

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 11<sup>th</sup> May 2019 at 11.00 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. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
7. Dr. K.K. Sharma
8. Shri Naresh Gaur
9. Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu
10. Professor Navdeep Goyal
11. Professor Rajat Sandhir
12. Professor Rajesh Gill
13. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
14. Shri Sandeep Singh
15. Professor S.K. Sharma
16. Professor Karamjeet Singh Registrar ... (Secretary)

Dr. Inderjit Kaur, 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 Shri Dinesh Prasad Singh, father of Dr. Mritunjay Kumar, Vice President, PUTA (A.C. Joshi Library), on 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2019".

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Shri Dinesh Prasad Singh and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

**Vice-Chancellor's Statement**

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

- (i) Professor Ved Prakash Upadhyaya, former Professor, Department of Sanskrit, has been awarded with President Award for contribution to Sanskrit studies.
- (ii) Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited has provided one sanitary vending machine, seven incinerators and 54 dustbins to Girls Hostel No.6 under the corporate social responsibility.
- (iii) High Energy Physics Group, Dept. of Physics has been awarded the DST project entitled "Indian Institutions –Fermilab Collaboration in Neutrino Physics" under the guidance of Professor Vipin Bhatnagar and Dr. Ashok Kumar. The total sanctioned grant is Rs.1.89 crore for a period of 5 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that while congratulating, he would like to understand the University for having extending this felicitation to Professor Ved Prakash Upadhyaya. Professor Ved Prakash Upadhyaya had been awarded a DST Project. While congratulating Professor Upadhyaya, he would like to know as to what this President's Award is because it is going to be a part of the Syndicate proceedings. Hence, what this award is? Has it been awarded to anybody else in the University earlier or the other leading personalities, who have been awarded this award because he is not sure whether there is any such award which is named as President Award? Is there any detail about this or this award has simply been awarded by the President? He urged the Vice Chancellor to throw some light on this. There should be some citation or some brief abstracts, etc. because the author of the statement is the Vice Chancellor. Could anybody tell them as to what this President Award is? He further said that though he is not anybody to comment on this, but what has been happening in the past say, "the Hon'ble Chancellor, President of India, who came to the University for Convocation, gave some medals to the students". Could they call them Vice-President Award just because the same have been awarded by the Vice-President? In fact, the Award would be known by its name. If the awards are being distributed by the Vice-President, could they be called Vice-President's Award? What he understood is that such awards are instituted by the Department of Languages, Government of India, and they give the awards which are distributed by the President of India in President's House. So instead of saying award for contribution to Sanskrit Language, they called it President's Award because President has given it. He is not sure whether this also is covered under that.

The Vice Chancellor asked has any of the member update on this.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that there seemed to be a grey area in this.

It was informed that last month also, such an issue relating to Dr. Jagdish Prasad Semwal, former Professor, VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur, was brought in the statement of the Vice Chancellor. Shri Ashok Goyal is correct that it needed to be checked as to whether it is President's Award.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is just possible that tomorrow the Chief Guest might be the Prime Minister. Would it be named as Prime Minister Award? However, all the awards of the Languages Departments are actually given by the President and the function is also held in the President House. The name of the award is something else.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the name of the award could be something else. Hence, it should be checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to see whether any award with this nomenclature existed in the provisions. If it is found to be correct, then it is alright; otherwise, it should be revised and brought again to the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Sure".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that without any prejudice to Professor Ved Prakash Upadhyaya ji. A lot of congratulations to Professor Upadhyaya ji for whatever award he has got, but the record must be correct.

Referring to Sr. No.7 of the Action Taken Report, Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that it was an item relating to Ph.D. guidelines, which was referred back to the Committee. Since the issue of Ph.D. guidelines is such that it is could not be easily understood as also what is to be done about this. The other day, he was discussing the issue with Madam as she was a member of the Committee earlier. Now, it has been learnt that the Committee has been changed. He felt that when the issue is discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate and generally whenever any item is referred back, it is done owing to certain reasons, which are known only to the members present in the meeting of the Syndicate and Madam (Professor Rajesh Gill) was also present in the meeting. He is unable to understand and at least the Vice Chancellor should take care of the members who participated in the discussion on the issue, should be made members of the Committee. However, in this case under consideration, he is unable to understand as to why the Committee has been changed.

Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that otherwise also President, PUTA, is always made a member of such Committees.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the persons present here in the Syndicate were the members of the Committee, they should at least be not removed and even if they are not members, one or two of them should be made members so that they could give the input and update the other members of the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Right".

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that; otherwise, there would be problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Professor Navdeep Goyal has not rightly told as to what was decided by the Syndicate. Without any offence, he just wanted to point out that the Syndicate had sent back the case to the same Committee. The Action Taken Report says a new Committee has been constituted. What was the objection for a new Committee to be constituted? There were some doubts in the minds of the members of the Syndicate, and that was why, it was referred back to the same Committee, so that the proposal comes with clarification. Now, he says that there was no objection for any new Committee to be formed, whichever Committee was existing on the date of the Syndicate meeting and had sent the recommendations, this be referred back to the same Committee, and the new Committee be disbanded. Secondly, this gives very bad impression that it has been written that "the meeting of the Committee has been fixed for \_\_\_\_\_", and the blank had to be filled. Such things needed to be taken care of. He reiterated that the entire issue should be referred to the same Committee, the recommendations of which were earlier considered by the Syndicate. Madam Rajesh Gill has posed a very pertinent question, that in fact, has been a very healthy practice that any issue relating to the Campus, especially the teachers of the University, - whether it is academic or administrative or anything affecting the teachers, President

PUTA, automatically becomes the member. But of late, he has observed that whether by way of omittance or ignorance or intentionally, is not being put on the Committees, and not only this, even if she is there somewhere, she is being taken off. So he has every reason to assume and believe that there is nothing like wilful or intentional effort to do that, but if it is not, make it sure that the President, PUTA, is made a member of the afore-said Committees irrespective of the fact as to who is the President of PUTA.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he supported the suggestion made by Shri Ashok Goyal because the teachers' viewpoints needed to be projected in the meetings of the Committees, which could only be done by the President, PUTA.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he also supported the suggestion made by Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would certainly strengthen the decision.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he has been saying it in almost every meeting of the Syndicate starting from January 2019 that an impression is going, which needed to be removed at the earliest and whosoever would stand, even if it is not a fact, the message going in the society is as if there is a conscious effort on the part of the office of the Vice Chancellor not to put members of the Senate and Syndicate on any Committee, who used to be the members of the Committees for years together. Specific instructions have been given that no member of the Syndicate and Senate be included in the panels. Even some members of the Senate, who were on the panels, and the matter is academic, the disqualification is 'being the members of the Senate' and Dean of the Faculty is not a qualification. Even if it is wrong (the information is wrong), he thought that it is imperative to ensure that such kinds of messages should not go out. He further stated that he had been raising the issue of protocol also, but he has no hesitation in confessing and conceding that his efforts have completely failed and nowhere the hierarchy is being taken care of. Junior persons are being appointed Chairpersons of certain Committees, even though certain senior persons are members there. So much so, in a very polite manner, he had conveyed to the Vice Chancellor that he would be the last person to attend any Committee meeting, where the non-Senator or non-Syndic is the Chairperson of the Committee and members of the Syndicate and Senate are just members. Though he was assured that the matter would be looked into, unfortunately the same has not been done and the same thing is going on now. He thought that the Vice Chancellor has full confidence in the competence and also in the conduct of Syndicate and Senate members, and if it is so, the Syndicate and Senate members do expect that the impression outside should not be as if the Vice Chancellor and the members of the Syndicate and Senate are on different pages; rather, it should look as if they are all one and he (Vice Chancellor) being the head of the Syndicate and Chairman of the Syndicate. But unfortunately at the cost of repetition, he is telling him (Vice Chancellor) that the impression is as if the Vice Chancellor is not happy with the Syndicate. If he (Vice Chancellor) is not happy with them, they would be very happy to know on what count he is not happy, but at the same time, he thought that this much right they have formally or informally to share with him (Vice Chancellor) that there are some concerns in their minds also and this he is speaking on behalf of all the members of the Syndicate, and it is not his contention alone. As pointed out by Professor Navdeep Goyal about the appointment of a new Committee relating to Ph.D. guidelines, this was also the viewpoint of everybody. So he thought that as Chairman of the Syndicate, it is a very-very serious matter because it is the viewpoint of all the members, something needed to be corrected.

The Vice Chancellor said that so far as his (Shri Ashok Goyal) first submission is concerned, i.e., about the protocol and seniority, earlier certain lapses were there at some places, but now he is taking all the precautions and giving first preference to the

members of the Syndicate and Senate. As such, now it is not happening and he is giving them this assurance. Even if it has happened, it might be owing to oversight.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that what is happening is that to ensure that the protocol is not disturbed, he (Vice Chancellor) has stopped putting members of the Syndicate and Senate on the Committees, Inspection Committees, panels, etc.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not like this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is there and he could tell him (Vice Chancellor) in private and he did not want to tell here that specific instructions have been issued that the list should be submitted to him after removing the members of the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) must tell him, but he would like to inform that at some places where he felt that the Hon'ble members of the Syndicate and Senate are overburdened, only they have been spared, and persons like Professor Navdeep Goyal have been given certain very important assignments and they have been spared from those assignments where the job could be carried out without their valuable assistance. However, he would like to tell that he is getting fullest support from both the Houses, i.e., Syndicate and Senate. If there is anything, it is merely the confusion.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that, in fact, the confusion is more dangerous than the fact.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are very esteemed and responsible persons. It is his responsibility and theirs' also to remove this confusion as there is nothing like this at all.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the message is that the Syndicate is different and the Vice Chancellor is theirs' and they would not allow any of them (members of the Syndicate) to be appointed as member of the Committees. This is the message.

The Vice Chancellor said that this message is wrong.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu remarked that if this message is wrong, he (Vice Chancellor) should prove it.

The Vice Chancellor said that, earlier, the seniority issue was there, but it should not happen like this. Secondly, some of them, who were/are overburdened, he is assigning them certain new jobs, which are very important and their assistance is required there and the others would not be able to do those jobs. For example, the entire work relating to course(s) has been assigned to Professor Navdeep Goyal where earlier he was not there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that discussion took place in the meeting of the Syndicate and ideas were expressed. In the meeting of the Committee, he told that these were the points which were raised in the meetings of the Syndicate or the Senate. This is what they are saying that the discussion, which took place here, is known only to the members of the Syndicate. Hence, their presence in the Committee is must. Secondly, the issue of seniority is there at certain places. Citing an example, he said that the admissions to Honours School courses are approaching and all the Chairpersons of the Departments are senior persons and they are also the members. He had come to know that someone very junior person has been appointed and it would be very difficult for him to take the work from the senior people. It is not that they have

any problem with him, but sometimes it becomes very difficult for a junior person to take work from the senior persons. He, therefore, suggested that it should be avoided.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the discussion should not be diluted. In fact, the problem is because junior person has been appointed as Chairman of the Committee and seniors are just members. This meant, they are not taking care of the dignity of the senior persons.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that had he (Vice Chancellor) any doubt about their competency.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to it. If they need to improve on an issue, it could be done and there is no harm in it. If anything like this is somewhere, he would be the first person to appreciate and welcome them, if informally they tell him. It is only happening owing to communication gap as they are not able to meet frequently as he is busy and they are also busy somewhere. He added that he would like to understand several things from Professor S.K. Sharma, but is not able to find time for the purpose, and Professor S.K. Sharma is also not easily available.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that his (Professor S.K. Sharma) availability is difficult and his (Shri Ashok Goyal) availability is not there at all and he (Vice Chancellor) also fell in his (Shri Ashok Goyal) category as his available is also not there.

Shri Naresh Gaur remarked that whenever the Chief Minister gets changed, the Principal Secretary, Director General of Police, etc. are also changed saying that they are very busy they should be shifted to Forest Department, etc. This is what which is happening in the University now, and this is the reality.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, actually, what they are talking today, is the outcome of joint discussion that if the Vice Chancellor convenes the meeting of the Syndicate only to get the items approved, they could approve the items even without discussion because if there is mutual trust, there is not problem, but if there is a lack of mutual trust, probably that needed to be addressed first, and thereafter, the items. Hence, they thought that after all, he is also the head of the family, why could they not talk that these are their concerns.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Sure". He has always said that he works 24 × 7 and there is no restriction for the members of the Syndicate and Senate. They could tell him to how many of them he has refused to meet or give time.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that it is not that he (Vice Chancellor) has refused to meet, but he usually says that they should talk to his Secretary.

The Vice Chancellor said, "No", he could not say so for them (the members of the Syndicate and Senate).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) had said this, but he would not disclose the names, to whom he had said this. However, he had said this, and that is why, he is saying so. At least, he (Vice Chancellor) has neither said this to him nor Professor Navdeep Goyal nor Professor S.K. Sharma. He could only tell the names of those to whom he had not said this, but could disclose the names of those, whom he had said this, only in private.

The Vice Chancellor said that he might have asked the outsiders to take time from his Secretary, but not to the members of the Syndicate and Senate. However, he asked those persons to take time from his Secretary, whom he received SMS because all

engagements are taken care of by his Secretary, but he might not have said this to them (members of the Syndicate and Senate).

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that they talked to him in fear because they did not know when he (Vice Chancellor) would get angry.

The Vice Chancellor said, "No", there is no need to fear from him and his image should not be built like this.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there is a benefit of putting the members of the Syndicate on the Committee that they could look at the perspective from different point of view and when that item is considered by the Syndicate, instead of defending by the Vice Chancellor, it becomes their duty to defend the recommendation(s). He thought that this is very good for him (Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said that it might have happened in this case, but in majority cases, it does not happen. However, he would see to it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the issue relating to affiliation of Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to state that he was waiting for this issue as it is very-very serious concern. Though personally speaking, he had always been against creating a parallel governing structure in the form of Chairpersons Committee/meeting, which was introduced by the previous Vice Chancellor (Professor Arun Kumar Grover), any way for interaction and for mutual input, the Vice Chancellor called the meetings of the Chairpersons. He (Vice Chancellor) being the man of management, knew that there is a concept of participatory management and as a concept of participatory management even the representatives of lowest cadre are also included while taking the decisions in the management. Resultantly, the President of PUTA had always been invited to the meetings of the Chairpersons, but unfortunately President, PUTA, has been removed from the said forum/list. Why? If her name is not included, he could understand that it could be through an oversight, but if the name is already there and the same has been removed, then of course, there has to be some ground. He enquired as to what the reason for this.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, in fact, he (Vice Chancellor) must be knowing that she was given frantic calls to say, "Please don't come as you are not supposed to come to the meeting". It was very humiliating.

The Vice Chancellor said that she must have told this to him because he is not aware of the majority of the things.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that he had received phone call(s) from the office of the Dean of University Instruction because earlier her e-mail id. existed in their mail and the e-mail came to her. Thereafter, she was told not to come to the meeting of the Chairpersons.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that an enquiry should be conducted as how the President, PUTA, was removed from the forum/list. He further said that before Professor Navdeep Goyal speaks anything, another thing he would like to bring to their notice is that this Action Taken Report also speaks.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that these are the confusion, he could tell them.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, in fact, they help the administration.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this Action Taken Report itself speaks that whatever important decisions were taken in Zero Hour or the decision which would be taken now, they don't become the part of the proceedings, what to talk of Action Taken Report.

The Vice Chancellor said that they do take several decisions during the Zero Hour.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could themselves see that nothing has been mentioned about the decisions taken during the Zero Hour.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is being informed that from next meeting, Action Taken Report would also include the decisions taken during the Zero Hour.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant, till now they are not doing so.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they would ask him as to what has been done about the decisions taken in the Zero Hour.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that from the next meeting onwards, the action taken report on the decisions taken during the Zero Hour must be provided.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that in the last two meeting he had suggested to issue the circular of earned leave for College teachers but the letter in this regard has still not been issued to the affiliated Colleges.

It was informed that the letter might have been issued as the concerned officials had come to him (Dean, College Development Council) and asked him whether the letter is to be issued or not and he had directed them to issue the letter immediately.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that but the letter has not been issued so far and the same might be in process.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that he had also raised the issue of admission through lateral entry in the previous two meetings but still no action has been taken. Though the examinations are starting from 14<sup>th</sup> April, the candidates did not know their status and what is to be done. He had also made an application to the Registrar on 18<sup>th</sup> April, but he did not know to whom it has been marked. Even though about 25 days had elapsed, nothing has been done in this regard.

It was clarified that the admission of candidate/s through lateral entry, about which Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan is talking, could not be made as he/they are not eligible as the University from where they have qualified the lower examination is not approved by the UGC. Earlier, the University had allowed admission of such candidates as a special case, but since the session 2018-19 is almost over and they are not in a position to allow admission at this belated stage. As such, it is not that they are not doing anything. If something is illegal and is to be legalised, it would definitely take time.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan enquired whether the university, about which they are talking, is not recognised by the UGC. How could they treat a university illegal which existed in the list of approved Universities of UGC?

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they (University) should give in writing that the said university is illegal and if an year of candidates is got wasted, they would be held responsible.



Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 11<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that when the name of the university existed in the list approved University of the UGC, how could they tell that the university is illegal? .

The Vice Chancellor directed the officers to look into the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thought that he could not express his viewpoints. In fact, Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan is right that in the last/last to last meeting of the Syndicate some decision about this was taken. Principal Mahajan had suggested that they should be given admission through lateral entry. If they (University Authority) felt that they are not eligible for admission through lateral entry, the same should be given in writing. However, they should keep it pending for a long period, so that they could adopt a course of action what they wished to, including approaching the Court. Or they could take a liberal view keeping in view the discretion available with them. His simple view is that whatever decisions are taken in the Zero Hour discussion, the appropriate action must be taken on them.

The Vice Chancellor said that it must be got expedited.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that before them (Vice Chancellor and the Registrar) there were the Vice Chancellors and the Registrars and they including the office people were of the view that Syndicate members were of the opinion that the issues related to public interest are to be taken up during Zero Hour and the decisions would be taken there, and they would inform outside that decisions on issues related to them have been taken, but the office people are of the view that they are not supposed to record anything else except the discussion/decisions on the agenda items. In this way, the members of the Syndicate are happy as well as the Vice Chancellor and the Registrar. When it is not to be recorded, how could it be implemented? When it is not implemented, people asked them that though they were saying that it has been done, but where it has gone.

It was clarified that it is not like this. Whatever discussion took place and decisions taken during Zero Hour, all are recorded and circulated to the concerned quarters for necessary action, which could be verified. However, it is true that action taken report did not include the decisions taken during Zero Hour. In fact, he had already directed the concerned officials to submit the Action Taken Report on the decisions taken during Zero Hour also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he meant to say is the discussion held during the Zero Hour and decisions taken therein are being recorded, but the Action Taken Report on them is not being provided to them. He is saying that the Action Taken Report on the Zero Hour should also be provided. He remarked that there is improving in the office functioning after taking over the office of Registrar by Professor Karamjeet Singh, but the improvement is seen, people become greedy and wanted more and more improvement.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever is being said about Professor Karamjeet Singh is true, but he would like to inform them that his entire team is working with full dedication. In fact, he has asked all the Officers, who are sitting here, to note down all the points and give the same to him along with their observations and thereafter, he gets them compiled.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that appreciation of Professor Karamjeet Singh did not mean that these Officers are not being appreciated.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that, in fact, it is a team effort.

Referring to Part 4 of the Action Taken Report, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma pointed out that this item was withdrawn from the agenda of Syndicate meeting dated 16.03.2019. However, in the Action Taken Report, it has been written, "The case which was withdrawn has been allowed to be kept pending till for the orders". He enquired as to who has allowed this.

Dr. K.K. Sharma clarified that since the matter was related to the recommendations of Pay Commission, they had to withdraw the item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the Inspection Committees go to the Colleges and submit the reports. They already decided in the Syndicate and Senate that there is no need to appoint an Affiliation Committee this year. Obviously, the reports of the Inspection Committees are supposed to come to the Syndicate. He is foreseeing the problem that since the new academic session is going to start soon and several affiliated Colleges wish to start new courses.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma intervened to say that, earlier, the practice was that after the receipt of the Inspection Committee report, the Dean, College Development Council used to issue a letter to the College concerned stating that the College has to fulfil the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee within the stipulated period. However, this year that letter has not been issued to any of the affiliated Colleges. He suggested that the said letter should immediately (within 2-3 days) be issued to the Colleges.

Professor Navdeep Goyal remarked that if the report is received in the month of July, when would they make the admissions?

At this stage, some of the members raised the issue about the functioning of the Colleges Branch. The said that the Colleges Branch is the pivotal of the University and majority of the Fellows belonged to the Colleges.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Dr. K.K. Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to appoint an experienced person as Deputy Registrar (Colleges).

The Vice Chancellor said that he is going to do the reshuffling of Deputy Registrars. He is only waiting for 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2019.

Dr. K.K. Sharma remarked that the reshuffling is urgently required.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that certain officials of the Colleges Branch are required to be changed and certain new also needed to be brought in.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is absolutely necessary.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he did not know though Professor Navdeep Goyal has said that it has been decided in the Syndicate and Senate that the Affiliation Committee would not be constituted. In fact, no such decision had been taken. Rather, the Vice Chancellor had said that now the Affiliation Committee would not be appointed. At that time, the Vice Chancellor had not expected as to what would be result of not appointing the Affiliation Committee. Had the Syndicate members argued at that time that they would appoint the Affiliation Committee, it might have thought that they are interested in the appointment of the Committee. Now, the result of not appointing the Affiliation Committee is being felt. Till date, none of the Inspection Report has been considered by the Syndicate, which is mandatory as per the Calendar. Today, they have no option, but to appoint an Affiliation Committee, which they could be appointed in the month of January itself.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that instructions in writing should be given to the Inspection Committees as different yardsticks are being followed by the different Inspection Committee, which usually varies from each other. Recently, she has gone on an inspection and she had requested Professor Sanjay Kaushik, Dean, College Development Council, to provide her the reports of the previous two Inspection Committees and she was astonished to see the lot of variance in both the reports. Even the year was not mentioned in the report. Hence, one could not say whether the report was of the year 2014 or 2015 or 2016 or 2017. When she asked the College people, they put the date with their own hands after looking into the file(s) maintained by them. The members of the Inspection Committees, at least the Chairperson, must know as to what they are supposed to do and they must mention the date where they are putting their signatures, and there must be uniformity in the Inspection Reports. The members have just initialled from where it could not be gauged as to who had put in the signatures. After signing the report, the members must write their names and there must be some essentials for the Inspection Committees. She suggested that such instructions should be evolved, approved and provided to the Inspection Committees.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that it has been suggested several times that certain instructions are to be evolved, which should be provided to the Inspection Committees. In fact, a Handbook of Instructions should be got prepared and provided to the Chairperson of each Inspection Committee. Only then the uniformity could be maintained, otherwise not.

The Vice Chancellor enquired did such instructions not exist.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said, "No Sir".

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no such instructions are there. Although it has been discussed several times, the instructions could not be evolved.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that certain instructions would be common and certain subject-wise.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is thinking that they should appoint the Affiliation Committee, which would look into the data related to the affiliation submitted by the Inspection Committees compiled by the office of the Dean, College Development Council.

When Shri Harpreet Singh Dua tried to raise another point about the Action Taken Report, the Vice Chancellor said that now the agenda items should be taken up for consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be noted that this discussion is an important contribution towards running the University because he (Vice Chancellor) found several things/issues in it. Otherwise, there would be no benefit as there could be something else in his (Vice Chancellor) mind and something else in the minds of the members.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that, from January onwards, it is almost the fifth meeting of the Syndicate. In these meetings, they had taken 4-5 decisions about the affiliated Colleges and decided that circular(s) would be issued to the affiliated Colleges. However, if they go through the Action Taken Reports, they would not find anything about those decisions/circulars in them. Citing an example, he said that in the first meeting it was suggested that since the prospectus of the Colleges are going to be finalized and for which they needed the fee structure, even though they have brought an item relating to enhancement in fees for the courses being offered at the University Campus, it was suggested that a Committee should be formed to examine whether the

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 11<sup>th</sup> May 2019

fee is to be increased and if so, how much increase is to be effected keeping in view the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. From January 2019 onwards, almost four months have elapsed.

The Vice Chancellor said that perhaps, a Committee has already been constituted.

Continuing, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Committee, to which the Vice Chancellor is referring to, is constituted only to finalize the Admission Guidelines and not for considering enhancement in fees.

It was informed that a Committee had been constituted to consider the issue enhancement in fees and a meeting of the Committee had also been held, but the Committee did not recommend any enhancement in fees.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the Committee had been constituted to consider enhancement in fees only for the courses being offered by the University at the Campus.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they should be told as to who were the members of the said Committee from the affiliated Colleges.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the minutes of the Committee should have been placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that if the Committee is constituted for the Colleges, persons from the affiliated Colleges must be made members of the said the Committee.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma informed that only 1-2 persons from the Colleges were the members of the Committee and all others were from the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that even in the Committee, constituted to finalize the Admission Guidelines (for affiliated Colleges), majority of the members were either from the University or from the local Colleges. None of the eight teachers, who are representing the Colleges in the Senate, had been made member of this Committee even. Showing the Committee, he said that this is the formation of the Committee. Although this is the most important item, it has been brought as a table agenda (Item 21).

The Vice Chancellor said that 10 persons in the Committee are from the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that none of the teachers referred to by the Vice Chancellor is from the privately managed Colleges. So far as the teachers of the Government Colleges in the Committee are concerned, they could not control the fees of the Government Colleges as the same are determined by the Direction Public Instruction (DPI)/Government and the teachers did not have any role to play. The Punjab Government had sought from them on 21<sup>st</sup> March as what is their claim for the next Pay Commission. If they are making preparation here, some preparation is also being made by the Colleges.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Dr. K.K. Sharma jointly said that there are four persons from the privately managed Colleges in the Committee constituted to finalize the Admission Guidelines.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, what Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua wanted to say is that there are persons from the Colleges, which include from Punjab State as well as from privately managed Colleges, but they are the Principals of the Colleges and not the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that his perception on this issue was that since the issue of fees fell within the purview of the Principals/ Management of the Colleges, he made them members of the Committee.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this Committee was constituted to finalize the Admission Guidelines and not to consider the issue of enhancement in fees. The issue relating to enhancement of fees is a separate one and a separate Committee should be considered for this purpose.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan also said that the Committee being referred to was constituted to finalize the Admission Guidelines.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it seemed as if that Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua had raised a very pertinent question that though they did not know as to which was the Committee for considering the issue of enhancement in fees, even if this Committee was constituted to finalize the Admission Guidelines, in this also the teachers of the Colleges have not been made members.

It was again informed that the Committee constituted to consider the issue of enhancement of fees of the affiliated Colleges did not recommended any hike in fees.

To this, Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that at least the minutes of the Committee should have been brought to the Syndicate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that even if the Committee have not recommended any hike in fees, at least the minutes of the Committee should have been brought to the Syndicate so that they could have discussed as to why the fee hike has not been recommended. When they have brought the issue of fee hike of the University to the Syndicate, why have they not brought the issue of fee hike of the Colleges?

Professor S.K. Sharma stressed that there is a dire need of strengthening of Colleges Branch because the whole blame fell on Dean, College Development Council.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that the office of the Dean, College Development Council needed to be shifted to the Administrative Block as the people says that they face a lot of difficulties in coordinating with the activities performed by both the offices, i.e., Dean, College Development Council and College Branch.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that there is no use of keeping the office of Dean, College Development Council at Rajiv Gandhi College Bhavan. He was supported by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is correct and he believed that since the office of the Dean, College Development Council has been shifted to Rajiv Gandhi College Bhavan, people are facing a lot of problems. He, therefore, suggested that the office of the Dean, College Development Council should be shifted back to the Administrative Block.

Professor Rajat Sandhir remarked that a lot of time of the people is wasted in transition.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 11<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, in the last meeting of the Syndicate, she had raised a point that certain persons (13 in the number) have been working in the University under the Faculty Recharge Programme (FRP) of the UGC. In fact, persons under the Programme are selected through a very rigorous process. These persons have not got salary for the last three months. Though after her raising the issue, their salary has been released, there is some confusion about the persons, who have joined after 2016 owing to which only a consolidated salary of Rs.50,000/- p.m. has been released to them. She had taken up this issue when she was elected as President, PUTA, for the first time. Certain persons are of the view, which is correct also up to some extent, that they are being meted out step-motherly treatment.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he would like to endorse the opinion given by Professor Rajesh Gill. He further said that they have been treated badly and would run away from the University.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said that earlier, none was ready to prepare their salary bill, what to talk of giving them room, computer system, labs, etc. The UGC has been writing strong letters again and again stating that the University, which did not treat them at par with the regular faculty members, would invite penal action.

Professor Rajat Sandhir remarked that he (Vice Chancellor) had already got a warning on the issue from the UGC.

Continuing further, Professor Rajesh Gill said that after the letter regarding payment of consolidated salary of Rs.50,000/- p.m., the University has received a letter in the month of April, wherein they have directed that these persons should be paid salary in accordance with the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. Why they are still being paid a salary of Rs.50,000/- p.m. only. She urged the Vice Chancellor to resolve the issue at the earliest. The concerned people are of the opinion that should they leave their work and go to the UGC and run there from pillar to post.

It was informed that the UGC has said that the salary of these persons is being considered under the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission and until the same is finalized, they be paid a consolidated salary of Rs.50,000/- p.m. Earlier, the UGC had given the pay-scale and when they released the grant to the University, they released it in accordance with Rs.50,000/- p.m. each. Now since the grant has not been received by the University from the UGC, the University is paying salary of Rs.50,000/- p.m. to these people from its own sources.

Professor Rajesh Gill urged the Syndicate to interpret the letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> April 2019 received from the UGC, a copy of which is available with her, wherein it has been mentioned that these people should be paid in accordance with the recommendations of 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. Does it mean Rs.50,000/- p.m. The interpretation should be done by the Syndicate and passed on the same to the Finance and Development Officer for necessary action.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that, in fact, they are the faculty members of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would like to bring to their notice that certain people have already given their request for transfer and that is only owing to the persistence of this problem. If the problem allowed to persist for a long period, the people would definitely insist for transfer.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that another decision, which was taken by the Syndicate, was that a circular be sent to the affiliated Colleges asking them as to why they are not making promotions of teachers under the CAS, and they be directed to do

the same at the earliest. If they did not take action on the decisions of the Syndicate, the agenda would definitely swell. He remarked that nothing is being done and they are at same place where they were in the month of January 2019. If this circular is issued after a month's period, it would not be of any use. When the Vice Chancellor said that now they should take up the agenda item, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the agenda include appointment of certain persons on compassionate ground, whereas about 2000 teachers are waiting for the compassion. A decision was taken that a Committee would be formed to look into the qualifications for the Principals of Degree Colleges and Colleges of Education and also to see whether the guidelines for both the posts of Principals are the same. This decision was taken in the month of January, at least now the Committee should be formed. In fact, the qualifications and procedure of recruitment for both the posts is different. Even if it is same, it should be clarified, so that the teachers do not suffer on this count. Another point is that as and when they go for inspection of a college, according to the guidelines, the College Managements ask them to give the report there and then to them. But everywhere it is not possible to write which one wants to write as sometimes they do not find situations conducive there. There are some Chairpersons, whose names he did not want to tell here.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) may give him the names after the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would tell about it. These are the official instructions that a copy of the report be given to the Principal of the College. There is no need to tell the name(s). The report which is submitted by the Inspection Committee, it is submitted for the consideration of the Syndicate and the Syndicate may or may not accept that report. But the instructions from the office are that the report be given to the college there and then, so that they get enough time to remove the deficiencies, meaning thereby that it is assumed that the report has attained finality and the Syndicate has no business to raise finger this way or that way. Actually, as per the Statutes, it is the Syndicate, which after considering the report has to accept or seek some clarification or give some time to remove deficiencies. There is no fault of anyone, this is what they have been practicing for the last so many years. To follow that and in view of expecting efficiency, it is specifically asked to the members of the Inspection Committees to give the report to the College there and then. It is considered that otherwise the Committee would submit the report to the University, subsequently it would be sent to the College Principal for taking action, which would also take a week's time. The Colleges might be required to make some recruitments. Therefore, he has to advertise the post(s).

The Vice Chancellor said that it is alright, but, what should be done in this matter.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that this issue had been discussed in the Syndicate thrice and decided that some procedure has to be evolved.

It was informed that suppose an Inspection Committee goes to a college and points out some deficiencies. As per rule, when the report is submitted by the Inspection Committee to the University, the University should write a letter to the College pointing out the deficiencies and not to send the report as such. But over a period of time considering the lengthy process involved, a copy of the report is given to the Principal of the College.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is very difficult to write the report there and then because they cannot write what they would like to write by sitting in the College itself.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this system needed to be changed.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that there could not be any problem in writing the report there and then.

Principal Gurdeep Kumar Sharma said that when there are discrepancies, they have to point out those discrepancies to the Principal of the College. It was done to save time. By doing so the college could know about the deficiencies immediately start removing the deficiencies. This decision was taken after a lot of thinking.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what they did is that instead of setting the things right, they tried to find out a short-cut solution for everything. The problem arose when they said that the whole process of affiliation, i.e., granting affiliation or not granting affiliation, must be completed by 31<sup>st</sup> of March. Inspections are supposed to take place, starting from the month of November itself at the most by January. Latest by 31<sup>st</sup> March, the report should be put up to the Senate and whether the affiliation is granted or not, should be conveyed to the College. But they are discussing this in the month of May. So, in order to compensate the period which has shrunk, they evolved the method of giving the report to the College there and then. Now, he is telling what Professor Navdeep Goyal is saying. If he (Shri Ashok Goyal) goes for inspection, he may say that there is need of three teachers, but Professor Navdeep Goyal may say that there is requirement of only two teachers, if Professor Rajesh Gill goes, she may say that there is a requirement of one teacher only, there is no uniformity. So, it is for the Syndicate to consider whether the recommendation of the Inspection Committee is right or not. The Syndicate would uniform it. The Syndicate may say that the Inspection Committees which have written that three or one teacher is required is wrong. But by pointing out to the College, the Syndicate might say that the College should appoint two teachers, because it is the discretion of the Syndicate whether to accept the inspection report or not. Now, suppose, if they say that the report should be given to the College there and then, and the inspection Committee has asked them to appoint one teacher only, but when it would come to the Syndicate, it may say that they need to appoint two teachers. However, the College Management would say that their Inspection Committee has asked them to appoint one teacher. Though, this is the provision in the Calendar, but to hide the delay on their part, they committed the violation and then to hide that violation, they committed another violation and so on. Now they are discussing this in the month of May, but they do not have any alternative with them even today. They are just thinking about 2019. Now the question arises of practical problem being faced in the matter. It is said as to what is the problem in writing the report by sitting in the College. They all are social animals. They are representatives of public. The report is got written under pressure and bargain is done with regard to appointment of one or two or three teachers, sometimes they pressurise not to ask them to appoint regular teacher, they insist upon to write in the report for appointment of contract teachers or they may pressurise for the appointment of guest faculty instead of contract teachers. Sometimes they would ask to remove some condition. If somebody would ask him, he may say to fill the report himself and get his signatures. This is what is happening and it is happening with everybody. That is why, it is the provision that the inspection report is to be submitted to the Syndicate, but the report has not come to the Syndicate even today. They are thinking of making an Affiliation Committee, rather they have already constituted the same.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that there is one more important issue which Shri Ashok Goyal has said. When the Inspection Committees goes to the colleges, especially the Girls Colleges, where even the Principal has been a lady, he requested that at least the Chairperson of the Inspection Committee should, at least be a lady.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to ask if only female Chairperson is required or any female member could also be added in the Committee.



Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 11<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all members of the Inspection Committee cannot be female members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Dr. Harjodh Singh is meant to say is that the Chairperson of such Inspection Committees which go for inspections in Girls Colleges should, preferably be, a female.

Dr. Harjodh Singh suggested that more than 50% ladies should be there in the Inspection Committees visiting the Girls Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be taken care of and instructed the Registrar to note it.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that once he went for inspection of a College of his University as a member of the Inspection Committee. The lady Principal of that College told them that the College was trying to implead her in a case of opium, but she did not care for it. The Committee was surprised to listen all this. It is not known whether she would like to threaten the Committee or her intention was something else. He, therefore, requested that at least the Chairperson of the Inspection Committee visiting a Girls College should be a female.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has been noted.

Professor Rajesh Gill wanted to know as to how much salary would be given to the UGC Recharge Faculty.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they would be given salary as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would get salary as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission because still 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission continuing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Syndicate should approve it and with this there would be no confusion to the Finance & Development Officer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first the Finance & Development Officer should let his view know to them.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu wanted to know as to what is the interpretation of the letter regarding payment of salary as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.

On being said (by the F.D.O.) that the documents are not available with him at the moment, Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the letter of 19<sup>th</sup> November, the salary to be paid has been mentioned as Rs.50,000/-.

It was said that the faculty under the Faculty Recharge Programme would be paid as per the UGC norms. As per the latest letter, the UGC has sanctioned Rs.50,000/- p.m. At that time, 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission salary was in vogue. But after that they did not receive the grant. Now they have requested them to release the grant. In the meantime, Professor Rajesh Gill has showed her concern regarding the payment of salary to the FRP faculty. Then, after taking orders from the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the grant from the UGC, released the grant for payment of salary as per the latest order. A general letter which has been addressed to all the Universities, wherein it has been spelt out as to what would be paid to the FRP, when it is to be paid under 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, all these things are under consideration. Till then they would be paid as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. As per the latest order they would be

paid a salary of Rs.50,000/- per month, that is why they are being paid Rs.50,000/- p.m.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, on a point of order, that this is not right. This letter was in the knowledge of Finance & Development Officer also, received in the name of Registrar, Panjab University specifically. The letter is dated 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> April which has been received in the office of Finance & Development Officer on 15<sup>th</sup> April. It says that they are to be given salary as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. To say, that they have the letter which says that they would be paid a salary of Rs.50,000/-, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) would not subscribe to it. To say that only a general letter has been issued to all the Universities, he would not subscribe to that letter also, especially in view of the fact that a letter which has been received in the name of the Panjab University and which has been received in the office of the Finance & Development Officer on 15<sup>th</sup> of April.

It was informed that such a general letter has been issued to all the Universities where there is FRP faculty.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked then as to what is the ambiguity in it.

It was stated that the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission is continuing since 2006 and in the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC, they have issued a letter wherein it is mentioned that the FRP faculty would be paid Rs.50,000/- p.m. But in the latest letter which has been received, they have mentioned that the FRP would be paid salary etc. according to the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission from the year 2016. However, they would be paid salary according to the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission till a decision is taken with regard to the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission and as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, the UGC has ordered to pay them Rs.50,000/- salary per month.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired that before that, would they not be paying more salary then Rs.50,000/-?

It was informed that before that they were paying more, but when they received the letter, they started paying a salary of Rs.50,000/- p.m. after the receipt of the letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked does the letter says the salary of Rs.50,000/- would be given as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission?

It was said that the language of the letter could be read out. It was also informed that rather the audit had asked them to make recovery from them. However, the audit was told that there is a letter from the UGC and for the time being they would be paid Rs.50,000/- p.m.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the letter under question says does not say as per the 6<sup>th</sup> CPC. It says "towards advanced estimated salary". It is not as per 6<sup>th</sup> CPC. It is only advance against salary, it is not even salary. This letter was received in November, 2018 and just to negate it, they sent a letter in the month of April, stating that they be given salary as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission which they were paying before the letter of November. Thereafter, they said that they should be given the estimated salary of Rs.50,000/-. But now they (UGC) have again said that they should be paid as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. Now, he is not able to understand that they are giving them salary according to the letter where they have not written that they should be paid as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, they are treating it as 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission and where it is written that they should be paid as per the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, they are not accepting it.

It was informed that after this, they have not received any grant.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, 'yes' they can say this that they have not received the grant after that.

It was informed that the latest grant which has been sanctioned was the same according to which they (faculty under FRP) are paid. This faculty is being paid out of the University funds. Rather the audit had said that the money which has been paid to them in excess, that should be got recovered from them. The audit was not ready to pass the salary and the audit was asking for recovery. However, it was informed to the audit that it is not a case of recovery as the matter is under consideration and it would be regularised. At the moment the faculty under FRP is given a salary Rs.50,000/- p.m., but as soon as they receive a letter in this regard, they would be paid salary according to that and all the arrears would also be paid to them. If there is any recovery, that would be done later on. In the situation mentioned above, they are being paid a salary of Rs.50,000/-, otherwise the audit was asking for recovery from them.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired, when they received the letter where it has been stated that they should be paid Rs.50,000/- p.m., were they paying more salary even after the receipt of that letter.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that letter in respect of one person for recover was received late.

It was informed that now they are paying them salary in anticipation.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that they are not paying them in anticipation; rather, they are paying them salary as per the directions.

It was said that they did not receive the grant and they are paying them salary as per rules. The rule is that until and unless they receive the grant, they cannot incur any expenditure.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about the penal action which Professor Rajat Sandhir was talking about.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that it is in some different situation.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the teachers under FRP come through a very rigorous process. Many of them got offers from foreign countries, but they joined Panjab University and rendered those assignments.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is like that issue of Post-Matric Scholarship where they did not get grant from the government, they withheld the degrees of the students. If it is a rule that in the absence of grant, they cannot give the salary, then wherefrom the salary would be paid?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the University should take up the issue of salary of FRP with the UGC. They should also take into consideration the humiliation meted out by the teachers. The departments did not make salary bills of these teachers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, how they would make the bills when there is no money for paying them salary. He asked, is there any rule that in the absence of grant, they would not be paid salary.

It was informed that they could give them salary only with the special sanction from the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor and that also in anticipation of the receipt of grant from the UGC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, this meant, that they are having this discretion.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired if they have written to the UGC about it. It was informed that they did write to the UGC about it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that when she had a talk with the Finance and Development Officer about the release of their salary on 10<sup>th</sup>, after one hour, the teachers then informed that their salary has been released.

The Vice Chancellor said that the main issue is that if they do not have the money, from where they could give them salary. They should try to understand the crux of the problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he appreciates what the Finance & Development Officer has said, but only if they are following these rules in letter and spirit in all the cases. If this University can pay salary to a person under objection of the audit for years together, then why they are hesitating to pay salary to the faculty under FRP in anticipation. He enquired as to how the salary of Dr. Sukhwinder Singh is being paid since for the last 10 years under objection of the audit.

It was informed that no payment is made under objection.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that such payment is being done even till today.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he (F.D.O.) should get it checked.

It was informed that a letter is being written to the UGC so that there may not be any objection from the audit. They did want to help these teachers to which Professor Rajesh Gill said that he should do something from the University side.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to why the UGC is not sending the grant.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would talk with the UGC.

At this point of time, Shri Naresh Gaur said that as has been said by many members, if the action on the decisions taken during the zero hour discussion is reported in the Action Taken Report, most of the issues would have been solved. He has raised issues two times in the last meetings. It could not be known as to what has happened to that issue, whether some action has been taken on it or not. He had raised the issue relating to Chief of University Security on which there is embarrassment for themselves as well to the University. It is embarrassing that a teacher to whom the University is paying about Rs.2 lacs salary, has been deputed for a job other than for which he has been appointed. It is not ethically fair. On the one hand, they are saying that there is dearth of teachers, and on the other hand they have deputed a teacher for some other job. A wrong message is going in the society. A teacher should do the job for which he is appointed. So, the next senior officer, though he did not know, who is the next senior, should be given the charge of Chief of University Security. If he is not interested, then the charge should be given to the next senior person. It is not good that a University Professor should hold the charge of Chief of University Security, it also maligns the image of the University. He requested that this issue should be resolved at the earliest.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this issue should be resolved now.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to update the members as to what has been done in this regard.

It was informed that when this issue was last discussed, a Committee was constituted by the Vice Chancellor which also included the former Chief of University Security, Professor Anil Monga to assess as to what should be done. The recommendations of the Committee have been received.

The Vice Chancellor said that case is in process and it is not so that the matter is neglected

Professor Navdeep Goyal wanted to know the recommendations of the Committee.

Shri Naresh Gaur intervened to say that he did not contest what the Vice Chancellor has done in this case, but he wanted to know as to what was the need to constitute a Committee in this regard. He (Vice Chancellor) has to take charge from one Security Officer and give it to another Security Officer. Now one Committee would give a report, then another Committee would be formed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Chief of University Security has much role to play in the Convocation. In this year's Convocation, there was lot embarrassment to the guests for which the Chief of University Security is responsible. Even the former Vice Chancellor was not allowed to enter in the hall.

The Vice Chancellor said, that was unfortunate.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he himself had faced a lot of embarrassment, but the guests should not have meted with such a situation.

The Vice Chancellor said that one thing was that the programme was preponed for 22 minutes and secondly, the deployment of security personnel was not proper.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if someone who is doing clerical work, is put on security duty, how he would do that. Further if they start taking the work of a mason from the labour or vice versa, how it is possible.

The Chancellor said that the recommendations of the Committee have been received and they would be informed about it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it should be decided here and now.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Naresh Gaur not to be haste in this matter. He has already told them that, they should let him think on this issue of security. That is why he had constituted a Committee. When he would get convinced, he would do it, but they should let him understand the issue as it is a very-very difficult issue. Some laboratories which remain open for late night, he had been monitoring this also. The girl students would like to study there, but there is no arrangement of lights. He has got done the lighting arrangement in Sector-25 campus. The Microbiology students sit in the laboratories for late at night. They are also thinking to have some arrangement for outsourcing of security.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that a Professor should be given the job of a Professor to which the Vice Chancellor said that it would be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it needs to be thought dispassionately that in the Syndicate, not only once, but twice, it has been said and both the times, the Vice Chancellor said that he should be given some time to think on this issue. But after thinking on the issue, the way which was evolved was that a Committee was constituted on the decision of the Syndicate and the Registrar is telling that the said

Committee has also given its recommendations which meant that the recommendations of that Committee have more importance than the decision of the Syndicate. It is being told that the Committee has given the same recommendation which the Vice Chancellor has said. It meant that the version of the Vice Chancellor has been endorsed by the Committee also. Even after the recommendations of this most important Committee, the Vice Chancellor is saying, let him think on the issue. Does it mean that what the members of the Syndicate has said, they said it without thinking on the issue. Two months have already passed. Either (Vice Chancellor) should say that the Syndicate has nothing to do with it and he has to retain the same Chief of University Security with him till his term ends or he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should be told that by retaining this Chief of University Security, the lighting arrangement would be set right for those girl students who would like to sit in the library late at night. Is he an electrical engineer? When the Vice Chancellor interrupted, Shri Ashok Goyal requested him to say if he wanted to say something.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to repeat the same thing that he has come from a different institution, so they should let him understand the system prevailing here. They should not keep this thing in mind that he (Vice Chancellor) is over ruling anything. It is also there that he cannot overrule.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if the efficiency is affected, they could take the action. Suppose, he commits some wrong thing, there are certain provisions and they could take the action.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are many provision, but could not take action everywhere.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would be enlightened if he (Vice Chancellor) shares openly as to what are his apprehensions because they are here to help the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would talk to them on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what he (Vice Chancellor) has said in the last meeting to which the Vice Chancellor said that he would look into it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, 'No' he has said that he would talk to them, but so far nothing has been discussed in this regard with them. Now a new thing has been told that a Committee has been constituted to consider this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he has taken the opinion of someone, Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say, when he said, why the opinion has been taken?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there were some Syndicate members in the Committee, they could defend the decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not implementing the recommendations of the Committee, rather he would do something after discussing the matter with them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they were not aware whether a Committee has been constituted. It is told only when they asked about the matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that when they asked for the updates on the issue, they are being given the updates. It would be done at the earliest after talking to them.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that with this, the image of the University has maligned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now, no meeting of the Syndicate would be held to which the Vice Chancellor said that a meeting of the Syndicate would be held. Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to tell them as to when the Syndicate meeting would be held.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Syndicate meeting would be held in the instant month. The Vice Chancellor told that he had called him (Shri Ashok Goyal), but he could not come as he was out of station on that day. They should not get hurried. He would take a decision in this regard with their cooperation.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to when the decision would be taken to which the Vice Chancellor said that the decision with regard to issue of security would be taken within this month only. He further asked as to which decision would be taken to which the Vice Chancellor said that he would tell him about it. It meant that the decision taken by the Syndicate could also be implemented to which the Vice Chancellor said, why it could not happen? Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the Vice Chancellor should say that the decision of the Syndicate would be implemented within this month.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would take any action after consulting them.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that their only request is that the Professor should be relieved of this assignment.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it should not happen that they relieve one teacher and appoint some other teacher at his place. This job should not be given to any of the Professors.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that these issues are more serious than the agenda and they are very much pained. By becoming over-excited and over ambitious, they took a decision on *honoris causa* degree, the apprehension which was there that the prestige of the University might not be lowered, in spite of their best efforts, it happened, for which they are pained. However, they are more pained that a message is going to the society holding them responsible for all this. Thereafter, in the Senate he had taken a serious objection to the fact that why the Vice Chancellor is allowing discussion on a topic where the discussion cannot be allowed. He had said, it may not happen that instead of honouring a person, they might not dishonour the person, the same thing happened and that dignitary did not come to receive the degree. The decision of the Senate, he would not say unanimous, but it was almost unanimous, minus one person. Now because of him or because of Ashok Goyal, as is being alleged, to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is not so. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said, if it is not so, he had said that the decision of the Syndicate of calling a special meeting of the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor should have defended that decision, which was, unfortunately, was not defended by anyone, except the Registrar i.e. by way of giving a statement in the newspapers as an answer to a query. The dignitary did not come and the rumour mongering which took place, it was expected that the Vice Chancellor, at least should take some people into confidence as to where the things have gone wrong. But even after such a long period of time, nobody knows as to what has actually happened and the University got a bad name, there is no doubt about it. The Syndicate and, especially, some of the members of the Syndicate and Senate are also getting the bad name that it has happened because of them. He thinks that the Vice Chancellor should come out straight to see as to where the things have gone wrong and where they need to be careful in future, so that such an embarrassment is not caused to the University also to the persons concerned whom they are supposed to honour in future.

The Vice Chancellor said that the first thing is that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) always held himself responsible that it has happened due to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he never say anything which is unfounded. In the last meeting he had said that it has been said from the office of the Vice Chancellor that this Committee is that of Congress members and the Syndicate is also consisting of members belonging to Congress party and they cannot do anything. He asked, had the Vice Chancellor enquired about that thing? Has the he (Vice Chancellor) asked him (Shri Ashok Goyal) as to who have said this? If he is saying that this thing is coming out of the office of the Vice Chancellor, it pains him. They are sharing this with him. He (Vice Chancellor) should not say that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is owning something himself. He is owning only if somebody is saying so. The Vice Chancellor should take care of it that if somebody is saying something and the name of the Vice Chancellor is being attached to it, that should be taken seriously and as to how it should be ensured that such a thing should not happen in future.

The Vice Chancellor said that the input which he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has given to him, he has told the office about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not been told about it, so how he could know about it. He (Vice Chancellor) did not tell him about the steps he has taken in this regard. Next day after the meeting of the Senate, he received a phone from the Secretary to Vice Chancellor that he forgot to express his thanks as he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has saved from the situation getting ugly. He felt that the things have ended in a very good note, but from the next day, he started getting feedback that the one person who has written the letter, that has been got written by Shri Ashok Goyal. These things have been coming out from the office of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should not go on the hearsay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is why he is saying if the Vice Chancellor would give some statement, that would attain finality, it would give an opportunity to the people to say something.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal that he is very sensitive and he should not to go on hearsay. This is not a good thing. However, what they speak, he communicates the same to the concerned unit. The second thing which he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has said that he has not been told about the development which took place in the matter, that might not have been told to him or, perhaps, the office people have also not told him. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) has talked about the panel, he (Vice Chancellor) strongly told it to Dean College Development Council. He should not, at least think, that whatever is spoken here, is of no use. He has a different type of image of the Syndicate. He says it on record that he is getting fullest support from both the Houses. He is very much thankful to each one of them for unanimously approving the conferment of *honouris causa* degree and Vigyan Rattan Award. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) has not at all been targeted, rather he (Shri Ashok Goyal) facilitated it formally and informally.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would let him know where he was targeted and who has said it.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said they are not able to understand as to what they are talking about.

The Vice Chancellor said that being the Chairman of the House he is saying the he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is nowhere involved in this issue. They should not waste time on hearsay. He would also like to share with them that he has received a phone from Dr. Sudha N. Murty that she would not be coming to receive the *honoris causa* degree. She said that she is pained to know that some uncomfortable news have been published in



the newspapers about it. However, he could understand as to how the news are published in the newspaper. Today, one gentleman told him that the newspapers had reported that the Vice Chancellor is out of station. So, he requested Shri Ashok Goyal that let them stop all these things, don't go on these things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they cannot ignore these things.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is wastage of energy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, do they keep their eyes closed?

The Vice Chancellor said that a responsible person is saying to him not to go after such things. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) is having a very high opinion at his (Vice Chancellor) end. So, he should leave all these things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, perhaps, his colleagues did not understand it. Whatever he is saying, he is saying it on behalf of all of them. When a serious thing is taken in a lighter way, then the serious thing does not remain serious. He is saying that an impression is going against the Syndicate and not against Ashok Goyal. It is being quoted that this is being said by the Vice Chancellor which is wrong.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is wrong, all the decisions are being taken unanimously. If someone is saying so, let him say. He would not like to say time and again as to what was being said about the Syndicate and Senate. He would not like to in the past.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, who are the people, who say like this? These are the people, who are members of each and every Committee, and are nominated/appointed on the Committees by the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to keep meeting him, perhaps, the confusion is because of this only.

Shri Ashok Goyal explained as to why he is not meeting him. In the last meeting, he (Vice Chancellor) has said that they should keep one thing in mind that he is not guided by anybody and he does not accept the advice of anyone.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he would say so again. Though he would not be guided by anyone, but he would listen to all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, had he (Vice Chancellor) said it that if someone says something right, he accepts it, then it would have been right. But if he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that he does not accept the advice of anyone, then why he would come to him.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is a wrong interpretation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has said that it would be their wrong perception that he acts on the advice of someone to which the Vice Chancellor said, 'yes' he had said so. So, he thought if he requested the Vice Chancellor to do something, he would not accept his advice.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the Vice Chancellor has not said so, rather he has said that he did not accept any negative suggestion.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that they should make a calendar of inspections where every activity should be noted.

The Vice Chancellor instructed the Dean College Development Council to note it.

Continuing, Professor S.K. Sharma said that he has been seeing from the last many years that there is no such calendar. On the lines of Academic Calendar, there should be an inspection calendar. It should be mentioned in the Calendar as to when the notice etc. would be sent to the colleges and in how many days the report should be submitted and the discrepancies removed. All these things should be on the record.

Professor Rajat Sandhir raised the issue of extension in term of appointment of Dean Student Welfare whose term is ending on 31<sup>st</sup> of May.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should approve it, that is all.

The Vice Chancellor said that issue of extension in term of appointment of Dean Student Welfare should be kept pending till 23<sup>rd</sup> of May after which he would do as would be suggested by the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to when the next meeting of the Syndicate would be held.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are some issues which are to be taken up in the meeting of the Syndicate after 23<sup>rd</sup> of May. These issues include the approval of promotion under CAS, besides this there are one or two more issues which are very important. These issues should be included in the agenda of the Syndicate meeting to be held after 23<sup>rd</sup> of May; otherwise, those issues would get very late as there would be no Syndicate meeting in the month of June. He suggested that they should hold the meeting of the Syndicate either on 28<sup>th</sup> or 29<sup>th</sup> May.

The Vice Chancellor said that another meeting of the Syndicate would be held in this month.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to fix the date of the Syndicate meeting as they have also to see their schedule to which the Vice Chancellor said that it would done in the second half of this month.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that every time there comes a question regarding uniformity in the inspections. He suggested that a manual should be prepared for inspections.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Professor Ved Prakash Upadhyaya, former Professor, Department of Sanskrit, on having been awarded Certificate of Honour along with a cash prize of Rs.5 lac by the President of India; and
  - (ii) Professor Vipin Bhatnagar and Dr. Ashok Kumar, Dept. of Physics, on having been awarded DST Project entitled “Indian Institutions – Fermilab Collaboration in Neutrino Physics”.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor’s Statement at Sr. Nos. 1-(ii) and (iii), be noted;

3. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 16.3.2019, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted, except Sr. No. 7, for which it was decided that the matter relating to changes, if any, in the existing Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines in accordance with the UGC Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree, be referred to the same/old Committee, and the new Committee be disbanded.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

- (i) as had been the practice, President, PUTA, be made member of the Chairpersons forum and he/she be invited to the meetings of the Chairpersons;
- (ii) in future, Action Taken Report on the decisions taken during the Zero Hour/General Discussion be also submitted to the Syndicate;
- (iii) since several shortcomings about the working of Colleges Branch are being reported, the Colleges Branch be strengthened;
- (iv) the minutes of the Committee constituted to look into the issue of enhancement of fees, etc. of the courses being offered by the affiliated Colleges, be placed before the Syndicate for consideration;
- (v) since a lot of the time of the Officers/officials of the offices of Dean, College Development Council and Colleges Branch and the Principals of the affiliated Colleges got wasted in transit, the office of Dean, College Development Council, be shifted back to the Administrative Block;
- (vi) the issue relating to non-payment of salaries to the persons working under Faculty Recharge Programme in accordance with the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission recommendation, be got resolved at the earliest;
- (vii) a Committee be formed to look into the qualifications for appointment to the post of Principals of Degree Colleges as well as Colleges of Education and also to see whether the guidelines for both the posts are similar;
- (viii) a Committee be constituted to frame guidelines/ instructions for Inspection Committees to be constituted to consider grant of affiliation and extension of affiliation, and the guidelines/ instructions, besides other things, must include that the Inspection Committees to be constituted for Women/Girls College(s) would be headed by a female, calendar for undertaking inspections, and the Inspection Committees would submit their reports in the University office;
- (ix) after the receipt of the Inspection Committee Report(s), the Principal(s) of the concerned College(s) be written to by the Dean, College Development Council to immediately comply with the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee(s);

- (x) an Affiliation Committee comprising the following Syndics be constituted to consider the Inspection Reports relating to grant of affiliation and extension of affiliation, on behalf of the Syndicate:

1. Shri Ashok Goyal : Chairman
2. Professor Navdeep Goyal
3. Professor Rajesh Gill
4. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
5. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
6. Dr. K.K. Sharma
7. Shri Jagdeep Kumar.

- 2.** Considered minutes dated 29.03.2019 (**Appendix-II**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the fee structure (Tuition fee and other University Charges) in the University Teaching Departments and Regional Centres of the Panjab University, Chandigarh, for the session 2019-20.

**NOTE:** The Senate in its meeting dated 06.05.2018 (Para IV under Item C-39) (**Appendix-II**) considered the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 30.03/21.04/29.04.2018 (Para 22) with regard to the minutes dated 30.01.2018 of the Committee of the certain Syndics, in terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 10.12.2017/19.12.2017 (Para 32) regarding rationalization and revision of fee structure, examination fee and all other charges for P.U. Teaching Department and its Regional Centres, for the session 2018-19 and resolved that:

1. Recommendation of the Syndicate contained in Item C-39 on the agenda, as per (Appendix-\_), be 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;
2. The fee for the newly introduced courses especially Masters Program in Governance and Leadership be not hiked for three years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said the Committee has given some recommendation regarding fee, some of these recommendations are very good. Earlier there was a confusion in the fee of MDS and MBBS. Henceforth the fee structure of the University can be determined for the whole course in one go and not only for one academic session. This is a very good formula and there would be no confusion in it. With such a mechanism, at least the student would be in the knowhow as to what would be the fee structure for his course. Thus, the Committee has done a very good thing. The increase in fee has been mentioned as 10% for new students and 5% increase in the next session, this is also reasonably good. The Committee has recommended 5% increase in fee for ongoing students. For the traditional courses, the 5% increase in fee is alright, but there are certain courses where the fee is much more. When the students took admission, they were not aware that their fee would enhance like this. But now since it has been mentioned as to how the fee would be enhanced, they would become aware of it. The courses where the fee has been enhanced much more, the students would also feel it and it would also become an issue. When this would become an issue, it would later on also affect the new students. So they should take care of this issue also, lest it may not happen that because of students' agitation, they

have to roll back the enhanced fee of traditional courses also along with certain such courses where the fee enhancement has been much more.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that this issue is running since 2013. Before 2013, the fee was not increased in the university for many years. At that time it was alleged that since the University has not increased the fee for many years, so the fee should be increased by 10%. At that time, they had said that, had they been increasing the fee in the past by 2½%, they would not have to face such a situation. They think that all the students would be able to pay 10% enhanced fee. Though it is the duty of the University to provide education, but at the same time, it is also the social responsibility of the University because it is a public sector. They cannot compare it with private sector or other private universities. Similarly, the status of teachers and students in private Universities and Public Sector Universities is also different. So, it was said that the increase should be minimum and nobody deny it. But at the same time, they can also not say that the salary of teachers should be paid by increasing the fee. The increase in grant is not a fixed component. The government has given 6% increase on the grant which the University was getting ten years ago. So, the 10% increase is not fair. The former Vice Chancellor had said that the University is in crises and if they did not increase the fee, the University would close down. They are not having money to pay the salary of teachers. So, he (former Vice Chancellor) had said that they should do something. He had given his dissent at that time against 10% fee hike. It was alleged that many students come in very big cars etc. At that time also, he had said that let they should check as to how many students study in the University and how many cars belong to the students. Only 10-15% students would such students, otherwise many students belong to poor families which include girl students also. The affect of 10% fee hike in the University would also be seen in the colleges because the College Managements would say that if the University had increased fee by 10%, why they cannot increase it. In the colleges situated in rural areas, the drop-down of students is already much more. Yesterday, he was going to Malout for inspection, from Moga to Malout, there was no such shop where there is no board for IELTS coaching. He requested that the 10% hike in fee is not fair. If with such an increase in the fee, they are able to recoup the deficit, then it understandable, but if they could get only Rs.1½ to Rs.2 crores by doing such an enormous fee hike, it would not be of any use because the students would sit on dharnas or hold agitations which would spoil the atmosphere of the University. Some people with vested interests also play their role as is being played in the University for the last 5-6 months, it would be played again. When it happened during the term of former Vice Chancellor, he had asked him at that time also, as to which Senators has done stone-pelting. In order to avoid such type of situation arise again, therefore, they should increase the fee genuinely which the students could also understand. They could also make them understand that 2% or 4% increase in fee would be genuine. As has been told by Professor Navdeep, the Committee did a very good job by increasing the fee for the whole course. But he would like to ask as to why the fee has been increased at once for the whole duration of the Course? Why they have assumed that they would not get any grant from the Government. Tomorrow, there may come a government which might say that it is their priority and necessity to impart education and health facilities to the students and the society for which the government could give them grant. Why they observe that the government would not give them grant and why they have increased 5% fee for the coming four years of the course. This is wrong. Last time when they enhanced 10% fee, they enhanced 5% fee of old students. The former Vice Chancellor had said that the University is at the verge of closing down, but he had agreed to the fact that the University should not close. He, therefore, requested the Vice Chancellor that the fee might not be increased more than 5%, however, it would be better if the increase in fee remains between 2% to 3%. As regards issue of enhancement of fee of on-going students, that is not up to the mark. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor as to what he would like to say about the on-going students, he (Shri Naresh Gaur) clarified that the fee of on-going students had already been increased by 10% in the previous years.

Speaking on the issue of migration fee, he said that this fee has been increased from Rs. 400/- to Rs. 1000/- which is about 2.5 times more. Re-admission fee (each time) has been enhanced from Rs. 200/- to Rs. 500/-. They could enhance it by 10%, but here it has been increased manifold, but sometimes such things did not come to their notice. When they were preparing budget, he had told the Finance & Development Officer that they made the increase up to 50% and not 10%. He would like to say that there are several departments where the seats remain unfilled. If they increase the fee of those departments where the seats already remain vacant, the students would prefer to go to some other institute where he would be getting better opportunity. Thus owing to the non-fulfilment of the seats, the University has to suffer a much bigger loss. So, he is of the firm view that the fee should not be enhanced, only the nominal increase in the fee could be made.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the Committee has deliberated on the issue of fee and the average fee is increasing only between 6% and 8% and not 10%. Probably, they have given undertaking in the Court as also to the MHRD that they would increase the fee. Shri Naresh Gaur has talked about the other charges. These charges were, perhaps, not revised for quite a long time, that is why these are being revised. The F.D.O. could tell when these charges were last revised. The third thing which he would like to highlight is about the maintenance and user charges for the use of equipment of the departments. The amount collected from these charges is used for the maintenance of the equipments such as laboratory instruments etc. But it has been observed that in some departments, these charges have not been increased. He was of the opinion that these charges should be increased for which a Committee could be constituted so that the charges are enhanced rationally, so that the infrastructure in the departments could be maintained properly as they do not have development grant.

Shri Naresh Gaur, on a point of order said that Professor Rajat Sandhir has stated that they have given an affidavit in the Court to the effect that they would increase the fee. He agrees to it, but they have not given this in writing that they would increase 10% fee.

Principal Rakesh Kumar Mahajan, while referring to point No. 5 & 6, at page 18 of the agenda relating to late fee, said that there is 30% increase in both the items. The Syndicate members might remember that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, they have said that the Examination fee of the University for Colleges has increased enormously owing to semester system. They had said that if it had jumped in such a way in the last years, it should be reduced. This prompts the student resort to agitations and they have to convince the students with a great difficulty. He requested that the late admission fee with the permission of the Chairperson and the late admission fee with the permission of the Vice Chancellor be reduced. It could be thought to increase this fee between 6% and 8%.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that everybody is saying to enhance the fee by 6% to 8%, but the fee has already increased 200%.

A din prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that these charges are for the University Teaching Departments/Centres and Constituent College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a very-very delicate and serious matter. He thought that the Vice Chancellor would explain. He was surprised to see that it is not the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor has not even approved the recommendations of the Committee. This meant that the Vice Chancellor is not in agreement with the recommendations of the Committee. If he (Vice Chancellor) is in agreement, then he expects from the Vice Chancellor to explain the

rationale which has been applied by the Committee members. Unfortunately, barring three members, rest of the Committee members were not available. Only one member of the Syndicate, i.e., Professor Rajat Sandhir, happens to be the member of the Committee, besides the Finance & Development Officer and the Secretary to Vice Chancellor. In the absence of the endorsement or approval of the Vice Chancellor, the papers which have been circulated to them, though he would not like to go in as to what was there in his mind. The papers circulated to him is that, it is straight away marked to the Syndicate and the minutes have not been approved by the Vice Chancellor. That means, either the Vice Chancellor has no stand on it or the Vice Chancellor does not agree with it. The Syndicate is not to consider the recommendations of any Committee, whereas it has to consider the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor. This is what the technical position is. However, he could safely presume that the Vice Chancellor has shown complete faith in the wisdom of the Committee. One of the members of the Committee has contributed by saying few things on the basis of the assumptions, that maybe they have filed some affidavit in the Court, that maybe the enhancement in the fee has not been made for so many years, which the F.D.O. would be able to tell, meaning thereby that without taking those assumption into consideration, they have made the recommendations. Now it is for the FDO, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) told these things so many times that whenever they come with kind of proposal for enhancement, they must come out with tentative figures of revenue which they would be generating, so that while taking the decision, they should know that all the decisions they are taking to earn Rs.10 crores of rupees. Thus, they could evaluate the relevant pros and cons that for Rs.10 crores they are ready to face agitation also.

The Vice Chancellor said that the tentative fee structure for revenue has been prepared by the FDO and submit it now to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that he may have kept it with him.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in future, if any such proposal is prepared, the tentative estimates should be attached with the item, so that they may not have to do much discussion. But, here he has felt that there is no rationale. At some places the Committee has made recommendations for enhancement of fee for various activities by 300 to 350% and it is not known as to what is the rationale behind it. Where the fee is hiked to Rs.200/- it would be better if it is written against it that the fee of Rs.200/- has been continuing since this and this year. So, they could understand the rationale that the enhancement has not been made for the last so many years and so the enhancement has been done. But they cannot do anything on presumptions, the Committee has also done everything on presumptions. If the Vice Chancellor would desire, the Syndicate would also approve it. He requested that they should see the recommendations of the Committee and *inter alia* stated not to mind it what he is saying, He read out the second para of the recommendations of the Committee which says, certain professional departments, i.e., University Business School, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology and University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, have recommended their specific fee structure on the basis of the recommendations of the respective departmental Committee. Therefore, in their case, the fee structure may be approved as recommended by concerned department. If this is the application of mind by the Committee, do they expect same from the Syndicate? Are these departments autonomous, are they departments independent of the University, are they a separate entity, are they not to keep them also a part of the policy decision which they are going to take, keeping in mind, as Shri Gaur has said, that they are a public University and not a private University. Unfortunately, their mindset is that they have started following the private Universities. They have started moving towards the privatization, not realising, they talk of Oxford University, Cambridge University and other such Universities and say that these Universities are charging so and so fee. They forgot that the public institutions like the Government

Medical Colleges, IITs, Delhi University etc. as to what fee these institutions are charging. Madam (Professor Rajesh Gill) was telling that her two children have studied MBBS recently from Government College, Patiala at Rs.13,000/- per year. Now it has gone from Rs.13,000/- to Rs.1,20,000/- per year. On being interrupted, he said he would like to tell that unless and until this fee hike proposal is not rationally supported and if he (Vice Chancellor) just wants to get the stamp of the Syndicate on it, it is something different. They should listen what the Committee has said and now he is translating the Committee's recommendations. It clearly speaks that since the Syndicate has to reduce some part of the enhancement, they should recommend an exorbitant increase, as if they are going to a vegetable market where people are in the habit of doing bargaining. Similarly, Syndicate would also think that the Senate would also make some cut in the fee, so the increase in fee should be kept at the higher side. Are they doing justice for the decision making? What they are doing? If they are saying to make 10% increase, it means that they recommend 10% increase, it means that the expectation is this that at least 5% would be approved or some cap would be imposed for increase of Rs.1,000/- or Rs.2,000/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not thinking so and nothing of this sort has been done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this has been done. The Committee members do share with him (Vice Chancellor) as to how much cut would be made by the Syndicate or the Senate. That means, rationale is not there and practical view of bargaining is there. Further, nothing has been mentioned as to how much revenue would be generated by increasing the fee. It has been said that the FDO has prepared the proposal where it is spelt out as to how much revenue would be generated. It is a very serious thing.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is why, he says that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is very intelligent.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that last time also, he has stated that the injustice, they have, in fact done with the students by raising 400% examination fee. Actually, it pains them that they are not giving justice to the students and a thinking has developed that at least 5% fee must be increased. When they would start thinking that 5% fee should be reduced. Why they don't ask the government to provide grant to the University to which the Vice Chancellor said, that time would also come. He further said that they are just hearing that good days would come. By good days, he means to say that such a time would come.

The Vice Chancellor said, that time would definitely come.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the examination fee was increased, it was said that the fee is being increased just to pressurise the government and to tell them that University has raised funds to the tune of 12% and so the government should also contribute the equal amount. When that amount from the government would be received, then the University would be in a comfortable position and then they would reduce it. But nobody remembers that. Thereafter, the government changed and the term of the then Vice Chancellor also ended. Now, they should say that a new chapter should be started to improve the image of the Syndicate and Senate. They are here to do justice with the society. Would they be able to justify the society by adopting this type of measures? In the departments of UBS and UIPS, the proposed fee hike has been to the tune of Rs.10,000/- or Rs.20,000/-. Is this in the reach of a common man? But, their one point programme is to generate revenue. He enquired if in this fee structure there is any aim as to how to improve the academic excellence. If it is there, it is understandable, but if the aim is just to generate revenue at the cost of students,



that is not correct. So, until and unless, the rationale is given, he is not in favour of increasing even a single penny in any kind of fee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Panjab University is a Public sector institution and in India there are very few such institutions where daily wagers, *ad hoc* employees or some rickshaw puller who could get education in such institutions. As told by Shri Naresh Gaur, earlier also when the fee was enhanced, they have got their dissent recorded. In their colleges, they have already snatched away the right from these people in the colleges by increasing the fee exorbitantly. So, they should not snatch away from the poor people the right to get education in such institutions. So, he requested that he is not in favour of this fee hike.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would not speak on the issue of fee, but she would like to give her observation on this item, but let the other members first talk about on the fee issue.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the first thing which they have to see is, as to what are the requirements of the University. Is the government giving them the money which is required for running the departments? Recently, a Chairperson told him that to get the whitewash, they require Rs. 90 lacs. The laboratories and instruments are in a very pathetic condition; rather everything is in decaying situation. So, either the Vice Chancellor should say, 'okay', they are going to take care of these requirements of the University from the funds which are coming. The percentage of the money which they are getting from the grants is spent to pay salaries, hardly leaves anything, even for the maintenance of air-conditioners, paying electricity and water charges which are increasing day by day. Where from they would get the money? He was the Chairman of the Committee which had set up University Institute of Engineering & Technology. At that time, some people said that they should have concern for the underprivileged to which he had said, 'okay'. So, they made a full financial balance sheet of UIET. They calculated what would be the break after four years, what is the break even after seven years. Then they found that the fee should be Rs.1 lac. There was a concern over there and he fought like anything and ultimately he said, 'okay' and what they should do is that they should reserve some seats for the underprivileged. Hundred percent of the underprivileged people would not come to this particular place because of merit etc. So, he had said that let they should reserve 30% seats for underprivileged and keep the fee for them as Rs. 30,000/- whereas the fee for others would be Rs.1 lac. But, he did not know why they could not do so for these particular institutes? Every time, the fee is increased saying that this much percentage of money would go to the students. Have they ever calculated as to how much money they have given to the students from the earlier year? There are so many scholarships in this University which are not being used. Why cannot they make a kitty that those particular students who are from the unprivileged section, those who cannot afford to pay the fee, they could give them fee concession from that particular fund. So, what they should do is that if they are increasing the fee, they should make a kitty out of which money could be used for subsidizing the fee structure so that the unprivileged could be helped. This should be their duty and they should take care of them. If they look at a school fee in a good institution, it is a few lacs of rupees. Though he agrees with the increase in fee, but it should be a rationale increase and not raise it blindly. They should take into consideration when the fee was enhanced last time and at what percentage it was enhanced and at what percentage their expenditure is increasing for which they are not receiving any grant from the government. So, all these points must be taken into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal, on a point of order said that none of the members has said that they have to take care of the underprivileged and they are not saying that the fee should not be increased because it would be beyond the reach of underprivileged. Nobody has said this. They are simply discussing that being a State University, they

have to charge the fee at the minimum level to the meritorious students who are seeking admission on merit whether they belong to the upper class or to the lower class. As far as giving benefits to the underprivileged is concerned, it is altogether a separate matter, they are not discussing it.

Shri Naresh Gaur, on a point of order said that as talked about by Professor S.K. Sharma regarding School fee, can a rickshaw puller's child could go to such school about which Professor Sharma is talking.

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

Continuing, Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should not talk only about Chandigarh school or colleges because the University does not belong only to Chandigarh, this University also belong to Punjab. There are so many big school, how a son of a rickshaw puller or a mason could take admission in those schools.

Professor Rajat Sandhir, on a point of order, said that there is provision of Students Aid where the student could give an application for seeking help from that fund because that fund is used for helping the underprivileged.

Shri Sandeep Singh and some other members said that the students are not aware of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should concentrate on the issue as there is no question of underprivileged.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they were discussing fee structure of the colleges where it is said that no fee hike would be done, but in the University they have been increasing the fee exorbitantly which meant that the University is in much need of money than the colleges. Further, it means that the college students are more poor than the University students. If the fee is to be increased, it should be increased both for the University as well as for the college, otherwise not, rather it should at par. Further, 2-3 members have referred to page 18, Annexure-II where the heading is 'Other charges applicable to the students of University Teaching Departments, Centres and Constituent Colleges'. First of all, he would like to know whether the Affiliated Colleges and Constituent Colleges are two different things. Would they apply two different system on Affiliated Colleges and Constituent Colleges. Secondly, the migration rule/procedure has to be the same whether the student is studying in an Affiliated College or Campus or in a Constituent College. They are increasing the Migration Fee for the Constituent Colleges from Rs.400/- to Rs.1000/-and not for the Affiliated Colleges. So, they cannot have two systems i.e. one for a student studying in a Affiliated College and one for the student studying in a Constituent College or at the University Campus. Similarly, the PUPIN fee is both for the affiliated college students as well as for the University campus students. Similar is the case with late admission fee. In the University, the late admission could be taken by paying late fee with the permission of the Chairperson and in the Colleges, it is with the permission of the Principal. After a specific date with late fee, the admission allowed with the permission of the Vice Chancellor in the University and same is the case with the Colleges. So, this type of discrepancies should be removed. If such fees are not enhanced in the colleges, it should also not be enhanced in the University.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that while enhancing the fee structure, they should also keep in mind the income of the parents of the students. The wage at the DC rate is Rs.303/- per day. About 85% people live in villages. When they have to pay even Rs.250/- to a labourer per day, they gave with great difficulty. He was of the opinion that the fee should not be increased, not even 1%, rather it should be decreased. When he had taken over as the Vice Chancellor of this University, he had said that there

would not be dearth of money. The students who were alleged to have involved in stone pelting, they are still facing the court case. They could not get rid of that case, whether they are right or wrong. None of them have been given clearance and they still attend the courts. Those students cannot get any government job owing to that case. They were feeling that the enhancement in fee which was done earlier, that would be reduced to some extent. But nothing has happened and the same thing is happening even now. Earlier also, this was the tendency to increase the fee and the burden be put on the students. When this fight is with the government, why they don't ask the government to release the grants? The FDO has been just telling as to how much money is required for running the University. They are elected members of this House and they are answerable to the society outside. Earlier, the late admission fee with the permission of the Vice Chancellor was Rs.1500/-, and the same was increased to Rs. 2250/-, but now the same has been proposed to Rs.3,000/-. They should also see that the admissions are falling down in their Regional Centres with the enhancement of fee. He, therefore, requested that the fee should not be increased as it would put a lot of burden on the parents of the students. Professor S.K. Sharma has talked that seats have been reserved for unprivileged in the private schools. But the situation is altogether different and the ground reality is totally different as no SC or BC student is admitted in those schools. In spite of being educated, they have to fight for their rights, how the illiterate people in the villages could get the facilities. He said that the issue of enhancement in fee should not have been brought to the Syndicate, otherwise they have to face the same situation of stone pelting.

The Vice Chancellor said as to why he (Shri Sandeep Singh) is saying the same thing which had happened earlier.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that earlier also the stone pelting was held because of enhancement in fee, that was the root cause of stone pelting.

The Vice Chancellor said this proposal has been prepared by the Professors of the University, they must have recommended this enhancement keeping something good in mind.

Shri Jagdeep Singh said that yesterday, after the order of the Patna High Court, the Supreme Court has given a verdict with regard to the contractual teachers that these teachers would not be given equal pay to that of regular teachers. They all respect the Supreme Court. Their constitution says that theirs is a Welfare State, but after observing the judgement, it seems that the Court has tried to protect the Corporate State as far as financial aspect is concerned. Such decisions, in the long run, would harm the society. He is a supporter of the Welfare State. In the Fee Structure Committee meeting, he has said that he is, at the most, in favour of enhancement of 2% to 2½% only. It has been also said that why the fee is not being increased in the College, in this context, he would like to say that he is totally against any fee hike in the colleges because the strength of students is already decreasing in the colleges. They could see that in the Doaba, Malwa and Majha regions, lot of IELTS Centre have opened. Out of the total students admitted in the colleges, 25% students could not get through the examinations and about 10 to 15% students leave their studies in between and rest of them prefer to go abroad. Then how the colleges would manage to meet their expenditures. So, in order to meet the expenditures, he is in favour of increasing the fee rationally i.e. at the most 3%. They are still very much sure that whosoever government comes to power, he (Vice Chancellor) would definitely bring grants to the University. He has already done a very big job by getting the increments for Ph.D.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that as stated by many members that there has been irrational increase in the fee. He is of the opinion that the fee of on-going students should not be increased because they have not been told earlier about

it. The new students joining the courses would be in the knowhow as to what fee they have to pay, so this is right, but he also agrees to Professor S.K. Sharma that there could be some hike in fee, but it should be enhanced reasonably if the University is not receiving grant from the government. It should not happen that the fee should be increased by 200% or 300%. However, they are very much sure that he (Vice Chancellor) would bring a lot for the University. If there is some problem being faced on account of finances, a reasonable hike could be made as they have also to think that the University should also run.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that many members have given their inputs. But she would like to talk about that when something is finally approved by the Syndicate/Senate, it becomes a statute. She has observed that there are many mistakes which are not properly checked. For example, sometimes it is written 'Master in Public Health' and sometimes 'Master of Public Health. There are so many such like mistakes which they have to check. They are competing with the private Universities, they are also trying to set a brand name for themselves. So, these things are very important and everything should be transparent on the University Website. She also referred to page No. 6 of the agenda, where incomplete titles have been given, such as under the subject of 'English' it is written 'Proficiency in English Spoken and', University Institute of Pharmaceutical, University Institute of Fashion Technology and Voc. Same thing is there in other titles also. In this document, the words have been wrongly spelt out in University Institute of Legal Studies also where the word 'legal' has been spelt out as 'legall'. There are many such mistakes. At page No. 8, Centre for Women Studies, under the heading Master in Governance Leadership, there is a Certificate Course, but it is not mentioned which Certificate Course is this, no fee structure has been mentioned. Similarly, it is written, Crash Course (4-weeks) and nothing more about it, no fee structure has been mentioned.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to look into the points as raised by Professor Rajesh Gill.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, perhaps, there is some alignment problem and owing to that some words might have omitted.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that the item belongs to the fee structure.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that can they not evolve some such a system where it should be seen that the document is presentable, there should be some editing, language should be proper etc. because this leads to a very embarrassing situation to which the Vice Chancellor said that it would be seen to improve the things.

The Vice Chancellor said that now they should conclude the issue. He has noted suggestions given by the members and he honours the feelings of each and every honourable members of the House. He has felt that the members are very-very sensitive towards the different components that may attract the increase in the fee, whether it belongs to the students who are coming from a very poor background or others, he appreciates the members for the concern shown by them. But at the same time, they must keep in mind, as he told on his first day and still he is putting his effort for that and with the grace of God, they have been successful in that endeavour. They have to take the University at greater heights in the field of research and innovation, in spite of various constraints. However, gradually, the things would be normal. They have been successful in getting two increments for Ph.D. This issue was lingering on for the last 12-13 years. There are some other such issues where the indications are positive. He feels that in the coming years, all such things would be alright. Sometimes, it is not possible to do the things immediately, but efforts are being taken. That is why, he used to request the members to go to the Library and see the changes there. They could see the changes which have taken place in the class rooms. This

would boost his morale. Some people are saying that only fee is being enhanced to collect money, but this is not so. For him, students are the first and foremost priority, irrespective of the background, they are coming from. He would try to help them directly as he could do. But if it could not be done directly, he would do it indirectly in some other mood at some other place. For example, the persons engaged in the cleanliness work such as hostels etc, they are longing for since long paying them salary with DA/DP. The University is not getting any development grant or any support from anywhere. So, he feels that these people who are working since the last 10-12 years, there is nobody to take care of them. It is very clear mandate of the UGC and the MHRD that the Universities have to generate their own resources. However, he agrees with them that that the hike in fee should be reasonable. He would like to share with them that he is trying to bring more scholarships for the students. There are some scholarships which are not even distributed to the students, although the scholarship amount is very meagre. However, they are trying to make these scholarships more visible. If they are enhancing the fee, in another way, they are also giving it to the students. They are not keeping this money with themselves. Some Professors are making efforts to make the scheme 'Earn while Learn' more successful and they are also thinking to enhance the money to be paid to the students and involve more students in that scheme. The Vice Chancellor further said that the seats in the departments have increased, but sitting capacity in the Library has not been enhanced. There was no space to sit, there was no proper lighting arrangement, there was no provision to keep the belonging of the students such as bags etc. Now shelves have been prepared to keep the bags, arrangement for lighting has been made, fans were provided, mats were provided, there were lights outside the Library, heaps of filth were lying. All these things were got done. Unauthorised encroachments were removed. Now they could see the change over there. They could see that the Laboratories were in a very miserable condition. He used to meet the students one to one and get the input from them. He also used to meet the Sweepers and Malis and get input from them also. The Laboratories being used by the students of undergraduate courses are in a very dilapidated condition. Either the instruments are outdated or the instruments which could be repaired, they do not have money to get these instruments repaired. In the Start-Up of Innovation Programme, they are ranked at Sr. No. 9. He used to visit the Department of Physics where he has seen that six girl students were working in a very small room, all these girls were working on the new Start Up Innovation Programme. When he asked them about their requirement, they simply said that they do not require anything, but they should be given a proper/adequate space to sit and the equipments which are out of order, those should be got repaired. On the one hand, it is published in the newspapers that the ranking of Panjab University is sliding down and they are also not appointing teachers and on the other hand, the conditions of their laboratories is in a very pathetic situation. In this way the system would collapse down. As they know their only recognition is research. He also used to meet the teachers of the humanities who were also saying that they may not be given anything, but they should provide facilities, at least to the teachers of Science Departments. They further said that in the Science departments, teachers used to get projects, but this is not so in the humanities departments owing to which they manage to get good rooms so they could sit even after late hours, but the teachers of the Humanities subjects do not have rooms to sit. In the humanities departments, they are facing a great hardship. Four-five departments are such where the teachers do have space even to sit and did not have computers, which are essential nowadays. If in the present times, if they say that the Panjab University teachers are not having computers, how they would justify it. He is of the opinion that in the humanities departments, there should be at least one smart room for the students and one air-conditioned room, with 2-3 computers, where the teachers could sit and work, only then, they could sit. But, how all these things could be done? They are not getting even a single penny for development. Infrastructure is in a very bad shape. Barbed wire of the boundary wall is broken from many places, but since they do not have money, the broken wires are being repaired. They should themselves go and see the situation. He is having the same concern as that of the

Syndicate members. At the moment he is not expecting any grant from any quarter. The Class-IV employees do not have houses to live as most of these houses are not living worthy and they do not have money for their repair. In many of the departments, the electricity wires are hanging and the departments are not having money to repair all these things. They talk of Welfare State, which he also honours, but at the same time they should also understand the reality. He was also thinking to do so many things and also having a Vending machine, but where from the money would come? There are so many necessities which he could share with them because they all are members of a family. He would like to tell them that he is also in favour of giving more and more concession to the students. If they get some grant from the government, as has been said by Shri Naresh Gaur, they could also think of making some reduction in the fee and other charges. Even the self-financing courses are also dying now. If they close these courses, where their teachers would go? Where their students would go and what would happen to their buildings? If they think carefully, they would see as if they have plunged into a vicious circle. They cannot turn backward. The only way is that they have to go forward only. The University Institute of Engineering is a self-financing department and the deficit there is about Rs.18 crores. The Vice Chancellor informed that they are giving concession to the poor students such as physically handicapped, economically weaker section, sports, students aid fund, etc. to the tune of up to Rs.2.5 crores, in spite of all the constraints. In Students Air Fund, they are giving about Rs.35.5 lacs., in merit-cum-means scholarship Rs.54.5 lacs. Thus the total aid being given to the students comes to Rs.2.46 lacs.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that majority of the self-financing departments are in deficit.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired as to how much money they would be getting?

Shri Sandeep Singh wanted to know as to with how much income a student falls under category of weaker section?

It was informed that in the partially self-financing courses, 5% students get full fee concession who belong to economically weaker section whose income is less than Rs.2.5 lacs. On being asked by Shri Sandeep Singh, it was informed that a certificate to this effect from the Tehsildar would suffice the purpose. For example, if there are 50 seats in a course, 3 students of economically weaker section would get full fee concession.

Shri Sandeep Singh further enquired if the fee concession is just given on the income certificate issued by the Tehsildar only or there is/are some other parameters also.

It was told that only the income certificate is required and the candidate should come in the merit if there are more candidates.

Shri Sandeep Singh asked whether this fee concession is extended to the College students?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this provision is there only in the self-financing courses.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that self-financing courses are run in the colleges also to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it could be taken care of by the Management of the College and the University can do nothing in it.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if they have to do something in this regard, they should prepare a chart where it should be mentioned as to how much money they are giving to the students and how much they are earning out of the self-financing course. The biggest bottleneck in this process is that there are several scholarships, but those scholarships are not being disbursed, which means that the scholarship section is not working properly. To his knowledge about 20 scholarships are being received from USA, perhaps, till date the last year's scholarships have not been disbursed. He requested the Vice Chancellor to get these scholarships in order and this should be put on record. The students complete their courses, but they did not get scholarships.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the amount which would be collected on account of the fee which they are enhancing, Shri Ashok Goyal interrupted to say that they are not enhancing the fee, only the proposal is there to enhance the fee. Continuing, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua wanted to know whether the enhanced income on account of fee hike would be a part of the sanctioned grant or it would be an additional income to the University which the University could use as an additional money. Clarifying it, he said suppose the University is getting Rs.100 crore sanctioned grant from the government. Would the additional amount generated being generated on account of hike in fee would be deducted from the grant of Rs.100 crore being given by the government or would they use this amount for development purpose.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that does Dr. Dua meant to say that if the University generated an additional amount of Rs.2 crore, the government would reduce its grant by Rs.2 crore?

It was informed that as on to date, the total revenue expenditure is about Rs.520/- crores. Now the enhancement of expenditure whether it 4% or 5%, would be on the amount of Rs.520 crore. This amount of Rs.520 crore is coming from two sources, one, Rs.220 crore from the Central Government and Rs.27 crores from the Punjab government. The government has committed to enhance its share of grant by 6%. The remaining amount has to be generated by the Panjab University. If they have to recruit teachers and the non-teaching staff, they have to increase the fee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he forgot to mention one thing that many of their departments are not qualifying for FIST because they do not have adequate number of teaching faculty. Several other departments are not able to qualify for CAS, they do not have position for them.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that as per the calculations of the Finance & Development Officer where he has said that if they have to fill up the posts of teachers and non-teaching staff, then they have to increase the fee, is not correct. Suppose, three teachers are retiring today would be getting Rs.4.5 lacs salary. But if they appoint a new teachers, he would just get only Rs.40,000/- per month, thus from the salary of one retiring teacher, they would be able to pay salary to three teachers. How they could make comparison like this. On being said by Professor Navdeep Goyal and that the retiring teachers would be getting pension also, Shri Naresh Gaur said they should not link this issue with pension because the pension fund is different.

The Vice Chancellor said, no, it is not different as asked the Finance & Development Officer to explain about it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is part of the deficit.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that as asked by Shri Ashok Goyal as to how much revenue they would generate if the fee hike is done, so, it is very important to know as to what are their other sources of income and expenditure. If there are leakages in a water pipe, the water would not reach at the desired end. So, they have to think about

it as to what has to be done to plug up the leakages. For instance, a beautification drive is on and someone told her that about Rs.90 lacs are being spent on this. Information was also sought by someone under RTI regarding green signboards, where it has been informed that lacs of rupees are being spent on the green signboards. Can't they do something about these things? If some wrong projects have been passed in the past, can they not undo those projects?

The Vice Chancellor said when this work of beautification was started, he immediately called the Finance & Development Officer who told him that in the name of Professor Balwant Gargi, a beautification project has been approved for which Rs.90 lacs have been sanctioned. At that moment, he told the F.D.O. that let they stop it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the work has not stopped.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that the FDO told him that they cannot stop the work like this as this project/budget has been approved by the Governing Bodies of the University. Otherwise, he was also feeling that this is a wasteful expenditure.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they cannot afford to spend this much of amount for this beautification project. All such proposals which had been got approved earlier should be placed before the Syndicate. The University has started E rickshaws, but it is not going get any money out of it.

The Vice Chancellor said that without their saying and without having approval from them, he has withheld the e-rickshaw project. This project would be reviewed and for that purpose a Committee has been constituted, however for the time being this project have been kept on hold. He has got the analysis of the beautification project and it has been told that the (coconut) trees there would destroy, in that Committee there is no expert.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that instead of undertaking the beautification project, it would be better if all the lights of the University are replaced with the LED lights. It would reduce the electricity bill to half.

The Vice Chancellor said that the work on this is already going on. In the official accommodation, all the lights have been replaced with LED lights. He is taking various economy measures, proper/less use of papers and notebooks, stopping of visiting cards, for entertainment programmes, minimum amount is sanctioned etc.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that these are very small measures, they should look into the big expenditure involving lacs and crores of rupees. She remembers that in the last budget meeting, the FDO has very well explained and they have given some proposals also. Suppose, they have given this budget in the year 2015-16, and thereafter, in 2016-17, every year to give a new budget, but they did not ever monitor it as to how much expenditure was done and how much work was accomplished in the last year.

The Vice Chancellor said that she (Professor Rajesh Gill) should not say like this. He says something only when he did something in the matter.

Professor Rajesh Gill, while pointing towards the tiles of the floor of the Syndicate room, said that they could see the plight of these tiles. If this is the plight of the tiles of Syndicate room, then what would be the positions of other rooms outside?



The Vice Chancellor said that that the work which has been done by the XEN Office, he would ask the Registrar to get it inspected and, therefore, he would place all this before them.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the unnecessary expenditure should be avoided.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that about Rs.53 lacs have been spent on the repair of the Golden Jubilee Guest House, but still wetness is there and water is leaking in all the washrooms. He enquired as to whom the contract had been given, why payment was made to him when the work was not up to the mark.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the XEN Office is closed, they would be able to save a lot of money to which the Vice Chancellor said that all efforts would be made.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they do not say that the XEN Office should be closed, but at least they could have some check on it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the XEN office should be closed as lot of money is being spent on that office.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua also endorsed the view point of Professor Navdeep Goyal and added that the material purchased by them did not meet the specifications. They could get the work done through outsourcing and this office should be closed as this is just a white elephant. Double of the cost is charged by the XEN Office if they are asked to do something and the quality of the work done by them is also not good.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he saw the budget very carefully and found that about 20% of the total budget is being used by the XEN Office.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said, as stated by Professor Navdeep Goyal, if 20% budget is used by the XEN Office, it meant that Rs.100 crore are spent by the XEN Office.

Professor Rajesh Gill wanted to know as to how much money has been given to Honorary Professors/Visiting Professors as the information has not been provided to her as the said information has not been provided in the Action Taken Report. It may also be informed as to how much money is still being paid to them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the issue of fee was also discussed several times in the Syndicate and Senate meeting. He informed that the fee of the colleges is more than the University fee. It was then said that at least, for the traditional courses, it should be at par with the Colleges. That is why, it was said that the fee should be increased but not exorbitantly, otherwise it would create a problem.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that there are different types of colleges, such as private colleges, aided and unaided etc, but the University is a government institution, so the colleges could not be put at par with the University to which the Vice Chancellor said that he agrees to.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to conclude the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that once it has happened in the University when they did not enhance the fee for about 5-6 years. The grant was continuously coming and the fee was not increased. As the fee was not increased, a disparity was observed with the neighbouring Universities. He was of the opinion that the fee should not be increased exorbitantly, but it should be increased rationally. Some members were

talking about the vacant seats. In this regard, he said that there is no problem of vacant seats in the University.

The Vice Chancellor also said that there is no problem of vacant seats as they are allowing conversion of earmarked seats, i.e., NRI seats in the general seats which help them to fill all the seats.

Professor Rajesh Gill again reiterated and requested the Vice Chancellor to ensure that the information with regard to the expenditure incurred or being incurred on the Honorary Professors and Visiting Professors be provided to her. The Honorary Professors and Visiting Professors should not be allowed to continue even for one day beyond the completion of their term of three years.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that if they compare the fee of traditional courses of Colleges with the University, there is huge gap. They could have different slabs for traditional and self-financing courses.

The Vice Chancellor said that in order to rationalize and get it done, a Committee of 4-5 persons would be appointed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to say that they have passed the budget for the year 2019-20 and they have mentioned the project fee in the budget. If it is said that with this fee hike, they would be able to get Rs.2.5 crores, they have to see, have they mentioned the project figure from the fee hike as Rs.2.5 crores in the budget (2019-20). If the project figure is mentioned as Rs.1 crore, then why they are saying here that they would generate Rs.2.5 crores. The budget which they have already passed for the year 2019-20, if in the budget, the project figure is one crore, then they have to think for generating one crore only and not Rs.2.5 crores.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Registrar to check as to what figure has been mentioned in the budget.

On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal as to whether they have mentioned the projected figure as Rs.2.5 crores, it was informed that in the budget for the year 2019-20, they have mentioned the amount a bit higher than Rs.2.5 crores. This is how they are befooled. How they have mentioned the projected figure more, which means they have presumed in the month of December that the figure would increase. Therefore, there is no need to bring this item here because they have already got it approved in the budget.

It was informed that after this budget, a revised budget is also prepared. While preparing the budget, they have to work out the figures with some estimation.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Naresh Gaur asked as to what has been the basis of the estimation.

It was informed that they had made projection of Rs.307/- in the budget for the year 2019-20 and there is some enhancement which has been clearly mentioned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that enhancement is there, but how and why that enhancement was presumed.

It was informed that for preparing the budget they have to presume something to give the estimated figure.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is unable to understand this formula of finance. As and when they have to make the budget for the next year, they have to prepare it at

the present rates. They cannot take up the anticipated increase until and unless it is approved by the competent authority. Suppose, he has to calculate his income for the purpose of paying income tax for the next year, he cannot calculate it with the anticipated increase. Since 2006 to 2012, it had never been said that the budget has been prepared on the basis of anticipated increase, but after 2012, the budget was started to be prepared with anticipated increase. If the things would go like this, then they could take a blank chit from them to do whatever they want to do. Now, it meant that they have presumed 1% or 2% or 3% anticipated increase. On whose assurance this increase has been mentioned. It means, the FDO, with the help of the Vice Chancellor and other people is sure that they would be able to get at least this much increase done, but this assumption is not acceptable.

It was clarified that Shri Ashok Goyal ji is correct, but the Budget Estimates for the year 2020-21 are to be sent to the UGC/MHRD by the month of September 2019. Similarly, they were required to send the Budget Estimates for the year 2019-20 by the month of September 2018. When they have to send the Budget Estimates to them, they have to include the projection the year under consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the projection for the year 2020-21 would be based on the year 2019-20, and the Budget Estimates for the year 2019-20 had already been prepared. When clarification about the revised Budget Estimates was tried to be given, Shri Ashok Goyal said that decision about this is yet to be taken. This meant, the Budget Estimates were prepared on the basis of anticipated income, but on what anticipation they have prepared the budget. In fact, they could anticipate the increase in number of seats, increase in number of courses, or any other increase from other sources, etc., but they could not anticipation on, the decision on which is to be taken by some other authority.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could have made the projection on the basis of some trend.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the fees were hiked last time, it did not mean, the fees would also be increased next time. On the other hand, the Vice Chancellor himself is talking about decreasing the fees, if adequate grant is received from the Government, and when this trend is to be taken into consideration, the curve would come down.

The Vice Chancellor said that matter would be got considered by 4-5 persons, who would rationalize the fees.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired as to what would they do after even getting it rationalized? At least, they should know as to what they are trying to do.

When Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the time is at their disposal, the Vice Chancellor said that they did not have the time to get it rationalized and brought to the Syndicate again because the meeting of the Senate has been fixed for 26<sup>th</sup> May 2019.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in case they would like to place it before the Syndicate again, then it is right; otherwise, the Committee is to be authorized to make recommendations on behalf of the Syndicate, so that the matter could be placed before the Senate for consideration where the members could discuss the issue threadbare.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that why should they authorize the Committee; rather, they would like to discuss the issue here as members of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the matter is to be placed before the Senate, it needed to be placed before the Senate in its ensuing meeting, which is scheduled for 26<sup>th</sup> May 2019 and not in the month of September that they are increasing the fees for the year 2019-20.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, then it is to be done right now and the Committee is to be authorized to make recommendations on behalf of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would definitely take it to the Senate.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the matter is to be placed before the Senate in its ensuing meeting, the Committee proposed to be constituted should be authorized to make recommendations on behalf of the Syndicate. However, so far as rationalization is concerned, no outcome is expected. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor, Shri Ashok Goyal gave his consent to be on the Committee, but for the information of the Vice Chancellor, he would like to say that nobody is interested in increasing the revenue or rationalize the fee structure. In fact, in the University, they applied simple formulas while enhancing the fees, i.e., 10%, 7%, or 5%. He has been raising the issue during the last three meetings that wherever they could increase the revenue, there also the same has not been increased even after assuring thrice. Citing an example, he enquired as to why the NRI seats have not been enhanced in the Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies. Who is the stumbling block in that?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is absolutely necessary.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had been assured again and again, but what the Committee has done. He is observing that though the earlier NRIs' fee structure has been given, but then same had been removed. He has been demanding that the number of NRI seats should be brought to the Syndicate for approval, but they did not bring.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has been ratified.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has not been ratified and if so, when and where it has been ratified.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, they would do it in the next item.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that he (Vice Chancellor) forgets as at that time he (Vice Chancellor) had said that he would keep Professor Navdeep Goyal on the Committee as he would do it, but he has not done it.

To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that how could he do when he is not on the Committee?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that anyhow it could not be done and now they did not have time though at the time of last or last to last meeting they had the time. He suggested that whatever seats could be reserved/given to the NRIs, why the same are not being given to them.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to spare some time and be present in the next meeting of the Committee and see that these things are got done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could discuss this issue while considering the next item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that so far as next item is concerned, Professor of Law is present here.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that so far as item under consideration is concerned, it is decided that a Committee of 4-5 persons would be constituted to rationalise the fee structure of various courses and make recommendations on behalf of the Syndicate.

Shri Naresh Gaur remarked that if everything is to be done by the Committee, for what the Syndicate is there. When Professor S.K. Sharma said that they could discuss the recommendation of the Committee in the Senate, Shri Naresh Gaur said that why could they not discuss the matter in the Syndicate itself? If decision is taken to constitute a Committee of 4-5 persons to rationalise the fee structure of various courses and make recommendations on behalf of the Syndicate, his dissent should be recorded.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Sandeep Singh said that their dissent should also be recorded.

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee, be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to rationalize the fee structure (Tuition fee and other University Charges), and make recommendations to the Senate, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Sarv Shri Naresh Gaur, Sandeep Singh and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua recorded their dissent.

**3.** Considered the matter relating to NRI Fee structure (**Appendix-III**) along with NRI seats (**Appendix-III**), to be sanctioned, in each course, for the session 2019-2020.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.03.2019 (Para 30) (**Appendix-III**) 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.
  2. Accordingly, the above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 10.04.2019 (Para 12) (**Appendix-III**) and it was resolved that consideration of Item C-12, be deferred.
  3. A copy of data of previous years i.e. 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 (**Appendix-III**) regarding sanctioned and filled seats of NRI and Foreign Nationals in various department of the University.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the courses offered at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital are regulated by the Dental Council of India (DCI), additional seats could not be created there. However, in the BDS courses, which is also regulated by the DCI, they have already kept NRI seats, but within the sanctioned strength. Within the sanctioned strength, they should create the NRI seats here also. Obviously, if they create NRI seats within the sanctioned strength, then it became reservation, but the reservation could not go beyond 50%. As such, be believed that if the reservation there is 46.5%, then they could decide today itself that 3% seats would be reserved there for NRIs. In this way, the total reservation would become 49.5%. Resultantly, 3% seats of B.A.LL.B.,

B.Com. LL.B. for LL.B. would be reserved for NRIs. However, if any seat (NRI seat) remained vacant, the same would be converted into general category.

Professor S.K. Sharma enquired as to why the NRIs could not be created in other Professional Departments?

To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since there was no problem in other Departments, they have already created NRI seats there. Earlier, here the NRI seats were there, but the Bar Council of India (BCI) said that they could not create additional NRI seats and they had to undo them. In fact, they should not have undone the additional NRI seats.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they did not know as to how much percentage of seats has been reserved in the Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies. However, Professor Navdeep Goyal told that 46.5% seats have been reserved in the Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies, but they are not sure as to how many percentage of seats have been reserved there – whether these are 46% or 46.5% or 47%, and in any case they could not go beyond 50%. Whatever percentage of seats have been reserved there, the remaining of 50% should be reserved for NRIs. Citing an example, he said that if it is 46.5%, 3.5% should be reserved for NRIs and if it is 47%, then 3% should be reserved for NRIs.

On a query, it was informed that overall 46.5% reservation is there in the Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to page 108 of the Appendix, stated that in the Department of Laws, they have created four seats in the LL.M. course, but none filled up during the last three years. Now, they have also done in LL.M. course being offered at University Institute of Legal Studies, i.e., LL.M. (Self-Finance), LL.M. (Evening) and there are two categories in L.M. (Evening), i.e., (i) LL.M. (Evening) Fresh graduates; and (ii) LL.M. (Evening) for Advocates/Judicial Officers, and even for Advocates and Judicial Officers two seats NRIs have been created. What are they doing? Could the Advocate and Judicial Officer be an NRI? He could not expect that they could do this? Moreover, these are those seats, which had never been filled up. What are they doing in the University – Advocates and Judicial Officers NRIs?

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that possibility is there that one (Advocate/Judicial Officer) could have gone abroad and have to come back.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that LL.M. (Evening) for Fresh Graduates has been written and he did not know as how they have done the work. What did they mean by fresh graduates? So far as Advocates and Judicial Officers are concerned, since they would not be able to compete in general category, it should be mentioned as “LL.M. (Evening)” only and the words “fresh graduates” should be deleted. An advocate, who is residing abroad in the preceding six months at the time of taking admission to LL.M., is an NRI as per Income Tax Return; otherwise, he is not an NRI. However, when the person concerned remained here in India for six months, his status of NRI is finished. Since the course is of two years’ duration, how one could remain NRI.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the status of NRI is seen only at the time of admission and not thereafter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then it is wrong. That meant, one could had spent just six months abroad, and take admission under NRI quota.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is a rule.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that where it is written. NRI would remained NRI and his/her status of NRI, which was at the time of admission, could not change in between the course. Citing an example, he said a person took admission in Five-Year Law under the NRI category, what fee would they charge from him/her during the period of five year (duration of the course)? To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they would definitely charge NRI fee from his/her. Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant, his/her status would remain same for all the five years. How could it be possible that the person, who remained abroad just for six months, his/her status is changed just after six months, but they charge NRIs fee from him/her? Owing to this, they might have done the 'wards of NRIs'. His/Her status would not change as earlier he/she was ward and would remain so. They might have covered this, but not that once the NRI's status is given and thereafter would be least concerned about it. Therefore, it should be "LL.M. (Evening) for Advocates/Judicial Officers", but the sanction of two NRI seats should not be given.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that a new interpretation has come and he had said this in the Syndicate also. Now, they have created certain additional seats for NRIs in various University Teaching Departments and Professor Navdeep Goyal was associated in it. Could they take legal opinion from anyone? In fact, he had said that the legal opinion should be sought from a person, who has been representing the University in such cases in the Court of Law. They had already been doing so many things earlier also. They had created seats for NRIs in supernumerary capacity and made admissions, which was not permissible, and all the Professors of Law were party to that. Should he take that it as a legal opinion? Today also, they had taken opinion from a Professor in the case of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, wherein he had written that out of 15% NRI seats, 10% seats should be reserved in self-financing, where there is only one class, one teacher & one course and there they are making reservation of 10% in self-financing. Could they do that? It was a self-financed course and when the UGC raised some objection, they changed its nomenclature at their own as "Partially self-financed" and now they are reserving 10% seats in self-financed out of 15% NRI seats from partially self-financed seats. Up to what extent, this opinion would stand. Since he is not a man of Law, he did not know it, but it meant that they have carved out 10% NRI seats for self-financing out of 15% NRI seats for partially self-financed. Meaning thereby, that these would be with higher fee structure, which could not be done. The opinion has been obtained from a Professor and the matter has been placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are 50 seats in MBA at Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi and 10% of them are paid seats as in self-financing they faced complication from the UGC. As such, 5 seats in MBA at BHU are paid seats, but the students concerned would study along with other students.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Vice Chancellor is absolutely right. First of all, it could be done where they have different fee structures for traditionally subsidized courses, and there they could have paid seats. However, here the entire Institute had paid seats. The Institute is already having paid seats and there is no other seat.

The Vice Chancellor said that the paid seats have been abolished.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said the paid seats have not been abolished. Now, the paid seats, which are self-financed seats, have been named as partially self-financed seats. In fact, they had also named them as self-financed seats, but when objection was came from there that whatever teaching and non-teaching employees are working in the self-financed Departments, they would not pay salary of those employees. Cleverly, they changed its name from self-financed to partially self-financed, and now they have added another category to it. What are they doing? So far as NRI is

concerned, they could do for NRIs. Firstly, they reserved 15% seats for NRIs within 100 seats, and the NRI seats are not filled up and since these seats were not filled up, they converted them as general category and filled them up. Now, they have brought in another proposal that out of these 15% seats, 10% should be filled from self-financed and if the remaining 5% are not got filled up, the same should be filled from the general category. Meaning thereby, that now even in self-financed courses, they have created a new category of self-financed by prescribing a higher fee, but this would not stand scrutiny of law. So far as the practice being followed by BHU is concerned, he had talked to Professor Davinder Singh and he (Professor Davinder) told him that this is also being done by Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla. He told him (Professor Davinder Singh) that whatever BHU and Himachal Pradesh University is doing, is nothing in comparison to what this University used to do. The extent they violated the law up to 2006, perhaps none could violate. However, the issue went to the Court, they have to stop this NRIs business. As they have to stop the NRIs business, they have to see this deficit in the Budget. The Institutes (University Institute of Engineering & Technology and Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital) were established in the year 2005 or 2006 and that time also, person like him was the Vice Chancellor and persons like them were the members of the Syndicate and Senate, and it was said at that time that these Institutes would eat up the University and all this is on record. They had suggested that these types of white-elephants should not be created and at that time, they were told that the University would function only because of these Institutes and they have not to look towards the Government even for a single penny and money would flow to the University like water and they are already fool and there is no need to befool them. Now, he has been told that whatever deficit is there, more loss than that is from these two Institutes (University Institute of Engineering & Technology and Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital). Had these two Institutes been not there, they would have surplus funds. So he is saying that at the time to taking decision(s), they should be careful of the fact that the University has to run for all times to come, and it is not that they should just take care of the present. Secondly, in this he has to make a request that the manpower audit of the both of these Institutes, i.e., University Institute of Engineering & Technology and Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, must be got done.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are going to get the space and manpower audit done in the months of May and June. He has himself seen in one of the Departments that there are only 78 students and they have provided 1 P.A., 1 Clerk and two Peons.

Professor Rajat Sandhir remarked that there are even less students in certain other Departments.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that the manpower audit of all the Departments/Branches of the University should be got done.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that earlier also the manpower audit was got done.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu suggested that small Departments/Centres, which are to be clubbed, should be clubbed and the existing staff should be asked to work for them.

Dr. K.K. Sharma suggested that instead of manpower audit, the cost audit should be got done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the manpower audit is got done at the earliest, maybe they would not have to enhance the fees.



Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that so far as he knew three types of fee is being charged in the Dental and Medical Colleges, i.e., in the private Colleges, half of the seats are management seats, Government seats and NRIs seats. There are no seats with the nomenclature of paid seats and the paid seats would not stand in the Court of Law.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that earlier when they had got done the manpower audit, the Departments in order to justify their staff had shown the workload not twice but thrice.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that the manpower audit should be got done from the external agency.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that since he was involved in the earlier manpower audit, he knew that certain Departments had shown periods of two hours duration instead of one hour and the teachers used to come only for three days.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that there is other side of the story as well.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the recommendations, which have come from the Committee comprising Professor Navdeep Goyal.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that Professor Navdeep Goyal is overburdened, and that was why, he is not appointing him member on certain Committees.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is not overburdened, but burdened under the trend, which has been developed by the University. It has come in writing here that the fee to be increased at par with private Dental Colleges in Punjab because it is not there in the Government Colleges. This is the proposal which has come and in the same proposal, legal opinion has also come. What are they doing? The legal opinion came and they went ahead. That was why, he had said that the legal opinion should be sought from a person, who are contesting in the Court of Law. It is interesting that the person, who is giving this legal opinion that the NRI seats should be converted into self-financed seats, for his own Institute is saying that NRI seats should not be created. 3.5% Reservation which they have just now in LL.B., B.A. LL.B. and B.Com. LL.B. courses, but for his own Institute, he is saying that NRI seats should not be created and for other he is giving legal opinion that the NRI seats should be converted into self-financing category. What this mockery of the system is? If the work is got done from the expert(s), there would not be any problem. What he meant to say is that the work suits in the hands of the one skilled to do it. In fact, it is the job of the Legal Retainer. Citing an example, he said that if the Registrar is to get something done, he would call the Senior Law Officer to give legal opinion and he could get written whatever he wished. However, if the work is not to be done, the file would be sent to a person who would not respond and the reply would be that they have sent the file for legal opinion, but the same is yet to be received. Whatever legal opinion came, but they should be satisfied that the job is got done from a person, who is expert in the same. He had asked for obtaining the matter legally examined and the purpose for the same was not to put obstacles in its way. He remarked that if anything illegal is done in the University, it is mostly done in the Department of Laws. Whatever wrong admissions are done, the same are done in the Department of Laws. It is most interesting that the people of the Department of Laws are so sure that even if someone points it out, they would get orders from the Court. Whatever order has come for the Department of Laws, so far the University has never appealed against those orders. They could well imagine as to what is happening. Even if eligible candidate given admission, he/she had been allowed to attend classes and on

the basis of that order, the person concerned had obtained the degree because the University neither made an appeal nor got the stay vacated.

**RESOLVED:** That –

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

**4.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 11.03.2019 (**Appendix-IV**), to look into the rules of promotion policy/relaxation of time period for promotion of Laboratory and Technical Staff of Panjab University. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-IV**) was also taken into consideration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since he was the Chairman of this Committee, he would like to inform them that the portion, which has been mentioned in bold, are the changes recommended in the rules of promotion policy/relaxation in time period for promotion of Laboratory and Technical Staff.

It was pointed out that at page 115 of the Appendix, it has been written that “the person, who possessed the qualification 10<sup>th</sup> + Diploma or Graduate in any stream and having 6 years experience in G-IV are eligible for applying for the post of G-III under Clause 2.4 and Clause 2.5”. It would be better if the duration of the Diploma is specified as the Diploma could be of one year, two years or three years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if it is to be changed, the eligible for G-IV is also to be changed. At the moment, it is written so because the approved eligibility for G-IV posts is the same, which has been given here. When the persons have been given job with this eligibility, they are required to be promoted. However, there is nothing wrong in changing it, but it could only be done for future and for that they have to change the eligibility for G-IV posts.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as these qualifications for appointment?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one is for appointment and another for promotion. The qualifications for G-IV posts have already been approved. Earlier, the qualification was Matriculation, but the same was changed to 10<sup>th</sup> plus Diploma or Graduate in any stream. Certain persons are in job with these qualifications and these qualifications are needed to be kept for their promotions.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No", it is wrong. There is difference between appointment and promotion. Different conditions are there for appointment and different for promotion. Citing an example, he said that the conditions for appointment of Professor and promotion as Professor under the CAS are different. A person is eligible for appointment as Professor against selection post with five years experience, where under CAS the experience required is 8 years. They could not say that since only five years experience is required for appointment as Professor (selection post), why the persons having five years' experience be not promotion as Professors under the CAS. Therefore, they could not keep the qualifications for appointment and promotion at par. Coming to the persons to be promoted, he said that such persons could have these qualifications as well as below these qualifications.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that the persons with less than these qualifications are not now in the service.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that probability is there.

It was pointed out that the promotion for the same is there, i.e., experience of six years, 8 years and 10 years has been prescribed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a person having these qualifications could be there and he might have been appointed later. The other person with lower qualifications could also be there as he might have been appointed earlier, but he/she is the senior. According to him, they do such promotions on the basis of seniority-cum-merit or purely on the basis of seniority. If promotion is made purely on the basis of seniority, they could not adopt the policy of pick and choose that persons having higher qualifications would be promoted first and the persons having lower qualifications later on.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that three types of qualifications have been prescribed. One of the qualifications is the existing eligibility for the posts of G-IV, which has been mentioned under the existing provision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, this meant, they have segregated it in accordance with the qualifications. For some the experience is 6 years, for some, the experience is 8 years and for some other, the experience is 15 years. He could they say that the experience of 6 years, 8 years and 15 years be not prescribed on the basis of qualifications unless it is requirement that they have improved the qualification after getting appointed. If a person came with qualifications about six years before, he/she is promoted because he/she had the qualifications, but the person, who came 10 years ago on the same post, is being covered under the condition of 15 years experience.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these are the old conditions. In fact, the condition for under-matric is old one and they are not changing it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he meant to say is that they are saying "100% by promotion".

Professor Navdeep Goyal reiterated that the portion, which had been given in bold, has been recommended.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the logic behind the addition(s), which has/have been recommended.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the logic is if somebody is there with higher qualifications or attained the higher qualifications.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that there is a difference between having higher qualifications and attaining higher qualifications and they are altogether two different things.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a general grudge had come from the people that all other categories, e.g., clerical and others are being promoted, but here it is not sure that one would get promoted as they are not sure whether the post would be available. It is there that one would get promoted after a period of six or eight years. In fact, the promotion is against the vacancy and the requisite experience is also must, whereas in other categories, either the promotion is based on vacancy or experience. Both the things together are only prescribed in the case of Technical Staff alone.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that it is absolutely true and he agreed with him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the persons in the technical cadre who have qualification as has been in the case of clerical cadre, at least should have opportunity for promotion as and when they complete the requisite period of experience.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he is agreed with to it, but it is discrimination with the technical staff.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have changed it. In the existing provision the qualification is matric with science or +2 class with science for promotion for Group IV. In the proposed provision, even science has not been mentioned, or prescribed by the Senate for Group IV. It has straightway been written 8 years for matriculation, 15 years experience in Group IV for those persons who are under Matric i.e. who do not have the qualification prescribed by the Syndicate/Senate for Group IV. He said that they have kept the same qualification. If they bring it to six years, since promotion is against vacancies, even then they would not get promotion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the first issue is that of non matric as they have observed nowadays. Even if minimum number of candidates is there, there might not be a chance that all of them get promotion. It could not work even the condition is removed. But they are not removing it because someone might be there who could be due for promotion. He agrees to it that whatever has been written in existing provision with regard to experience, it could be reproduced as such in the proposed provisions. The second number condition could also be added on proposed provision. As regard the first category of candidates are concerned, at least they should be made eligible after a period of 6 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be seen otherwise it might create heartburning.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that would not be heartburning as their representatives were also present in the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the members of Technical Staff Association would be only those who are eligible after putting in 6 years service. When Professor Navdeep

Goyal said that they were senior persons, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they might be those who have already been promoted.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that they could do it as 6 years. His only concern is that those persons should be made eligible who have done three years Diploma after matriculation..

The members agreed to the proposal this proposal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been mentioned that a person having Graduation degree in any stream is eligible. He asked is there no need of science?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, earlier, it has been matriculation with science.

The Vice Chancellor stated that it cannot be Graduation in any stream. The science shall have to be inducted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, earlier also, graduation with science was not there. However, they prescribed three years diploma, then the graduation with science would be the necessary. They will have to make it as graduation with science.

The Vice Chancellor again said the science should compulsorily be made the essential qualification for promotion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the symmetry should be made as Three Years Diploma or Graduation in Science. He further said that in case, in Punjab Government the qualification is not Graduation with Science, they could think otherwise.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that it is very much in the Punjab Government. They have passed in Syndicate the graduation in science.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that, to his knowledge, in the affiliated colleges, the qualification of graduation with science is not there. It seems that even the promotions which have been made by the Punjab Government, it is not graduation with science. He, therefore, requested that it should be checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it would be subject to. If it is not there, then it should not be included here also.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should not be brought in written form, firstly it should be checked.

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

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

- The person, who possessed the qualification 10<sup>th</sup> + 3-Year Diploma or Graduate in Science and having 6 years experience in G-IV, are eligible for applying for the post of G-III under Clause 2.4 and Clause 2.5.

- 8 Years experience in Group-IV for those persons, who are Matric with Science or XII Class with Science, pass as prescribed by the Senate for Group-IV posts.
- 15 Years experiences in Group-IV for those persons, who are under Matric, i.e., don't have the qualification prescribed by the Senate for Group-IV."

At this stage, taking up the another issue, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the matter has been linked to item No. 4 in the term that it was a very disturbing issue that it was a very good thing the promotion policy which has been brought out by Professor Navdeep Goyal. The issue happened to be in discussion for the last so many years, it had been left in between that the promotion policy of the dental college teachers has been in pendency. A lot of conversations have been taking place there but he will not indulge in that. But they feel uncomfortable and after time and again assurances given to them, they have not been able to get justice. It was immaterial that whatever the people could say. They have requested to resolve the matter on personal level and on official level too, efforts have also been made. Professor Rajesh Gill has collected some data also with a view to ensure that how best possible benefit they can give to the maximum number of teachers so that there is no dissatisfaction. He said that his request to the Vice Chancellor was that instead of lingering on the issue on one way or the other, let this Syndicate take a conscious decision of the fact, as to how to expedite the things in a way that at the earliest that they come up with a scheme which can be approved by Syndicate or the Senate or from wherever it is required. Unfortunately, the committee which was constituted, in spite of best efforts, it has not moved further, which was the concern of the Vice Chancellor and also concern of all them. He said that he has to say that the Syndicate should take a decision only to send the message that they were more serious than those who were affected parties and they were not interested in any kind of blame game.

The Vice Chancellor said that if it was over.

While appreciating the concern of the Vice Chancellor, Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to carry the matter somewhat further. She appreciated that the Vice Chancellor is very much concerned with this as this is a very sensitive issue because the people had been facing stagnation for the last so many years.

The Vice Chancellor said he had told to them that he has also been getting feedback directly from the teachers. He said that Shri Goyal had been chairing that Committee. He had just been waiting for his report. This was the only issue which has been left over and there were only 12-13 people whose cases, he would like to settle before the next meeting of the Syndicate. He had discussed 2-3 parameters with those people. Citing an example, he said that one of the model is that of Banaras Hindu University as stated by Shri Goyal, which is still lying standstill. If they come with another model, and if it would have been feasible, it would also be made applicable through Senate and Syndicate. But he desired that it should be time bound. He does not want to linger on the issue any more and the deprived who are all highly devoted would be given their due.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the Committee which has been constituted should submit its report before the next Syndicate.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that he would like to know what was that Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the Vice Chancellor had given statement last time also and he had told him (Vice Chancellor) that it was registered in his mind that Shri Ashok Goyal was the Chairman of the Committee and he being the Chairman of the Committee is responsible for the delay and that was why, it had been registered in his (Vice Chancellor) mind that Shri Ashok Goyal was the Chairman. Had he been the Chairman of the Committee, he would have clinched the issue. Actually the Chairman of the Committee is someone else.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the issue is that they all wanted to resolve the issue which should be done at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was under the impression that Shri Ashok Goyal was the Chairman.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the Vice Chancellor should get the meeting of the Committee convened.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Professor Gill should be given a chance to put forth here viewpoints, being President of PUTA, it is her duty. They have worked a lot on the issue. If they discuss the issue here, it would carry weight..

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it was her moral responsibility as PUTA President. The matter has been delayed excessively due to various reasons. She requested the Vice Chancellor that first of all, she should be given a heard carefully and if it carries the support of the Syndicate, they would be able to clinch it very quickly. She had tried to gather a lot of information about the policy, the feedback had also been taken from the teachers as to what they did want.

The Vice Chancellor said that she must do it and discussion is not needed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the matter should be clinched by appointing the Committee of the present Syndics. He did not know as to why the matter is being delayed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be beneficial to listen to Professor Gill.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she will not take much time. In BHU, Jamila Milia Islamia and Delhi University, there has been DAPC and she has collected relevant documents from all the three institutes after talking to the people who had been involved. She said that it was only to clinch the matter could be clinched by forming a Committee of three four members of the Syndicate who would be able to do this before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor enquired if they wish to revive the earlier Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be better to take the Syndicate members along for which there are two three reasons and one of them is that when the matter would be resolved, it would go to the Board of Finance. It would be better that it is done on priority basis so that it is forwarded to the Board of Finance immediately and only then it would be through. If they do it as DAPC, because it is the government scheme, there would be no problem in Board of Finance. The second thing was that the Syndicate members have no personal interest in it, but all sincerely wanted that this should be got done. He said that since it is already registered in Vice Chancellor's mind, Shri Ashok Goyal should be made the Chairperson of the Committee and one or two Syndicate members from the Campus be included in it. If needed, one two more

members could be added. He is hopeful that they would resolve the issue in fifteen days.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it would find its way before the next Syndicate meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said, should they supersede the earlier Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this would be in supersession of the earlier Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that there already exists a Committee and they were talking of forming another Committee. It should not be done in this way.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let him tell that this is not in supersession. He had already told to the Vice Chancellor that the supersession has already taken place. Actually, he did not want to open the Pandora box. Let it be left here, whatever the members were saying that would be suitable.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Syndicate could form a Committee and let them should form it today itself. Moreover, the members are promising to clinch it before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that if the Vice Chancellor would do the things in the suggested way, they are sure that the issue would definitely be clinched; otherwise, the issue would linger on.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was heartily and sincerely speaking that he wanted to resolve the issue. Moreover, he wanted to settle it within a time bound manner.

Shri Harpreet Dua and Shri K.K. Sharma said that it should be declared that the Committee has been constituted.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members not to get anything wrong done from him. There has been immense litigations, it would be very difficult to face the litigation in this respect. A lot of issues are lying unsettled. Though they had requested the DCI many a times for promotion of these teachers, but the DCI has not responded at all. For example, if they promoted all and someone enquired through RTI, what would happen? He has enquired from the DCI and also requested them to give something in black and white, but they are ready to give in writing. It is coming to his mind that the Committee, which is already in existence, could be expanded by adding some more people, as is being suggested by the members, and the committee be requested to expedite the matter. It would also avoid violation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the extended committee would create problems, and that was why, he was asking for forming of a small committee by the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they appointed Committee on Committee, it would be nothing but mockery of the system. Three committees for the same cause are practically not feasible.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that let them perceive that the Syndicate is concerned that the matter has been pending for so long, and the Committee is unable to reach to the conclusion.



The Vice Chancellor said that it cannot be stated so. He further said that what he wants was that whatever Committee already existed, the same be told precisely that whatever they could deliver, they give the report which should be placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate. The findings of the Committee could be seen and if they feel fit, they could constitute the Committee.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the meeting of that Committee be convened at the earliest.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to tell the Vice Chancellor that he (himself), Prof. Navdeep Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill are the members in that Committee, but if the meeting of that Committee is conveyed, they would not attend the same. He did not want to disclose the reason here. The concern shown by the Vice Chancellor not to supersede the committee seems to be good, but the supersession has already happened. He asked what did it mean, was it not the stricture passed against the functioning of the Committee? Somebody comes and says, why such and such person has been in the Committee, the answer was that let he also is included in the Committee. That was why, they were saying that in order to avoid the controversy, they should not harm the teachers of Dental Institute. At least, the Syndicate could do it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that supersession could be done in the interest of public. Moreover, it was the Syndicate that was making supersession.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever is being done, it is being done by the Syndicate and he is nowhere in it?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Syndicate resolved to appoint the Committee, would it be in good taste? In fact, they were trying to find out a reasonable solution, as they are feeling unhappy and it was also brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor. A special message was also given to the Secretary to Vice Chancellor and they were told that it has already been circulated, which as per his claim, has not been circulated. He remarked that they were not foolish.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since it is a good thing, it should be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would come with workable solution at the earliest.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever he had told, under the circumstances, had the Vice Chancellor been there, he would have also not appreciated it. Now, the Vice Chancellor is feeling bad, but at that time he did not felt so. He further said that it has also been given in writing to him (Vice Chancellor) and the Vice Chancellor has taken action on it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he thought that if the Committee is enlarged, what is harm in it?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in that way the work cannot be got done as the minutes are difficult to get signed.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to why they would not attend the meeting of the committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no tussle at all. If it was so, the Vice Chancellor could have enlarged the committee earlier when he did so, and at that time

he could have appointed Dean, Faculty of Medical Science by designation instead of by name. Then, he could have understood it, but the addition is somewhat different.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is unable to understand what it could be termed as.

Ashok Goyal said that this was a communication gap.

Professor Rajesh Gill said even after two months, it was difficult to get the minutes signed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would suggest the solution to the problem. Even if he did not attend the meeting of the committee, it is immaterial. Let the Vice Chancellor bring the proceedings of the Committee. He asked did the Vice Chancellor think that the issue would be clinched in this way.

The Vice Chancellor said that he meant to say that the Committee would give its observations and after that things would move accordingly because so many Committees have been constituted on the issue and it has become mockery of the system.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Committee cannot move a step ahead because the minutes of the Committee have not been signed/ implemented so far, and the next meeting cannot take place. She said that the work would go to a halt permanently. She requested that the issue should be clinched at the earliest.

Dr. K.K. Sharma suggested that a Committee be constituted under the Chairmanship of Vice Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that at the moment they are coming forward straightway, but personal interests are involved, and that was why, the Vice Chancellor wanted to avoid that.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the matter was such that whatever Committee has been constituted by the Vice Chancellor, they did not know about the internal politics of that Committee, but the things indicate that, that Committee was basically infructuous and its observations would be immaterial.

The Vice Chancellor said that already there has been so many Committees. The forming of new Committee would not serve the purpose. The matter, if resolved, would go to the Board of Finance as a policy matter, and thereafter the same would be placed before the Syndicate and Senate. Once the matter had cleared all the barriers, but the DCI put a query, that created problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what was being talked of that it was cleared, he would like to tell about the problems.. He said that although he was the Chairman of that Committee, but when it comes to fore during the discussion that the fault is at a particular point, then one should admit the mistake.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that by that way, it would linger on. She urged that let it be cleared. The teachers have suffered a lot and the PUTA was pleading to the Vice Chancellor for support.

The Vice Chancellor said that his concern was more than them and, therefore, some more time should be given. A letter directly came to him. He was not made aware of everything. It had been being told as of today.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that everything was told to the Vice Chancellor. He had gone himself to tell it to the Vice Chancellor. In the last meeting, he had told to the Vice Chancellor that he was not the Chairperson of the Committee. In the mind of Vice Chancellor still the same impression is there. He further said that whatever had been told by others, it is registered in his mind and what has been told by him, that found no place. He said that the impression was made before the Vice Chancellor that it was because of the Chairmanship of Ashok Goyal, the work has been halted. He enquired who had told him that he (Ashok Goyal) was the Chairperson of the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not aware as to how it was in his mind that he (Ashok Goyal) was the Chairperson and something biased is taking place. If the case of those people would have been included, it would have been a good thing. It was very plain submission to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what did it mean? It means that they had depicted such a picture that it was biased and some alterations be made, and the Vice Chancellor did it. He asked what was the problem here in constituting the Committee of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was his submission and not objection. The objection was from the members. He further said that he wanted that, first the observations of the Committee should have been seen.

The members enquired as to what had been resolved.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did want that the report of the Committee should be allowed to come, so that in the light of the suggestions given by the Committee, the action could be taken after further deliberation but the members of the House after deliberation unanimously decided to form a new Committee.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested the formation of the Committee with five members and the requested that the names of the the Committee members be announced.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that whatever names for the Committee have been suggested are, Shri Ashok Goyal, (Chairman), Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Rajat Sandhir, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Professor S.K. Sharma and Professor Rajesh Gill.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that let they requested to clinch the issue at the earliest.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that either the number of members be made five or seven.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that name of Dr. Harpreet Sigh Dua should be included. Shri Naresh Gaur endorsed the suggestion of Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Karamjeet Singh enquired as to who will be the convener of the Committee.

It was clarified that the Convener of the Committee would be D.R. Establishment.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Principal of the Dental College, should also be included in the Committee.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 11<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, the Committee be authorised to invite any person to the meeting, as it deems fit. The assistance of Principal of Dental College and Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences could be taken as and when required.

Professor Rajesh Gill said during his (Prof. Raj Kumar's) tenure, so many chronic issues, have stood resolved.

After discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That, in order to clinch the issue of promotion of teachers of Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Science & Hospital under Career Advancement Scheme, the following Committee be constituted with the liberty to invite any person to take assistance:

1. Shri Ashok Goyal ..... Chairperson
2. Professor Navdeep Goyal
3. Professor Rajesh Gill, President PUTA
4. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
5. Professor Rajat Sandhir
6. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua

**5.** Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the following Deputy Registrar, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch / Department	Date of Promotion	Date of confirmation
1.	Shri Surjeet Singh Thakur General Branch	30.06.2009	01.04.2017
2.	Mrs. Anuradha Makhija UIET (Voluntary Retired on 08.01.2019)	26.05.2011	06.09.2018
3.	Shri B.B. Talwar Secrecy Branch	16.10.2015	07.09.2018
4.	Mrs. Poonam Chopra UIET	02.06.2016	09.01.2019

Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

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

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired as to why the confirmation cases of April, 2017 are being brought before the Syndicate in 2019.

The Vice Chancellor said that such confirmation should be made in due time.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the following Deputy Registrars, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

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

	General Branch		
2.	Mrs. Anuradha Makhija UIET (Voluntary Retired on 08.01.2019)	26.05.2011	06.09.2018
3.	Shri B.B. Talwar Secrecy Branch	16.10.2015	07.09.2018
4.	Mrs. Poonam Chopra UIET	02.06.2016	09.01.2019

**6.** Considered minutes dated 04.04.2019 (**Appendix-V**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said about item No. 6, he has some observation. He said that after page No. 125, on number 5, Ms. Neeru. The observation of the office is right. As per Syndicate Para 5, dated 26/8/2006, no qualification is required for the widow of the deceased employee for Class C post. What the Committee was doing further, was that 'Committee while examining the documents, found that 8<sup>th</sup> certification submitted by the applicant, is having overwriting. Therefore, the Committee asked the office to verify the certificate of the applicant from the issuing authority and defer the case. He asked as to how they could defer the case. Whose qualification is not required, the case of that applicant was being deferred.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that who had attached the certificate, she should have been asked as to why she had appended the certificate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there was no meaning in deferring it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that this was otherwise, an offence.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was subject to verification. On this Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whose qualification was not required, why deferment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if she has produced fake certificate, and put a query as to if even then the job would be given?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it would have been a different case, if she would not have submitted the certificate. Shri Ashok Goyal also said that in case the certificate would not have been given, it was another thing.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there was a case of compassionate appointment, the lady had submitted an affidavit that his son be given the job and afterward said that she was willing to withdraw her affidavit and she did want this job for herself. There was another case where an affidavit from the mother that her son should be given the job instead of her. He further said that as he said that they must get affidavit from the son. Generally what was happening in most of the cases was that he takes the appointment but later on does not look after her mother. So there should be an affidavit from the son that he will look after her mother.

The Vice Chancellor said that such an provision has already come, in place.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at least, they should approve of the case subject to verification.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that there was no need to approve of this appointment.

While reading page No. 122, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if there was any provision that one could attend the meeting in place or on behalf of the actual member. He pointed out the name of Prof. Shefali Singla on behalf of Professor Jagat Bhushan.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that no one can go in place of other.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in this it has been written Professor so and so. If has not been written the Chairman of Dental. He said that his simple question was that could anybody go on behalf of someone as a junior. He said that it has been told so many times, that the things happen to come directly to the Syndicate. He said that in this case, only seven members attended the meeting and out of seven, one was unauthorized, on somebody's behalf. Only six members have attended the meeting and eight members could not attend. He put a query as to if the minutes of this meeting were valid. He said that was there none to see it.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has rightly been so.

Dr. N.S.Sidhu said that if the size of the committee would be larger, the people would not be able to attend the meeting. The sufferers will be the applicants.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at least this should be taken care of and size of the Committee be tried to be concise.

The Vice Chancellor said that as per his knowledge, there was another Committee, the meeting of which has not been convened so far.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that there happened to be a Pension Committee and the term of that Pension Committee got lapsed, but the meeting of that Committee had never been convened from the Year 2010 to the Year 2013.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that to the minimal, A.R. Establishment should be directed that in future, not to get the meeting attended on behalf of others. One letter should also be issued to those who have sent persons in their place. Shri Ashok Goyal added to it by stating that the requisition of 51% quorum should also be notified.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that it was now concluded that leaving aside the application on serial No. 5, all other cases from 1 to 4 and 6 to 7 have been passed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that serial number 6, could be approved subject to verification. It was a matter of Duplicate certificate and they should not delay it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that his appointment was subject to verification of certificates. Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu also said that the certificates shall have to be got verified.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever was in the purview of the Committee, the Committee should work within that limit, even if the Committee does not write all these things, in that case too, the verification do occur.

Professor Rajat Sandhir asked if, item could be passed without quorum.

Professor S.K.Sharma said that he had sent his comments, and in this way, the quorum might have been considered to be completed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this was not the case. If it happens so, that all the members send their comments, then there was no need of holding the meeting with

members present. He further said that if Professor S.K. Sharma had sent his comments, then he will have to clarify on these two-three points.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 04.04.2019, as per **Appendix**, be approved, with the stipulation that –

- (1) Shri Radhe Shyam S/o Late Shri Ramjit, be appointed Peon after giving him relaxation in the maximum age limit, under Rule 5(i)(d) at pager 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016;
- (2) Ms. Neeru W/o Shri Amarjeet Kumar, be appointed against a Class 'C' post, subject to verification of her certificate from the concerned authority; and
- (3) Mr. Parwinder Singh S/o Late Ms. Jaswinder Kaur, be appointed Clerk, subject to verification of his Degree/DMC of B.Sc. (IT).

## 7.

Considered –

- (i) the issue of grant of extension in Ex-India (Earned) Leave w.e.f. 18.05.2018 to 05.11.2018 to Shri Manmohan Shah, Programmer, UIET, P.U. as requested by him vide application dated 05.11.2018 (**Appendix-VI**); and
- (ii) the resignation of Shri Manmohan Shah, Programmer, UIET, w.e.f. 06.11.2018, as he has deposited the requisite amount in the University account in lieu of 03 months prior notice required, under Rule 16.1 at page 84 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

Information contained in office note (**Appendix-VI**) was also taken into consideration

- NOTE:**
1. Shri Manmohan Shah joined the University service as Programming Assistant w.e.f. 02.03.2005. Later on he was appointed as Programmer w.e.f. 28.02.2013 and subsequently confirmed as such w.e.f. 01.03.2014. He is a Class 'A' employee.
  2. He was granted Ex-India (Earned) Leave w.e.f. 15.03.2018 to 17.05.2018 vide order dated 15.03.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) issued by the Establishment branch.
  3. Shri Manmohan Shah vide application dated 15.05.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) requested for grant of extension in Ex-India Leave w.e.f. 18.05.2018 to 05.11.2018, but his request was not acceded to by the Vice-Chancellor and he was directed to resume his duty forthwith vide letter dated 29.06.2018 (**Appendix-VI**).
  4. In response to above, he again requested to re-consider his request for extension in Ex-India Leave w.e.f. 18.05.2018 to 05.11.2018 vide email dated 09.07.2018 being a reason that he is pursuing a course related to concepts in information technology

and has already deposited course fee and commuted for accommodation for the said-period. But his request was again turned down and he was advised to join duty immediately failing which disciplinary action will be taken under Regulation 11.9 at page 120 P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 vide letter 05.10.2018 (**Appendix-VI**). The said letter was also followed by reminder.

5. Shri Manmohan Shah vide application dated 05.11.2018 written that he is not able to resume duty immediately as he has to complete his course and submitted his formal resignation from the position of Programmer w.e.f. 06.11.2018. He was advised vide letter dated 08.01.2019 (**Appendix-VI**) to deposit three months salary in lieu of notice period. Accordingly, he has deposited the requisite amount through SBI cheque No. 279141 dated 15.03.2019 and receipt No.80961 dated 15.03.2019 (**Appendix-VI**).
6. The leave applied for extension w.e.f. 18.05.2018 to 05.11.2018 is available in his leave account.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked as to what was the issue of three months' salary of Shri Manmohan Shah.

The Registrar explained that Shri Manmohan Shah had taken ex-India leave w.e.f. 15.3.18 to 17.5.2018 and had applied for extension in leave from 18.5.18 to 5.11.2018. In the meantime, he had sent a resignation and for resignation, three months notice was required. He has deposited three months salary. Now the question was that what could be done to the period of 18.5.18 to 5.11.2018.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he could be given three months earned leave and as he would be treated on leave, hence no salary shall have to be paid to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to if he has deposited the money of the notice period. He further said that actually as per law, he is entitled for disciplinary action because he had been on unauthorized leave. His resignation could not have been accepted. But in the first instance, they have accepted his resignation, now the audit has raised the objection. They have been giving leave to unauthorized person. Firstly disciplinary action should have been taken, his designation could not have been accepted. The action would have been prompt, he will have to be punished and they shall have to dismiss him from the service. Inspire of dismissing him, they have accepted his resignation and now after having accepted his resignation, they have been condoning his unauthorized extension because of audit objection. He said that they have by this time, no alternative except to accept his resignation but in future, issues should be taken care of.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could be placed on without pay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that without pay cannot be done for unauthorized absence. When there was unauthorized absence, if disciplinary action would be taken against him then it would be done in a way that this pay on unauthorized absence, not



entitled for any pay and in addition to that whatever the penalty is to be imposed. He further said that he was on without pay and it was not earned leave.

The Registrar said that the applicant had been saying that from 18.5.2018 to 5.11.2018 be given him as per earned leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have not sanctioned his earned leave.

The Registrar again explained that what the applicant wants was that he has paid three months payment and his payment for leave in account be paid to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said how much earned leave was there in his account.

The Registrar said that it was sufficient enough.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that later on he will ask for encashment.

The Registrar referred to the cases of persons who have left the job in this way.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that after resignation, there was no leave encashment. The leave encashment was only after the death or retirement.

The Finance and Development Officer explained that his submission was that he could not be granted earned leave for this period, because he has resigned prior to it. The absence period from 18.5.19 to 5.11.18 be declared as extraordinary without pay.

The members agreed to it.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) Shri Manmohan Shah, Programmer, UIET, Panjab University, be granted Extra Ordinary Leave without pay w.e.f. 18.05.2018 to 05.11.2018 ; and
- (ii) it be recommended to the Senate that the resignation of Shri Manmohan Shah, Programmer, UIET, Panjab University, be accepted w.e.f. 06.11.2018, as he has deposited the requisite amount in the University account in lieu of 03 months prior notice required, under Rule 16.1 at page 84 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

**8.** Considered minutes dated 07.02.2019 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to grant of paternity leave to the College teachers:

**NOTE:** Rule 22.2 appearing at page 101 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016 is applicable to all University employees, i.e., Teaching and Non-teaching. Hence, the recommendations of the committee dated 7.2.2019 may be made applicable to the employees of the colleges (both teaching & non-teaching).

The Vice Chancellor said that the item No. 8 relates to paternity leave to college teachers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as has earlier been stated by him that this was a very small issue. He said that the college teachers were being made to suffer a lot. He

said in their University, there have been 320 days' leave, and in college, the leaves are either 240 or 180.

It was explained that these leave had been 180 days.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that in colleges of education, the number of leaves was only 90 days.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the year 2012, the earned leaves of colleges were increased from 8 to 12 days, but since the Punjab Government had increased these leave in the year 1991, these should be given effect from 1991 itself.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it was not so. He asked Shri Ashok Goyal to give his opinion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was giving his own opinion and Shri Gurdip Sharma must give his own.

Shri Gurdip Sharma said that Shri Ashok Goyal should give his opinion but the things were not so.

Shri Ashok Goyal reiterated that to his mind, these leaves should have been given w.e.f. 1991, but he did not know as to why 12 leave are not being given from 1991 and why from 2012. He further said that this issue had also come up in the meeting of the Syndicate in December 2015 Syndicate, and the issue was resolved. Thereafter, representations had also poured in which are pending with the Registrar for the last ten months. He said that the issue should be addressed in either way.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 07.02.2019, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

- 9.** Considered if, the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 published vide Gazette notification dated 27.12.2016 (**Appendix-VIII**), be accepted totally, as requested by Coordinator, EO Cell-PWD, P.U. vide application dated 04.04.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**).

**NOTE:** A copy of UGC letter No. F.No.-6-5/2017 (SCT) dated 07.04.2017 is enclosed (**Appendix-VIII**).

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he did want to say about item No. 9. He said that in principle, it was okay. What section would be changed, it has not been spelled out. What they would do with the Gazette. The complete bundle of gazette has been appended and it has not been mentioned as to which section would be changed. What will they do?

The Registrar explained that they have no choice to make.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that what was the meaning of this gazette. What was the meaning of that, this gazette has been adopted. He said that they have to adopt only the relevant section.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it would only be settled after constituting a Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever the UGC has written, it has been written about circulation of the gazette notification regarding PwD and the circulation should be made accordingly.

Professor Rajat Sandhir that they have to give the benefits, the relevant sections should be modified.

The Registrar explained that there issue was that they have to follow it. He said the in the first instance, it would be adopted followed by circulation.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that this should be sent to the Regulation Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever has been stated by Professor Rajat Sandhir, he did not know as to why concentration has been made on this. The number of notifications which came to the University, published in gazette from government of India, these cannot be implemented without making necessary amendments. Actually they have to amend their statute. This was a must to be done otherwise what happens, on the one hand, they say that they were following the UGC, on the other hand, they say that they were following the MHRD.

The Vice Chancellor said that firstly the incorporation needs to be made.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it was not sure, as has been stated by the Vice Chancellor, as to if it would be incorporated or not. It was our only task to say.

The Vice Chancellor said that to his view a Committee should be formed which should analyze and compile the things steadily. The members agreed to it.

It was declared that the Committee would consisting of Prof. Rajat Sandhir (Chairperson), Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Jagdeep Kumar.

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

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

- (i) a Committee comprising Professor Rajat Sandhir, Chairperson, Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Jagdeep Kumar be constituted to go through the above said Gazette Notification and suggest amendments to be incorporated in the relevant sections of the Act so that the same could be sent to the Regulations Committee for further necessary action; and
- (ii) after finalization, the document be circulated to all the quarters concerned.

**10.**

Considered recommendation dated 27.03.2019 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that Dr. Samer Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Microbial Biotechnology, be granted Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) for a period two years (including the period of six month's EOL without pay, initially granted by the Vice Chancellor), under Regulation 11 (G) at pages 139-140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, w.e.f. 10.01.2019, to enable him to join as Senior Research Officer in the Centre of Experimental Medicine & Surgery, IMS, Banaras Hindu University (BHS), Varanasi, and he be also permitted to retain lien on the post held by him in the Department of Microbial Biotechnology.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Samer Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Microbial Biotechnology, be granted Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) for a period of two years (including the period of six month's EOL without pay, initially granted by the Vice Chancellor), under Regulation 11 (G) at pages 139-140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, w.e.f. 10.01.2019, to enable him to join as Senior Research Officer at Centre of Experimental Medicine & Surgery, IMS, Banaras Hindu University (BHS), Varanasi, and he be also permitted to retain lien on the post held by him in the Department of Microbial Biotechnology.

- 11.** Considered request dated 12.03.2019 of Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Ex-Associate Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., for reviewing the decision of the Senate dated 03.11.2018 regarding imposing the major penalty of dismissal from service and to withdraw the office order issued, in this regard, vide No. 1653-70/Estt. dated 25.02.2019. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Associate Professor (Temporary) was dismissed from the service of the Panjab University with immediate effect, as per provisions contained in Chapter IV), Rule 3(B) (vi) page 114, of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2006, on the basis of Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH), which was considered and approved by the Syndicate and Senate.

2. Rule 10.1 (Right of Appeal) appearing at pages 119-120 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, reads as under:

“Every employee to whom these rules apply shall be entitled to appeal against order imposing upon him any of the penalties to the appellate authority as mentioned here under:

(a) Senate—for employees of Class A

(b) & (c) xxx xxx xxx xxx.”

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what he realizes in the matter, was that one should go by the Sexual Harassment Act. In Sexual Harassment Act, they were not the appellant authority. This should not have come here.

The Registrar explained about point No. 10.1 of the Act.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it has clearly been written in the Act, that it was either Court or Tribunal. it cannot come here.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if it was so, then it should be sent the concerned quarter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said the item should not be rejected; rather, it needs to be withdrawn.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the letter shall have to be written to the concerned person about the decision. Professor Navdeep Goyal did not agree to the proposal of writing letter to the person concerned.

Shri Rajat Sandhir said that the dismissal letter has been signed by the Vice Chancellor. He said that the appointing authority in their cases, was the Registrar.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill explained that their appointing authority was the Senate and anybody could sign on behalf of the Senate.

**RESOLVED:** That Item 11 on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn.

**12.**

Considered if:

- (i) the report dated 26.11.2018, 09.01.2019 & 13.02.2019 (**Appendix-X**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with reference to acceptance of below specification furniture purchased for boys and girls hostel, be accepted;
- (ii) the advice dated 14.04.2019 (**Appendix-X**) sought from Shri S.S. Lamba, Labour Law Officer and Enquiry Officer with regard to misconduct of Er. Harmandeep Singh, JE, and Er. S.K. Sharma, SDE II, Construction Office, P.U., be accepted;
- (iii) the enquiry report dated 13.03.2019 (**Appendix-X**) submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Enquiry Officer, in respect of Shri Harmandeep Singh, J.E., with regard to remaining absent unauthorizedly without any intimation from duty w.e.f 25.05.2017, be accepted; and
- (iv) the penalties (if any) to be imposed on the delinquent officials/officers, be decided.

Information containing the detail history office note (**Appendix-X**) was also taken into consideration

- NOTE:** 1. Professor Navdeep Goyal the then DSW made a complaint with regard to the purchase of furniture, procured by the XEN for Girls Hostel No. 8, 9 and Boys Hostel No.8 (i.e. wooden beds with boxes-200 Nos. and PVC chairs with arms - 200 Nos. amounting to Rs.13,24,000/- and Steel Almirahs-154 Nos. amounting to Rs.14,93,415/-.
2. Shri S.S. Lamba was appointed as Enquiry officer and the enquiry report submitted by him vide letter dated 12.12.2017 (**Appendix-X**) was considered by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.03.2018 (Para 10) (**Appendix-X**) and it was resolved that:
- (i) the enquiry report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Inquiry Officer, **as per Appendix**, be accepted;
  - (ii) the Registrar be directed to initiate disciplinary action against Er. Harmandeep Singh, J.E., Panjab University Construction Office;

- (iii) for taking a decision against Er. S.K. Sharma, SDE-II, Panjab University Construction Office, being 'A' class officer, the case be referred to the Senate;
  - (iv) the scope of the enquiry be widened to enquire into the involvement of other persons including the XEN in the present case and for the purchases made for other hostels and regional campuses, etc.;
  - (v) the CVO reports on the issue be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.
3. As per Rule 1.1 (ii) appearing at page 74 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the post of and held by Shri R.K. Rai and Shri S.K. Sharma are Class 'A' posts. However, the post of Junior Engineer held by Shri Harmandeep Singh is a Class 'B' post.
  4. As per Regulation 3.1 appearing at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Senate is appointing authority of Class 'A' employees and the Syndicate is the appointing authority of Class 'B' employees.
  5. Regulation 3.3 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 speaks that the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.
  6. The minor and major penalties stand defined under rule 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
  7. As per decision of the Syndicate dated 30.03.2018 as mentioned under note No.2 above the matter for taking a decision against Er. S.K. Sharma, SDE was placed before the Senate in its meeting dated 08.07.2018 as Item No. C-10 but no business took place in the said meeting. In the meantime Secretary to Vice-Chancellor vide his note dated 24.09.2018 (**Appendix-X**) desired that the Item with regard to physical verification of all the purchases by the XEN office be withdrawn. Accordingly, the said Item No. C-10 was withdrawn from the Senate Agenda.
  8. As per decision of the Syndicate as mentioned under Note 2 (v), the observation of CVO was considered by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2018 and 18.02.2019 and it was resolved that the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee of technically expert persons to consider the observation dated 5.11.2018 submitted by Chief Vigilance Cell, P.U., for physical verification of the purchase of furniture items made by the P.U. Construction Office for Boys and Girls Hostel (2009-2013). Copies of the decision of the Syndicate dated

23.09.2018 and 18.02.2019 is enclosed  
(**Appendix-X**).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he sees something misleading here that the people of the office has not done the good work. They might have presumed that there would have been sitting people here and they will read at their own of their meaning. He further stated that the Committee was constituted by the Vice Chancellor and the Committee had recommended that there was a loss of money and the money be recovered. It has been suggested that 60% be recovered from the person who has been run away, 30% be recovered from the person who have worked in supervisory capacity and 10% be taken from the Controlling Officer. He asked as to what kind of criteria, methodology or law was which he did not know about. He said that in case the money was to be recovered, then the full money be recovered from the person who had been absconding. But the Enquiry Officer who had conducted the enquiry, opinion has also been taken from him but unfortunately, it has been taken after that Committee. The Committee meeting happened in March and the opinion has been taken later on. The Enquiry officer has stated that the whole fault was of the person who had happened to be absconding. The Controlling Office has not been issued any charge sheet and enquiry too, has not been made against him. He said that they had been liberal. The real culprit had run away and the innocent, who had signed in good faith, had been trapped. He said that his submission in this matter was that whatever the enquiry officer had recommended, the warning should be issued to Controlling Officer and the rest full fault was that of absconder, the money be recovered from his calculated benefits whatever they were, but this man should be issued a warning.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the warning should be given to both the persons to be careful in future.

**RESOLVED:** That -

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

**13.** Considered –

- (i) recommendation dated 14.01.2019 of the Standing Committee, with regard to non payment of loan by Shri Ravi Dalmotra, ATO (Artist), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., to various individuals;

- (ii) if any penalty is to be imposed upon him; and
- (iii) if the payment of retirement benefits, be released to Shri Ravi Dalmotra, ATO, who stood retired from the University services on 31.10.2018 after attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years.

Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The Principal-cum-Professor, Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital was informed vide order No.12043-49/Estt. dated 29.10.2018 that Shri Ravi Dalmotra working as A.T.O. (Artist) be retired on 31.10.2018 on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years and his retirement benefits be kept pending till the final decision of the Standing Committee.
  2. Sarv Shri Mahinder Pal Singh and Shri Ravi Goyal, Shri Jaspreet Singh (Rohit Puri), Shri Aman Vohra and Shri Amrit Kumar all outsiders made complaint against Shri Ravi Dalmotra that he had borrowed money from them and did not make the payment back to them. The matter was referred to the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee in its report has recommended a major penalty to be imposed upon Shri Ravi Dalmotra and no retiral benefits be released to him.
  3. As per Rule 1.1 (II) appearing at page 74 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the post of Assistant Technical Officer (ATO) held by Shri Ravi Dalmotra is a Class 'B' post.
  4. As per Regulation 3.1 at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 the Syndicate is the appointing authority and as per Regulation 3.3 at page 118 of the said Calendar, the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.
  5. The minor and major penalties stand defined under Rule 3 at page 114 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in this item they were talking about Standing Committee with regard to Non payment of loan by Shri Ravi Dalmotra. He said that the loan has not been taken from them.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the lenders were also not their employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has one request to be made to the Vice Chancellor and it was that, was that Standing Committee, could also deal with the case under Section 302. He asked as to if there was any term of reference of that Committee. Was this case within the ambit of Standing Committee? What was that, was it High Court, Supreme Court, Special Court or Superior Court, what was that? There has been a special mention of the purposes for which this Committee has been constituted.



Shri Naresh Gaur said that if one has to take borrowing from outside, what does the University law says. If someone is debarred from the University, what will the Standing Committee or University will do in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first of all, the Standing Committee should not have entertained the complaint. They should not have enquired into it even if the complaint was received and they should not have submitted the report and this report should not have been submitted to the CVO office because, it was not within the ambit of the University to see all those things. It should be withdrawn.

Prof. Rajat Sandhir said that this complaint has been received from two people. But if they look at the document, it says that he has entered into a private business with them. Can an employee enter into a private business? He does not want to defend the report. Other thing serious is if they look at the chronology from how many people from the University he has taken money and there are so many cases in the bank... He does not want to defend the report.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the complaint was received the same was marked to the Committee and the marking itself is wrong. He said that until and unless there are any rules in this regard, they cannot do anything.

Prof. Rajat Sandhir said that indebtness is there in the rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal told that there are no indebtness rule in our rules. He further asked if there are indebtness rules in the Standing Committee to this Prof. Rajat Sandhir said that there are no such rules. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that if there are any service rules to deal such cases, then all these cases should be dealt with under those relevant rules and they cannot do anything and if any action can be taken under those rules, then the same may be taken. He further asked on which ground the university has given details.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they work in the bank and there are clear cut rules in the Bank that they cannot do outside borrowing with the permission of the Bank.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked why the University has withheld the benefits if they have no authority to do so and now the matter regarding releasing of benefits has been brought in the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That Item 13 on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn.

**14.** Considered if the following Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XI**) be executed between:

- (i) Panjab University, Chandigarh, and Punjab Renewable Energy – Systems Pvt. Ltd., J-105, Tower J-7, First Floor, CBD Belapaur Railway Station Cum Office Complex, CBD Belapur, Navi Mumbai for enhancing, within the country, the availability of highly qualified skilled manpower in the fields of engineering, technology, management and Science; and
- (ii) Panjab University, Chandigarh, and Western Sydney University, Australia, ABN 53014069881, for recognizing the mutual benefits to be gained through a cooperative program promoting scholarly activities and international understanding.

**NOTE:** A copy of the letter dated 30.04.2019 of Dean Research is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that he has two MOUs, one is from Punjab Renewable Energy System Pvt. Ltd. It is private limited Company and the MOU is very comprehensive. It is not an institute or the University. Sharing of facilities has been provided at page 329. At point 'C' it is provided "shall provide access to the facilities to the scientists, members of the faculty and the students as per various rules and norms of the Institute. She asked whether it is an institute. She said that it is not an institute but a Pvt. Ltd. Company. What is its stature?

Prof. S.K. Sharma said that this is a company supplying the wood and the agriculture residue to the plants which are losing power. There are only two plants which are going on otherwise they are supplying raw material. They simply want to use the facilities of the Panjab University. They are yet a consultancy. They want to use our facilities and manpower for their own promotion and the University is not going to get anything. He wanted to put on record that Proforma for the MOU which is signed with the Department should be same type as is being used for approving Ph.D. registration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Department concerned which has signed the MOUs might have something to say in this regard and it should be asked from them.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that only the MOU has been signed but the purpose for which it is signed has not been mentioned.

While discussing the case of Mr. Chander Mohan, Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the person concerned has requested that the money may be given to those persons from whom he has borrowed from his retiral benefit.

Regarding MOU the Vice Chancellor said that they will get it re-examined.

**RESOLVED:** That –

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

**15.** Considered –

- (i) if suitable directions, be issued to General Secretary, Sanatan Dharam Parcharak Sabha, for his alleged allegation vide their letter dated 23.04.2019 (**Appendix-XII**) regarding undue interference, harassment and creation of problem by the University in day-to-day working of S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana, in response to letter No.3656/DCDC dated 21.04.2019 (**Appendix-XII**).
- (ii) the point-wise reply (**Appendix-XII**) of the College Branch in response to the report of the Committee dated 14.09.2018 accepted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2019 (Para 27) (**Appendix-XII**).

**NOTE:** 1. A Committee comprising of Dr. R.K. Mahajan, S. Prabhjit Singh, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Dr. IPS Sidhu visited SDP College for Women, Ludhiana, on 14.09.2018 and the report submitted by the Committee was considered and accepted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2019. A copy of the decision of the Syndicate along with report is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

- 2. During general discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 it was decided that the letter be issued by the DCDC to SDP College for Women, Ludhiana, for giving point-wise reply on the report of the Committee dated 14.09.2018 as mentioned under Note 1 above.
- 3. The Registrar vide letter dated 02.05.2019 (**Appendix-XII**) issued an advisory to the General Secretary, Sanatan Dharam Parcharak Sabha, emphasising that SDP Sabha should extend cooperation to the University and its decision making bodies on the issues under examination and non compliance of the instruction of the University is likely to be taken seriously by the University Syndicate.
- 4. An office note containing the observation of the DCDC is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

Shri Naresh Gaur said that in the resolved part they had already discussed 3-4 points. In the first part it was condemned that the note was unanimously accepted. In the second part, the Syndicate had condemned the allegation of Hindu Sikh on the Committee but that was not taken on the resolved part. It may be included in the resolved part that the entire syndicate had unanimously condemned the allegation. He further told that the action taken by the DCDC was on behalf of the governing body and not in his individual capacity. The Syndicate had ordered DCDC to write letter to that college. But from the reply of the letter, it appears that they do not bother the University. In that letter whatever allegations have been leveled against DCDC, in his

view, those allegations are not on the DCDC but on the whole Syndicate. It is not his personal opinion but the opinion of all the members of the Syndicate.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that they had given a Show Cause Notice to the College but instead of giving reply to the Show Cause Notice, they have leveled allegations.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should take action against the College under Regulation 11.1. A strict action should be taken against the college so that similar message could go to the other colleges. On the one hand four lecturers have been removed from service but on the other hand a letter dated 2.5.2019 has been given to one teacher Ms. Monika that she has not done work as assigned to her and she is asked to take salary upto 18<sup>th</sup> April. The room where the teachers sit was locked and four senior lecturers have been removed from service.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that there is not any rule which they have not violated. There is so high handedness in the College that they do not bother about the M.L.A. or the University.

Shri Jagdeep Singh said that the House condemns the reply of the management of the college to the letter sent by DCDC on behalf of the Governing Body. Now, what Shri Gaur has said as also which has been discussed earlier, the House condemn the allegation of the College that the University has tried to give criminal colour to the incident. The spirit of the University is for the education and the teachers. The College removed four teachers from service. The Grievances Cell wrote a letter to the College followed by the letters of DCDC and the Registrar. They were called twice. The letter of the Registrar clearly stated that there are no odd hours in the University. The University works day and night. The University works even on holidays and they are saying that they have not done work for vested interests. They have worked for the interest of education. He suggested that the action against the College should be taken under Regulation 11.1 and 11.2. The college should be asked if it needs any type of help from the University, the University is ready to provide. If no action is taken against this college, then other colleges will also follow the same path and we will have no other work except to hold meetings.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the College is saying that the University is interfering in its day to day work. He suggested that the University should stop interfering them and it should disaffiliate that college.

It was informed that a Notice under Regulation 11.1 will be given to the College and the last opportunity will be given to satisfy the University and to comply with the conditions of the affiliation.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if the college is given 10 days time, then the College would approach the Court and get stay from there.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the College be given warning under Regulation 11.1. He further said that if the College gets stay, then the University cannot do anything in this regard.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the University should adopt legal procedure.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have received reply from the College, which is unsatisfactory. In addition to that it is a very obnoxious letter.

Shri Naresh Gaur said, in fact, the University had also written two letters.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether in both the letters the University has mentioned that their reply is not acceptable.

It was informed that one letter was written to the Principal and the Management.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the University had written a letter to the Principal and the reply was received from the Management, the University should not have entertained the reply. It was clearly mentioned that the College Branch should entertain only those replies which are being received from the Principal. We have not only entertained the letters of the Management but also responded to the same by way of writing the letters from the University. It means that the Syndicate has no value. The Registrar has written to the General Secretary of the College.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that a letter to the Management is written when the first affiliation is granted to the College. Thereafter once the Principal is approved, all correspondence has to be done with the Principal.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked whether the Principal of the said college is approved.

It was informed that when the Management had written a letter to the University leveling allegations, then it had become necessary to respond to that letter otherwise there was no requirement to write letter to the Management.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Notice under Regulation 11.1 be given to the College.

It was asked whether 10 days time is to be given or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University should write a letter to the Principal that it has been resolved in the Syndicate that action is likely to be initiated as per Regulation 11.1 in view of unsatisfactory reply given by you vide letter No. so and so and dated so and so also contents of your letter so and so. The Syndicate after doing it seriously has asked you to explain within 10 days about your contentions to enable the Syndicate to take the decision as per Regulation 11.1. Shri Ashok Goyal said that as Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma told that the College at Mukerian has got stay against the University for 10 years but the University has not taken any action to get the stay vacated. Everybody is hand in glove with each other. The University has not even filed an application before the Court. If the University gives notice under Regulation 11.1, then it should immediately file a caveat in the Court so that the College does not get ex-parte stay against the University.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that as Shri Ashok Goyal has said that when the reply of the College was not found satisfactory, the University is going to give notice to the College under Regulation 11.1 informing them that the University is going to impose Regulation 11.1 against them and if they have anything to say, they should respond.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it is a notice under Regulation 11.1 as to why action should not be taken against you in terms of Regulation 11.1. He further said that if no reply is received by so and so date, the Syndicate shall be at liberty to take action against them as per Regulation 11.1.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that along with this College the Committee had gone to three more colleges including Atam Balbh Jain and D.D. Jain College and the replies have come from both the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that before sending this notice, it should be got vetted from an Advocate as ultimately case has to be filed and in his opinion it should be assigned to Shri Anupam Gupta or any advocate as per the suitability of the Vice Chancellor as it involves prestige of the University. He further asked if the University has received reply from both the Colleges. If yes, then why the reply has not been put before the Syndicate?

The Vice Chancellor asked to produce those replies before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether their reply is satisfactory. If it is satisfactory, then the report of the Committee is wrong. Even if the reply is not satisfactory, why the same has not been placed before the Syndicate. They have alleged that when there are complaints against number of colleges, why the University is targeting only their college. The University should give them signal that all colleges are alike for the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur raised the issue of sexual harassment of one girl namely Deepika. She has demanded that the University should form a Committee to look into the matter. Shri Naresh Gaur requested that a Committee may be formed whose Chairperson should be a lady. He further requested that Prof. Rajesh Gill may be made Chairperson of the Committee.

Raising the matter of SPN College, Sh. Jagdeep Singh asked whether the report of the Internal Complaint Committee (ICC) is final as they have no full knowledge of the Act and whether the University has to take final decision as they would interfere only as per the Act. He further asked as to what is the role of the University after the report of the ICC. He still further said that if the Syndicate has to take the decision, then the Vice Chancellor be authorized to form a Committee from the Senate members and then the report of the Committee be put up before the Syndicate for final decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would form the Committee

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the letter dated 23.04.2019 written by the General Secretary, Sanatan Dharam Parcharak Sabha, alleging undue interference, harassment, dividing the community on religious lines and creation of problem by the University in day-to-day working of S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana, be condemned and displeasure of the Syndicate be conveyed to him; and
- (ii) a show cause notice be issued to S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana, as to why action for disaffiliation, be not initiated against it, under Regulation 11.1, page 160, Panjab University Calendar, Volume-1, 2007 for persistent violation of the condition of affiliations and University Regulations. The College should satisfy the university on the issue of compliance of the mandatory conditions and regulations within 10 days. In case the College fails to do the needful, the university will take action as per above stated regulation. However, before issuing the show cause notice to the College, the same be got legally vetted from the Legal Retainer of the University.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor and sent to S.P.N. College, Mukerian (Hoshiarpur) to enquire into the case of sexual harassment.

- 16.** Considered recommendation dated 01.05.2019 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 (**Appendix-XIII**), that payment of commutation of pension to Shri P.S. Mehta, be released as per Pension Regulations of the Panjab University.

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

- 17.** Considered –

**I.** the following recommendations contained in the minutes dated 01.05.2019 of the Committee (**Appendix-XIV**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 10.04.2019 (Para 9) (**Appendix-XIV**) to examine the proposals regarding increase in number of seats/additional/new courses in various departments of Panjab University, from the academic session 2019-20:

- (i) Item No.2 (proposal D mentioned in letter dated 03.04.2019), that 10 seats out of 15 under NRI category for BDS courses at Dr. HSJIDS be converted to self financing seats. Admission to these seats will be based on merit of NEET examination. Fee for the same to be kept similar as that of Punjab Non Govt. Dental Colleges with a provision of yearly fee hike includes.

Out of the remaining 5 seats in the NRI category, if any seat/s is/are left vacant after first counselling, they will be converted to self financing category.

**NOTE:** 1. This will help make up some of the revenue to the Institute as compared to previous policy wherein seats were allowed to convert to general category during the second counselling.

2. A copy of relevant extract of the minutes dated 01.05.2019 of the Committee along with letter dated 03.04.2019 as also the legal opinion of Professor Rattan Singh are enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

- (ii) (Item No.3 (a) that MBA (Entrepreneurship) at UBS, be started and the Regulations/Rules/ eligibility criteria and fee structure etc. as proposed by the Chairperson, UBS vide letters dated 06.02.2019 and 06.03.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**), be also approved.

**NOTE:** The relevant extract of the recommendations of the Committee dated 01.05.2019 is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

- (iii) Item No.3 (b) that Master in Tourism and Travel Management (MTTM) and Master in Hospitality Management and Catering Technology (MHMCT) courses

at UIHTM, P.U., be started and eligibility criteria, admission criteria, fee structure/ financial implications and student intake etc. as proposed/worked out by the Director, UIHTM vide letter dated 08.01.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**), be also approved.

**NOTE:** The relevant extract of the recommendations of the Committee dated 01.05.2019 is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

- (iv) Item No.3 (c) that Certificate course in Yoga and Meditation (Vivekananda Studies), be started and eligibility criteria and number of seats etc. as proposed by Professor Nandita Singh, Coordinator, Centre for Vivekananda Studies vide letter dated 25.01.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**), be also approved.

**NOTE:** The relevant extract of the minutes dated 01.05.2019 of the Committee is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

- (v) Item No.3 (f) that ME Computer Science and Engineering (Cyber Security) at UIET, be started and the intake as also fee structure as proposed by the Coordinator and the Administrative Committee vide letters dated 01.05.2019 and 14.03.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**) be approved.

**NOTE:** The relevant extract of the minutes dated 01.05.2019 of the Committee is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

- (vi) Item No.3 (i) that PG Diploma in Computer Application (self financing) at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, be started and eligibility conditions and fee structure etc. as proposed by the Director vide dated 30.11.2018 (**Appendix-XIV**), be also approved.

**NOTE:** A copy of the relevant extract of the minutes of the Committee dated 01.05.2019 and office note dated 26.03.2019 and are enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

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

- (i) Item No. (a) that PG Diploma in Radio Production and PG Diploma in Journalism and Mass Communication at School of Mass Communication, be started, from the Academic session 2019-20 and the eligibility criteria, fee structure, Rules and Regulations as proposed by the



Chairperson, School of Communication Studies vide letter dated 02.05.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**), be also approved.

**NOTE:** A copy of the extract of the minutes dated 02.05.2019 of the Committee is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

- (ii) Item No. (d) that self financed Ph.D. Programme (UIPS), be started from the academic session 2019-20 and the nomenclature, fee structure, eligibility criteria etc. as proposed by the Department in the minutes of sub Committee dated 25.04.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**) and letter dated 01.05.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**), be also approved.

**NOTE:** A copy of the extract of the minutes dated 02.05.2019 of the Committee is enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the fee for the M.B.A. (Entrepreneurship) may be kept at par with the UIAMS where the fee is Rs. 50,000/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether they are going to start self-financing course at UBS. He said that when the staff is to be provided by the University and infrastructure is also of the University, then what the meaning of self-financing. He further said that they should not make this University a shop. Every Department whether UIILS, UIAMS, UIHMT or Dental Sciences etc. are starting self-financing courses. They are not expanding the education system. He suggested that the University can expand the education by creating more sections in M.B.A. He further asked on what basis they are charging fee in lacs. He also said that they are selling material like private institutions while sitting in state University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if a good course has to run then they have to provide better infrastructure as is being provided by other IIMs. He said there is good thing in the proposal that 45% of the fee will be used for improving the infrastructure of the Department. That will not only help in this course but the picture of the whole department would change.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they can buy good infrastructure but they would not get meritorious students. He further said all facilities have to be provided to the students. The condition of infrastructure of the UIAMS is also not good. He further asked whether by starting this course, the traditional course of M.B.A. would not effect.

The Vice Chancellor said that better will prevail. The benefit of the course would be that they can give good feeding to the regular course. There is a good demand of this course and the children of Punjab who are going far off places for higher studies, will get benefit of this course at Panjab University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal gave example of his department He told that they had also started a self-financing course. In the starting, they were not getting meritorious students. Now, the position of that course is that meritorious students are also getting admission. He discussed the course at Hotel Management Department of the University. He said earlier the Hotel Management Department is running B.Sc. course. Now, they want to run Master's Course with some specialization. Both the courses are self-financing in nature. That Department is not any liability on the University and with the starting of the new course there would not be any liability.

Thereafter Prof. Navdeep Goyal discussed Yoga course which is a weekly course. There would not be any liability of this course on the University.

Prof. S.K. Sharma said that syllabi of all the new courses be prepared and the requirement of staff may also be mentioned.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that all the three courses which are being run in the Hotel Management Department have no liability on the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that ultimately these courses would become liability.

Prof. S.K. Sharma said that balance sheet should be prepared for the new courses. It will give clear picture of any course whether it would be beneficial to start the same.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that full papers of the new course and the faculty requirement etc. have not been provided. He further said that he is equally worried as the other members of the Syndicate regarding starting of this new course.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier they have mentioned...

The Vice Chancellor said that he had asked them that in the first instance they should go with minimum requirement. If the course sustains, then the major share of funds will be given to the Department and this has all been done in consultation with other members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the seats for NRI be reduced and projections for the next 5-10 years may be made.

Prof. Rajesh Gill discussed about the inter-disciplinary course in Vivekanand Studies. She said this is a very good course. She pointed out some corrections to be made.

Prof. S.K. Sharma said that there is some problem as the syllabus of the Yoga course should have gone to Faculty first.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether the syllabi of other courses have gone to the Faculty.

The Vice Chancellor said that maximum syllabi have gone to the Faculty. He told that there is some doubt about the syllabus of yoga course but the syllabi of other courses have gone to the Faculty. The Vice Chancellor further said that if the syllabus of the yoga course had not gone to the Faculty, then this course cannot be started. Thereafter, after confirmation the Vice Chancellor said that this course has been approved by the Faculty.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal discusses about the course of Computer Science and Engineering. They are already running M.E. in Computer Science and Engineering along with one more course Cyber Security is also running. It has 13 subjects out of which 5 are common and there is no much strength of the students in this course. So, as the subjects are common, the students of more than half the class are taught common. Classes for the remaining students have to be taken separately. It is the latest subject and the fee is not on higher side. He believes that if the seven classes are taken separately, the Department would not face any problem.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that this relates to thesis, and there is a large number of theses.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that actually he had taken up this issue later on.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said that let them see the supervision of the thesis. Hence, one subject may be added for additional workload. She pointed out that at page 34 of the Supplementary Agenda the duration of thesis of M.Tech./M.E. Programmes has been given and suggested that the word 'thesis' should be replaced with '**dissertation**'.

To this, Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that there are lot many things, which needed to be corrected.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that a general circular in this regard should be issued that as and when such issues are taken up, it should be ensured that language/wording is correct.

One of the members suggested that it should be sent to the Dean.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has already been approved by the Dean. He further said that such problem are being experienced in the subjects of Science and Engineering.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that at page 32 of the Supplementary Agenda, it is written 'Dr. Harish Kumar, Coordinator, CSE' and the recommendation is signed by Dr. Ajay Mittal, on behalf of Dr. Harish Kumar, whereas it should have been for Coordinator, CSE and name of the Coordinator should not have been there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had signed on behalf of Coordinator.

Shri Ashok Goyal again pointed out that in one of the items, it has also been mentioned that so and so had attended the meeting in place of so and so. He was of the view that, in future, such things should be avoided. In fact, it should not have been placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that some persons proceed on leave without submitting application for leave. Now, the things are on the right tract as they have taken a decision that no faculty members can go out of station without taking prior permission/sanction of the competent authority. A circular in this regard has already been issued to all the Departments.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that Vice-Chancellors are liberal but the members of the Syndicate are not liberal.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that every aspect of the matter needed to be checked.

Professor S.K. Sharma enquired whether it has been passed by the Faculty or not. He said that if it has been passed by the Faculty then syllabus should also be appended with the item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the syllabus is not required to be placed before the Syndicate as the concerned Faculty is competent to approve the syllabus.

Referring to **Sub-Item (vi)**, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, the strength in other courses at Hoshiarpur is reducing and as per the demand of the region, the Director, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur has proposed to start PG Diploma in

Computer Applications (Self financing) and that was why the item has been placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a chance to start the PG Diploma in Computer Applications should be given to them.

Referring to **Sub-Item II** (i), Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had asked them to submit their requirement in writing but they have not submitted it properly. As far as he knew, they have discussed about P.G. Diploma in Radio Production and PG Diploma in Journalism and Mass Communication. The faculty members of the department told him that the course in Mass Communication is very popular amongst the students and every year a large number of admission seekers placed on the waiting list are deprived of the admission due to shortage of seats. Two courses have already been running there and they said that some of the portion of syllabus is common and that was why they have proposed to start P.G. Diploma instead of enhancing the seats of 2 Year M.A. and they have also kept the fee of these Diploma Courses as normal fee. In this way, some of the students who want to do journalism could be adjusted in these Diploma Courses and waiting lists could be reduced.

The Vice-Chancellor said that by starting these Diplomas, the feasibility would be enhanced and they assured that they would run these courses with the existing strength of the faculty as well.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to point out that they have seen many new courses but the format of these courses is different. She was of the view that format of these courses should be common and essential.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two things, one they have asked them to submit their proposal in writing, and the other is that they have added few things.

The Vice-Chancellor said that some common format for such new courses should be there.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that, in this way, new equipments/infrastructure would be developed in such departments.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that before starting such courses manpower analysis should be got done; otherwise only some of the courses would run properly whereas the others would not. The manpower and infrastructure required is only known to the persons who wanted to start such courses. They University must know as to how much employability would be there. He was of the view that whatever Committee is looking for such courses would have to keep in mind the manpower analysis and total overall picture of that course in the country.

Professor Navdeep Goyal referred to page 59 of the agenda regarding existing Ph.D. Course running in Pharmaceutical Sciences and New ADD-ON (self-financed course) Ph.D. Course, and read out the existing Ph.D. criteria, i.e. 'all the candidates are required to qualify GPAT or GRE (for International Students) exam before Registration for Ph.D. and 'the candidates should have a minimum of two years fellowship/scholarship from any national agency/industry to pursue the research work and for new ADD-ON (Self-financed course) Ph.D. Course, both GPAT and non-GPAT qualified candidates will be admitted and Non-GPAT candidates will have to clear PU Ph.D. Entrance Examination. He further said that for the existing Ph.D., there is no annual fee and for Ph.D. in 'Pharmaceutical Sciences and Technology', there is a fee of Rs.1.5 lakhs + Rs.50,000/- contingency per annum (contingency to come back to the Institute).

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired could they start Ph.D. (self-financed)?

Professor Rajat Sandhir agreed with Shri Ashok Goyal.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that then they have to treat all the Departments of the University as Self-financed Departments. He enquired as to what are they doing by starting Self-financed Ph.D. Course. The fee has also been fixed at Rs.1.5 lakh. Then how could they claim to be the pioneer University of the country and taking pride in guiding research.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they are just doing like C.M.J. University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that they should make it open by declaring a fee of Rs.2 lakh or Rs.2.5 lakh. In this way, the people would not go to other Universities of the region. Resultantly, those Universities would be closed down.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he had searched on google and did not find Ph.D. (self-financed) anywhere.

Professor Navdeep Goyal endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Rajat Sandhir and said that he has suggested them in other way but they did not pay any heed to his advice. Instead of starting Self-financed Ph.D., it should be Industry Sponsored. In this way, it would be justified and that was his feeling.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are two type of Ph.Ds. in Professional or Technical Courses – (i) is regular Ph.D.; and (ii) is Industry Sponsored Ph.D.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had also suggested for Industry Sponsored Ph.D., which could also be justified. In fact, Industry Sponsored Ph.D. is available in many Universities, including IIT, Mumbai, and fee for such Ph.D. is on the higher than the normal Ph.D.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that what is happening is that the topics of Industry sponsored Ph.D. students are generally based on the Projects of the industry concerned, and in such cases, the industry pay the fee of the students and they also absorb them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for Industry Sponsored students, the fee would be borne by the sponsoring Industry. In this way, the relation of the University with such industries would be better and they also become their recruiters.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that this item should be referred back with the suggestion that the Ph.D. proposed to be started should be 'Industry Sponsored Ph.D.' instead of Self-financed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be referred back.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that Panjab University is one of the best Institutes in the country.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, in this case he had given the same viewpoint, but somehow they again took this case to their faculty and opined that they wanted to start this type of Ph.D.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to give more weight to University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) because it is one of the important

Institutions of the University and by starting Industry-Sponsored Ph.D. there, the University might come at number one in the next ranking. By starting Industry Sponsored Ph.D., the connectivity of the UIPS might also enhance with the Industries.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had said the same thing to them, but they had not paid any heed to this.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that industry would send people to the University happily for this type of Ph.D.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations contained in the minutes dated 01.05.2019 of the Committee (**Appendix-XIV**), constituted by the Vice Chancellor, pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 10.04.2019 (Para 9) (**Appendix-XIV**) to examine the proposals regarding increase in number of seats/additional/new courses in various departments of Panjab University, from the academic session 2019-20, be approved as under:

- (1) that Item No.2 (proposal D mentioned in letter dated 03.04.2019), regarding conversion of 10 seats out of 15 seats to self-financing seats, under NRI category for BDS courses at Dr. HSJIDS be kept pending;
- (2) that MBA (Entrepreneurship) at UBS, be started and the Regulations/Rules/eligibility criteria, etc. (except fee structure) as proposed by the Chairperson, UBS vide letters dated 06.02.2019 and 06.03.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**), be approved, with the stipulation that the fee structure for this course be the same as is for MBA (Self-financing) course(s) being offered at UIAMS;
- (3) that Master in Tourism and Travel Management (MTTM) and Master in Hospitality Management and Catering Technology (MHMCT) courses at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, P.U., be started and eligibility criteria, admission criteria, fee structure/financial implications, student intake, etc. as proposed/worked out by the Director, UIHTM vide letter dated 08.01.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**), be approved;
- (4) that Certificate course in Yoga and Meditation (Vivekananda Studies), be started and eligibility criteria, number of seats, etc. as proposed by Professor Nandita Singh, Coordinator, Centre for Vivekananda Studies vide letter dated 25.01.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**), be approved, with the stipulation the language mentioned at pages 29 and 30 of the Appendix, be modified in consultation with Professor Rajesh Gill;
- (5) that ME Computer Science and Engineering (Cyber Security) at UIET, be started and the intake as also fee structure as proposed by the Coordinator and the Administrative Committee vide letters dated 01.05.2019 and 14.03.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**) be approved; with the stipulation word 'Thesis' at page 32 of the **Appendix**, be replaced with "**Dissertation**", and for other corrections Professor Rajesh Gill be consulted; and
- (6) that PG Diploma in Computer Application (self-financing) at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, be started and eligibility conditions, fee structure, etc. as proposed by the Director vide dated 30.11.2018 (**Appendix-XIV**), be approved.

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

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

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

- (i) the fees for NRI students for all the above-said courses needed to be revised as the same is on the lower side;
- (ii) the projection, at least for next five year, be provided by the respective Departments for all the new courses being introduced, so that the viability of the courses could be assessed; and
- (iii) a circular be issued to all the University Teaching Departments requesting them to be careful while making recommendations regarding starting of course(s), scheme of examination, guidelines, rules, regulations, etc. so that mistakes as pointed out by Professor Rajesh Gill do not recur.

**18.** Considered if B.A. (Hons.) & B.Com. (Hons.) courses in the Department of Evening Studies-Multi Disciplinary Research Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh be introduced w.e.f. the Academic session 2019-2020 as proposed by the Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies-Multi Disciplinary Research Centre vide letter dated 31.08.2018 (**Appendix-XV**) along with minutes dated 25.09.2018 (item 3) (**Appendix-XV**) of the Joint Academic and Administrative Committee. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XV**) was also taken into consideration.

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

**19.** Considered if, Dr. Anish Slath, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management be appointed as Honorary Director under Rule 2.1 (c) page 695-696, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016, in light of Legal opinion dated 03.02.2019 and 12.03.2019 (**Appendix-XVI**) obtained from Legal Retainer.

**NOTE:** 1. Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam was designated as Honorary Director of University Institute of Hotel, Management and Tourism with immediate effect, till further orders. He had joined as such on 13.11.2015. Whereas the Chairpersons/Heads of the Department/ Institute are

appointed for three years as per University Rule 2.1 page 695-696, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016.

2. Rule 2.1 (c) page 695-696, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016 reads as under:

In case a Associate Professor in the Department is not available the Chairperson/Head shall be designated, by rotation, from amongst the Assistant Professor in the Department who have at least 8 years teaching experience as Assistant Professor in the Department, according to length of service. The period of service as temporary *ad hoc* Assistant Professor on a full-time basis in the department will be counted towards the requisite period of 8 years' teaching experience as Assistant Professor in the Department. Provided that in exceptional circumstances, for reasons to be recorded, the Vice-Chancellor in making recommendations to the Syndicate on designation of a Chairperson/ Head, may deviated from the principle of length of service or the stipulation of length of teaching experience as the case may be.

3. For the time being Dr. Anish Slath, Assistant Professor, has been designated as Honorary Director with immediate effect till further order, vide office order dated 30.4.2019 (**Appendix-XVI**) and matter has been placed before Syndicate in its instant meeting as an information item (I-(iii)).
4. A copy of the Syndicate decision dated 26.10.2014 (Para 30) (**Appendix-XVI**) along with the policy/rule pertaining to rotation of Headship available in P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2009 are enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).
5. An office note containing the history as also the name of faculty members who were given the additional charge /appointed as Honorary Director of UIHT&M is enclosed (**Appendix-XVI**).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Harjodh Singh enquired about appointment of Dr. Anish Slath, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management as Honorary Director. He said that in other Departments/Institutes, the persons are appointed as Chairperson/Director/Principal for three years term. Why he is being appointed as Honorary Director?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he wanted to tell two-three things about the rotation policy of Chairpersons, Directors, Principals, etc. in the Departments/Institutes of the University in the Syndicate, which is appended with the agenda. It was observed that the requirement of the Regulatory Bodies, such as AICTE, BCI, DCI, MCI, etc. would also be kept in mind at the time of rotation of headship in such institutes. He pointed out that guidelines of AICTE are not appended with the item. What AICTE says, he did not know? Whether it is amongst the Professors or otherwise? Would they have to keep it in mind not only for this Institute, or also for other Institutes?



The Vice-Chancellor said that the requirements AICTE in this regard are very clear. ]

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if AICTE requirement is not there, then the rotation policy of the University should be implemented. In fact, they should have to see the whole issue in its entirety. If this course is not covered under AICTE and they do not intend to take the approval from the AICTE, then rotation policy of the University for three-years should be implemented. However, if they intend to cover it under AICTE, then the designation of Honorary Director till further orders is alright.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the AICTE requirement is very clear that the Institutes which are covered under AICTE, could not have Director/Principal below than the rank of Professor.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that if it is implemented in all the Institutes which covered under such a policy, then this policy should be implemented for this Institute; otherwise not.

To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that they have to make such appointments as per the requirement of the Regulatory Bodies, such as AICTE, DCI, BCI, etc. as it has already been passed by the Syndicate.

Professor Rajesh Gill opined that they have to go by the Legal Opinion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that legal opinion of three years is okay. He also read out the policy pertaining to rotation of headship which existed in the Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009. He suggested that it should be implemented in all the University Teaching Departments, Institutes, Centres, etc. as far as possible, keeping in view the requirements of the regulatory bodies.

Professor Rajesh Gill again said that Legal Opinion is very strong and they should have to go by it.

Dr. Harjodh Singh suggested that the headship should be for three years.

Professor Rajesh Gill informed that Dr. Anish Slath has already joined.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that, when they have the Legal Opinion in this regard, the appointment should be approved for three years instead of till further orders.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Harjodh Singh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be examined.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that when there is legal opinion, there is no need to get it examined.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that then it should be implemented in all the Institutes as opined by Shri Anupam Gupta, who has very clearly written that "he does not think it would be proper for the University to make an exception for Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam".

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that it should not be started from this Institute only.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has already been there. Earlier, it used to be amongst the Professors, but it should be implemented in all the Institutes covered under AICTE.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they would not allow the adoption of policy of pick & choose.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that let them pass it for three years.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma endorsed the same and enquired as to what has to be examined in this.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they have to go by the Legal Opinion.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they have to stabilize the Institute. The University is starting new courses and he was of the view that rotation of headship should be there, but it should be according to the requirement of the Regulatory Bodies. He remarked that suddenly they are changing the person, who is maintaining the quality. According to him, it should not happen.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it had already happened there. It could be continued till a Professor is not available and it will be okay till further orders. However, he was of the view that, thereafter, AICTE norms should be checked.

Professor S.K. Sharma said, it is alright.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out as to why AICTE norms were not implemented in respect of other Institutes? Why they are picking up this issue at this stage?

Professor S.K. Sharma said that in other Institutes i.e. Chemical Engineering & in UIET, such a policy was not there and no Assistant Professor or Associate Professor was appointed as Director or Chairperson of the Institute and rotation of Headship was only amongst Professors.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is very important Institute in the region and they are only running U.G. Classes in it. People have inspirations about this and they say that it is an old University and postgraduate classes as well as Ph.D. should be started. They wanted to maintain standard of such important Institutes and also to give mature leadership. In case they could be able to do it, it is okay, otherwise, the things would remain the same as these are going on.

Professor S.K. Sharma while agreeing to it said that in other Institutes of the University approved by AICTE, no person below the rank of Professor is appointed Chairperson/Director.

Dr. Rajat Sandhir said that when rotation of headship was started in the University, there was a lot of heart-burning on the Campus and still they bent upon to implement this rotation policy in the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he also remained a Lecturer in the past. If they started rotation of headship amongst Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors, an Assistant Professor would also become Chairperson. He further said that if they see there is a lot of difference between the calibre of the Assistant/Associate Professor and the Professor.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that then they have to implement the Central Government Policy. He further said that they have already diluted it and they have to implement it.

Professor S.K. Sharma stressed that in the Institutes approved by AICTE, no one is appointed Chairperson/Director below the rank of Professor.

One of the members said that it is a democratic process.

The Vice-Chancellor said what does he mean by democratic process? Using this policy, they are designating them as Director/Dean. He also remained a Lecturer.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that it is a case of rotation of headship and it was not happening for the first time in the University. Moreover, legal opinion has already been sought in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have not to see the interest of any individual; rather they have to see the interest of the University. They have to take the University forward and have to establish it as a big institute. They should not pressurize him (Vice Chancellor) for such matters to take decision in favour of anyone. He wanted to tell them that it was a wrong decision on the part of the University.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that this decision was taken in 1980's before their joining the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was done by the then Vice Chancellor.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they can change this decision by bringing an agenda item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to re-visit this issue keeping in view the requirements of the Regulatory Bodies.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that it should be for all the Departments which fell under the purview AICTE and there should not be any pick and choose.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired what decision has been taken in respect of Item 19.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever decision is taken, it should be common for all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is least concerned whether the decision is taken in favour of A or B, but it seems that whatever decision had been taken in 2014, it has been taken by keeping something in mind. In 2015, when the decision was taken, till further orders, it must had been taken by keeping something in mind, and now to follow the AICTE norms is also being taken by keeping something in mind. He was of the view that why such a message could not go outside that they are objective. He pointed out that when this particular case has come up for discussion, they are saying to re-visit and see the norms of AICTE. According to him, there is no hitch about re-visiting it in accordance with the norms of AICTE, but until and unless it is revised, what is the problem in following the existing position.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the existing position is being followed in this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the existing position is not being followed in this case.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that discrimination is being done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the decision was taken in 2015, why it has been written till further orders.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that he was talking of the decision that taken in 2014 and did not know about the decision of 2015.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that everybody knows the decision. If he (Dr. Navdeep Goyal) did know, it is up to him. He elaborated that wherever they did not want any particular person to take as Chairperson, the orders were issued till further orders and wherever they wanted to replace someone immediately, term orders were issued. He was of the view that when the rotation policy has already been approved, they have to go by it. Now, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor S.K. Sharma are saying that they are hundred per cent supporting the rotation of headship as per norms of Regulatory Bodies.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he has never seen Dr. Anish Slath or met him.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that he has neither seen the person nor related to him in any manner.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, actually, he meant to say something else. The person in question was not a Professor at that time.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members to summarize.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that policy decision could not be summarized.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever is existing, let it go on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is like a popular saying, show me the man, I will show the rule.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should not be done like this.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that if they wanted to re-revisit, then the whole policy of rotation should be re-visited and whatever decision is arrived at, should be implemented in all the Departments/Institutes.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that whole policy should be re-visited.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now the problem is that they are quoting the rule of rotation policy where the person can be appointed as Chairperson up to the rank of Assistant Professor. A parallel rule is being created by quoting that in such and such departments, no one could be appointed as Chairperson/Director below the rank of Professor. As per this policy, the Assistant Professor can be appointed as Chairperson. If tomorrow, all the Professors from such Department resign and new Central Institute is opened and no Professor is available, then as per this Policy, the Assistant Professor/Associate Professor could be appointed Chairperson. It is a matter of chance that they are working here as Professors. When this policy of rotation of headship was introduced, there were only one or two Professors in even big Departments and the persons, who were working there, were not getting chance to become Chairpersons. In 2004, a Resolution was moved by a Professor to the effect that from now onwards the rotation of Chairperson should be amongst the Professors only and that person had virtually to run away from the Senate Hall. The members questioned him as to how he

dared to debar the Assistant/Associate Professors from becoming the Chairpersons. That was why, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying that after introduction of any system/policy, it was very difficult to withdraw the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they run away from the meeting in such a way, how could they run the administration?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had run away from the meeting as happened in the last Special Meeting of the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that till they reviewed/revisited the policy of rotation of headship keeping in view the guidelines/rules of the Regulatory Bodies, like AICTE, DCI, MCI, etc., the existing policy should be followed in letter and spirit.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is true. When the new Institutes came into existence in the University, the Syndicate had taken a decision that the policy pertaining to rotation of headship existing in the Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2009, be implemented in all the University Teaching Departments, Institutes, Centres, etc. as far as possible, keeping in view the requirements of the Regulatory Bodies.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wants to tell them the interpretation of the word as per requirements of the Regulatory Bodies and why it had been written there. The purpose of it was that where there was requirement of a Professor, a Professor is to be appointed as Chairperson/Director etc. Keeping in view the requirement of the Regulatory Body, Regular Director should be appointed there. He pointed out that according to the requirement of the Regulatory Body in Dental Institute, there was a requirement of Regular Director, but it was not done and the Institute is not recognised by the DCI. At the moment the recognitions is till further orders.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that if they want to do they can do.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how they can appoint, as the case has gone to the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. They had said in the Court that it is not necessary whereas according to the requirement of the DCI, it is a substantive post and they brought the orders of the Court. In the case of Hotel Management which is not approved by the AICTE, the orders were issued till further orders.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there has been confusion somewhere.

Shri Ashok Goyal further said that the same Vice-Chancellor in respect of Hotel Management issued orders of Director till further orders. Is Hostel Management Institute is AICTE approved? How they can talk of Regulatory Body in respect Dental College? Whereas the Dental Institute is approved by the Dental Council of India and there they have not respected it and the Institute which is not approved by AICTE, they say they have to revisit AICTE.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not waste time and come to the conclusion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not wastage of time.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there should not be any pick and choose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they want to do something on it, then they have to insist; otherwise, what is going, let it continue, then he may also allow the same. Only U.G. course should be taught there and there is no need to start P.G. courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice-Chancellor that if he has such a strong reservation then why he has approved the appointment of the incumbent in question till further orders. They are in a dilemma, if they disapprove the appointment, then the person in question would be angry and if they approve the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor then what would be achieved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was not so.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to why it has been placed before the Syndicate. He pointed out that in the Legal Opinion, it has clearly been written that if they want to continue with the present incumbent, then they can place the case before the Syndicate. That was why it has been placed in the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that now the matter is placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Rajat Sandhir informed that the charge of Honorary Director has already been handed over to Dr. Anish Slath.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on the one hand the matter has been placed before the Syndicate and on the other hand the charge of Honorary Director of Hotel Management has already been handed over to Dr. Anish Slath. He was of the view that if they say that the earlier person may be allowed to continue, then he (Dr. Anish Slath) will say that the Syndicate has taken decision against him and if they pass what the Vice-Chancellor has approved, then the other person will say that Syndicate has taken decision against him. Now, they are in a fussy position as the Vice-Chancellor will say that he is in a hurry.

Professor Navdeep Goyal endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal. He said that the word 'till further order' is written owing to that if they want to take any clarification from AICTE, they could do so. However, the Hotel Management Institute has not been still approved by AICTE. Legal Opinion also says that the appointment could be made for a maximum period of three years.

Intervening, Professor Rajat Sandhir enquired then as to how they will decide.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether they have to go to AICTE in respect of this Institute.

To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal replied in positive.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, then they have to look into the case of UIET and Chemical Engineering & Technology. In these Institutes, they are following the rotation policy of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in UIET and Chemical Engineering they are rotating the chairpersonship amongst the Professors only.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is misinterpreting and they have to go as per this policy. It is a matter of chance that there are Professors, but as per policy it can go up to Assistant Professors also.

Professor Rajat Sandhir endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the decision was taken, it was the presumption that rotation of headship in UIET and Chemical Engineering will remain up to the rank of Professors and the same was asked to be written.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at that time it was written that where there is a substantive post, as per the requirement of Regulatory Body, the rotation of headship would not be there.

To this, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to do that and wherever the correction is required that should be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they did not want to correct the same. They have brought the rotation of headship to such a level for which he has no word to say. This University is 138 years old and if someone runs away, how could he bring the rotation.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that he meant to say that one of the Professors of the University had moved a resolution in the Senate to revise the decision of rotation of Headship only amongst the Professors and it should not go up to the level of Assistant Professors or Associate Professors. The said Professor had to face such resentment from the members of the House that she has to leave the house. He suggested that he (Vice Chancellor) should share his viewpoints on the issue of rotation of headship with the Senate members in the ensuing meeting of Senate scheduled for 26<sup>th</sup> May 2019.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would definitely share the same with them, though it seems improper. He is here to safeguard the interest of the University.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that they all are here to look after the interest of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said, how can he run away from the House?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if he moves a Resolution and the members are not ready to approve the same; rather start criticising and no one supports, then he has no other alternative, but to run away from the meeting. Thus, whatever Shri Ashok Goyal is saying, is right.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that let the appointment of Dr. Anish Slath as Honorary Director of University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management be approved for three years.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that they have to approve it for three years.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that, in view of the legal opinion, they have to approve it for three years.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they have taken legal opinion from a Senior Legal Retainer of the University, and they have to go by that and approve the appointment of Dr. Anish Slath for three years.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that it should be Director instead of Honorary Director. When the person from outside/other Departments was appointed, he/she was designated as Honorary Director.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Director is not compulsory; one might be given the designation of Chairperson.

Professor Rajat Sandhir endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Director is better term in respect of Institutes instead of Chairperson.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that every designation looks nice.

One of the members remarked that then one could be given the designation of Vice-Chancellor also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should see the old designation as well so that there might not be any contradiction.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that they could set right the policy of rotation of headship.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that in some other Departments of the University, the present incumbents have already completed the term of three years. He was of the view that such case should be reviewed and where new persons need to be appointed, they might be appointed at the earliest.

Professor Rajesh Gill endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Professor Rajat Sandhir and suggested that the office be asked to collect the data in this respect.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the existing practice should be continued.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said then the designation of Chairperson is alright.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be Coordinator also.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that it should be Director.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that in the Institute, it should be Director.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, they have kept the designation of Director.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he wanted to know whether they could give the designation of Director to the former Honorary Director from the back date.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have only to give a certificate to this effect.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the members to decide if the former Director be given the designation of Director from back date.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired how can they appoint him as Honorary Director?

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the person appointed earlier was given the designation of Honorary Director.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could not do so. They have done whatever they wished.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that, earlier, this issue had not been placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are discussing this issue since long. There are many complications, which needed to be taken care of before taking any decision.



Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor could appoint any person on any post, but his/her appointment on that particular post could not become designation. The person in question is Associate Professor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if tomorrow he wanted a *bona fide* certificate from the University, then what designation would they mention in that certificate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would write Director.

The Vice-Chancellor said how can they write Director?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in view of the legal opinion, even in the case under consideration, the order has been issued till further orders, and till further orders meant that he could continue even after the expiry of three years.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether till further orders mean that he could not continue beyond three years.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is clearly mentioned in the legal opinion by Mr. Anupam Gupta.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if he has completed three years term as Director or Honorary Director, he could be given the designation of Director. He further said that as is being suggested by other members, he (Vice Chancellor) could appoint him (Dr. Anish Slath) for three years. None could stop them from re-visiting the decision. However, unless and until they approve the revised decision, the incumbent would continue as Director of the Institute. He further suggested that if they are feeling that something wrong is going on, the University could discuss this issue by placing an agenda item before the Syndicate as Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said earlier during discussion.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the members to understand the issue. He is again saying that he is not against it. This issue is creating hurdle since long time and due to that they are unable to start P.G. Classes in such a good Institute. This Institute should have started P.G. classes long back. Moreover, there is no Ph.D. programme even though the Institute has a very well established laboratory. He had personal experience when he had gone to Italy recently, they appreciated it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that earlier there was no laboratory at the Institute.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the Institute of Hotel Management was started by removing the Staff Club, they felt very pained and the faculty had protested much because it was in the heart of the Campus. Later on, the Staff Club was shifted to Sector 25. The laboratory at the Institute has been created just recently.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is a very decent laboratory.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that the development could never be there at the initial stage, but it comes with the passage of time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is talking of Undergraduate Classes, but at that time there was a problem of funds to run the Institute. Whatever decisions they are taking to start Diplomas/Certificate Courses, they are taking with a view to earn money for the University.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that instead of going upward, they are going downward.

When the Vice Chancellor mentioned about the Central Universities, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not talk of Central Universities.

Professor Rajesh Gill said where is the faculty?

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired, do they have sufficient faculty for this purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the day, the University starts thinking in terms of earning money, it will be the downfall of the University, forget about academic excellence. As an individual and citizen of this country, he straightaway opposes such a policy where the State Universities are aiming at earning money.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that at the moment one of the Western Universities is at the top.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are all private Universities.

Professor S.K. Sharma said whatever they maybe.

Shri Ashok Goyal, while referring to enhancement of fee, said that it is nothing, but privatization.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that if they increase the number of courses without proper faculty and infrastructure, it could not be termed as earning money.

Several members in one voice said that they should avoid commercialization of courses.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that IITs have raised its fee up to Rs.4 lakhs.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should see the status of IITs. It seemed that they are just interested in the enhancement of fee and are not worried about the academic standards.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that after passing out from IITs, the student used to get packages of Rs.50 lakhs and here the students even after doing Ph.D are wandering here and there without any job.

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

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the whole policy of rotation of headship, be reviewed.

**20.**

Considered if:

- (i) the introduction of M.A. in Life Long Learning 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.

Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

- 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. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 10.4.2019 and resolved 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, employability, fee structure etc. It be also verified whether the nomenclature of the said courses exist in the list of approved courses of UGC.

Accordingly, the Chairperson, Department of Life Long Learning and Extension has submitted the justification, in this regard, duly approved by the Convener, Board of Studies in Education and the Dean Faculty of Education vide letter dated 2.5.2019.

Initiating discussion, Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he wanted to talk about the nomenclature of the course, viz. Life Long Learning and Rural Development, which did not exist anywhere in the country. According to him, the name of the course is : Life Long Learning and Extension which is being offered at Delhi University, and this is what the mandate of the Department is.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to check the nomenclature of the course with the UGC and find whether it existed or not. Further, if they see the faculty of this Department, only two-three faculty members are there and those too are at the verge of retirement. In fact, these are converted posts. He did not know whether they are regular or not. He said that before starting this course they have to see the status of the faculty members; otherwise, the course will not be successful.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that all faculty members in this Department are converted faculty members from Projects and they are not regular faculty members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to see it.

One of the members said that it should be looked into and no back door entry of faculty members should be there.

**RESOLVED:** That the matter of introduction of M.A. in Life Long Learning and Rural Development (2-Year Degree) course (4 Semesters) in the Department of Life Long Learning and Extension, Panjab University, be revisited.

- 21.** Considered minutes dated 18.04.2019 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to finalize the Admission Guidelines for affiliated Colleges/Teaching Departments for the session 2019-20.

Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out that at Page 12 in Clause 7 of Admission Guidelines meant for admission to B.Com. Part-1, there is complication in Part A, B, C and D. He also handed over his request in this regard in writing to the Registrar on the floor of the House. He suggested these guidelines should be made simple as in the admission days; they might receive calls from different quarters. Earlier, there was a provision that the candidate, who has passed +2 with Commerce Stream with 45% marks, 50% marks with Arts Stream, 55% marks with Non-Medical Stream and 60% marks with Medical Stream, were eligible to take admission to B.Com. Part I. He suggested that it should be made simple so that the candidates might not face any type of hardship; otherwise, they are going to receive telephone calls from the nearby Colleges. He further said that the candidates who have passed +2 in Commerce Stream irrespective of whether from P.S.E.B. or C.B.S.E., four marks weightage is to be given to him/her.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu suggested that they should check the Regulations, perhaps, it could be there.

To this, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that it is not like this.

It was clarified that since it is a part of Regulations and they have to change the Regulations. For Commerce students, the eligibility for admission to B.Com. 1<sup>st</sup> Year is 45% marks, i.e., the candidates, who have studied Commerce, Theory of Commerce, etc.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the simple thing is that whether the candidate has passed +2 with Commerce Stream from Punjab School Education Board or Central Board of School Education, but how many subjects of Commerce he/she has studied at +2 level and weightage of 4% each is to be given to him/her for studying of commerce subjects at the time of preparation of merit. It is very simple.

It was clarified that Regulations cannot be changed straightaway by the Syndicate.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they should tell him as to how it could be simplified, so that there cannot be any confusion. It is written +2 Commerce or B.Com. Part-I (Old Scheme), which is not understandable.

It was clarified that it is to be corrected at the level of Regulations Committee and thereafter the Syndicate could approve the same.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that, this meant, they have to wait for another one year.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that let him add as these are regulations of separate courses and compiled ones and not new ones. He was of the view that if they want to make any change, it would be done at the level of Regulations Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that what is the meaning for taking admission to B.Com. Part-I by a student, who has already done B.Com. Part-I though under old scheme.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 11<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is the meaning for taking admission to B.Com. Part-I, they have to pass B.Com. Part-I.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they are talking of B.Com.I under old regulations.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that it does not exist now.

It was clarified that these regulations were made for old system but they have to change it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is alright but he wanted to know the meaning of existing.

It was again clarified that these are old regulations formed way back long.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there was no +2 and there was Higher Secondary or Prep. Earlier, degree course was of 11+3 and now it is 12+3. Earlier, it was 14 years and now it is 15 years. He pointed out that its meaning is not that who has already passed B.Com. Part-I and he has to take admission again in B.Com. Part-1.

It was clarified that it was in old scheme.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was not there in the old scheme.

It was clarified that it was for those persons who have taken admission in B.Com. Part-1 after passing Prep. and thereafter left the degree course without completion. Now the question is that if he wanted to do B.Com., he/she has completed the course of 2 years after Matric.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for taking admission in B.Com. I, the candidate should have passed B.Com. Part-I in Old Regulations.

It was clarified that he understands for taking admission in B.Com.Part-1, the study of 12 years is required.

Shri Ashok Goyal questioned then why it has been written B.Com. Part-1.

It was clarified that he has passed Prep. and thereafter he has taken admission in B.Com. Part-1 and if after passing Part-I, he dropped the course and later on after 4-5 years, he wanted to complete the degree, then they say that he has already passed B.Com.I and he will be given admission in B.Com. Part-II.

Shri Sandeep Kumar said that it is a case of more than 28 years back.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a case of more than that and may be 36 years back. According to him, +2 was introduced in the beginning of 80.

It was clarified that what regulations were made at that time needs revision and they must be revised.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that how they can write B.Com. Part-1.

Shri Sandeep Kumar said that this policy has become redundant now.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that they have to see the Calendar in this regard.

After going through the Calendar, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not only in B.Com. but it is in B.A., B.Sc. and even in all classes and it should be cleared.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is very confusing.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that at that time there were two types of schemes in B.Sc., the candidate who has to study Physics, Chemistry and Biology that was B.Sc. Medical and the candidates who did not study Physics, that was B.Sc. Part-I. This scheme is for those students in the transit period so that they might not suffer at that time. This was way back long but now this has to be changed/amended.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to find a solution to the problem which is pointed out by Shri Sandeep Kumar.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that Controller sahib has given this information that in the Semester System Examinations, it has already been amended/changed.

It was clarified that in the year 2015 when Semester System was introduced at Undergraduate level, this terminology is not being used.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this provision has now been changed and what slip has been pasted in their copy of Calendar Volume must be pasted in the copy of Calendar with them. Shri Ashok Goyal further said that first of all they should remove B.Com. Part-I and now the issue of 45% marks should be the eligibility for taking admission in B.Com. Part-1 + 4% weightage on account of commerce subject/s studied at +2 level.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is already there. He means to say that the candidates who have passed +2 in commerce stream is/are eligible with 45% marks, in Arts stream with 50% marks, in Non-Medical stream with 55% marks and in Medical stream with 60% marks are eligible for admission in B.Com.-I and there should also be weightage of 4% per subject of commerce studied by the candidate at +2 level.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that it is already there.

Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out that at Page 8, Point 7, there is a provision that if any student has passed Semester 1 and could not take admission in Semester 2 by one reason or the other, he can take admission in 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester next year. He was of the view that same provision should be there for the candidates who have passed 3, 5 and 7 semester, they may also be given regular admissions in 2, 4, 6 and 8 semesters (old semesters). It is missing here and it should be added so that the students may not suffer. It should be approved for U.G. and P.G. Classes as well. He pointed out that last year they have made provision for such students, as a special case, with the permission of Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that if any candidate left the seat after taking admission, refund should be given to him as per rules. It is also a part of admission guidelines and suggested that a note should be added there that fee of such students be refunded after retaining Rs.1000/- only.

Dr. Narinder Singh Sidhu said that there are U.G.C. guidelines in this respect. If the students leave the seat during admission days, only Rs.1000/- are deducted and

if he/she leaves the seat after the classes are started, refund is given as per the slabs mentioned in the guidelines.

It was clarified that there are clear-cut guidelines of U.G.C. in this respect.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that it will be looked into.**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 18.04.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to finalize the Admission Guidelines for affiliated Colleges/Teaching Departments for the session 2019-20, be approved, as per **Appendix 2.(vii)**, the candidates, who got admission in 1<sup>st</sup> Semester in a College and after completing the 1<sup>st</sup> Semester, could not get the admission in 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester due to one or other reason, are being allowed admission in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester next year with the condition that the candidate must have attended the classes/appeared in examination in the College in 1<sup>st</sup> Semester, this provision/facility be extended to the candidates of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Semesters as well. Such a facility be extended to Postgraduate students also.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That refund of fee rules of UGC be followed.

**22.**

Information contained in Items R-(i) to R-(viii) was read out, viz. –

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of B.Sc. (Hons.) Chemistry and M.Sc. (Hons.) Chemistry at the Centre of Advanced Studies in Chemistry, P.U., for the session 2018-19:

Sr. No.	Name of the Student/ class	Annexure
1.	Ms. Shruti Garg B.Sc.(Hons.) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year, 6 <sup>th</sup> Semester, (May 2019 Exam.)	'A'
2.	Ms. Ashmita M.Sc.(Hons.) 1 <sup>st</sup> Year, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Semester, (May 2019 Exam.)	'B'

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes dated 01.03.2019 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, for revision of the result of Ms. Aditi Singla, student of B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> Semester, Roll No.15130336, December, 2015, as an exceptional case, without any further precedent.

**NOTE:** A copy of the notification No. B.A.I Sem./2016-D/308 dated 13.03.2019 vide which the result of Ms. Aditi Singla has been revised is enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh the following faculty, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on

temporary basis w.e.f. 06.03.2019 for 11 months i.e. up to 05.02.2020 with one day break on 05.03.2019 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Dr. Lalit Kumar	Associate Professor
2.	Dr. Shipra Gupta	Associate Professor
3.	Dr. Vishakha Grover	Associate Professor
4.	Dr. Puneet	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Poonam Sood	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Sunint Singh	Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Neha Bansal	Assistant Professor
9.	Dr. Rose Kanwal Jeet Kaur	Assistant Professor

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

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

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

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

- NOTE:**
1. An office note along with copy of order dated 05.04.2019 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**).
  2. The above matter was earlier placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.2.2019 (Para 10) and it was decided that the matter be routed through the Faculty of Arts.

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

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Gurjit Singh	Punjabi



2.	Mr. Surinder Singh	Political Science
3.	Ms. Seema	Physical Education
4.	Mr. Saumyadeep Bhattacharya	English
5.	Dr. Kamlesh Narwana	History

- NOTE:**
1. The above faculty members had been re-appointed (afresh) vide office order dated 24.07.2018 and 05.10.2018 (**Appendix-XXII**) respectively, at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for the academic session 2018-19.
  2. Request dated 10.04.2019 of Director, PURC, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib along with minutes of Academic Committees dated 09.04.2019 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).
  3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

(vii) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Shri Des Raj, Research Scholar to complete Ph.D., as a special case vide letter dated 25.07.2018 (**Appendix-XXIII**), on the recommendation of the Chairperson, School of Punjabi Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh vide letter dated 05.07.2018 (**Appendix-XXIII**).

- NOTE:**
1. Pursuant to letter dated 25.07.2018, Shri Des Raj, vide letter dated 05.12.2018 (**Appendix-XXIII**), requested to remit the delay fee fine for submission of Ph.D. thesis, but his request has not been acceded to by the Vice-Chancellor, and he has been requested to deposit the fee i.e. Rs.41455/- and 1,75,000/- calculated up to 30.04.2019, vide letter dated 02.04.2019 (**Appendix-XXIII**).
  2. Shri Des Raj, Research Scholar, School of Punjabi Studies was enrolled for Ph.D. in the faculty of Languages (Punjabi), P.U., Chandigarh under enrolment No.6458 dated 15.05.1982.
  3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.01.2013 (Para 43-(R-xvi) (**Appendix-XXIII**) has resolved that the last date for submission of Ph.D. thesis by all the candidates enrolled under old/new Regulations, which was earlier extended up to 31.12.2012, be extended up to 30.06.2013.
  4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.04.2017 (Para 20) while condoning the delay period of Ms. Monika Goyal had authorised the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Syndicate, to condone the delay in case of Shri Des Raj. Accordingly he was allowed by

the Vice-Chancellor to submit his thesis for examination.

5. A detailed office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXIII)**.

**(viii)** Pursuant to the orders dated 25.04.2019 **(Appendix-XXIV)** passed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 10559 of 2019 (Madhu Kataria Vs. Panjab University), the Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed that:

- (i) in supersession of this office order No. 7483-89/Estt. dated 22.04.2019 **(Appendix-XXIV)**, Ms. Madhu Kataria, A.T.O. (G-II), Department of Botany, be allowed to continue work as such after attaining the age of 60 years being a deaf & dumb (specially able) till the final outcome of the case in CWP No. 10559 of 2019.
- (ii) she be paid salary on the same terms and conditions on which she was already drawing from the substantive post held by her in the Department of Botany.

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

**Referring to the Sub Item R-(v)**, Professor Rajesh Gill said that last year, they had decided in the Syndicate that the candidates, who have done simple B.A. Pass Course, are also eligible for admission to M.A. Economics. But that decision has not been appended with the agenda. She suggested that the basic qualification for the admission to M.A. Economics is B.A. (General) with Economics and not B.A. (Hons.).

The Vice-Chancellor said "Okay".

**Referring to the Sub Item R-(vii)**, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the candidate had been working as Lecturer in Punjabi University and now he has retired from the service. Therefore, he is not in a position to pay such a huge amount of fine. He requested that a minimum fine should be imposed on him

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that since he is retired person, the minimum fine should be imposed on him.

The Vice Chancellor requested to the members to also go through the Regulations/Rules/Guidelines of the University in this regard.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that he is doing Ph.D. just to prefix "Doctor" before his name.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired that on what formula the fine has been calculated by the office.

The Vice Chancellor said that since the person has retired from the service, the issue regarding imposition of fine would be looked into.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Item R-(i) to R-(viii)**, on the agenda, be ratified.

**23.**

Information contained in **Items I-(i) to I-(vii)** was read out, viz. –

**(i)** In pursuance of orders dated 18.03.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 7231 of 2019 (Dr. Upinder Sawhney and Anr. Vs Panjab University & others), wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit to continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is pending, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

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

**(ii)** In pursuance of orders dated 18.3.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 7231 of 2019 (Dr. Rajiv Lochan Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 15.5.2019, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

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

Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

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

**NOTE:** A copy of office order dated 30.4.2019 is enclosed.

- (iv) To note minutes Item No.12 and 13 dated 28.03.2019 (**Appendix-XXV**) of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2019 (Para 13) while approving the minutes dated 27.11.2018 (Item 6) and 24.12.2018 of PUSC has also resolved that in future, the minutes of the Executive Committee of PUSC be placed before the Syndicate as an information item.

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to be distributed in equal share to Mrs. Vimla Malhotra (Mother) and Ms. Kitty Malhotra (Sister), in respect of Late Ms. Meenu Malhotra, Senior Assistant, D.U.'s Office, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 05.03.2019, 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.

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mrs. Amrik Kaur W/o Late Shri Shamsher Singh, Carpenter, Construction Office, P.U. Chandigarh, who expired on 13.11.2018, 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.

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

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 11<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Sudesh Kumar Senior Technician (G-II) UIPS	08.06.1988	30.04.2019	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
2.	Ms. Madhu Kataria Assistant Technical Officer (G-II) Department of Botany	30.11.1984	30.04.2019	
3.	Shri Ram Dass Thakur Senior Technician (G-II) UIPS	05.05.1981	30.04.2019	
4.	Mrs. Tripta Rani Stenographer PU-ISSER	07.03.1982	30.04.2019	
5.	Mrs. Indu Thapliyal Superintendent Re-evaluation Branch	31.08.1987	31.05.2019	
6.	Shri Prem Lal Superintendent Examination Branch-III (Form Cell)	25.05.1989	30.04.2019	
7.	Mrs. Saroj Bala Thapar Superintendent R&S Branch	08.09.1989	30.04.2019	
8.	Shri Sat Paul Superintendent Examination Br.-I	01.09.1989	31.05.2019	
9.	Shri Parbodh Kumar Sareen Senior Assistant Examination Br.-I	19.01.1983	31.05.2019	
10.	Shri Hans Raj Carpenter Construction Office	01.06.1995	31.05.2019	
11.	Shri Raj Dev Record Lifter Certificate Section	01.04.1976	31.05.2019	
12.	Shri Hari Singh Security Guard Boys Hostel No. 2	01.01.2001	30.04.2019	
13.	Shri Ram Sureman Head Mali Construction Office, P.U.	26.12.1975	31.05.2019	

<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>
14.	Shri Bhagirathi Beldar Construction Office, P.U.	02.04.1993	31.05.2019	

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

**Referring to Sub-Item I-(ii),** Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that the Department of Professor M. Rajivlochan has wrongly been mentioned as 'Economics', whereas his actual Department is '**History**'. She suggested that necessary correction be made.

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

Karamjeet Singh  
Registrar

Confirmed

RAJ KUMAR  
VICE-CHANCELLOR