor asked could it be right to give time up to 15<sup>th</sup> June to fill up the post(s) by the Institute?

Different members expressed different views about whether they could advertise the post or not.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Haryana Public Service Commission has given advertisement.

Shri Ashok Goyal was of the view that they could not advertise the post. On being told by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma that the Haryana Public Service Commission has given advertisement, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they did it with the permission of the Election Commission.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could advertise the posts even now.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, perhaps, they do not know as to how much difficult it is for the Standing Committee to act in a college because they treat them in a very derogatory manner. He is not talking about their college only, it happens in other colleges also. So the view of the Vice Chancellor is totally correct that the student of the session 2018-19 studying there should be brought to the University Institute of Applied Management Science. With this, they would be able to maintain the sanctity of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier also the students of MCA from one of the Colleges situated at Chandigarh were shifted to the University and penalty was also imposed on the college, the fee was taken by the University. Now, if the Vice Chancellor intends not to do it, then they would talk in that manner.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had no such intention, but his only purpose is that the name of Panjab University should not be maligned.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that the Institute of Management should be given time to comply with the conditions imposed on it.

The Vice Chancellor said that, perhaps, by doing so, they would be wasting their time.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is obvious because the next semester would start and if they are not able to comply with the conditions before the start of the next semester, then the University has to do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they might take any decision and they might give time, but before giving time, it should be seen whether he (Vice Chancellor) has the power to grant time. The Vice Chancellor might give time, but they all do only those things for which they do not have the power to do under the plea that let they should not harm the students, etc. Out of pity, they do give relaxation, but it is owing to such relaxations that nobody cares for the rules. Regulation 5.1 at page 159, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 is very clear, which states that "The affiliated college may apply for grant of extension of affiliation if it has already complied with all the conditions imposed for its affiliation". This Institute was given affiliation for the session 2017-18, but they did not comply with any of the conditions imposed on them. They, however, also granted affiliation for the session 2018-19 in violation of the said regulation. They have already given the affiliation and without going into the reasons as to how it has been given, who has given it, now what he is saying is that they have to take care of the fact that it should not happen for the year 2019-20. If they are giving time to fill the post by 15<sup>th</sup> June or so, that would mean that they are giving time keeping in mind to open the doors for 2019-20, which is not within his (Vice Chancellor) powers. Why? Because, Regulation 12 at page 161 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 says, "Every college must comply with all the conditions, imposed for grant of affiliation,

within the stipulated period, failing which affiliation may be withdrawn". But they have already given enough time and two years' have already passed. Now, their main concern is related to the students. They could take care of the interest of the students by shifting them somewhere in the University. If they feel, that such a mechanism is not viable, only then it should be thought to complete the course there. But, at least they should not give such a signal that the doors are still open. In the year 2010 also, this Institute had tried to start the Institution with the same name and at the same place, but it could not be done at that time. The same thing was brought in the year 2017 and the situation in which all this was done seemed as if they were adamant to do it in all conditions setting aside all the rules and regulations, and thus it was done. Therefore, whatever decision they have to take today, they should take it very carefully. They should not take the decision thinking that everything is alright there. He would like to tell that everything is not correct there. The Inspection Committee which had visited the Institute in the month of November, the Registrar and the Dean College Development Council were the members of that Committee. He (Vice Chancellor) should ask from them whether the information asked for by them from the Institute, was provided to them or not. If not, then they should say that the information was not provided. Some Professors had gone to inspect the Institute, but the Management of the Institute was aware that nobody could stop the affiliation because senior Professors were going there once, twice and then thrice, giving one month, two months or three months' time to comply with the conditions. So, they should take a decision keeping all these things in mind. He feels that they would not be able to get the land separated for the Institute. If they could do it, it would be a very good thing. However, if they are not able to do so, then they would give them some more time. For land separation, they have been giving them time since 2017 and now it is 2019, but they could not get the land separated so far. If all the conditions imposed for 2018-19 are fulfilled, then they have every right to present it to the Syndicate, as a special case, that it should be considered, keeping in view the peculiar circumstances. But today, if they open up that way for 2019-20, it would be much more. They should only allow the students of session 2018-19 to get the degree completed as they are not against the students. The University may get the degree completed here at the campus or at the Institute itself. But to his mind, to get the degree completed at the University Campus, would not be possible because the University Business School would not allow it, as it would affect the career of their (UBS) own students. The students of MBA Institute would not be willing to join UIAMS as their admission had been made on the basis of CAT. He does not want that the students are made to suffer. Whenever they talk about any issue relating to the students, they usually say how the students are at fault. So far as the appointment of teachers is concerned, it is argued as to what is the fault of teachers. If wrong procedure has been followed by the Institute concerned, someone has to suffer. In that case also, they would say as what is their fault and they should be regularised. There is no problem in regularising them if it is within their power. If tomorrow somebody questions them, they should be able to defend their action.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the Institute had not complied with the conditions imposed on them, as per University Regulations/Rules, he did not find any alternative but to withdraw the item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said there is no difficulty in withdrawing the item. Even the Affiliation Committee which was functioning on behalf of the Syndicate had also withdrawn it in accordance with the regulation. However, subsequently, the same Committee with few other members who had not attended the previous meeting, again revived the affiliation. Thus, they have already committed the violation.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the affiliation granted to the Institute was withdrawn by a Committee, why the same was revived by the other Committee.



Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if one is an employee of the Institute, he/she is supposed to watch the interest of the Institution as well. Suppose, one Committee was being chaired by him (Shri Ashok Goyal) and other by a person belonging to the Institute, it is imminent that he/she would definitely favour the Institute. Thus, the affiliation was withdrawn by the Committee headed by him and revived by the Committee headed by the person belonging to the Institute.

The Vice Chancellor said that according to him, the Fellows should not go in the Committee where there is conflict of interest.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that while forming a Committee, the clash of interest should also be taken into consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that as and when he goes as a member of the NAAC, a *pro forma* is got filled from them to the effect that they were not connected with the Institute to be visited during the last five years and are not supposed to be connected with the Institute in the coming five years also

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is done to ensure that there is no conflict of interest, but if the Committee is constituted only to ensure the favouritism, one is supposed to favour.

It was said that it meant that the students of 2018-19 are being allowed to appear in the examination as a special case.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that the Institute has not been granted affiliation. The office note also says that the examination of the students be got conducted and the Management of the Institute be given three months' time to fulfil the conditions. However, the Students' Return be accepted. On being asked whether they would allow the students to appear in the examination and the Management would be given three months' time, Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that it is what which has already been done. Now they are discussing the situation which is prevailing after those three months time. He suggested that the same status should be allowed to be continued. The students who are already studying in the Institute, should be allowed to continue and their examination be got conducted by the Panjab University till they complete their degree. So far as the case of affiliation is concerned, the same would be considered after compliance of the deficiencies.

It was said that now it is clear that affiliation for the year 2018-19 would be considered only after the conditions are fulfilled by the Institute.

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

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the student of M.B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> Year (Session 2018-19) be allowed to appear in the examination to be conducted by the Panjab University.

**20.** Considered the request dated 28.01.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**) of Dr. Ramesh Sahani, Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, to contest Lok Sabha Election, 2019. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIV**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** As per Rule 1 at page 137 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016, the Syndicate is the competent authority for grant of permission

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

to an employee to seek election of Parliament, Legislature/Local Bodies/ Municipal Corporation, etc.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the Lok Sabha Election are approaching fast, permission to Dr. Ramesh Sahani, Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology needed to be granted at the earliest.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that as per the documents appended with the item, permission had already been granted to him and orders issued.

It was clarified that, in fact, the mistake occurred on the part of the office. The request of Dr. Sahani for allowing him to seek election to the Lok Sabha was approved by the Hon<sup>ble</sup> Vice Chancellor as per rules, whereas the matter was required to be referred to the Syndicate. But the office did not read it properly and issued him the letter. Thereafter, they came to know that the letter was issued to him wrongly. So they thought the letter issued to him be withdrawn and the item be placed before the Syndicate for approval. On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal whether the said letter has been taken back from him, it was said that the letter has not been taken back so far from him, but the process has been started.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it is unfortunate that the orders of the Vice Chancellor were not read out carefully, how the office is functioning. He further enquired whether the item related to the grant of half pay leave to Dr. Sahani or for permission to contest the Election. He further said that Dr. Sahani has applied for leave on 28.1.2019 whereas the elections were announced in the month of March. How did he (Dr. Sahani) came to know that the elections are being held? He drew the attention of the House to Rule (xiii) at page No. 137 of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2016 which reads as under:

“1. A University employees shall apply for permission to seek election to Parliament, Legislature, Local Bodies like Municipal Corporation, Municipal Council, Zila Parishad, Block Samiti, Gram Panchayat & Cooperative Bodies, etc., as the case may be, through the Head of the Department/Branch and the Dean of University Instruction/Registrar within two weeks of the announcement of the date of election by the Election Commission or any other competent authority”.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the above rule, he (Dr. Sahani) was required to apply after the Election Commission has declared the dates. But, here, they have sanctioned him leave in the month of February. Even if, they have granted permission to contest the election, it is also wrong because the permission could be granted within two weeks of the announcement of the date of election by the Election Commission. The item had only come to them because it has been realised that it needed the permission of the Syndicate. Dr. Sahani has also applied for grant of half-pay leave, whereas he was supposed to apply for this, after acceptance of his nomination papers. Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to from which date they are sanctioning him half pay leave to which it was informed that he has just applied. This is what he is saying that they are getting it approved from the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he (Dr. Sahani) has applied for half pay leave w.e.f. 8.4.2019 to 23.5.2019.

Shri Ashok Goyal said what does it mean, he has yet to file his nomination papers? He read out Rule (xiii) (2) at page 137 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-III, 2016 which says that, A University employee who is permitted by the Syndicate to seek the above election and whose nomination papers have been accepted, shall proceed on leave of the kind due up to the date of election. According to this, he could



Shri Ashok Goyal said that he should have mentioned it in the application that he has filed his nomination after getting permission from the Syndicate and his nomination papers have been duly accepted by the Returning Officer.

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

**21.** Considered if:

- (i) the introduction of M.A. in Life Long and Rural Development two year degree course (4 semesters) w.e.f. the Academic session 2019-20, be approved.
- (ii) the Rules and Regulations for the above said course, be also approved.

**NOTE:** 1. The Faculty of Education in its meeting dated 30.03.2019 vide Item No. 3 has approved the recommendations dated 12.03.2019 of Board of Studies in Education for introduction and rule and Regulations for the said course.

2. The recommendations of the Faculty of Education dated 30.03.2019 have been approved by the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council.

3. An office note is enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the two items (Item 21 & 22) had come here after approval from the concerned Faculty. The first item related to the Faculty of Education. They would like to introduce M.A. in Life Long and Rural Development, two year degree course (4 semesters) w.e.f. the Academic session 2019-20. It has been approved by the Faculty of Education.

Professor Rajesh Gill asked, should they not attach the syllabus along with the items. She is not able to know as to what is M.A. in Life Long and Rural Development.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the syllabus is not placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the Item the name of the course is mentioned as M.A. in Life Long and Rural Development, which is confusing. It should have been M.A. in Life Long Learning and Rural Development.

The Vice Chancellor said that the contents of syllabus etc. have been approved by the Faculty.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, without the contents of the Syllabus, how they would come to know as to what would be taught in the course.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever syllabus contents have been recommended by the Academic Committee, they accept it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after approval by the Faculty, the item is placed before the Syndicate. Here, they have just to see the procedure or facility.

The Vide Chancellor said that to see the syllabus or contents is the domain of the Academic Committee or the Faculty.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it cannot be done in this way. It would mean that they are starting the courses blindly as they do not know as to what is the viability, desirability, need and to which section the course would serve, etc.

Professor Rajesh Gill said while referring to the minutes of meeting of the Faculty of Education held on March 30, 2019, at page 8 of table agenda papers, in the resolved part it has simply been mentioned, "Considered the agenda item and approved the recommendations of the Board of Studies in Education (meeting dated 12.3.2019) as per Appendix". There is no discussion at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that nothing has been mentioned here, even the fee structure has not been given. He asked as to what is the urgency in approving this item.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what is the resolved part.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the item be referred back to the Convener, Board of Studies to resubmit the case along with details with regard to viability, desirability, need of course, section and category to which it would serve, the potential students who would be joining the course, employability, fee structure etc.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the nomenclature of the Course should have been approved by the University Grants Commission. She wanted to know if M.A. in Life Long Learning and Rural Development is an approved course by the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Course might have been approved by the UGC, but they should bring the item with complete facts and details.

**RESOLVED:** That Item C-21 be referred back to the Convener, Board of Studies to resubmit the case along with details with regard to viability, desirability, need of course, employability, fee structure, etc. It be also verified whether the nomenclature of the said course exists in the list of approved courses of UGC.

**22.** Considered if, recommendations dated 30.03.2019 (Item No. 22) (**Appendix-XV**) of the Faculty of Science, for award of B.Sc. (General) degree to a student of B.Sc. (Hons.) under the framework of Honours School System (CBCS) passing out in 2019, be approved. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XV**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** The recommendations of the Faculty of Science dated 30.03.2019 have been approved by the Vice Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Academic Council.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a provision in B.Sc. (Hons. School) that when certain number of credits is obtained by a student and he/she wished to leave the course, he/she could be awarded B.Sc. Pass Course Degree. He further said, as per the regulation, a student could be promoted to M.Sc (Hons.) if he/she obtained 140 credits, and B.Sc. Pass Course Degree if he/she obtained 120 credits. However, the B.Sc. (Hons.) degree would be awarded if he/she obtained 150 credits. This provision had also been approved by the Faculty of Science. Since it is the last batch of B.Sc. (Hons. School), it needed to be considered and approved so that the students of

B.Sc. (Hons.) might not face problem at the time of their promotion to M.Sc. (Hons.) class. Since they had introduced the CBCS system at the undergraduate level at the campus where the credit system is different, they have to amend the regulations of M.Sc. (Hons.) accordingly. Thereafter, it needed to be sent to the Regulations Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had already the provision to award B.Sc. Pass Course Degree, but they are changing the regulations only because they have introduced the CBCS system. However, *prima facie* it looks as if they are taking fresh decision because it is not written that they are changing the corresponding regulations. He suggested that it should be written that after the introduction of CBCS system, keeping in mind the requirements there are certain regulations which needed to be amended. Accordingly, the amendments in regulations should be suggested in the form of existing and proposed regulations. He further said that the item stand approved, but the office which has suggested the amendments in the regulations should send the aforesaid amendments in the format suggested above.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) recommendations dated 30.03.2019 (Item No. 22) (**Appendix-XV**) of the Faculty of Science, for award of B.Sc. (General) degree to a student of B.Sc. (Hons.) under the framework of Honours School System (CBCS) passing out in 2019, be approved; and
- (2) the Dean Faculty of Science be requested to send the amendments in regulations in the form of existing and proposed regulations

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to make necessary approval on the recommendations of Dean, Faculty of Science under the framework of Honours School System (CBCS).

At this stage, some discussion relating to Item 13 took place and the same has been mentioned under Item 13.

**23.**

Information contained in Items R-(i) to R-(iv) was read out, viz. –

- (i) In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Anupam Sharma, Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University on contract basis up to 07.03.2024 (i.e. the date of his attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date he joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

**NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted by him after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at

page 132 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2016 will be applicable.

2. The Senate decision dated 29.03.2015, item-8 (C-20) circulated vide No. 3947-4027/Estt.I dated 11.05.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.
3. Rule 3.1 appearing at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 reads as under:

“The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

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

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 6, page 118-119, Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

2. Request dated 21.11.2018 of Dr. Sipra Sagarika is enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).

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

**NOTE:** 1. Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

2. Dr. Amit Katoch vide request dated 01.03.2019 (**Appendix-XVII**) had written that he had been selected as Assistant Professor (permanent) in college cadre of Himachal Pradesh by Himachal Public Service Commission, Shimla.

3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the names of the candidates who have passed examinations for the various degrees of the University and have become qualified under the regulation for admission to such degrees for the award of degrees at the 68<sup>th</sup> Convocation to be held on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2019, under Regulation 1 at page 27 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, as under:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of Examinations</b>	<b>Degrees to be conferred on Annual Convocation to be held on 28.04.2019</b>
	<b>Part-A</b>	
1. 2. 3.	D.Sc. D. Litt. Ph.D.	To all the candidates whose viva-voce are conducted and cases submitted to the Vice-Chancellor from 03.03.2018 to 27.04.2019, on behalf of the Syndicate.
	<b>Part-B</b>	
	M. Phil.	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 25.02.2018 to 21.04.2019 (7 days before the Convocation).
	<b>Part-C</b>	
1. 2.	M.D. M.S.	To all the candidates whose results stand declared from 25.02.2018 to 21.04.2019 (7 days before the Convocation).



Sr. No.	Name of Examinations	Degrees to be conferred on Annual Convocation to be held on 28.04.2019
	<b>Part-D</b>	
1. 2. 3. 4.	LL.M. M.Tech. M.E. (Chem. Engg.) Masters Degree of Engg. (All Branches)	First three first divisioners of the year of passing whose results stand declared from 25.02.2018 to 21.04.2019 (7 days before the Convocation).
	<b>Part-E</b>	
1. 2.	1. Master's degree (M.A./M.Com./M.Sc./M.Ed. etc. Annual & Semester System) Examinations in various Faculties.  2. Following Bachelor's degree examinations, B.E. in:  (a) Chemical Food Technology Telecom. & Inf. Tech. Electro. & Comm. Engg. Bio-Tech. Comp. Sci. & Engg. Electrical & Electronics Mechanical Civil Electronics & Electrical Comm. Engg. (b) B. Pharmacy (c) B.Sc. (Hons. School) (d) B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) 5 Year Integrated course (e) Bachelor of Arts (Hons. School Economics) (f) Bachelor of Dental Sciences (g) <b>Any other newly instituted Examination.</b>	First three first divisioners, whose results of April/May 2018 examinations stand declared from 25.02.2018 to 21.04.2019 (7 days before the Convocation).

**NOTE:** All the candidates who have been placed in the first division and secured first three positions in the final Merit list, after taking into account the process of Re-evaluation, where-ever applicable, may be allowed to be invited to the Convocation. This will, however, be subject to the condition that they have not earned Compartment/re-appear/P.R.E. in any subject/paper/Semester/yearly examination. Candidates who have applied for Degree in Absentia and have collected or not collected the same from the University may be allowed to be invited to the convocation.

**Referring to the sub item R-(i),** Shri Navdeep Goyal said that this item related to re-employment of one of the University Professors. It has been written that re-employment of Dr. Anupam Sharma, Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical

Sciences, Panjab University on contract basis up to 07.03.2024 (i.e. the date of his attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date he joins as such with one day break as usual, be approved. In the last meeting of the Syndicate, Professor Rajesh Gill, while referring to re-employment of Professor Reeta Grewal, had pleaded that one day's break should not be there and it was decided that there would not be one day's break. One thing is that they should treat this as the decision of the Syndicate and consider it as final that, in future, there would not be one day's break at the time of re-employment of faculty members or the case be referred to the Senate along with all the relevant papers. However, so far as one day's break is concerned, it is not required.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, earlier also, the decision had been taken by the Syndicate. She had raised the issue in the last to last meeting of the Syndicate, while considering the case of Professor Reeta Grewal, Department of History.

It was informed that the decision had been taken by the Syndicate and Senate, and in the decision it had been written that when re-employment of any faculty member is to be made, one day's break is to be given.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, in fact, earlier re-employment was made on half salary, and that was why, one day's break was given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal Said that the matter should again be placed before the Syndicate/Senate.

It was said that the matter could be placed before the Senate, but right now the position is that the re-employment is to be given with one day's break.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is to be got done from the Senate.

It was informed that, earlier, when the Senate took the decision regarding re-employment of faculty members, it was decided that re-employment is to be made with one day's break.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill said that as it is a rule, it is not required to go to the Senate as the rule could be amended by Syndicate itself.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that if the Syndicate could make the rule, it could also amend the same. She urged that the decision with regard to re-employment of faculty members without one day's break should be taken.

It was said that it needed to be relooked into.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is another point that though the same has been decided, but he would like to discuss the same. It had been decided that "the re-employed teachers will not be entitled for any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher is already living on the campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation". He said that most of the people are continuing beyond the age of 60 years and they have been allowed by Court, and they all are completing their 5 years. What has happened because of that, is that the people, who were residing outside, have already waited for their turns for five years, and now they would start getting accommodation at the Campus. However, if they start getting vacated accommodation from those, who have completed the age of 60 years, the period of their stay at the Campus would decrease. His view on this is that at several places, like Delhi University and Punjabi University, they are providing accommodation to teachers even during re-employment. So there is nothing wrong in it. Now the situation is that all the incumbent teachers, would get the accommodation at the Campus for the period they deserve or others have remained at the Campus. Why should they not amend that rule also to say that the re-employed

teachers could also retain accommodation at the Campus? This is the issue, which must be discussed. Though he is raising the issue, he did not need accommodation at the Campus. Neither has he got University accommodation nor would take it in future.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that whatever facilities have already been given to the re-employed teachers even those are also wrong, so they should not add more facilities. The teachers, who are working in the University, are not getting the accommodation at the Campus. If the re-employed teachers are allowed to retain the University accommodation, in-service teachers would be deprived of this facility.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the period of stay of the old teachers would be less at the Campus. The present teachers have already deprived of this facility and would now get this facility as majority of the teachers have completed their tenure of re-employment of 5 years.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if they make the rule now that the re-employed teachers would be allowed University accommodation, they would be deprived of the accommodation for some more years.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that Shri Naresh Gaur is actually against the re-employment.

It was clarified that in the meeting of the Senate dated 22.12.2012, it was decided that the decision be made effective from 8.9.2012. However, the re-employment shall be after one day's break following the date of Superannuation and usual one day break will be given at the completion of every year of re-employment.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it needed to be changed.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is date of 8.9.2012.

It was informed that 22.12.2012 is the date of the Senate meeting. It could be the date of the Syndicate meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the decision of 2012 was the one, in which re-employment for five years was taken. Hence, it is the old decision.

The Vice- Chancellor said that the matter would be again placed before the Syndicate and Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that either the matter should again be placed before the Syndicate or the decision could be taken today itself.

At this stage, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that his dissent should be recorded in the Item which related to convening of special meeting of Senate to consider the issue of extension/re-employment to the Principals beyond the age of 60 years.

Some of the members including Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Sandeep Singh said that his (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) dissent could not be recorded as he was not present at that time.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Item R-(i) to R-(iv)**, on the agenda, be ratified.

**24.** Information contained in Items I-(i) to I-(v) was read out and noted, i.e. –

**(i)** To note minutes (Item No.10, 12, 15 and 17) dated 26.02.2019 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of the meeting of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

**NOTE:** The minutes of Executive Committee of PUSC were placed before the Syndicate for consideration, but as per discussion held in the Syndicate meeting dated 18.02.2019, the same are placed before the Syndicate as an information item.

**(ii)** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Shri Parwinder Singh S/o Late Smt. Jaswinder Kaur, Ferro Khalasi, Construction Office, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 28.01.2019, while in service:

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
3. Encashment of Earned Leave up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

**(iii)** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Neeru Wd/o Late Shri Amarjeet Kumar, Cleaner, Boys Hostel No.3, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 18.01.2019, while in service:

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
3. Encashment of Earned Leave up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2016.

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

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the employee and post held</b>	<b>Date of Appointment</b>	<b>Date of Retirement</b>	<b>Benefits</b>
1.	Dr. Anupam Sharma Professor University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, P.U.	09.03.1988 (as Research Officer on Temp. basis)/ 01.02.1995 (as Lecturer)	31.03.2019	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulations 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.  (ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for
2.	Dr. Rajiv Lochan Professor Department of History	23.07.1987	30.04.2019	

				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).

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Ms. Navjeet Kaur Officiating Librarian A.C. Joshi Library, P.U.	02.04.1980	31.03.2017	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Charan Singh Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) Department of Biophysics	11.12.1981	31.03.2019	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
3.	Shri Swaroop Chand Senior Technician (G-II) UIPS	05.01.1988	31.03.2019	
4.	Mrs. Joginder Kaur Superintendent General Branch	27.10.1988	30.04.2019	
5.	Shri Bharat Bhushan Malhotra Senior Assistant Degree Unit, COE's Office	04.02.1984	30.04.2019	
6.	Shri Balwant Singh Negi Daftri USOL	01.04.1972	30.04.2019	
7.	Smt. Shakuntla Devi Peon Dr. HSJIDS & Hospital	02.12.1991	30.04.2019	
8.	Smt. Kamla Devi Peon A.C. Joshi Library	25.11.1999	30.04.2019	
9.	Shri Pritam Chand Frash Department of Chemistry	21.07.1980	30.04.2019	

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

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that he did not know how the items for ratifications and information had been passed in the last meeting of the Syndicate. Perhaps, one of the most important members might have said that it is approved. When he enquired it from one of the members, he told him that these items had been approved. Hence, it came to his notice that the ratification and information items had been approved, but according to him, these items were not taken up. He asked him (the member) who told that 'Yes', he had said that these are approved. He stated that there was one most important item, which got approved under ratification. According to him, from the University point of view, it was the most important issue which related to increase of 50 seats in MBBS in Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh. In fact, the above said item should have been brought to the Syndicate for consideration. The said item was approved by the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate. He did not know as to what was emergency in approving the item in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, and the item was placed before the Syndicate for ratification. He thought that it is yet to be discussed, but he was told that the said item had already been ratified/approved. He felt astonished that 50 seats in a course of Medical College had been increased, and they did not know as to when the same was approved. Hence, this point needed to be discussed – whether they have given approval before the approval is given by the MCI, or have they given them a No Objection Certificate (NOC) or have they given approval of sanctioning 50 seats. If it is subject to approval of the MCI, it meant they are at the mercy of the MCI. If the MCI declined approval tomorrow, what would be the value of their Inspection Report? He did not know as to when the College applied and when the Inspection Committee visited the College, submitted the report in the University Office, when was the note put up to the Vice Chancellor, when it was approved by the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation approval of the Syndicate and when it came for ratification. Nothing is known? Ultimately, it came to his notice that the inspection has been done by the Committee, which had, perhaps, been constituted a year ago - he has been told one year, it could be 8 months or 10 months. However, what has been mentioned in the report is “so and so (Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences)”, who was no more the Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences, as by then someone else had been elected as a Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences, but the nomenclature has been written the same and the signatures had also been done in the similar manner. The persons, who had been sent for Inspection, had no experience of Medical subject/field. Whosoever, had constituted the previous Committee, he had not included any person from the Medical College, though PGI's respectable Doctor was there in the Committee, but the PGI's people did not know as to what are the requirements of Medical College? The requirements of the Medical College, are known only to the persons of Medical Colleges. As such, there was no person from medical field in the Committee. The Committee, which was sent, comprised of three members – one related to Pharmacy, second from PGI and third from the Dental, but no one is related to the medical field. Even then the Committee visited the College and recommended increase in seats. If somebody is to be made member of the Committee by virtue of Dean of the Faculty concerned, then person, who is Dean of the Faculty on the day of inspection, should be appointed as a member of the Committee. Had it been so, the Dean, Faculty of Medical Science, who himself has remained Registrar of a Medical University and also a Professor and Head of Medical College for so many years and whose services are also available to them, could be utilized. He did not know how the old Committee was formed and visited the College as there is no account of all those things with them. He pointed out that, had the item taken up for consideration and discussion, taken place at that time, the shortcomings would have been pointed out and perhaps, the item might not have been ratified. Every time, the Medical College bring the papers at eleventh hour and plead that since it is most urgent, it should be done right now. They always delay their application, procedure and when they send them letters of fine, they come for the condonation. If the university asked them to talk to set the system right, they tell that the University did not

know as to how the Medical Colleges function. They must be aware as to what is to be done there, so far as evaluation and the examination systems are concerned. Now, the Vice Chancellor must have known something about the functioning of the Medical College.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was somewhat aware about the affairs of this College. The issue had come and he had ordered for halting the process. In one case, marks between 10 or more were sought. What should he tell them, when their own people do like this. Anyhow, he had stopped the process even though the matter was most urgent. He asked the Dean, College Development Council to brief the members in detail.

It was said that the position is almost the same as has been told by Shri Ashok Goyal. A Committee had been formed and the members of the Committee were those, whose names have been mentioned by Shri Ashok Goyal. They have submitted the correct report, and on the basis of that report the file was put up before the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor. In fact, they were saying that permission of the University is required before approval of the MCI. In that month the meeting of the Syndicate could not be held, which was perhaps postponed owing to some reason.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired, had they verified it that whatever they were saying is actually the direction of MCI?

It was informed that there was no flaw in the Inspection Report, which was submitted by the Committee, owing to this only, the file was submitted to the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why did they send the Inspection Committee? They had already taken a decision that wherever there are Regulatory Bodies like NCTE, AICTE, UGC, DCI, MCI, etc., first the College concerned would obtain the permission from the Regulatory Body, and only then the Inspection Committee would be sent. He enquired whether only the NOC has been given by the University to the College or affiliation has been granted.

It was informed that at that time, they had written that it is subject to approval by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, what did he mean by subject to approval of the Syndicate? They had placed the item for ratification, which meant "in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate". If the Syndicate did not approve, what would they do because they had issued the letter to MCI.

It was informed that in the letter issued to the College (Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh), they had written exactly what he (Shri Ashok Goyal ji) is saying, i.e., subject to the approval by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they might have written in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate and not subject to approval by the Syndicate. In fact, there is a lot of difference between 'in anticipation' and 'subject to approval'.

It was informed that though the exact language is not known, their meaning was that if the Syndicate did not approve, it would be treated as refusal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the ratification, it escaped from their attention and got ratified. None of them said that it is absolutely necessary and it should be thoroughly discussed. Ultimately, it got ratified as a routine item.

The Vice Chancellor said that one thing is needed to be looked and he still remembered that he had got something recorded there.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to inform them as to why lot of hue and cry is there. The persons from this very College met Dr. Parvinder Singh in the year of 2016 and put pressure from several quarters (Education Secretary, Home Secretary, etc.), but by chance he was the Chairman of the Affiliation Committee in that year also. They exerted so much pressure on the then Vice Chancellor also. The Vice Chancellor, who was at Hyderabad, had to telephone him (Shri Ashok Goyal) from there and thereafter from Bombay to say that the matter of Government Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh, should be taken care of. He told him (Vice Chancellor) that he is prepared to look into the issue of the College, but they should be told that they are not above the University. Three-four faculty members of that College, including Principal, had come to the University and they were given the impression by the former Vice Chancellor that Shri Ashok Goyal's job is to put obstacles in their ways and they were scared because they did not know whether he (Shri Ashok Goyal) would sign the papers or not, but when he came, he signed the papers which were already prepared by them. They had kept a person ready to go to MCI office to submit the papers. However, he told the members that they had made mockery of the system. They (Colleges people) are doing this for the last so many years and always take the University for granted. At least, they should also think about the University. At that time, they (College people) had committed/assured that, in future, such a mistake would not occur, but the same thing is happening even today. Today, they are again saying to do it in haste and the argument extended in support of it is that earlier the Principal was someone else.

It was informed that when the case was put up to the Vice Chancellor, he (Vice-Chancellor) had ordered that legal opinion should be obtained from some Professor of Law and it should be ascertained as to whether they could do it or not. As such, the file was sent to the Professor Rattan Singh, University Institute of Legal Studies, for legal opinion. Professor Rattan Singh, after looking into the case, opined that they could do it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this should not be done hurriedly and instead, they could take sufficient time to complete the task. If any paper relating to this case is to be put up to him, which needed urgent attention, it should be properly underlined so that he could give attention to it immediately as there is no pressure on him to do it.

### **General Discussion**

1. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate they had resolved during the general discussion that since certain Fellows are not being allowed journey days by their respective Principals, a circular be issued to the affiliated Colleges in this regard. Perhaps, no action in this regard has been taken by the University so far.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council to issue a circular in this regard to the affiliated Colleges by tomorrow.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that a strong worded letter in this regard should be issued to the affiliated Colleges.

2. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that a Committee, comprising him (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) and other two persons, was to be constituted for College at Miani, Hoshiarpur. Until the Committee is constituted, a letter should be issued to the College asking them not to take any punitive action against the teacher(s).



It was informed that no such decision was taken in the case of College at Miani. Rather it was pointed out that such cases are prevailing in many affiliated Colleges. However, so far as issue of teacher(s) is concerned, they could issue a letter to the College. So far as constitution of Committee is concerned, no decision was taken as the anomalies pointed out by (him) Shri Jagdeep Kumar in regard of less payment of salaries, deduction of P.F. as per Regulation(s) of the University, non-payment of H.R.A., etc. existed in several other Colleges as well. They could not ask this College specifically to correct itself. In fact, they had decided that all these issue would be taken care of while conducting the Periodical Inspections.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that, in fact, he had said at that time that the teachers of the College are being told that the College did not have adequate workload for them and he had told that the Syndicate had taken a decision about 25 years ago that if the subject of incumbent teacher is being discontinued, he/she should not be removed, but should be adjusted in another subject in which the workload is there. And in this context, it was said that a Committee would be constituted.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that such a situation is also prevailing in S.D.P. College for Women, where four women teachers have been removed from the service.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the teachers of S.D.P. College for Women have written a letter to Vice Chancellor, Registrar and Dean, College Development Council. They are also apprehending that they would be removed from the service.

Dr. K.K. Sharma intervened to say that three months' notice has been served to these teachers. However, with the intervention of the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor, the College has halted the process, but the sword always hang on them.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council to call the Chairman of the Management and the Principal of the College to discuss the issue.

3. Principal (Dr.) Inderjit Kaur said that wherever injustice is being meted out to the teachers, they must take action against the Colleges concerned. However, in the Colleges where the admissions had come down and full salaries are not being paid to the Principals, they have to take a lenient view about such Colleges because the Colleges are giving serving the Society.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had visited certain affiliated Colleges in Hoshiarpur District. He usually talked to the management people, teachers and non-teaching staff which include Peons, Chowkidars, Sweepers, etc. He had observed that these persons are working there at a salary of Rs.3000-4000/- per month for the last more than five years. He had asked the Chairman of the Managements of the Colleges to enhance the salary of Peons, Chowkidars, Sweepers, etc., who are working at a salary of Rs.3000-4000/- per month, between Rs.500 and Rs.1000/- per month, and they had assured that the salary of these persons would be increase. Secondly, the Colleges also appoint certain persons on contract basis, whom they removed after some time. One of the lady contractual employees, who was working in the College at a monthly salary of Rs.7000/-, told him that the college is contemplating to remove her from the services, because the College would appoint new person in place of her at a lower salary, and if it did not remove her, her salary would have to be increased.

Such a practice is prevailing in several Colleges. He had specifically told the College to continue with her services, if she is not doing something wrong. He is only making the request to the Colleges in this regard but not asking them to do these things compulsorily.

4. Professor Rajesh Gill said that first of all she would like to thanks the Vice Chancellor for handling the issue of MoUs in a very good manner and the decision was also conveyed in the Chairpersons' meeting. Although there were people who were very uncomfortable with the decision taken by them, overall it is a very good decision as the MoUs need not be personalised.
5. Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is a UGC Re-charge faculty in the University, which is recruited by the UGC directly and their salary also comes from the UGC. At the moment, eight to ten persons are working in the University as UGC Re-charge faculty. Their salary has not come for the last about three months. Yesterday, she had also talked to the Finance and Development Officer in this regard, who told her that sometime it got delayed. Certain circulars had also been received from the UGC stating that they have to be treated at par with the other faculty members of the University. It is not good that one does not get salary for three or more months. She urged the Vice Chancellor to find some via-media to this problem. She suggested that a possible should be explored that their salary could be get passed from the Audit under objection, so that they could be paid salary without any further delay.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are very good researchers. He had received a very categorical letter from Professor D.P. Singh, who is a Chairman of one of the University Teaching Departments. Whatever she is pointing out has been mentioned in the afore-said letter. However, he stressed that funds are required everywhere and they have to generate funds from one source or the other, i.e., either from the Government or from the parents of the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that they have to cut the wasteful outflow of the funds. At the moment, everything has been let loose, including appointment of Visiting Professors, Honorary Professors, etc. and the process is still underway. It was suggested that all such things should be discontinued. On the one hand, they have nothing to eat, and on the other hand, they are incurring wasteful expenditure.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is going to call a meeting on this specific issue of Distinguished and Emeritus Professors. He had also told in the meeting of the Chairpersons yesterday. There is a practice in the University that even if someone is doing an academic work, he is paid honorarium. Even if the work relating to review of Journal is done by a faculty, he/she gets remuneration. He had yesterday taken a decision in the meeting of the Chairpersons that the faculty members have to do the work of reviewing of journals, etc. without any remuneration as it is an academic work and they have to cooperate for this.

6. Professor Rajesh Gill said that they have appointed a number of persons as Visiting Professors and Honorary Professors during last 5-6 years, which needed to be reviewed by appointing a Committee as they could not go on forever.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is already in his mind.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Committee, proposed to be constituted, should also look into as to how much expenditure has been incurred on it and what work has been done by the persons concerned.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that such persons (Visiting Professors and Honorary Professors) had been provided room in the Departments, computers, printers, air conditioners, etc., whereas such facilities are not provided to the regular faculty members.

Shri Naresh Gaur remarked that it is an additional burden on the University exchequer, which should not be there.

7. Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are certain ex-servicemen in the Security, and they have an important issue.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that the security personnel did face problems.

Continuing Professor Rajesh Gill said that certain security personnel are paid on daily wage basis and even some of the amount is deducted from their salaries. Moreover, they are not allowed any leave.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that the most pitiable position in the University is of the security personnel, malis and sweepers.

Continuing further, Professor Rajesh Gill said as to how the condition of these persons could be improved.

The Vice Chancellor said that it all depended on the receipt/generation of funds. He would definitely do something for them after the receipt of funds. They had recently increased the emoluments of certain categories by 3% annually.

It was informed that though they had recently increased the emoluments of certain categories by 3% annually, but these persons are being paid salary in accordance with the D.C. rates.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that there are several discrepancies in different categories of security itself as some are getting more emoluments and some less emoluments, which resulted into resentment and frustration amongst them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had already informed that the Government is not allowing them to fill up 84 posts, and the Government is asking them to outsource these 84 posts @ Rs.24,000/- per month each, but they are not allowing them to appoint people at Rs.16,000/- p.m.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that till the Government is not allowing them to appoint people @ Rs.24,000/- per month each, they should outsource this job.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to do it @ Rs.24,000/- per month each, which might result into resentment amongst the persons, who are already working in the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that even the expenses in the case of persons, who have been appointed at Rs.16,000/- p.m. each, are more. In fact, the actually expenses on them would be more than Rs.24,000/- p.m. each.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is going to outsource this job shortly because without that they could not carry on.

8. Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that a decision had already been taken in October 2018 that the staff members, who are posted in the Rajiv Gandhi College Bhavan, are allowed holidays and if they come on holidays, they are paid overtime allowance. However, such a facility is not extended to the staff members working in the University Guest House.

It was informed that they are seized of the matter and already on the job to rectify.

9. Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that there is no light in the backside of Arts Blocks, especially Arts Block-III and IV and Department of Laws. Even the electric poles have not been installed there.

It was informed that at several places in the Campus, the problem of lighting has already been solved. The problem could still be there at one or two places, which would be solved shortly.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it should not be delayed; otherwise, they could be some mis-happening.

10. Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that speed breakers are required to be put in front of University Auditorium as well as in front of Arts Block-IV because people usually drive their vehicles at more than 100-150 k.ms. speed, and the people are finding it difficult to cross the road. It is very risky and accident(s) could also take place there.

11. Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether instructions have been issued relating to the decision taken by them in the last meeting about girls of P.U.S.S.G. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

It was informed that instructions had been issued and the Director, P.U.S.S.G. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, was also called here. Since the issue related to lighting, security to the girls, a meeting of the Director was arranged with the XEN, Chief of University Security and other concerned persons, and a Team had visited the Centre.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the revised timings have been implemented there or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has been told that the revised timings have been implemented.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to know whether any letter has been issued to the Centre in this regard.

It was informed that the letter had been issued the same day and perhaps, the same was sent the next day. However, he is not sure.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the letter had not reached there at least within a week.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would get it checked.

12. Shri Sandeep Singh said that he has to make a request that whenever a Team/Committee is to be sent to Hoshiarpur, the services of senior Fellows, belonging to Hoshiarpur, should be obtained for the purpose. Similar practice should be followed for Ludhiana, Sri Muktsar Sahib, Ferozepur, etc.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay", it would be done.

13. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that last time also, he had raised a pertinent issue, which was taken seriously and noted also, and thereafter, the same was implemented immediately. In fact, he had said that at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), instead of giving charge to the senior-most teacher, the charge was handed over to somebody, who was a junior person and on deputation, i.e., the one who did not fall even in the seniority list. The Vice Chancellor had issue orders immediately and by chance after a week, again the Director had to go on leave, and the charge was given to the right/deserving person. In the process, they are getting enmity. What is his interest? It did not matter to him – whether charge is given to "A" or "B". His only interest is that nobody should have the power to break the established system. Now, they are saying "To hell with you (the members of the Syndicate and Senate) and to hell with the decision of the Syndicate. After correcting, they again repeated the same thing and he might be doing this at the instance of someone, who might have assured him protection from all quarter; otherwise, one could not repeat the same mistake after correcting once.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that question did not arise.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is happening because they did not take any action. Now, at least an explanation should be sought as to under what circumstances this has been done, to enable them to decide the appropriate action to be taken against him/her.

The Vice Chancellor said that definitely, it would not be allowed.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal said that unfortunately, the orders regarding giving charge to the junior person, who is also on deputation, have also been approved by the office of the Dean of University Instruction. When it was pointed out next day, the said orders were withdrawn. They (the office of the Dean of University Instruction) is saying they did not know as to who is the senior to whom, which meant they (Department people) could do anything in writing, the same would be approved. In fact, they (office of the Dean of University Instruction) should have the entire system as to who is the senior-most in which Department. It is the Dean of University Instruction, who is the head of the academics in the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the charge should always be given to the next senior-most person.

14. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it was also pointed out that a person, without having been sent by the lending Institution on deputation, has been taken on deputation by the University because the person concerned made a request that he should be treated on deputation. In this way, he was treated on deputation. The person has a bond from where he has person come and the Institute concerned is saying that the person should be sent back, and in this process, a period of 10 years would elapse on 15<sup>th</sup> of April 2019. They should tell him that in view of the rules, which have been framed by the University, neither anybody could be sent nor taken on deputation for more than 10 years. If he remained in the University even a day beyond 10 years, who would be responsible for that? Now, 15<sup>th</sup> April 2019 should mean 15<sup>th</sup> April 2019. Not in

this manner that to hell with them, he/she did not bother anything. This is not a right way. Or somebody should tell them where they had gone wrong. Tomorrow if somebody goes on leave from here after fulfilling a bond, and remain there more than the stipulated period, would they not take any action against him/her? Were they serving to the society? Moreover, he is going after giving charge in this manner. Again the person on deputation, who is not subject to their control, has been given the charge of TEQIP and at his own, he is communicating as Director/Coordinator of TEQIP. It is too much, where crores of rupees are involved

15. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that with heavy heart, he would like to bring to his (Vice Chancellor) kind notice and through him he would like to draw the attention of Dean, College Development Council, also the Colleges in spite of clear-cut regulations of the University, are exploiting the teachers much. The exploitation is being done in such a manner that it is not known even to the teachers. Even in the established Institutions, the Provident Fund of the teachers is being deducted from the date of confirmation, whereas it is clearly laid down in the regulations that the deduction of Provident Fund has to be started from the date of joining. Not only outside, it is happening in Chandigarh, leave aside the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab. As University, are they not supposed to safeguard the interest, if they (teachers) do not know? Secondly, certain Colleges, over and above the University and Government Regulations, had framed their own regulations/rules, which are contradictory to the University Regulations.

The Vice Chancellor enquired in what context they (Colleges) have framed their own regulations/rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that regulations and rules relating to Service Conditions and they say that these are their regulations & rules. Would the regulations & rules of the Colleges or the Regulations & Rules of the affiliating University, be followed?

The Vice Chancellor said that if he (Shri Ashok Goyal) wished, he could give the names of the specific Colleges to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that as to how many Colleges, he should name. When Dr. K.K. Sharma suggested that it should be taken care of during the Periodical Inspections, Shri Ashok Goyal said that Periodical Inspection, Inquiries, etc. are nothing but to postpone the system. When everything is in black and white, why a circular should not be issued seeking confirmation from all the affiliated Colleges that the regulations are reproduced below and in view of this, they are requested to certify that the Provident Fund of the teachers working in their Colleges is being deducted from the date of their joining, as per the University regulations/rules. Their date of joining, date from which their Provident Fund has been deducted and rate of interest should also be intimated.

16. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in certain affiliated Colleges it is happening that people are not sure as to what is the formula of seniority, whereas it is crystal clear. First they started creating confusion and ultimately started their own interpretation. Actually, a person, who has been appointed on probation, is confirmed after he/she completes the probationary period, but from which date, from the date of joining. What happened is that the day the probation is completed, they call it a date of confirmation and count the seniority from that date, i.e., after one year, whereas it is clearly written in the University Regulations/ Rules that the seniority is to be counted from the date of joining.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is the position everywhere.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though it is clearly mentioned in the University Regulations/Rules and despite this, they are violating. Since he did not go outside, he always spoke on the basis of experience which he is getting from the Colleges situated in the Union Territory of Chandigarh. If it is happening in the Colleges situated in the Union Territory of Chandigarh, it might be happening at other places. As such, they need to write to the affiliated Colleges that seniority is to be counted from the date of joining. Thirdly, it is clear here that if the probation is not extended before its completion, the person(s) concerned is/are deemed to be confirmed. However, it had also happened here that even after completion of one year, the probation period of certain persons had been extended because the Provident Fund is to be deducted after the confirmation. This has been done to save the amount to be contributed towards their Provident Fund by the Institution. Resultantly, the persons concerned had suffered a loss of two years instead of one year. It is nothing but sheer cheating.

17. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the criminal attitude of the people has come to his notice. Citing an example, he said that a lady had been appointed. There is a Regulation/Rule that if certain persons have been appointed through a single Selection Committee, the person placed at serial number 1, as per the recommendations of the Selection Committee, is the senior and the person placed at serial number 2 is junior to serial number 1 and so on. A case came to his notice where the person placed at serial number 1 was not issued appointment letter, whereas the subsequent persons were issued appointment letters and were made to join. The appointment letter to the candidate placed at serial number 1 was issued after the period of 3-4 months. Resultantly, the person joined after 3-4 months. The teacher did not know that injustice is being meted out to her. Resultantly, the person, who was placed at serial number 1 became junior to others, who had been selected along with her, but were junior to her because she had joined late. When he asked her as to why she did not join in time, she told that she was not given appointment letter. Then he asked from the College as to why they did not issue her the appointment letter, they told that this lady was pregnant. He asked them as to who told them, they told that it was observed at the time of interview. He told them that no criminal act could be more than this. Does the law of the land permit it that pregnancy is a bar to the appointment or joining? Simply because they knew that the lady has to proceed on maternity leave immediately after joining, to save the leave with pay, they meted out injustice to her. Firstly, they meted injustice to her by not issuing the appointment letter for 3-4 months and then she was made junior to other persons who were selected along with her, but were junior to her. This issue has been hanging fire with the University for the last more than 3 months. He has been requested that they must assert and let the affiliated Colleges know. They had a simple stand the person, who has joined late, could not be senior to the person(s), who had joined before him/her. He felt that let good sense prevail as the purpose was only to give justice to the sufferer. He asked them to show him the proceedings of the Selection Committee as well as the appointment letters of the persons concerned. Dean, College Development Council, tried and he was told that these cases are of the year 2008. In the year 2011, certain orders were passed that the record of more than 3 year old should be destroyed. How such orders were passed? Could they destroy the result gazettes, which are more than 3 years old, and other important documents? As such, the record (proceedings of the Selection Committee and appointment letters of the teachers concerned) could not be made available. Hence, he asked them to seek the said record from the College concerned.

Thereafter, ask the College concerned as to why they issued the appointment letter to the teacher late. Let them face criminal action also. As such, they are unable to solve these things even as they did not bother about such things. Even if injustice is being done to a single teacher out of thousand, the Syndicate and Senate should be concerned about that, so that one should feel that somebody is watching him/her interest. However, it is labelled by some of the teachers that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is anti teachers and anti academics, but it could not deter him from discharging his duties. He also did not bother about those people, who did not know him. He is saying that if such type of exploitation of teachers is being done by the established Colleges, they did not have any moral right to talk about the shortcomings on the part of the small/rural Colleges. Firstly, they should correct the established Colleges, but opposite is happening here as they first lay their hands on the small/rural/weak Colleges because they did not have the guts to make even a signal towards the affluent Colleges but to talk about laying the hands. In view of this, his simple request, along with the request which he had made last time, that financial statement should be sought from each and every affiliated College. Whatever information has been mentioned in the Calendar, the same should be sought from the affiliated Colleges. He is sure that the letter about this has not yet been issued to the affiliated Colleges. These are the mandatory information, which the Colleges are otherwise supposed to submit to the University, whereas they are even not willing to demand from them.

18. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they are facing another big problem where they should also apply their mind. Especially, the College teachers are ignorant about the said problem. Either they are really ignorant or would like to remain ignorant. The Principals are also playing role in the problem. Two types of appointments are being made in the affiliated Colleges – (i) against aided posts; and (ii) against unaided posts. For unaided posts, the salary is paid by the Managements from their own sources and for aided posts, the salary comes from the Government. However, it did not matter to a teacher whether he/she is working against the aided or unaided post and for him/her both are equal as he/she is not concerned with the source of salary. But whenever an aided post is advertised, the person, who is working on an unaided post for the last five years, is asked to apply. He had also said last time that what to talk about giving the salary, which one was getting earlier, at the time of shifting him/her from unaided post to aided post, his/her salary is reduced to less than half on the plea that they would pay the salary in accordance with the aid got from the Government. It is in the minds of the teachers that while on the unaided, they could be removed from the service at any time. As such, they are ready to shift to the aided posts even at less salary. This actually is the beauty of the University to very clearly lay down that once the University has granted approval to the appointment of a teacher irrespective of whether he/she is working against unaided post or aided post, he/she is for all practical purposes on equal footing, so that they get confidence as to what would they get in shifting to the aided post. There are Colleges, which say that the work done by them on unaided post(s) for 5-6 years, has forfeited after their shifting to the aided post(s). Now, their experience would be counted afresh. He had told last time and it was confirmed by the Dean, College Development Council, that phone call(s) is/are being made from the University side approval against the aided post would only be given if resignation against the unaided post from the person concerned is sent. The University is saying so even though there is no such Regulation/Rule. All this is being done on the plea/request of the College people, who visit the University. In fact, they ask the University people to put pressure on the College for this purpose. When the resignation is given by the concerned teacher, they say that he/she could not be given any benefit of the



previous service rendered by him/her to the College. The persons usually shifted to the aided posts on less than half of the salary because of the uncertainty, but they did not even know as to what would be done by the Punjab Government in future. As such, injustice is being meted out to the teachers because of lacklustre attitude of the University. There are several other things, which are happening in the Colleges, needed to be corrected without waiting for the visits of the Inspection Committees. He further said that the Inspection Committees, which visited the affiliated Colleges, must know as what is to be verified by them. Now, a new concept had been introduced by the Colleges, especially Colleges situated in the Union Territory of the Chandigarh, but he did not know whether it is known to the University or not. They are aware of the appointments on contract basis, *ad hoc* basis, temporary basis, etc. However, now the new concept of resource persons has been introduced in the Colleges situated in the Union Territory of Chandigarh by the Government itself. Resource Persons are usually invited to the Seminars, Conferences, Workshops, Symposia, etc. The teachers, who are taking more workload than the Regular/Ad hoc/Temporary teachers, they have found a substitute for them and named as "Resource Person". This nomenclature has been given by the Government College. Where the Government itself is exploiting the teachers to this extent, what could they expect from the private Colleges? How the Government is exploiting the teachers because Panjab University is watching all this completely as a silent spectator. Resultantly, the Government Colleges situated in Chandigarh, the recruitment has not taken place for the last so many years. They did not require even though new courses are being introduced, new affiliations are being given by the Panjab University, and approvals are also being granted by the University. In this way, the Colleges are being run and the Governments are also not objecting to it. He had also told last time that they are taking the courses in the name of self-financing basis and salary to the teachers are being given from the Amalgamated Fund, whereas the custodian of Amalgamated Fund is Panjab University and not the College concerned. They are tolerating all this. It did not mean that he is saying this to the present Vice Chancellor. All this is happening for the last so many years. However, there must be a day when they have to mend their ways. As such, the Inspection Committees should be told that this new business should be dealt with iron hand. He added that even the Inspection Committees has started saying that one appointment should be made on regular basis, one on contract basis and another as guest faculty and if the appointment could not be made on regular basis, it should be made on temporary basis, even though all this is not within their power. They are doing all this at their own. Hence, they (Inspection Committees) should be clearly told that these are the parameters and guidelines and they are not supposed to go out of these parameters and guidelines, so that while considering by the Syndicate or any Committee for that matter knew that these are the parameters and guidelines. One Committee at one place say that four teachers are required this subject and another Committee at the second place for the same subject say that two teachers are required and the third Committee say 3 teachers are required and another Committee say that no teacher is required. He is talking only about the local Colleges. Citing an example, he said that suppose there are two Colleges, one for boys and another for girls, first they sought the course, and then they found that it is not viable, they said that they would run the course in collaboration with other College. When the inspection was conducted and asked to show the teachers, they told that the teacher is available in the neighbouring College and he/she is on leave today. Now, the very College, where the teacher was on leave, would also apply for affiliation and the same teacher would be shown at both the Colleges. Since the Inspection Committees for both the Colleges would be different, it would not be detected by them. Both the appointments would be approved by the University, whereas only one teacher would actually be appointed. It would not

be easily detected as the University did not have the databank. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua was saying that in the software, which he had given, everything is self-contained. He suggested that at least the same software should be put to use. He is saying all these things because he (Vice Chancellor) had said in the beginning that the biggest problem is of the affiliated College, and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) felt first they should lay their hands to the biggest problem and slowly and steadily the small problems would automatically be solved.

It was said that so far as seeking of information from the affiliated Colleges is concerned, though they seek information from the Colleges every year, this year, on the basis of the discussion took place in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, they had issued directive to the Colleges to provide information about the income, expenditure, salary, Provident Fund deducted, etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired did they are seek this information every year.

It was informed that as per Calendar, the said information is to be sought every year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though the information is to be sought every year, they did not seek this information from the Colleges. He challenged the Dean, College Development Council, to show him that the information is supplied by even 50% of the affiliated College.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, they could just have given the target. He directed the Dean, College Development Council to properly monitor it whether the information is coming from the Colleges or not.

19. Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, the item relating to promotion of teachers under the CAS was withdrawn in view of the Model Code of Conduct. He urged the Vice Chancellor to do something as the teachers were desperately waiting for their promotions. She suggested that the problem should be solved through a Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that what the Committee would do in this matter.

20. Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that certain promotion cases of teachers are hanging fire in different offices of the University.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that such things are not happening nowadays. At the moment, only 7 cases are pending in his office.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Vice Chancellor is talking about the Selection cases, whereas she is referring to promotion cases of teachers under CAS which are lying in different offices of the University, e.g., Establishment Branch, Accounts Branch, etc.

It was clarified that the cases are not pending in any of the University office. What happens is that sometime the cases lay in Audit Section owing to the objection raised by the Audit Department. The matter could be discussed with the Audit Department to sort out the issue. However, if any case is pending in the University office, the same should be brought to the notice of the University Authorities.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is true that the Registrar had helped them a lot, but certain cases are still lying pending in the branch where they were earlier.

To this, it was said that no such thing is there. However, if any case is lying in this way, the specific case should be brought to the notice to the Registrar.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the case of Dr. Ram Mehar is still hanging fire for the last 5-6 months.

21. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that several issues about the teachers have been highlighted by Shri Ashok Goyal and he would not repeat them. He would start from where Shri Ashok Goyal has stopped his speech. He would like to know in which manner the Inspections and Selections Committees are being formed. There are so many Colleges where even the full pay-scale is not being given even to the Principals, what to talk about the teachers. They usually appoint such a Principal as a Chairman of the Committee constituted to inspect another College. What did they expect from the person, who himself is unable to get full pay scale from the management of his own College. He added that 90% of the inspections are being done by the University in this manner.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that, in fact, at one stage they had approved, especially for Colleges of Education, that Principals and teachers of unaided Colleges (except Fellows) be not included in the Inspection Committees. However, the same is not being followed. He urged the Vice Chancellor to ensure that the above decision is followed.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he wanted to know as to where the decision, which has been referred to by Professor Navdeep Goyal, has been approved. According to him, nowhere such a decision has been taken. Every time, the teachers and Principals of unaided affiliated Colleges are sent as members of the Inspection Committees. As such, the decision referred to Professor Navdeep Goyal has not been taken anywhere.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that decision in this regard has been taken about two years ago. Even if such a decision has not been taken, it should be taken now.

It was said that if such a decision has been taken, it would be verified. However, the problem is that the Chairperson, Department of Education, are showing their inability to go on inspections and all the letters with regard to their appointment as members of the Inspection Committees are being returned. The next senior-most Professor of the Department has also requested them on phone that she should not be sent as member of the Inspection Committee anywhere as she is unable to go outside.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are several teachers and Principals in the aided affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are facing a big problem in the subject of Education.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that there are two reasons for this – (i) that they did not want to go with the teachers and Principals of unaided Colleges; and (ii) they had a large number of Senate members, from where they could appointment certain persons with specialization in the subject of Education as only one person is required. It is not necessary that only the person with the subject specialization in Education is to be the Chairperson of the Committee. There are Principals, whose Colleges have obtained high score in NAAC ranking. Leaving them aside, they are sending those persons about whom they have decided several time, i.e., that the persons who are not being

paid full salary be not sent as members of the Inspection Committees. When the persons, who themselves are not able to enforce the regulations/rules of the University in getting full salary from their own Colleges, why they are sending them as members of the Inspection Committees.

It was assured that, as told by couple of Hon'ble members that it has been approved by the Syndicate, now they would appointment members on the Inspection Committees after verifying the above referred decision.

22. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that about a few years ago the Punjab Government made certain recruitments of teachers against the aid posts and the probation period of the appointees was fixed for three years. Take a cue from it, the affiliated Colleges have also fixed the probation period of the newly appointed teachers as three years at their own.

To this, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that appointment letters of teachers come to the University and the University is not giving approval to such appointments.

23. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Colleges have also distorted the *pro forma* evolved by the University and have evolved their own *pro forma*. When they cross Moga, the Colleges did not provide any *pro forma* to the Inspection Committees and just provide them two pages. They have loaded everything on their computers and all the columns, including payment of salary, deduction of Provident Fund, non-teachers, etc., have been deleted. Day before yesterday, they argued for about 3 years and at last filled up the *pro forma* with their own hands. A mechanism should be evolved to evaluate the reports of Inspection Committees at random to assess as to what had been written in the reports.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that even dates have also been mentioned on certain reports.

The Vice-Chancellor remarked, is the reports are not seen by anybody.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the system has been inherited from many years.

It was said that what he (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) meant to say is that when the Inspection Committees go, the reports of previous year(s) are not given to them. Professor Rajesh Gill is saying that there are no dates on the old reports.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she had obtained three reports and on some of them even the year had not been mentioned.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the *pro forma* is not there, what would they fill in? Sometimes, the College people say that their computer system could not be operated as the concerned person is on leave. Earlier, the Chairperson of the Inspection Committee was given the *pro forma*.

It was informed that now they are asked to download the requisite *pro forma* from the internet.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the College people told the members of the Inspection Committees that internet does not work in their College, and if they had any doubt about it, they could themselves check it. Even if the internet worked in the College concerned, who would download and get print of the same. Secondly, it should be specifically mentioned that the *pro forma* is to

be filled up by the members of the Inspection Committees. In fact, all the *pro formas* are already been filled up. Whether Provident Fund is deducted 'Yes', salary full 'Yes' and so on. Inspection is finished within 20 minutes and the members returned. For evaluating such reports, the University had senior Professors or a Committee must be appointed for this purpose.

24. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have implemented the UGC Regulations 2009 and in those Regulations, the post of Professor also existed for the teachers of the Colleges. Though ten years have passed, but everybody is in slumber. Punjab Government has designated the teachers of the Government Colleges as Professors, but what about aided Colleges.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter would be looked into.**

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that the matter should not be hushed up as it is a very important issue. He said that 10 years have elapsed. The teachers who have secured the requisite points and have research work, needed to be promoted as Professors. He suggested that a circular in this regard should be issued to the affiliated Colleges.

25. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that earlier, they were discussing the issue of financial crunch/constraint. Whenever they would start construction of the building of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib or construction of any other building at the Campus, the cost factor should be taken care of. Citing an example, he said that the cost of construction in the University is double the construction which they get done in the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they follow the CPWD norms, they could not go below that. He knew that somewhere the cost is 2½ or 3 times more. Since the University is a Government organization, whatever estimate is to be given as per the specifications, they would be able to construct the building on those estimates. However, they would get the verification and other necessary things got done. If they construct a room for themselves at home, it cost about Rs.1 lac, but the CPWD cost is about Rs.3 lac.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not that they could not give less than CPWD rates. Whenever tenders are invited, the construction schedule, rates and discount is mentioned. As such, it is not that they could not get the construction done less than the CWPD rates.

26. Shri Naresh Gaur said that a Committee had been sent to a College in Ludhiana and the replies have also been received. However, still he is saying that SDP College has not paid salary to 6 teachers for the last 9 months. From June 2018, these teachers have not got salary.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that termination notice has been issue to the teachers separately.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that termination notice had been issue, but the same has been kept in abeyance in view of the letter written by the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the teachers concerned have not given anything in writing, what could they do?

To this, Shri Naresh Gaur said that it should be got confirmed from the College whether it is paying salaries to the teachers or not. The teachers have not been paid salary for the last 9 months. How it is possible to survive for them and their families? It has come to his notice that the teachers had been

asked to take cheques, but they have put riders with cheques that cheque(s) would be given to them if they agreed to this and this. Then the teachers were asked to submit resignation from the current date, and their previous service would forego and thereafter they would be appointed afresh. These kinds of pressure tactics are being exerted on them. SDP College is exploiting the teachers in this manner, which is not fair.

27. Shri Naresh Gaur said that several Colleges are demanding certain new courses. It is good that with the changing scenario the new system should be given to the Colleges, but his only request is that unless and until the College concerned did not recruit the requisite faculty members, the course should not be given to it.

28. Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Periodical Inspections of the affiliated College is imperative.

29. Shri Naresh Gaur said that, in the last meeting also, he had raised the issue of security personnel. He is again raising the issue because it is appearing in the newspapers also again and again and people are questioning them, which is natural. Whosoever is the senior-most person in the security should be given the charge of Chief of University Security or promoted as such because every person had dream to rise in his life, and the person concerned might also have dream to reach that level at one point of time. It has come to his notice that the senior-most person is B.E., M.B.A. (HR), M.A. (Public Administration) and LL.B. Despite having so many qualifications, he is deprived off the promotion. He remarked that the work suites in the hands of the one, skilled to do it. He, therefore, suggested that the charge of Chief of University Security should be given to the senior-most person in the security.

Shri Naresh Guar, referring to CPWD, stated that when he (Vice Chancellor) had gone to Ludhiana, the discussion had taken place to renovate the building of P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana. An amount of Rs.85 lacs was sanctioned for the renovation of the building by the Committee, which comprised of him (Shri Naresh Gaur), Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Principal Narinder Kaur, Ramgaria College, Ludhiana. The work which was to be executed, was completed with much less cost as they took personal interest in it and visited the markets several times. The quotation of airport chair was received for about Rs.11,000/- each, and the same very chair was purchased at the cost of Rs.6,000/-. He knew this because he had purchased the said chair for the office of his Union. Similarly, the computers were purchased at the cost of Rs.4,000/- each for which the market cost was much high. Everything is on record. There is a Madam (Mrs. Arti), who was also a member. In fact, they did not hold any meeting of the Committee until he (Shri Naresh Gaur) did not go. Thereafter, he was removed from the Committee.

30. Shri Naresh Gaur stated that Shri Ashok Goyal has said that that every College has framed its own rules/regulations. He went to a College, which was run by the SGPC. In the appointment letter of a teacher, it was written, "as per the Panjab University rules and as per the rules of the SGPC". He got surprised as to from where the SGPC rules had come. This is a vague appointment letter that as per the rules of the SGPC and he told them that he would not sign on these papers. Ultimately, he was removed from that Committee and somebody else was appointed in his place, and the appointment was approved. What would they do? He remarked that where the law and the teacher concerned would go? He thought in his mind that they are saved because they are in the Union, but the teachers of the Colleges did not have a good Union. Everybody has his own interest. Even the peons are getting more salary than the teachers,

who possessed M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees and are being paid a salary ranging between Rs.8,000/- and Rs.12,000/- p.m. He asked them as to what are the benefits of Union and for what purposes it is there. He told them that they are organized people and there are only 8% people, who are organized; otherwise, 92% of the people are unorganized and they are being exploited.

31. Shri Sandeep Singh said that, earlier, there used to be a Canteen in the Administrative Block (basement). It would be better if the same is reopened again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is in process.

32. Shri Sandeep Singh said that, last time, the migration case of Mr. Jashanpreet Singh (in the subject of Law) had come to the Syndicate. Though the migration had been allowed, no action had been taken in this regard so far.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he (Shri Sandeep Singh) is right. It was a case of two students and the same was recommended by the Department and the same was approved by the Syndicate. It has come to his notice that after the approval, being a similar case somebody else has represented. Even if it is a similar case, at least the decision of the Syndicate taken in the previous case should be implemented. The other similar case could be decided later on. Even if the decision is to be taken by the Department at its own level on the basis of the Syndicate decision taken in the similar case, they should take the decision. But not to implement the decision, is totally wrong.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to who kept the case pending for so many days in spite of the decision of the Syndicate.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that even the concerned students have not been intimated about the decision of the Syndicate.

33. Shri Sandeep Singh said that he had been raising this issue during the last two-three meeting. It is not good to raise the issue again and again. He had requested earlier also that the students are facing hardship owing to non-issuance of DMCs and Degrees by the University. He urged that the DMCs and Degrees should be issued to the students at the earliest. If he asked the Controller of Examinations, he replied that it could be dealt with by the Finance and Development Officer, and the Finance and Development Officer said that there is no such provision. On the other hand, they are making statements in the newspapers that they have not withheld the DMCs of any student.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to how this problem could be solved? The University had to bear a loss of Rs.15 crore even though they did not want jeopardize the career of the students.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that the grant from the Government could be late, but it is not that it would not come. If they could not release the DMCs to the students, a statement should be made in this regard. It is better for the students, who visited the University office time and again from far off places, to pay the fee instead of incurring expenditure on fare. The students came to the University and they ask them to return empty handed. Though the issue has been discussed in the three meetings of the Syndicate, they could not arrive at any decision so far.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see as to what could be done. He has full concern with him (Shri Sandeep Singh) and they did not want to

withhold the DMC of any student, especially of the poor students. However, they also have to see the finances involved in the issue.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that at the most the University could withhold the degrees of such students, but the DMCs should be released as the students have applied at different places.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said if a student would like to take his/her degree by paying the requisite fee, he/she should be given the degree. This was also endorsed by Shri Naresh Gaur.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should sit together and see if it could be done.

It was informed that as per the information, in the Post Matric Scholarship, the examination fee is not a component. The statement given by the Panjab University to the media is that, P.U. already giving 50% concession to SC students. However, the statement given by the Dean Student Welfare is only in respect of the students of P.U. Campus, Regional Centres as well the students of Constituent Colleges. The Finance & Development Officer has informed that they would not withhold the DMC's and degrees of the students of University School of Open Learning because they are also part of the University. Now some of the Principals of Colleges have started sending the fee and they have despatched the DMCs and degrees of the students of their Colleges. Some of the students who are personally coming to the University to get their DMCs or Degree as they might need the same for getting employment or higher education etc., those students are also being given DMCs and Degrees. Those who need these certificates are being given provisional DMC/Degree., so that there might not face any problem. At the same time the students who send their request online, the certificates are also being sent to them. Whatever could be done at their level, they are doing it. But where there are constraints, they cannot do anything. In such matters the authority or the Syndicate could take a decision.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that there are some students whose result is RLF, the examination branch says that they would not declare their result and also would not allow them to fill the form for the next class.

It was informed that it is being done for the General Category candidates only and not for the SC/ST category candidates.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that for the SC/ST students it is clear that since the Government would not give the money and the students are not able to pay it, thus they would not be allowed to fill the form for the next class.

It was informed that they are going to submit a list of fee defaulters to the Finance & Development Officer on 25<sup>th</sup> of April so that before they allow them for the examination, they must have a clear status as to how much fee of a college is lying pending. They have taken this preventive step so that it should be clear to them.

Shri Sandeep Singh said if the students are put to any loss on account of being denied to fill the form, who would be responsible for it. He asked the Finance & Development Officer as to what could be the solution of this problem. He has been requesting the F.D.O., Registrar and the Controller of Examinations, the issue is passed on to one another. This has been happening for the last three months.



Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan asked Shri Sandeep Singh, would it be okay if the DMCs are issued to the candidates to which Shri Sandeep Singh nodded in the affirmative. Therefore Principal Mahajan requested the Vice Chancellor to get the DMCs issued to the candidates.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they should issue the DMCs without any delay, however, they could withhold the degree. He could give a statement in this regard and ask the students to criticize the government instead of the University. He requested the Vice Chancellor to take this issue seriously. He had raised this issue in the last two meetings of the Syndicate, but nothing was done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Sandeep Singh is talking about the Government College, Hoshiarpur and they could take a decision in respect of this College. But, there are some such colleges, which, if given a little chance that the University dues are not to be paid, they would also ask for issue of DMC. In that situation, what they would do.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they should make details of the eighteen colleges which have not paid the fee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said if the DMCs are withheld on account of some fine, those should be issued.

Shri Sandeep Singh requested the Vice Chancellor to get this work done at the earliest as it has already delayed very much to which the Vice Chancellor said that he would look into it. He informed that yesterday, some students of his College came to take their DMCs. The Madam on duty asked them whether they belong to SC Category. He said to students that they should consume poison. This was his exact wording to the students. The Government College, Hoshiarpur, has a strength of 4-5 thousands. When they ask the candidate about his caste, it hurts him.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that this should be brought as consideration item and get the DMCs issued to the students.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he did not finish his version so they should listen to him a bit more. The students whose results have been withheld, he used to go to the Examination Branch and get their results noted and then tell them whether they have passed the examination or not. He requested that to declare the result of such students. When the next meeting of the Syndicate would be held, he would sit downstairs and not come to attend the meeting, if their results are not declared.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would definitely get information about it tomorrow.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Shri Sandeep Singh) is asking the Vice Chancellor, Controller of Examinations and the F.D.O. about the declaration of the result of the students, but he (Shri Ashok Goyal) he would like to ask him (Shri Sandeep Singh), as to what is the solution with him.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he along with them is ready to meet any person as they have to find solution of the problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the college and the University belonged to him and asked as to what they should do to get the money from the government.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that after meeting the Vice Chancellor, a memorandum has already been sent to the government. He would like to meet the Hon'ble Governor, Punjab, but he could not meet him. He had also requested Shri Vijay Sampla, Union Minister of State, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment who informed that the grant for Post-Matric Scholarship has already been sent to the Punjab Government. However, the Punjab Government says that they have spent the money somewhere else. But they cannot confront with the government.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to confront with the government.

Shri Sandeep Singh asked, how they could do it? They should go altogether to the Punjab Government and added that it is not his personal issue.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is election time and they should use it for the welfare of the University.

On being asked by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma if the whole amount has been received, it was informed that the whole amount has not been received.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is much communication gap.

34. Dr. K. K. Sharma requested to get the letter issued with regard to the earned leaves which were enhanced from 8 to 12 since 2012.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a decision was taken in 2012 that the earned leave of teachers be enhanced from 8 to 12. Actually, the spirit of the decision was that the earned leaves be enhanced to 12 from the year 2008. But somehow it was recorded that the earned leave shall be 12 from 2012 and before that these would remain 8.

Dr. K.K. Sharma, however, said that the earned leave was enhanced from 8 to 12 from 2012.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the earned leaves were not enhanced from 8 to 12 from 2012, but the fact of the matter is that these were enhanced from 2008.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there were eight earned leave for teachers of vocational courses in Punjab government colleges. They took a decision in the year 2012 that the earned leave of teachers would be twelve which were were eight. It was interpreted that from 2012, the earned leave would be twelve and before that these would remain eight.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is correct. How the earned leave could be enhanced from eight to twelve from a back date?

Shri Ashok Goyal said, why the earned leave could not be enhanced from the back date? How they get the pay scales from the back date?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the D.P.I. has also endorsed this letter and said that twelve earned leaves would be granted from the year 2012.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, are they not taking revised pay scales from 1.1.2016? How they could take the revised scale from 1.1.2016?

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the problem is this, the colleges are not allowing the enhanced leave even from 2012 and requested they should impress upon to implement the decision at least from the year 2012.

35. Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the Colleges charge Rs.2040/- from each student towards retiral benefits to the teachers. In the year 2017, they asked for a report from 190 colleges, out of which 105 colleges have submitted the report. The Colleges which are not paying retiral benefits to the teachers should be directed not to charge this amount from the students. Those who are charging this amount, should be asked to use this amount only for the purpose of giving retiral benefits to the teachers and not for any other purpose. It has been seen that they are using this amount for some other purpose also as they are not maintaining a separate account.
36. Dr. K.K. Sharma further pointed out that if a retired teacher or a former Fellow happens to visit Panjab University, more rent is used from him for booking of Guest House. The normal rent for in service teachers or former Fellows is Rs.250/- whereas for the retired teachers or former Fellows, it is Rs.350/- which seem to be insulting for them. The University may enhance the rent to Rs.300/-, but it should be the same for all. He, therefore, requested that same rate should be charged from them.
37. Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out that the general elections are being held till 19<sup>th</sup> of May and the examinations would be held on 20<sup>th</sup> May. It would be very difficult for the teachers to perform duty on 20<sup>th</sup> immediately after returning from the election duty. In many of the colleges, counting of votes would also take place, so the infrastructure of the college is locked two-three days earlier and nobody is allowed to enter. He requested to keep all these things in mind.

It was informed that they have issued a circular to all the Principals of the affiliated colleges where the examination centres have been set up to make temporary emergent appointments, particularly, keeping in view the elections scenario. For instance a Deputy Superintendent can officiate in place of Superintendent of an examination centre, provided one fulfils the qualifications prescribed in the University Calendar. No examination would be held in the evening session on 17<sup>th</sup> May and there would be paper on 18<sup>th</sup> May. On 20<sup>th</sup> morning, there is only one paper. Similarly, on 22<sup>nd</sup> evening, the strength of the students is very less and there would be no paper on 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> May. If they want, the University could shift these examinations in the month of June, but he did not want to trouble the teachers because the vacations are starting from 1<sup>st</sup> of June. They have put the date sheet on the website after getting it approved from the Vice Chancellor, so that if there is problem to anybody, he could share it with them.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the problem would arise when a Superintendent have to perform the election duty also.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether they could change the Centre Superintendent?

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the Centre Superintendent remains the same till the completion of the examination.

It was informed that the Deputy Superintendent could officiate in place of Centre Superintendent. They could also appoint two Deputy Centre Superintendent, provided they fulfil the required conditions. They have to work in such a way that the election might not be disturbed and at the same time the examinations would also be conducted smoothly.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they wanted to make any change, they have to take the examination on 12<sup>th</sup> June.

Principal R.K. Mahajan wanted to know if they could appoint a temporary teacher for this duty.

It was informed that it is left to the Principal of the College, provided a person has 5 years' or more teaching experience and qualify to be appointed as Centre Superintendent.

At this point of time Dr. K.K. Sharma enquired whether they have clinched the issue with regard to the more room rent being charged from the retired teachers or former Fellows.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee has already been constituted to look into the issue of room rent etc of various P.U. Guest Houses. This matter would also be looked into by that Committee.

Dr. K.K. Sharma again requested to charge the same room rent from the retired teachers or former Fellows.

38. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma wanted to know whether the Inspection Committees visiting the Colleges for grant of affiliation are constituted as per the UGC norms.

It was informed that the Inspection Committees are formed as per the UGC norms, but he (Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma) could point out if there is any infringement in his notice.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Inspection Committees are not formed as per the UGC norms. As per the UGC Regulations 2009 for affiliation, it is written very clearly that there should be one subject expert, nominee of the Dean College Development Council and one of the subject experts of the level of Professor to be nominated by the Vice Chancellor shall be the Chairperson of the Committee. He pointed out that there are two subject experts in the Inspection Committees being sent to the Colleges. He informed that for a college, a Committee consisting of 24 members have been formed, which was not required. The Committee which is sent by the Dean College Development Council to the Vice Chancellor for approval, he (Vice Chancellor) could appoint a subject expert from the Committee as Chairperson of the Committee for the subject to which the affiliation has to be granted. He pointed out that for grant of affiliation to a diploma course of one year or 6 months, 2-3 experts have been put on the Committee. From this, it seems that they are favouring a department.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know whether there is need of only one subject expert and requested Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma to repeat the same.

Principal Gurdip Sharma made it clear that only one subject expert is required and requested that they should see the UGC regulations of 2009.

Shri Ashok Goyal said suppose there is one subject, out of one, how they could appoint one as Chairperson.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there would be a total of two subject experts. As desired by Shri Ashok Goyal, he again read out the formation of the Committee again.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to how many persons go the Medical College for inspection. Would they send only one person to the Medical College?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said the number of subject experts would be as per the number of subjects for which the affiliation is to be granted.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that there is no bifurcation of subjects in the Medical College.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he is not discussing it with him (Shri Ashok Goyal) to which Shri Goyal said that he would like to understand the issue from him. Shri Gurdip Sharma said if the Committees are constituted rightly, there is no issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is also saying the same thing that if the Committees are not formed correctly, it should be corrected. He asked if they are to grant affiliation for B.A. Course, how many people would be included in the Committee.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the number of subject experts would as per the number of subjects for which the affiliation is to be granted and out of which one would be made the Chairperson of the Committee by the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked how the 24 persons have been included in the Inspection Committee?

Principal Gurdip Sharma said he does not know as to how 24 persons had been included in the Inspection Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the college about which he (Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma) is talking about, every year, a Committee consisting of such a number of persons visit the College. He asked, is he talking about the College at Chella, Makhsuspur (Hoshiarpur)? The answer was in the affirmative.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he is not talking to him (Shri Ashok Goyal). He is just saying that if they have appointed more experts in the Committees, that should be corrected.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to listen to the Dean College Development Council as to why the additional person(s) has/have been put on the Inspection Committee(s).

It was informed that they could not put more number of persons than required. There could be one such case. For example, they have appointed an Inspection Committee for grant of affiliation in the subject of Commerce. One Chairperson has to be appointed. It could be possible that the Chairperson might not have been appointed from the subject of Commerce and as such the number of person might have been increased.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Chairperson has also to be appointed out of the members of the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that if there is no Professor on the Committee, they may have included a Professor in the Committee as Chairperson.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in such a case, they should reduce one member and in his place a Professor should be made a member of that Inspection Committee and no additional person should be put on the Inspection Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the concern of Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma is that the financial burden on the college has increased enormously, so minimum possible number of persons should be put on the Committees. But he would like to bring to his (Vice Chancellor) knowledge another thing which he has raised earlier also that merely adopting the UGC does not make the rules and regulations applicable to the University, reason being that if tomorrow the case goes to the Court, this adoption does not stand. The Court would say to show their (P.U.) Calendar. By adopting the UGC, they have to make amendment in their Calendar and that is what the UGC has said. They have asked to make the necessary changes in their statutes.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have adopted many UGC letters, what these did not incorporated in their regulations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said now what is happening is that sometimes they make rules and regulations in the name of UGC or sometimes in the name of the University. As such different rules and regulations existed. Those colleges which are not able to afford the expenditure to be incurred for the Inspection Committee, they feel a lot of problem, not due of the fact that the Inspection Committee is coming to inspect the College, but because of the expenditure they would have to incur.

It was informed that sometimes the number of person on the Inspection Committees increases due to the number of different subjects/classes such as B.Com-I, II or III or BBA I, II, III. Secondly, in some cases, the members refuse, at the eleventh hour to go for inspection. In such cases, if there is already one teacher, they did not provide the replacement of that teacher. They used to say that only one teacher would take care of the inspection.

The Vice Chancellor said they did it in most of the cases.

39. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that for the evaluation of Ph.D. examiner, in some of the departments, three examiners are appointed and the reports from all the three are required whereas in some department two examiners are appointed. Where three examiners are appointed, the report of the best of two examiners should be taken into consideration. The examiners, who have retired, are not sending the reports despite requests from the Controller of Examinations and the Registrar for the last six months. He does not know as to what they are expecting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a very-very serious matter. He would like to tell for the information of the Vice Chancellor that they have had made a time schedule as to in how many days the thesis would be submitted and in how many days it would be sent to examiner and in how many days the report would be sent by the examiners. But if any examiner, for whatever reason, refuse to respond within the stipulated period, that examiners should be blacklisted. This is no way to play with the career of the students. This was done because the examiners did not send the reports years together. In some cases, when the Ph.D. was the essential qualification, it happened that one of the candidates had submitted his Ph.D. thesis two and a half year ago, the posts were advertised by the University, but the report from the examiner was not received. However, it was treated that the candidate is Ph.D. and he was appointed on that post

keeping in view that the candidate has no fault because it is the examiner who is not sending the report. It had happened twenty five years back. Now the case is with the Finance & Development Officer for grant of pension. The person in question is now demanding that he should be given the benefit of five years in pension as the Ph.D. was an essential qualification at that time. However, the Finance & Development Officer is saying that though the Ph.D. was an essential qualification, but he was not Ph.D. at that time. He is unable to understand, why this condition was imposed by the Accounts Branch or the R.A.O. because there was no such condition that one should had been Ph.D., but the condition was that the Ph.D. was the essential qualification. The Selection Committee, in spite of the fact that he was not Ph.D. at that time, treated him as Ph.D. and appointed him. Now, how they could deny him the benefit of pension. The then Vice Chancellor had thought that the examiner is not sending his report, but the person is Ph.D. Now that teacher has retired and his pension case is hanging fire because he is claiming benefit of five years for pension. Perhaps, a Committee has been constituted for that and it would be done. Since the examiners were exploiting the students for so many years, then they had decided to make some timeline so that the exploitation could be stopped. But in spite of that if Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma is saying that the report is not being sent for the last six months, it is not good.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is a one particular case. He thinks that if two positive reports have been received, then they should go ahead.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know that if two reports have been received, why they are not proceeding ahead?

It is informed that this is a very rare case. The University Business School ask for three reports. He had discussed this matter with the Dean. The department says that they could decide as to which two reports are the best only when they would receive all the three reports. This is a provision in the Calendar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is provision in the P.U. Calendar for two positive reports. Is the Dean saying that they would take the two best when all the three reports would come?

It was informed that the Dean has said that there is requirement of three reports as for as the University Business School is concerned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said suppose there is requirement of three reports, but if there are two positive reports, can they go ahead.

It was informed that it is to be decided after all the three reports are received.

Shri Ashok Goyal said for the UBS, there is requirement of three reports, but if there is department where six reports are required, should those six reports be positive? He asked as to how many positive reports should be positive to which it was said that two reports should be positive. Now, the worst condition is that they assume that the third report is negative. In that situation also, they would do the same thing which they could do today.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it would cause delay.

Shri Naresh Gaur also supported Shri Ashok Goyal.

It was informed that nine telephone calls and seven emails were sent to the examiners requesting to send the report.

Shri Ashok Goyal said why they sent him so many emails as it is a futile exercise.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there should be some limit for sending reminders. They could send two or three reminders and not more than this.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that two positive reports have been received to which Shri Ashok Goyal said the Ph.D. degree should be given to the candidate. He does not understand as to why they are not going ahead when two positive reports have been received.

On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal as to why they are not processing the case ahead, it was informed that a note has been put to the authorities in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University Business School has their own rules. In the University, the Ph.D. enrolment is made twice in a year, but in UBS, they make enrolment only once in a year. They cannot speak much on this issue because there are also such departments in the University which make Ph.D. enrolment once in two years.

40. Professor Rajesh Gill said that they stated it earlier also that since the Convocation is going to be held, there used to be a circular issued to the departments that the pending viva-voce examinations etc. should be held at the earliest so that degrees to the students could be given in the Convocation. She requested the Registrar to get it done at the earliest.

41. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the last meeting he had demanded information with regard to the MoUs executed by the University with other institutions as to what is their performance, how many people visited the other institutions, how much amount has been spent, whether these are workable or not.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this information needed to be given in the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this was discussed in the last meeting of the Syndicate also that this information should be given to all.

42. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that the University examinations are going to commence. The bill for practical examinations is submitted to the University and thereafter it goes to various branches for processing which takes a very long time. He requested that it would be better if the payment is fixed per student-wise, equal to the payment which the University is already making, it would save a lot of exercise made by the University as well as the college. Suppose there are one hundred students, the payment would be made by multiplying it with the payment fixed for each student.

It was said that there are so many things which need to be done. In following the procedures, which causes delay and a lot of manpower is also spent. There are other 2-3 points where they could fix the rates. The legacy system which is prevailing, it needs to be reviewed.



The Vice Chancellor directed the Finance & Development Officer to prepare a note for it and get it approved. Principal R.K. Mahajan urged that this system of making payment should be made applicable for the practical examinations which are going to be held.

43. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that the 5-Year Integrated Law Course is running in the University Institute of Legal Studies. Some teachers are teaching Law subjects and the others allied subjects. The teachers working in that Institute are not allowed to enrol Ph.D. students. However, in other departments such as Law or Punjabi or any other department, such a practice existed. He urged that the teachers of UILS, if eligible, should also be allowed to become research guide and to enrol students for Ph.D.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that such a provision is already there in the University Institute of Legal Studies. One of her students is teaching in Sociology in the UILS and she has successfully guided 4-5 candidates as supervisor registered in Department of Sociology.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is some problem in University Institute of Legal Studies. They wanted that the R.D.C. of UILS should be separated from Law Department. However, he told them that it is not possible. Actually, what is happening there, is that the enrolment for Ph.D. etc. for UILS is done by the Law Department and the Research Scholar enrolled for Ph.D. in the UILS would attend the classes in the Department of Law. As such, the whole control remains with the Department of Law. To his mind, there is need to streamline this. There are some things on which the UILS should have the control. The whole system should be looked into once properly as they cannot separate the subject as all the Professors either they belong to Department of Laws or the UILS, would be the members of the Research Degree Committee (RDC). But at the same time, there are some things, which needed to be looked into.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the UGC Guidelines are clear on this that the RDC would be in the main Department and registration of candidate shall be in one Department only. The subject of Sociology is not only taught in the Department of Evening Studies, but also taught in University School of Open Learning; however, the registration is done only in the main Department.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for the students of University Institute of Engineering & Technology enrolled for Ph.D. in Physics, RDC is conducted by the Department of Physics, but the control regarding their attendance, etc. has been left to the University Institute of Engineering & Technology. However, the same is not done in the University Institute of Legal Studies. This is what they require.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Research Centres have been created in CRRID and also at some other Institutes, but their RDC meeting is conducted by the respective department.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is what he is saying. The RDC should be conducted in the Law Department, but the other control should be left to the University Institute of Legal Studies. So, there is need to look into these things.

44. Professor Navdeep Goyal that the Ph.D. examiners come to the University from places like Delhi, Kanpur, Roorkee, etc. in their own car or taxi. When they have to stay at night, they have to pay for the driver also. About Rs. 2000/- or 2500/- are deducted from the payment of the examiner. Some

examiners do not talk about it and thus they (University) do not come to know about it. Those examiners who enquired about, he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) paid them from his own pocket because they have come to conduct the viva of his students. It does not look nice to charge money from a person who has come as a guest of theirs. The rates fixed by the University were decided long back ago. The rates of Central Universities are one and half time more than theirs. He urged, if they could do it, there is need to revise travel rates immediately because per kilometre rate fixed by the University is very less.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to it and directed the Finance & Development Officer to look into it as to what could be done in this matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the rates were fixed long time ago, the taxi is not available these days on that rate.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma while endorsing the view point of Professor Navdeep Goyal, said that the rates needed to be reviewed. These rates were fixed when petrol was selling at the rate of Rs.43/- per litre, but now is about Rs.73/-

The Vice Chancellor said that he would look into it, but at the same time he has also to see the financial position of the university.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the examiner should get at least that amount which he has spent.

The Vice Chancellor informed that he had gone to attend a meeting and he had been charging at the rate of Rs.8/- per Km, but they asked to claim Rs.25/- per Km. He (Vice Chancellor) said, if it is permissible, they could give, as he has to deposit the amount in the University account. He informed that in Banaras Hindu University also, the rate is Rs.10/- per Km.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in most of the Universities the rate is Rs.15-16/- per Km.

45. Shri Naresh Gaur pointed out that when some cheque is issued by the University even for paying the T.A., it is counted in their income. The amount which is being paid to them as payment for T.A. has been spent by them and it is just reimbursed to them. As such it is not their income. Why this is not paid in cash?

It was informed that there are instructions from the government to make all payments digitally irrespective of the amount.

46. Shri Ashok Goyal said that perhaps he had raised this issue earlier also. One of the Principal of Constituent Colleges is having charge of two colleges. He pointed out some deficiency in a College. Instead of taking action on that, the charge of that college was taken from him. As such, one who pointed out the deficiency was penalised. It did not make any difference for him if the charge is taken from him, but one thing has pained him as the people said that the charge of that college has been taken away from him. Now, the charge has been given to him. The issues which he has raised in the zero hour, he thinks that all those issues were just for the purpose of listening, whether these were recorded or not, whether addressed or not, but he would at least ask as to what has been done for those issues. As he had told him (Vice Chancellor) about the giving charge to a person who is on deputation, that is a very serious issue.

47. Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Gaur has raised the issue of Chief of University Security and the same issue was also raised by him last time also. It is a very ticklish issue. In the last meeting, since the Vice Chancellor had got very emotional, so he did not speak. At that time, he (Vice Chancellor) had said that when a Professor is a Chief of Security, he has his own position and the students fear from a Professor much than any other person. It meant that they should appoint Professors everywhere. By appointing a Professor as Chief of University Security, they are working against the prestige of a University Professor. A University Professor has nothing to do with Security of the University. If his teaching work is not suffering, it means that he does not teach the students. If his teaching work suffers, how could they justify it? There are so many things which he does not want to say. When they have Security Officer, why do they not give him the charge till they appoint a new Chief of the University Security? When they have been following this practice everywhere, why not here? So, this is not correct. If there is anything, he (Vice Chancellor) could share it with them with open mind.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Chief of the University Security) should be given some more time as it would enhance his (Vice Chancellor) belief.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has published in the newspapers that the University vehicle is being used for his wife who is employed in the Bank. This has maligned the image of the University. He does not think that they could take it so non-seriously. Instead of realising that there is something wrong in it, they are justifying it. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that the points which have been raised here, Action Taken Report on this points should be placed before the Syndicate.

48. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that interview for the posts of Principals for some colleges, has been fixed at Kamla Lohtia College and Professor Navdeep Goyal has to go there. He requested that the said interview be got cancelled, keeping in view of the Model Code of Conduct.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked the Dean College Development Council to inform the college telephonically about it to which the Dean College Development Council said that he would do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not do any such thing on which the Election Commission could raise a finger on them.

Karamjeet Singh  
Registrar

Confirmed

RAJ KUMAR  
VICE-CHANCELLOR