

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 16th March 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. Professor Navdeep Goyal
10. Professor Rajat Sandhir
11. Professor Rajesh Gill
12. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
13. Shri Sandeep Singh
14. Professor S.K. Sharma
15. Professor Karamjeet Singh Registrar ... (Secretary)

Dr. Inderjit Kaur, Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu, 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 the esteemed members of the Syndicate and welcomed them to the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

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

- i) Smt. Bhagwanti Mehta mother of Prof. S.K. Mehta, Director, CIL, on 26th February, 2019;
- ii) Shri Pushi Chowdhry, husband of Dr. Neelam Man Singh Chowdhry, Department of Indian Theatre on 4th March, 2019;
- iii) Ms. Meenu Malhotra, Senior Assistant, office of Dean of University Instruction, on 5th March, 2019.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Smt. Bhagwanti Mehta, Shri Pushi Chowdhry, and Ms. Meenu Malhotra and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members of the Syndicate that-
 - (i) Nobel Laureate Professor Bernard Lucas Feringa gave a lecture at Panjab University Law Auditorium and interacted with the students.
 - (ii) Panjab University Campus has bagged a National Water Award 2018 for being the best in the region and second in India for successful campus water usage. The award comprising a trophy, citation and cash prize of Rs.1.5 lacs was received by Dr Madhuri S. Rishi, Chairperson, Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, at the National Water Awards 2018 Ceremony organized by the Ministry of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation, on 25th of February, 2019. Shri Nitin Gadkari, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation and Road, Transport & Highways, Shipping, was the Chief Guest and Shri Arjun Ram Meghwal, Hon'ble Minister of State for Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation, Parliamentary Affairs, was guest of honour.
 - (iii) Panjab University along with CRIKC organized three-day CHASCON which was attended by over 1200 delegates and more than 1000 papers were presented. It was very nice and luckily the Organizer is here and they must congratulate him for the successfully conducting the activities and attracting the Scientists and Academicians across the States in India.
 - (iv) Dr. Santosh Kumar Upadhyay, Assistant Professor, Department of Botany, has been awarded the Young Scientist Award by the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences.
 - (v) Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry, has been nominated to the Editorial Advisory Board of "Neurochemistry International", the second Indian to be nominated. I extend him heartiest congratulations for this marvellous achievement. Certainly, it would be a motivation not only to the Scientists, but also to the domain of the Scientists and Academicians at work.
 - (vi) Dr. Tamanna R. Sahrawat, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bioinformatics, was adjudged second with a cash award of Rs.5,000 in the poster competition at Conference of the Society for Vector Ecology (Indian Region), in Goa.
 - (vii) Professor Kulwant Gill, former Chairperson of the Department of Laws, has donated an amount of Rs.54.14 lacs for the construction of Lecture Theatre in the sacred memory of her younger brother S. Manjit Singh.
 - (viii) Mrs. Renuka B. Salwan, Director, Public Relations, was conferred with 'Chanakya' Award for corporate reputation during 13th Global Communication Conclave 2019 organised by Public Relations Council of India at Jaipur.
 - (ix) Research team of Professor D.K. Dhawan, Department of Biophysics, has been granted Patent No. 306804 on 4th February, 2019 for the research "A radioactive trimer complex for the detection of tumors".

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

- (x) Professor Nishtha Jaswal, former Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, and Vice Chancellor, Himachal Pradesh National Law University, Shimla, has been awarded Amity Academic Excellence Award by Amity University.
- (xi) Professor P.S. Jaswal, former Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, and Vice Chancellor, Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Patiala, has been awarded Amity Academic Excellence Award by Amity University.
- (xii) A project titled “Structure-activity relationship studies of a novel two-component lantibiotic roseocin” of Dr. Dipti Sareen, Department of Biochemistry, has been approved for funding by DST-SERB, Government of India. The project carries a grant of Rs.19.75 lacs for equipment and Rs.12 lacs for manpower, travel, contingency, etc.
- (xiii) Dr. Kashmir Singh, Department of Biotechnology, has been sanctioned a grant of Rs.50 lacs by Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB), New Delhi, for the project “Genome-wide identification and functional analysis of long non-coding RNAs associated with biotic stress in vitis (grapevine)”.
- (xiv) DAV College, Abohar, has been granted the status of “Star College” under Star College Scheme of Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India. It should be put on record that it would be very-very inspirational factor for other prestigious Colleges, which they have.
- (xv) MCM DAV College for Women, Sector 36 A, Chandigarh, has won the 3rd rank in Best Citizen Led Initiative in Swachh Survekshan 2019 under Swachh Bharat Mission. It is also a very outstanding achievement by our Colleges. Once again, it should also be put on record. I also want to tell that a number of activities are always going in this College. It is really a very-very vibrant factor and all the Colleges must take inspiration from this as I want to see that each and every College is not less than anyone.
- (xvi) M/s. Mohan Fiber Private Limited has donated a sum of Rs.14.5 lacs to the Dental Institute for up-gradation of the radiographic facilities.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that Professor Rajeev Patnaik, Chairperson, Department of Geology, Panjab University, has been elected Fellow of Indian Academy of Sciences. He suggested that he should also be felicitated as it is a rare honour.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if communication regarding Professor Rajeev Patnaik, elected as Fellow of Indian Academy of Sciences has been received, it should not have been missed. However, he felt that certain persons did not know that it is to be communicated to the University authorities. Those who communicate, their cases came to the Syndicate and others not. He thought that they need to evolve some mechanism for the purpose.

The Vice Chancellor said that it seemed that this mechanism is not there. If the House agreed, a letter to this effect could be circulated at the Campus as well as affiliated Colleges.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that there should be only one contact point for this activity.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

At this stage, Professor Rajesh Gill stated that before they take up the agenda, she would like to make a request that the meeting is conducted in a very cordial atmosphere, resolved parts should be crystal clear. She had sought certain information, including extension of MoUs, which should be in ex-officio capacity instead of personal.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are planning to make it in a structured way. Her concern has been noted and they are working on the same. If she agreed, the observation part could be taken to the zero hour.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, in fact, what she wanted to say is that a week after the meeting, she had made a request to the Registrar for providing the information, which she had sought in the meeting of the Syndicate and the Registrar told her that it was not resolved. The resolved parts had been finalized just a day before yesterday. Thus, she had no alternative, but to seek the information as a Fellow. Then what is the sanctity of the Syndicate, where they had discussed the issue for so many hours? Yesterday, the resolved part was sent to her along with the information, which she had sought. The resolved part of the MoU, to which they were talking about, is not correct and the same needed to be corrected. The matter did not get settled only by saying ex-officio. In that particular MoU, who would be the ex-officio person, is required to be mentioned. Moreover, the MoU, to which she is referring to, had already been granted extension on 10th December 2018. They were saying in the last Syndicate that such and such clauses needed to be incorporated, what is important/sanctity of that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that before the term of last two Syndicates, they had made a provision, under which 2-3 Syndics were authorized to sit with the officials of General Branch to get the resolved parts prepared within one or two days. These two-three Syndics, who had attended the meeting of the Syndicate, used to vet the resolved parts. Thereafter, the resolved parts were used to be circulated amongst the members of the Syndicate with the request to point out discrepancy, if any, within a stipulated time. In this way, the resolved parts were used to be finalized within a week and the practice continued for two years. He thought that they could again continue with that practice. If the resolved parts are finalized at the earliest, it would be easy to act upon them. Sometimes, the situation demanded action immediately. If it is done, it would be a kind of help to the office as well as the Registrar and the Vice Chancellor. Nobody would have any objection to it as none has any intention to temper with the decision taken in the meeting. Since they talked in different languages, i.e., English, Hindi and Punjabi, sometimes these officials faced difficulty in understanding the real meaning/sense.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to supplement Professor Navdeep Goyal and share with the House, especially the Vice Chancellor that actually, what he (Vice Chancellor) is suggesting, let him confess that about six months back the Vice Chancellor suggested the same thing; rather, he asked him (Shri Ashok Goyal) that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should take care of the recording of the minutes, especially the resolved parts. He somehow told him (Vice Chancellor) that it would not be possible for him to do this. He (Vice Chancellor) had told him that they are facing a lot of problem in the recording of minutes. Hence, he was also of the same view, which at that time, he did not realize. However, subsequently they started recording here as to what has been resolved, but probably, that was also discontinued in the last meeting. In this connection, he could suggest that Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Navdeep Goyal be given this task of seeing and getting it drafted in view of what has been discussed and decided here. Thereafter, the same be circulated amongst the members with the request to point out discrepancy, if any. In this manner, the problem would be overcome. Why he is saying so? It is very-very important, reason being, that there was a meeting of the Syndicate, which took place in the month of September 2018, when

even the present Registrar was not there and the earlier Registrar was there. An item had come for consideration and a thorough discussion took place and a unanimous resolution was taken. However, even after six months, no action has been taken on that because the answer is the same that in this resolved is not written. Even if resolved is not written, whose job is this to write the resolved. Tomorrow, if somebody asks them that such and such item was placed before the Syndicate for consideration, what decision had been taken on that, could they give reply that no decision was taken on this item? It could be agreed that either (a) decision is taken or (b) decision is not taken. However, as per the reply from the office, no decision has been taken on this item. That was such a sensitive matter, which could put the University into trouble. The case related to sexual harassment, wherein it was resolved that since the Chancellor is the employer of the Vice Chancellor, the complaint be sent to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor might be remembering this. Though it was decided, somehow or the other, it is not recorded in the minutes. He did not want to attribute any motive. It is not recorded in the minutes and he would like to bring to his (Vice Chancellor) notice that even after six months that complaint is lying pending here in their office. He had pointed it out twice earlier also. He had also sent in writing to the Registrar, but to his knowledge no action has been taken so far, only on the ground that resolved part is not there. If they did not write the resolved part after discussing the issue at length, and did not take any action because resolved part is not written, would they be not held responsible tomorrow? Therefore, if they do this (assign the job of vetting the resolved parts of the Syndicate meetings to Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Navdeep Goyal), the entire mechanism would be at the right track. However, it would only be done, if it is written here – Resolved that Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Navdeep Goyal would vet the minutes, including the resolved parts, which would be circulated amongst the members before finalizing, calling for objection(s), if any, so that there is no discrepancy in the recording of the minutes. If it is agreed, then he thought they have to get it recorded here only; otherwise, they would again say that it was not resolved. Hence, it should be taken as his proposal and if anybody has any objection, they could discuss it; otherwise, let them resolve it.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that so far as the issue relating to September 2018 is concerned, though there is no need. Unfortunately, only two members, i.e., Professor Navdeep Goyal and he himself, of the previous Syndicate (Syndicate of 2018) are here, and it could be verified from Professor Navdeep Goyal and other members as well. Instead of lingering on the issue on one pretext or the other, he thought that they must clinch the issue. He is surprised that if he has sent in writing as objection to the tentative minutes, what to talk of acting on that, he has not received any reply even to say that his objection is overruled. Though he had a discussion with Professor Karamjeet Singh, Registrar, where he had said that he would come personally and would show him (Registrar) where the action on the part of the office is lacking. Somehow, he (Registrar) was so much busy and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) also could not find time. His simple submission is that they should all endeavour collectively to see that maximum discrepancies are removed at their own level without being pointed out. It is also news for Professor Navdeep Goyal that the complaint is still lying in the University office.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Shri Ashok Goyal is right as it was resolved that the complaint of sexual harassment against the former Vice Chancellor be sent to the Chancellor, being the employer of the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they are still saying that it had not been resolved, let it be recorded today that the complaint be sent to the Chancellor because the complaint is against the then Vice Chancellor and the Chancellor is the employer of the Vice Chancellor. Is it clear or they would still say that it has not been resolved.

The Vice Chancellor requested the other members to give their viewpoints on the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the other members would not be able to say anything on the issue as they (Shri Ashok Goyal and he himself) only were the members of the previous Syndicate.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the complaint in question should be sent to the Chancellor.

Dr. K.K. Sharma remarked that if it had not been resolved that the complaint of sexual harassment be sent to the Chancellor, it had also not been unresolved. This meant, something has been missed somewhere, and the mistake should be rectified now.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that, as said by a couple of members that two members (Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Navdeep Goyal) should be assigned the job vetting the minutes, it would be better if three members instead of two are assigned the job because if one of them is not available the other could come.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that Professor Rajat Sandhir, who is from the campus, should also be associated with the Committee, which he has proposed sometime before.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that sometimes they quickly arrived at a decision.

Professor Navdeep Goyal remarked that it is only for the help of the office and the Registrar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not that they are proposing this at their own level; rather, the Vice Chancellor himself had requested him for the purpose. It would solve the problem forever.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are their personal views and, that was why, he is not noting anything.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this is essential. In the last meeting of the Syndicate, so many decisions were taken, but they did not know as to what has been recorded. He has become the member of the Syndicate for the 3rd time and earlier it used to be that whatever had been resolved, the same was communicated to all the members and they were given 10-15 days to point out the discrepancy, if any. The same procedure was followed in the Senate as well. So this is very important; otherwise, what happens is – sometime something escapes.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired, is there any complaint against Dr. Grover?

The members unanimously proposed the name of Professor Navdeep Goyal to brief about this.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members should keep in mind the time while briefing something so that meeting could be over, well in time; otherwise, he would compel them to sit till evening.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should take some decisions and not leave the House in between. He pointed out that earlier the Vice Chancellor has said that no item would be placed before the Syndicate in the current agenda, but today few items

have been placed in the current agenda. He enquired whether these items should be taken up for consideration or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that two-three items which are of urgent nature needed to be taken up from the current agenda. He said that if any complaint has been received against the ex-Vice-Chancellor, the Syndicate is not competent to take decision on it as the employer of the Vice Chancellor is the Chancellor of the University and they decided at that time that complaint should go to the Chancellor's office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in spite of taking decision, the case/complaint is still pending in the office.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Navdeep Goyal should throw some light on the issue so that he as well as other members could know about it.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that complaint from any lady should be dealt with on priority and on emergent basis and whatever decision was taken; it should be sent to the concerned quarters without any delay.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Sexual Harassment Act is very clear and keeping this in view, action should be taken immediately as per the Act. If the matter relates to University employee, it should be sent to PUCASH immediately and if the matter relates to the Vice Chancellor, it should be sent to the Chancellor's Office. In the instant case, the matter relates to the ex-Vice-Chancellor, so it should be sent there immediately. According to him, whatever delay has occurred, it should not have been there?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he truly understands and updated himself and has already developed programme and issued instructions that complaints belonging to ladies should be tackled on priority basis. If such incidents occurred in an affiliated College, the Management of that College should be responsible and take action accordingly. He said that he wanted to bring some obnoxious thing to the knowledge of the members that for such an issue, the Vice-Chancellor is being asked to go there.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in such a situation they come to him (Vice Chancellor) with some expectations when all the channels are exhausted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issues relating to the Colleges should be tackled and resolved at the level of the College Principal/ Management/Faculty and should not come to the University. If such petty issues come to the University, they, with the help of Syndicate members would refer the complaint back to the college and, if need be, would give the charge of Principal of College to other person.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they approached the Vice Chancellor, if their grievances are not heard at the appropriate level.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that the Dean College Development Council should be asked to bring list of Sexual Harassment Committees of Colleges and put some social worker on the Committee, if one is not there. He pointed out that even a social worker is not being put on the Committee by the Constituent Colleges.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as far as matter relating to Constituent Colleges is concerned, these would be dealt with as per PUCASH.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in near future, when the NAAC team would visit P.U. Campus for accreditation, they could point out such sexual harassment cases.

But the Vice Chancellor is not responsible for all such things happening in the affiliated Colleges.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that normally the whole burden of the family lies on the head of the family.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the son is incompetent/*nalayak*, what one could do?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that he should own the responsibility.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is competent to take decisions independently. He was hurt as senior Professor is involved in it and she has requested him to take up the case on priority. Due to that he has sent a team there. But now similar case is again received in the University. He stressed that he would not spare them.

The members in one voice said that he should take appropriate action.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that appropriate action has not been taken against such people, and that was why, the persons dared to repeat.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Rajesh Gill is right. He asked as to who would take the action.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Syndicate is empowered to take the action.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such cases should not be brought here as Panjab University is the highest academic and research oriented Body. The University should not be dragged in such matters. If one wants to remain Chairman of the Management or the Principal of the College, they have to take action against the guilty.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that it is totally failure on their part.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is what he wanted to hear. They have all other issues and he has to look after them.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that if a complaint is against the Principal of any affiliated College, it should be looked into by the Management first.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that complaints are also against the Principals.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that there are two types of complaints – (i) against the Principal; and (ii) against the Management.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are three types of complaints, i.e., against the faculty, Principal, and the Management.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that if the complaint by a teacher against a teacher, it should be dealt with by the Principal or the Committee constituted for the College as per P.U. Calendar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such complaint/s should come to him (Vice Chancellor) only after exhausting all the channels.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Vice-Chancellor should take appropriate decision in such matters and all the members would support him.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

One of the members suggested that some mechanism should be developed in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would sit with some of the senior members of the Syndicate and discuss the matter/s.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that they could take help of Professor Rajesh Gill, Dean College Development Council and other senior members of the House.

The Vice-Chancellor assured that whatever information the members of this House wanted to take from him; he will share the same with them but not on the floor of this House.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that sometime, name of the person is not to be disclosed.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that a prosecutor cannot be a judge. He suggested that if the complaint is against the Vice-Chancellor, it should go to the Chancellor's Office and if the complaint is against the Principal, it should come to the Vice-Chancellor. It is the basic principle of Law.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Management is there.

Dr. K.K. Sharma suggested that complaint of Principal should come to the Vice-Chancellor through Management of the College.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that what could the Vice-Chancellor do in such complaints?

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not pressurize him in such matters.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if the Committee is constituted as per the Sexual Harassment Act, the Vice-Chancellor is competent to take action on the recommendation of the Committee.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the University has received complaints of sexual harassment from two Colleges and the Office of the Dean College Development Council should see whether the Committee against Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplaces is constituted in these Colleges as per Act?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Committee against Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplaces as per Act has not been constituted in majority of the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is asking the Dean, College Development Council to write a letter to all the affiliated Colleges to constitute Committee against Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplaces as per Act in their respective College within a week.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that the Committee so constituted should be mentioned in the Prospectus of the Colleges.

Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out that since all the members of such Committees are employees or faculty members of the respective College, one or two members from outside should also be included in it.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Chairman of the Committee thinks it proper, he/she may call a member.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that in such Committees, one social worker is must.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that a Committee should be formed as per Act and its term should be defined.

Professor Rajesh Gill wanted to know what has been resolved if the complaint is received in the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first of all listen to the Registrar, he will tell them about the matter.

The Registrar said that Professor S.K. Sharma has rightly said that earlier there was a practice to send the tentative minutes of the Syndicate meeting to the members. This precedent is still prevalent but actually they have delayed it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it was her first meeting.

It was informed that in their first meeting, they would have noted that he has written down the resolved parts and read out the same to the members. He is not talking of the discussion part. He endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Professor S.K. Sharma and said that sometime discussion on some issue took place and without any conclusion they jump to other issue. He has told the same to Professor S.K. Sharma. He elaborated that the two items about which he (Prof. S.K. Sharma) pointed out, he (Registrar) himself seen the recording and also asked some other person to verify the same. After hearing the video, he said that they recorded, what was decided.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not name the person.

It was further clarified that there was an item pertaining to the sexual harassment. They are the honourable members of the House and if anybody wanted to crosscheck the videography, they are welcome and if they found any change, the same could be brought to his (Registrar) notice. He (Registrar) further said that he himself crosschecked the same and found that nothing has been resolved there. He assured the members that he would read out the resolved parts to them and it is the responsibility of the Registrar that the minutes would reach to them within ten-twelve days. He said that one meeting was held on Friday and they decided to send the resolved parts to the members within seven days.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that one MoU was signed on 10th December 2018 and what they could do of that. She further pointed out that why names of persons figure there and such a clause should be changed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has taken it very seriously and he has removed the names from there. If she wanted to check the same, she could check it.

Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that the name of any person should not figure there.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that being Chairman of this August House, he reiterated that if there is any confusion regarding resolved part, they could meet the Registrar and see the Videography and could also bring it to his notice. He asked the Registrar to tell Professor Rajesh Gill about the second issue.

The members were briefed about the MoU.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it was done in December 2018, the date of which has been mentioned in the documents which was handed over to her.

It was informed that the MoU has not yet been finalized.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has already been executed in December 2018.

The members in one voice said that it should be revised.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not uttered a single word. He thought that the Vice-Chancellor could say something. He pointed out that they should take the responsibility of the issues, which does not relate to them and later on when the Vice Chancellor is summoned, it hurts. Why they are taking the responsibility which is not of them? The question of the Vice-Chancellor is that there is a College Management, Principal as they are independent units and why they are involving them. The Act Against Sexual Harassment is a law of the land; it is equally applicable to all the Universities and Colleges or any establishment of the country. It is desirable and advisable that these institutions are affiliated institutions of the University and the University has to ensure that all the legal formalities are completed at the time of affiliation, as the University checked legal formalities regarding ownership of the land, etc. Endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, he said that to constitute Internal Complaint Committee is the responsibility of the concerned College. In such cases, the employer might be the Management in the case of Principal and the Principal in the case of other employees of the College. There is no role of the Vice Chancellor as well as of the University. Why the Vice-Chancellor is summoned? The University is writing letters to them again and again and the aggrieved party is also sending letters to the University, but the University did not respond. The aggrieved person again complained that neither the College nor the University. That was why, the Vice Chancellor is being summoned. If they send a letter at the first stage that it is not in the purview of the University and it is a matter to be dealt with at the level of the Management of the College, the same letter has to be kept in the record, and then how could they summon him (Vice Chancellor)? Tomorrow, they could say that they had written a letter to the Chief Justice of Punjab & Haryana High Court and also say that they had written a letter to the President of India, could they summon them? He suggested that a letter from the University should go that the University is nowhere in the picture, as per the provisions of the Act, it is the responsibility of the College to deal with such case. As an affiliating Body, they have to ensure that a Committee is constituted by the Colleges as per the provision of the Act. However, he is disagreed with the statement made by the Dean, College Development Council that ICC exists in most of the Colleges. In fact, ICC did not exist in most of the Colleges. It is because nobody understands the importance of ICC. It existed only in conversation. As University, they must guide the affiliated Colleges and put it in the guidelines that the Colleges should form ICC as per the guidelines so that the Colleges do not face any difficulty at the hands of the Statutory Bodies. It should be clearly mentioned in the brochure/prospectus of the College and compliance must be sent to the University in this regard. Now, what is happening is that when nobody pays any heed to their complaint, they approach to the University. The impression is that when Management is not hearing their concern, as a Statutory Body, they approach the University, which is not bad. When there is a complaint against the Principal of the College, they approach the Vice-Chancellor and when there is a complaint against the President of the Managing Committee, all these things are inbuilt in the Act and they should not discuss it. Everything is described in the Act. Where ICC is to be formed, is also mentioned in the Act and its constitution is also described. If it is not in their purview, even then they could send a Committee to look into the issue. When they send a Committee, its reference is quoted and it was alleged that the Committee did not submit

its report, and if the Committee submitted its report, the Vice-Chancellor did not act. If they call the Vice Chancellor, they cannot say that this is not their duty. But the second thing is that Professor Karamjeet Singh has said that they were thinking that a dangerous statement might not come, but the same had come, in spite of the fact that he wanted to caution that they officially could not say that six months back an item was placed before the Syndicate but Syndicate had not taken any decision on it. The same was said by the Registrar. He has said that the members could come and see the C.D. to verify as to what has been resolved. Meaning thereby, it has been confessed that no decision has been taken on that particular item. If this thing goes outside that such a serious issue was placed before the Syndicate and Syndicate had not taken any decision, what would be the position. Actually what had happened is that neither Professor Karamjeet Singh nor the person whom he assigned the responsibility to cross-check was present in that meeting? He wondered why this work has not been assigned to the person who had attended the meeting and who could understand the spirit as well. Item was placed to consider the complaint and its decision was taken within one minute, except one person who said that it should not be sent to the Chancellor and decided here only, all others were of the opinion that it should be sent to the Chancellor. Only within 20 seconds the item was clinched and the Vice-Chancellor said that such complaints and court cases should be resolved. The issue which was not on the agenda, was discussed at length and it was decided that the item be placed before the Syndicate in one of its next meetings. Since the matter was not on the agenda and the item was clinched within no time, the office could not understand because at that time the Deputy Registrar (General) who is actually the custodian of the minutes was not present in the meeting. So, he did not know what actually happened in the meeting and the people, who recorded the minutes, did not know till the Vice-Chancellor give any ruling that alright it has to be sent there. The members of the Syndicate under *bona fide* plea understood that the decision in respect of this item was made to send the complaint to the Chancellor's Office. So far as second issue is concerned, it was decided that since the item is not on the agenda, an item be brought to the Syndicate in one of its next meetings. Not envisaging that after six months the office would say that nothing was resolved. He was of the view that they have to take a cautious decision that apart from what has been discussed, they should have to say what has been resolved. That is very unfortunate in the University that they say what is resolved. According to him, the resolved part should be understood from the discussion part. Madam (Professor Rajesh Gill) asked as to what has been resolved regarding MoU item of December 2018 meeting. Instead of correcting the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate held in December 2018, which were recorded wrongly and how it is to be amended, they say from future, they will look into it. What is to be amended is that in future all the MoUs will be in the Ex-Officio capacity, and any such MoU which has already been entered into prior to today's decision, necessary amendment be made so that MoU should remain intact. This should be recorded as such. Actually, this was the spirit of the decision in the last Syndicate meeting also. Now, Professor Karamjeet Singh has read out, they heard it and they were satisfied that what they wanted, the same was done. But, what he has written, written as per his profession and later on it was found that what they were discussing in the month of March 2019, had already been decided in December 2018. They have the right to be wiser every day. If they have committed any mistake, it should be corrected. The second thing about which Professor Karamjeet Singh was telling, the same issue has been discussed with him (Vice-Chancellor) by him and as of today, in the case of the University, the former Registrar by way of an affidavit has taken a stand in his reply that Vice-Chancellor is subordinate to Syndicate and Senate. The same Registrar who before quitting was giving some other reply on behalf of the University and after quitting the post, in his personal capacity has filed this reply. Now this reply unless and until, of course, if it is acceptable that Vice-Chancellor is subordinate to Syndicate and Senate, then the matter will be resolved and if it is not then they have to undo what has been done in the Court. He apprehended these things then why it had been discussed in the Senate and there the Vice-Chancellor had said that a Committee of two members

to be formed and after taking all input, they would decide in the matter. But unfortunately what has been resolved there, he did not know. The Committee had already submitted its report and accordingly given some recommendations. Those recommendations are still to be followed. His request is that it should be resolved that as per the decision taken in September 2018 meeting and as per the recommendations of the Committee, necessary steps as suggested be taken to safeguard the interest of the University and also the institution of the respective offices of the University. It should also be recorded. He was of the view that if they are cautious enough then there is no need to see C.D., etc.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is all confusion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have decided that a circular should go in this regard to all the affiliated Colleges and he sought suggestion in this regard from the members.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been brought to their notice that the Internal Complaints Committees, as per Sexual Harassment Act, are not invoke/not in existence in all the affiliated Colleges of the University, in this connection their attention is brought to the provision of Sexual Harassment Act, according to which all the Colleges are mandated to form the Internal Complaint Committee to deal with any complaints, at any future day, so that the College does not face any punitive/panel action at the hands of the Statutory authorities in the country including the University.

The Vice-Chancellor surprisingly said including the University. He further said that the wording including the University should be left.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Colleges do not form Internal Complaint Committees in spite of this, then the University can take action against such Colleges.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that this line should be separated.

Intervening Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that punitive/penal action will be taken against such Colleges by the statutory authorities in the country including the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that punitive/panel action shall be taken as per the Act and University can take action against the College as per Regulation 11.1. These things are mandated in the College as per the Act but the Colleges do not do so. If the Colleges do not follow the provisions of the Sexual Harassment Act or things mandated in the affiliated Colleges as the provisions of University Calendar, then the University can say, 'Why the College should not be disaffiliated?'

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that all in negative should not be written.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was not asking to write anything in negative, he was only elaborating.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was saying that the Colleges have not formed the Internal Complaints Committee (ICC). He suggested him to give all these suggestions, in writing, in a simple language so that it could be communicated to the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should delete the word University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Colleges cannot be heard.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

To this, Vice-Chancellor said that they should hear the Colleges.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that Colleges cannot be heard in respect of such cases/complaints and they have to form the ICCs and they are bound to follow it. Tomorrow they act according to this Committee or not, the Colleges would give reply for this. He is explaining only and not asking to write in this way.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that Committee to hear Grievances of Women, which is available on U.G.C. website.

To this, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said, "No, No". He further said that the name of the Committee should be checked before sending a circular to the affiliated Colleges, whether it is Sexual Harassment Committee or with some other name.

The members in one voice said that it is available on U.G.C.'s website and they suggested the DCDC to see it at his own level and thereafter issue a circular to the affiliated Colleges in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not take any decision in hurry.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that before sending such circular to the affiliated Colleges, they should seek legal opinion from the Legal Cell.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be noted.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that a letter in this regard had already been sent to the affiliated Colleges.

Endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that they had already submitted the appropriate reply in the University.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Shri Ashok Goyal has already explained everything and now he would not look nice to speak on this issue. There are two issues in the Colleges, it is clearly mentioned regarding representatives in such and such number and in such and such Committees but the practical position in the Colleges is different. The Principal of the College is playing the dominant part in the Management, election procedure is defined but they do not do so. The University had written a letter to the affiliated Colleges in the past and he had a copy of that, this letter was sent to 190 Colleges. Now-a-days too much work is being done in this direction and "Me Too" App has also come. He was of the view that the right of the persons/employees working in the Colleges to approach to the University for their grievance should not be snatched from them. He was saying this that they have no other way out such as to take legal action or to approach the Courts etc. is very difficult for them. The affiliation of the Colleges is such a rider by which there is always a fear in the mind of the Principal or Management of the affiliated Colleges that the University can take action against them. He said that as there is a PUCASH in the University, a statutory body should function here so that a rider should be there and the Colleges should be inclined so that there should be a rider on the affiliated Colleges. Out of 190 affiliated Colleges, there are 130 Colleges of Girls only and the right of the employees of the affiliated Colleges to approach to the University should be open and it should not be shut.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is okay and the University will not do so.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that system should be kept silent. He said that action would be taken but there is no need to write it in the circular letter.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they should be very clear in their thought and there should not be any confusion before sending such circular to the Colleges.

Some of the members said that a Committee should be constituted in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that is it very bad and now they are sitting mum, what is the *goal mall*. He said that he will send them in the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why members and Madam are sitting mum as they are all know everything in this regard. They are all of the view that the stick of the University should be hanged over their head to create fear in their mind, but it should not be used.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is always with the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when any complaint is received from the affiliated College, fact finding should be sent, but not to treat complaint under this Act. It should be fact finding and not a complaint against sexual harassment.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Ashok Goyal that one time he elaborate the thing in a very clear cut position but at the same time turned them in other direction.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was telling about the viewpoint of other members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he should express his own views and he does not need to tell views of other members.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has already explained her views.

The members by laughing said that the Vice-Chancellor sahib now understands very well.

Shri Sandeep Singh said '*Panchan da faisla ser mathe but patnala uthe da uthe*' meaning thereby that they are ready to follow the decision taken by the members and not ready to adopt it.

The Vice-Chancellor said Professor Rajesh Gill to give her viewpoint in this regard.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill said that she is expressing her happiness that the Vice-Chancellor is asking her to express her viewpoints.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this issue is concluded by Madam (Professor Rajesh Gill) and not by Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Shri Ashok Goyal has already expressed his viewpoints.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they have to go to the Colleges as per that Act ensuring them that Committee should be formed in the Colleges as per that Act and in spite of that if no action has been taken by the affiliated Colleges in this direction and thereafter if any complaint of such nature is received in the University, then the University has every right to interfere in the matter and take action against that College as per the provisions of this Act. He suggested that they have to move legally as per this act; otherwise the proceedings would be wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University has every right to interfere in such cases.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that when it is the responsibility of the University to implement U.G.C. rules and regulations in the affiliated Colleges, then it is also the responsibility of the University to implement this Act in the Colleges as well. Endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, he said that the rider of the University should be there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it should be there.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the conclusion has reached at the same position. Earlier, they said that they have nothing to do in the matter of the affiliated Colleges related to Sexual Harassment Act. But now they say that the rider of the University should be there. He said that the rider of the University should be there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when he said earlier that to avoid any punitive/penal action at the hands of the statutory authorities in the country including the University, then they said that the word University should be deleted. He said that same thing at that time.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it was the same thing that no one asks the University in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should understand that the University at least did not send the cases to the Chancellor's Office, P.M.O. However, the College people became so aggrieved that they make several complaints to the office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the provisions of this Act, University cannot act as an Appellant Authority but can take steps for its implementation in the Colleges and if the Colleges do not implement it, then it attract punitive/penal action. In such cases, they could write to them that they are not abiding the law of the land and the position of the University is embarrassed and why not punitive/penal action is taken against them.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to conclude this issue.

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar suggested that they (Syndicate members) would interfere for the implementation of this Act in the affiliated Colleges. They say many things to the Colleges to implement but later on all come to the Syndicate and Senate for its proper implementation. They cannot run away from their responsibility. The rider of the University should be there for the safety of the College and to safeguard the interests of the faculty of the Colleges; otherwise, the position of the faculty is very miserable. Their responsibility is to safeguard the interests of the teachers of the Colleges. They are not with any Principal, who harassed the teachers. This is their clear *funda*.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that in the definition of this Act it is clearly written that it is the responsibility of the employer. In some cases it is direct employer such as Management/Principal of the College and it is also written the bodies who administers or make policies also came in the category of employers, but categorically it is not mentioned the name of the University. He was of the view that the University rider should be there to implement this Sexual Harassment Act.

The Vice-Chancellor said that University cannot be an employer.

Dr. K.K. Sharma clarified that all knew that Management of the Colleges are the employers, but he was just saying that they should be inclusive for the implementation of this Act (Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013).

One the issue of resolved part as pointed out by Shri Ashok Goyal earlier during discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that on this issue a very lengthy discussion took place and at some point of time, it was looked during the discussion that they have resolved. The perception of someone should be that they have decided and at the same time the perception of someone else is that they have not decided anything yet. The perception of both of them (Mr. Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal) was that it was resolved at that time that the case should be sent to the Chancellor's Office. He was of the view that all the time it is not possible to finally dictate/tell the resolved part.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee which has already been constituted for this purpose will see that angle also and sent the issue for objection then it would be clear.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that it would go for objection.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the members to authorize the Registrar to call any two members of the Syndicate to verify the resolved parts.

The members in one voice said that there should be any three members of the Syndicate instead of two.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier this issue had come in the house and two-members were assigned this task. Now, the Vice Chancellor is giving some other proposal which could be better than that. Now he is giving suggestion?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not give suggestion. He said that Shri Ashok Goyal is saying why he is giving suggestion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not said why. He asked the Vice-Chancellor to tell how it is better than that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he will tell only if they allow him to speak.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is the duty of the three persons to see what actually has been resolved and they sit in the meeting that it could not be missed. If they ask out of the blow, the member may not be able to tell exactly, in spite of the fact he/she is sitting in the meeting. She was of the view that these people should be very careful throughout the meeting to note the resolved part and if there is any doubt, they can ask about it so that there could not be anything miss out. If anybody is called, then problem will remain the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is going to tell about this and what would be the benefit of calling them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they authorise two-three persons as suggested by Professor Rajesh Gill, they would not be serious, which would not be better.

The Vice-Chancellor further stated that they should authorise the Registrar to call two-three persons/members of the Syndicate for this purpose. He shared his experience with the House that he was new in the system of the Panjab University and he has called one-two members of the Syndicate/Senate for this purpose. He wanted that he should come and see all the things. When he called him (Shri Ashok Goyal), he

has very clearly said that he can check only the resolved parts and he has not enough time to see the proceedings in detail. Some of the members raised objection that every time he is calling the same person/s by saying that it is very wrong practice. On the other hand, one academician said that it is a mockery. He is a Chairman of this House and he is an executive. Where he should go? He has already done the experiment and he saw all are serious in this regard. When any decision is taken here none can run away from the responsibility. The decision is taken as a decision of the Syndicate and as Syndicate resolved and not written the name of any person/member. He has put forward a straight request to the members that they should put faith in every body and should have faith on each other. He was of the view that every person should be given opportunity. Things came here in this house by passing through many hands and also come here from the Managements of the affiliated Colleges. Now he has opened the window for the Chairpersons of the Managements and Principals of affiliated College, if they have any type of problem, they can come and meet him directly. If any faculty member has a problem, he/she can also come and meet him after waiting for some time. If they have to work in a democratic way, then they have to do all such things. He is fully agreed with the views of Shri Ashok Goyal which he has said many times clearly in the House that the Calendars/Act of the University is its Geeta and Bible and they should work according to them and if they deviate from there and go in a undemocratic way, no, it is not the intension of anybody. It should be for the betterment of the University and if any person/s from the University approaches him, then he has to hear his/her grievances. He has no other apprehension and he would not like to hear all such things and why he should hear.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all persons are sitting here and all decisions are being taken here and the persons sitting here authorised three persons out of them. If they call three persons out of them to vet the minutes then who would complaint for this, he did not understand this thing. Now tell him from where this problem will arise.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is saying why to call these three persons.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that then call all the fifteen members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that then they should look into.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no problem.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that if they do not call any member then they should prepare the minutes as early as possible.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired that they do not sent the tentative minutes.

It was replied that tentative minutes are being sent to the members of the Syndicate and fifteen days time is also given to them to point out any change.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is confusing two things.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to work by taking the members of the Syndicate and Senate together.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then call any three members of the Senate to vet the minutes.

The Vice-Chancellor told Shri Ashok Goyal that he is becoming rigid.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice-Chancellor says this thing then he would leave the meeting and go. He further said that he is saying that few members raised objection why to call such members only. Now, when all the members of the Syndicate authorizing these three persons then who will raise the objection. He did not understand who is showing the rigid attitude. There are two issues, one is of tentative minutes and other is of resolved parts. It will take time to prepare tentative minutes and it will reach to the members after one month or so and then fifteen days time is given to the members to point out if there is any discrepancy. To solve this problem, it was decided that resolved parts should circulate to the members after vetting within 7-10 days of the meeting to point out any discrepancy so that there cannot be any type of problem in following or implementing them. Now, they are trying to confuse between resolved parts and tentative minutes. For tentative minutes fifteen days time is given to file objections. Now by using the distrust or mistrust said by the staff or by the Registrar, probably is not in good taste. If it amounts to distrust, alright, let the Vice-Chancellor take the responsibility or let the Registrar take the responsibility that the minutes are verbatim as per the discussion took place, then there is no need of vetting. It is being done only to help the office or to smoothen the functioning of the office. Sometime there is heart burning why this person is called or why that person is called for translating the minutes. Sometime it is said mistrust or distrust. They should not use these words. Now the people who are concerned with this issue, all are saying that these three persons will bet the minutes. Now they are raising objection to it. To avoid all such things, they have given autonomy to the Registrar to call these three persons for vetting the minutes. If the Registrar calls him, he would not be able to tell anything. He has suggested the names of three University Professors for this purpose.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are five members on the Syndicate from Chandigarh.

One of the members of the House suggested that all these five members should be called for vetting of the minutes.

Professor S.K. Sharma said it will not be possible for him as he is residing far away.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are quoting the examples of affiliated Colleges that they are not following the mandatory provisions and due to that there is summoning of University authority. On the other hand, the complaint is pending in the University from the last six months and if it goes out and its responsibility will fall on the Vice-Chancellor. But they do not want the Vice-Chancellor to be trapped in this. His responsibility is that the Vice-Chancellor might not be implicated in unnecessary issues.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that as far as resolved parts are concerned, the Registrar is responsible for that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they try to help him, they take its meaning otherwise.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he respect your concern.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has used three words for him, one is discrimination, rigid and distrust.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these words are not used for him.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the word rigid is used for him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is again saying that rigid word is used for him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not rigid but when any decision is taken here and which is not in the interest of the University then he would say that he is not party to that decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he will give an opportunity to him to speak on the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if all the members have given their consent on some issue and according to him, it is not in the interest of the University, then he will not be party to such decisions.

Shri Sandeep Singh requested the Vice-Chancellor to resolve the issue as much time has already been passed and agenda items are still to be discussed. If the Vice Chancellor could do it, it is okay. If it is not required, then leave it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he could not do everything.

Shri Sandeep Singh said if the Registrar could do it, it is okay. In case it is not required, it should be left.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not mind, they could call any ten persons or any number of persons.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the Vice Chancellor should do it the way he likes.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the concern of all of them is that the resolved parts should be recorded correctly and sent to them in time. One suggestion is that the resolved parts be got checked from a Committee. The second suggestion is that Professor Navdeep Goyal or Shri Ashok Goyal should dictate the resolved so that it could be recorded. If there remains a discrepancy, the Registrar should be accountable for that. Suppose, there are 20 items, Shri Ashok Goyal or Professor Rajesh Gill or anybody else could dictate the resolved parts. He reiterated that the concern of each one of them is that the recording should be done properly, at least the resolved parts, to which the Vice Chancellor said that the recording is done properly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, keeping in view the concerns of the Vice Chancellor, there is another solution for this. The Vice Chancellor would agree to it that till the time the minutes are finalized, no follow up action could be taken. Therefore, let it be resolved that till the minutes of the Syndicate are finalized, the decisions would not be implemented. Then they could themselves see the University would get into a lot of problem.

The Vice Chancellor said, had he (Shri Ashok Goyal) undertaken the responsibility to correct the minutes, they would not have to spend so much time on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he is entrusted with job, he may not find time to do it, then he (Vice Chancellor) would say that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is not coming to correct the minutes.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would not call him (Shri Ashok Goyal) only, anybody could come.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that two suggestions have come up to resolve this issue. One of which was that three local persons could vet the minutes. The basic

intention is that the resolved parts should be correct. The Registrar has said that after discussing the item, they jump to the next item without knowing as to what decision has been taken on the item under consideration. It has been said that the decision be narrated by anyone of the members. He suggested that instead of this, the Registrar should narrate the decision, if any member has objection, he could get it vetted. Once the resolved parts are finalized, there would be no need to call any person for this purpose.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) has stated that the Registrar would narrate the resolved part. This is what they have been repeating again and again. He (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) is also saying that they used to jump to the other item without finalizing the resolved part.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they should not jump to the next item until the resolved part of the item under consideration is finalized.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Registrar to recite the resolved part taken on the issue of Memorandum of Understanding in the last meeting as he (Registrar) has said that the same resolved part had been recorded which he has written in his note book. First, he would like to tell that the he (Registrar) has not recited the resolved part, he (Registrar) has just written it. It was written that the MoU would be signed in the ex-officio capacity and not in the name of any individual. It has not been written that while discussing that this MoU has already been signed and accordingly the resolved part was prepared. He thinks that the Registrar might have written that the MoU should be signed in the ex-officio capacity. He asked, in whose ex-officio capacity? The ex-officio could be the Chairperson of the Department, the Vice Chancellor or the Registrar. He (Registrar) has written the word 'ex-officio' but in the detailed discussion which took place, it was said that if the MoU is being signed by the Chairperson of the Department, the ex-officio is Chairperson, if it is signed by the Vice Chancellor, the ex-officio is Vice Chancellor and if it is signed by the Registrar, the ex-officio is the Registrar. He clarified that ex-officio means by designation and not by name. At that time, it was thought that everybody has understood it. Now, as the Vice Chancellor says, it is alright, it is considered that something has been agreed to. By chance, it has not been written that this and this is resolved and after that it was considered that no decision was taken. In the issue of complaint, the same thing happened. The C.D. of recording of the proceedings was seen by those who were not present in the meeting and they say that nothing was spoken about the resolved part.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that to resolve the concerns of everybody, let the resolved parts should be narrated by the Registrar and the members should agree to it. In this way, neither there would be any need to call any person nor they have to do anything else. The resolved part should be finalized here itself after the discussion before they go to the next item.

The Vice Chancellor said that the resolved part would be repeated twice.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said it would be better if the resolved parts are also emailed to the members.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said if they started emailing the minutes, it would again be a problem. They should resolve each and everything here.

Dr. K.K. Sharma and Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the resolved parts should be narrated by the Registrar in the meeting itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if the resolved parts are narrated here itself and okayed by the members, then there is no need to call for objections. This was also endorsed by Shri Jagdeep Kumar.

The Vice Chancellor said, thus, this issue stand resolved and the Registrar would narrate the resolved parts here itself.

The members requested to narrate the resolved part of the current issue under discussion.

It was said that after discussion on the item, the resolved part would be read out to the members, to which the Vice Chancellor said that the resolved part would be narrated by the Registrar twice. Three decisions have been taken and still he (Registrar) has no clarity on two of them, so he would like to know these from them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that everything has been discussed, but the person, who has to record the minutes, did not have the clarity so far. Now they would go to the next item, then what he (Registrar) would record, to which the Registrar said that this is what he was saying. Shri Ashok Goyal again said that this is what they were saying that sometimes there is no clarity on some issues, so they should not make accountable only the Registrar and 3-4 persons could be associated with this task.

The Vice Chancellor said that now he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has again reverted back to the previous thing. It has already been agreed to that the resolved parts would be narrated twice here itself. Let the Registrar do it. If there is some confusion, they could see to it again.

It was informed that the three issues which have been discussed after the Vice Chancellor's Statement. One issue is that of Grievances Cell relating to Internal Complaint Committee for which the Dean College Development Council should be authorised to look into the issue.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that he (Registrar) should narrate the resolved part.

Professor Rajat Sandhir asked, first of all, it should be told by whom the information regarding Vice Chancellor's Statement has to be taken, whether it is IQAC or the Dean Reserch.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that a copy of the achievements for inclusion in the Vice Chancellor's Statement should also be sent to the Secretary to Vice Chancellor.

It was informed that with regard to the Vice Chancellor's Statement, a circular would be issued to all the Departments/Principals of the affiliated Colleges requesting them to send the information with regard to the achievements by the faculty members to the IQAC, Dean Research and Secretary to Vice Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should send the letter to the IQAC with a copy to the Dean Research and Secretary to Vice Chancellor. The responsibility to take action on the information so received should be put on the IQAC.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the email address of IQAC should be mentioned in the circular to be issued to the Chairpersons of the Departments and Principals of the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor asked if it is okay to all of them, to which the members nodded in the affirmative.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Registrar has said that now the information should be sent to the IQAC, Dean Research and Secretary to Vice Chancellor.

It was clarified that the with regard to the achievements, main letter be sent by the Chairpersons of the Departments and Principals of the Affiliated Colleges to the IQAC and a copy thereof be sent to the Dean Research and Secretary to Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the nodal point is the Registrar. Basically, the idea was to include the whole information in the Vice Chancellor's Statement. If it could be controlled from the office of the Secretary to Vice Chancellor or the IQAC, it would be a very good thing. But, they have to be asked to put up the information to the Vice Chancellor immediately after its receipt so that the same could be included in the Vice Chancellor's Statement for the next meeting of the Syndicate and the Senate as the case may be. In order to do this, a circular be issued. It be further resolved that anyone out of the three offices mentioned above should be asked that immediately after the receipt of the information, it would be put up to the Vice Chancellor, so that the achievement which deserved to be included, could be included in the Vice Chancellor's Statement for the next meeting of the Syndicate and Senate, as the case may be.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the words 'the information deserved to be included' are very subjective and they would get lot of information. The people who would become the members of Board of Studies, etc. would also start sending the information for inclusion in the Vice Chancellor's Statement.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is right what Professor Rajesh Gill has said and requested the members to simplify it.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they started to include each and every information in the Vice Chancellor's Statement, the Vice Chancellor's Statement would run into many pages.

Shri Ashok Goyal said in this way, as stated by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, the useless information would get placed in the Vice Chancellor's Statement and the persons who would not be aware of it, their real and deserving achievements would not get placed in the Vice Chancellor's Statement. That is why, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua has said that whatever information, they are getting, is alright. So, they have to make the criteria as to what information should be the part of the Vice Chancellor's Statement. Though it seems a bit odd to say, nowadays the condolences of father-in-law of so and so are also coming in the Vice Chancellor's Statement. People would start sending information if one is given award even by a Panchayat.

Many members opined that the people would start sending even a very small thing for inclusion in the Vice Chancellor's Statement, which would create a lot of problem.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there should be one nodal Officer, which should be the Registrar. They should prepare the guidelines to determine as to what sort of information could be included in the Vice Chancellor's Statement.

Dr. K.K. Sharma suggested that let the system work as it is working.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that everything is not supposed to come to the Syndicate in the Vice Chancellor's statement. Let they be asked to send it to the IQAC. However, the criteria should be evolved.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the system work as it is. Information regarding achievement of faculty members/department/ College should be sent to the IQAC with a copy to Dean Research, SVC and the Registrar for information and necessary action.

It was informed that from the discussion they have come to the conclusion that a communication would be sent by the Dean, College Development Council to the University teaching department as well as to the affiliated colleges that the Internal Complaint Committee (ICC) be constituted as per the provision of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. The other terms and conditions would be mentioned in the communication.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the colleges charge a sum of Rs.2040/- from each student for paying retiral benefits to the teachers. A letter in this regard had been sent to the colleges in the year 2017 after the decision of the Syndicate. Though the colleges charged this amount from each and every student, the management did not pay retiral benefits to the teachers. The colleges also did not send record relating to this to the University, in spite of the fact that the University had sought the same.

Professor Rajat Sandhir pointed out that Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma had suggested that it should be made a part of the prospectus, but nothing has been said about it.

It was clarified that it has already been said that the other things would be mentioned in the letter to be sent by the Dean, College Development Council.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to show the letter to a couple of members, who are easily available at that time. Since the issue related to women, the letter should be shown to Professor Rajesh Gill.

It was said that the second issue is relating to the MoUs, which has two components. On one issue, advice is to be taken from the Hon'ble members. However, for future, it is clear that the MoUs would be executed in ex-officio capacity and not in personal capacity. The MoUs, which had already been signed, advice from the Hon'ble members is required as to what would be the procedure to amend/revise the MoUs.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that now they have come to the conclusion/resolved part of the discussion, which had taken place so far. They have said that the MoUs signed/executed in personal capacity would be amended. So far as amendment of MoUs is concerned, the procedure could be decided by the University authorities, either through a Committee or some other mechanism. Today's resolved part is that the MoUs signed/executed in personal capacity be amended.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that for the MoUs, which have already been signed/executed, they could also execute a supplementary to them.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to read out the resolved part, which had come. There are four resolved parts and one of them is "that Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Nottingham Trent University and Panjab University, Chandigarh, be extended w.e.f. December 2018 to December 2023 to explore future collaboration between Nottingham Business School of Nottingham Trent University and University Business School of Panjab University", which in itself is a problematic.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the meeting of the Syndicate was held in the month of February 2019 and the decision had been taken that the MoU be extended from December 2018.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that first all, this is the problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that this is not the problem because the MoU was signed in the month of December 2018, that was why, they were taking the decision, but while taking the decision they are saying that the names of individuals would not be there. In fact, a decision was taken last time that the MoUs would not be in individual capacity and instead the same would be in ex-officio capacity, which amounted to the fact that amendment is required in them, but the same has not been noted.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is another point that the check list of 2019 had been signed by the Coordinator. How could they undo that?

The Vice Chancellor said that they should think as to how the MoUs, which have been signed/executed in personal capacity, could be amended.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that it has also not been mentioned in the terms and conditions that who would bear the expenses incurred by the students and teachers when they visit each others' Institute/University under the exchange programmes. From where the funding for this purpose would be met? This was the information, which she had sought from the Registrar, and some of the information has been provided by the Registrar to her. The former Vice Chancellor and other persons had visited certain Universities/ Institutes in abroad, their visits have been funded by the British Council, United Kingdom. How it had been done under the MoU, she did not know? Moreover, in the note prepared by the Coordinator, it has been written that in February 2018, Professor Arun Kumar Grover, former Vice Chancellor, visited Nottingham Trent University (NTU) as part of his farewell tour to the United Kingdom. She has not been able to understand it. This is their University (Panjab University) and not a shop of an individual that the funds are wasted in such a manner. If this MoU went out in public domain, the image of Panjab University would get tarnished very badly.

The Vice Chancellor said that the question is how to correct it.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is only a damage control, which should be done at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should tell him as to how it could be rectified.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that an update mail should be sent to the concerned agency that such and such would be their Nodal Officer.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since it is a decision of the Syndicate, naturally, its implementation would be the way as suggested by Professor Rajat Sandhir.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he had also sought information as to what work has been done under the MoUs, which had been signed/executed by the Panjab University so far. He urged that said information should be provided to him at the earliest.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there is always a provision in every MoU that if one agency wanted to make certain changes, it could write to the other agency for consent. Hence, as suggested by Professor Rajat Sandhir, they could write that in view of the Syndicate decision, the new Nodal Officer would be such and such.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since none of the parties would be at loss, this could be easily done.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that since the MoUs had been executed with Panjab University, Panjab University should be the nodal agency.

The Vice Chancellor said that in Banaras Hindu University (BHU), Varanasi, the system of signing/execution of MoUs is very structured. He is trying to bring that model to this University. The model is that the Registrar is the custodian of the University. Whenever any MoU would be executed by the University, it would be signed by the Registrar, Panjab University. Who would be the signatory on the other side, did not matter. In the MoUs, the Vice Chancellor did not come anywhere. In BHU, the Department to which the MoU is related to, the Head of the Department is taken as a witness. In this manner, they get signatures of three persons on the MoUs and the system is in place since long, and even the legal vetting has also been got done. He is thinking for adopting the same model here in Panjab University. Since here an important component is Dean Research, he is thinking that wherever necessary the Dean Research would also be made a party to it. However, the final decision in this regard would be taken later on.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that since the MoUs involved a lot of inputs, there should be a nodal person to coordinate the delegations coming from abroad, etc. Registrar should be the signatory to the MoUs and the Dean Research should be there to coordinate the activities. The problem arises when the report for NAAC, etc. is to be prepared, which could be solved if the report is prepared by the IQAC with the help of Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue regarding keeping the Dean Research in loop is still open. Whether they wanted to retain the Dean Research as and when required or retain him permanently?

Professor S.K. Sharma said that once he had brought MoUs. He had a very bad experience when the person from Florida University came here; however, one hour before the signing of MoU, the then Dean Research told him that they would not be able to sign the MoU. In foreign Universities, there is a post of Dean International Relations, who coordinated all such activities. When they had signed an MoU with University of Florida with the Energy Centre of Panjab University, one of the conditions was that whenever the students of University of Florida would visit Panjab University, they would pay \$ 5,000 per student to the Panjab University and the teacher(s) of Panjab University, who would go there, would get money from the fund so collected. He suggested that such a provision should be incorporated in each and every MoU; otherwise, these are of no use.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Professor S.K. Sharma) has talked about two components, i.e., Panjab University and another University/Institute. They did not have control on the person visiting from the other University/Institute. Their only concern should be as to who would be the signatory from their University. If they imposed any condition on them, they might land into a problem.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that in order to coordinate the activities, the Dean Research should be involved in the MoUs.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar remarked that he (Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan) would be annoyed as he is a man from the Management.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that he would like to say that whenever any proposal is made for assessment by the NAAC, the same is always finalized through the IQAC. As such, if the Director, IQAC, is made a part of it, it would be better.

The Vice Chancellor said that signatories and making different persons a part of the MoU are two separate things.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan clarified that he is not talking about the signatories, but supplementing what Professor Rajat Sandhir has suggested.

The Vice Chancellor said that anyone could be a part of it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, in fact, they had started to decide impromptly. It would be better if first the proposal is brought, discuss threadbare and then decided; otherwise, they would not reach at a proper decision.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to just point out that the MoUs are of two types – (i) one between with one particular Department; and (ii) another between multi-Departments. As such, they need to think differently for them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at the moment they were talking about the signing of the MoUs and not discussing that such and such should be involved. What has been said by the Vice Chancellor, actually that model existed here also and the Registrar used to sign the MoUs because as per Panjab University Act and the Regulations, the Registrar, in fact, is the one, who represents the University. How somebody else is signing the MoUs, is beyond his understanding. Since it had been approved by the Syndicate, he could not escape from the responsibility even though it is beyond him. The MoUs should actually be signed by the Registrar. The next step is, as to who should be the custodian/responsible for the MoUs. Whether it is to be taken care of by the department concerned, Dean Research or a Committee is to be decided later on. It did not come into the picture at the time of signing of MoUs. So far as witness/es is concerned, minimum witness is one, but if they thought, they could have the provision of more than one witness to make them party to the MoU. However, at the moment they are talking only about the signatory of the MoUs. Secondly, the MoUs should not be person centric. The other guidelines could be framed later on.

It was informed that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Syndicate (18.2.2019) had been signed absolutely correctly. The entire process of relating to signing of MoU, which related to extension of MoU, was brought to the notice of the House. Hither to, the said MoU has not been signed by the Registrar. They have thought over the issue in depth and come to the conclusion that the proposal would be mooted by the Department concerned. Informally, they had also decided that in the case of MoUs relating to foreign countries; henceforth, the contact persons would be Dean, International Students though the signatory would be the Registrar. In future, the MoUs would be executed as to be decided by the Syndicate. So far as the MoUs, which had already been signed/executed, are concerned, the problem in the same would be solved through a Committee to be constituted for the purpose. In this way, they would re-examine each and every aspect of the matter.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that in the TIGRIS project, which amounted to crores of rupees, they have written that they did not know about it. Now, it is being said that the MoU related to the Chemistry would go to the Department of Chemistry, but it is not like that. One of the MoUs related to Food Security, other to Physics and another of Public Administration.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the custodian of MoUs is the IQAC. If they did not do like this, they would run into a trouble at the time of the NAAC visit.

It is was clarified that the concerned Department prepares the draft MoU, including the terms and conditions. So far as signatory is concerned, the signatory of the MoUs would be the Registrar. However, in the case of foreign MoUs, the contact

person would be the Dean, International Students. Thereafter, it would go to the IQAC. Whatsoever MoUs had been executed between the Panjab University and other Universities/Institutes, all went to the Dean Research.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the custodian of the MoUs should be IQAC.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that there is no post of Dean Foreign Relations. In Panjab University, there is a post of Dean International Students. He felt that for such type of MoUs (foreign MoUs), there is a need to have such a post, which would look after only this aspect, and the person concerned could coordinate with the Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is thinking for constituting a Committee, which would deliberate on it threadbare and bring an exhaustive proposal at the earliest and they must try that the proposal is approved in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

It was informed that now, it has been resolved that, in future, they would do this, and so far as the details are concerned, the same would be considered by a Committee to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor. The recommendations of the Committee would be placed before the Syndicate for consideration. So far as the issue raised by Shri Ashok Goyal relating to sexual harassment case is concerned, since the case is pending for the last about six months, though they had given their ruling, he (the then Registrar) could not write it down.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that so much constructive discussion had taken place and it had been resolved here, but owing to one reason or the other, it could not be noted down. What would have happened is that the minutes would have been recorded as such, and the situation would have arisen that nothing had been resolved on the issue. He is not holding anybody responsible.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that it is the practical reason.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though they had arrived at the decision that the pending complaint relating to sexual harassment, as per the earlier decision, be sent to the Chancellor as he is the employer of the then Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to repeat.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the pending complaint, without mentioning the name, against the then Vice Chancellor, be sent to the Chancellor, later being the employer of the Vice Chancellor.

On asking by the Vice Chancellor, the other members in one voice said, "Right Sir".

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if they did like this, the responsibility would not fall on the Vice Chancellor.

When Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma talked for obtaining legal opinion on the issue, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is saying so because there is no need for any legal opinion or for holding any formal discussion. Though the decision had already been taken, they have not followed the same.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the meeting of the Syndicate held in the month of September 2018, this decision was taken, but somehow or the other the same could not be recorded.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that was why, he had said that, without giving any reference, the pending complaint against the then Vice Chancellor be sent to the Chancellor. If that decision was not taken, the same has also been taken now and even if the decision was taken, the same has been reiterated because they did not want to come on record they had delayed the same and kept in their office.

The Vice Chancellor said that then it should not be got resolved. Where so much delayed had taken place?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since they have to send the complaint within a stipulated time, his only concern was that. In fact, the first complaint had come from the office of the Chancellor. As and when the complaint had come to them, they had taken the decision and it was also there that it should not be delayed and should be sent immediately. Since the Registrar had changed, the same could not be followed up and the letter could not be written. When the minutes were circulated to the members, he immediately pointed out the discrepancy and before that he asked whether the complaint has been sent to the Chancellor's Office, the office replied that it has not been recorded, whereas the same was resolved. Then he wrote a letter that it had been resolved and the complaint be sent to the Chancellor's Office. He (Registrar) saw the DVD and also shown to someone else and came to the conclusion that according to them it has not been resolved and the recording of the minutes has been done correctly. Now, the question arises if somebody ask a question that this item was placed before the Syndicate for consideration in the month of September, what decision was taken on the issue? Would the University say that no decision was taken? Now, to take care of the date, he is saying that if they resolve today and send the complaint to the Chancellor's Office tomorrow, then at least the problem of delay would not be there.

The Vice Chancellor said that delay has taken place.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is because the Syndicate has taken the decision today.

The Vice Chancellor said that why they did not sent the complaint to the Chancellor's Office earlier.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that since the University was in a fix about the decision taken by the Syndicate on the issue and the same has been clarified today. Without giving any reference, in view of the decision of the Syndicate being taken today, the complaint should be sent to the Chancellor's Office.

The Vice Chancellor said that the House discussed the issue in its September 2018 meeting and they are ratifying the same now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are referring to the decision of the Syndicate taken in its meeting held in the month of September 2018.

To this, the Vice Chancellor remarked, "Are they blind"?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are taking the decision today.

The Vice Chancellor said that the letter is of September 2018. Why the same has come to the Syndicate today? It might tarnish the image of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the Syndicate met in the month of September 2018, a letter which had come from the Ministry of Human Resource and Development (MHRD) and was in the custody of the University, was neither shown to the Syndicate and was also concealed from the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. They had

asked as to what is the reply to this, they only said that it has escaped from the attention. They have also the same reply that though it had come in the month of September and decision taken, the decision could not be recorded. It is better late than never. It remained pending because the decision could not be recorded. Now, it has been brought to their notice, they discussed, resolved and decided to send it to the Chancellor's Office.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are talking about the negligence on the part of the office, Registrar and the Vice Chancellor. September matter brought to the Syndicate today. He said that some way out to this should be told and the way out should be such that nobody is held responsible and the reply should be accepted without any ifs and buts.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the reference of both the meetings should be given. They should do like this that they discussed this issue in the Syndicate in its meeting held in the month of September 2018 and the Syndicate meeting dated 16.03.2019, and sent it to the Chancellor's Office. Clarifying he said that it should be recorded: Resolved that with reference to the discussion on the complaint of so and so in the meeting of the Syndicate held in September 2018 and the meeting of the Syndicate dated 16.03.2018, the complaint is being sent to the Chancellor for necessary action as the Chancellor is the employer of the accused against whom the complaint has been made.

The Vice Chancellor said that when it had been resolved by the Syndicate in the month of September, were they sleeping during the last six months?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the tentative minutes were circulated to the members, he pointed out that the minutes have been recorded wrongly.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired why did they not brought this to the Syndicate meeting held in the month of October 2018 or in the month of November 2018.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had pointed it out in the meeting of the Syndicate and they could verify it from the record.

The Vice-Chancellor said that why did they not get it resolved in the December 2018 meeting of the Syndicate?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wrote the letter in the month of December 2018.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what they are doing today, why it was not done at that time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was pointing it out by writing letter/s again and again to the Registrar as well as to the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to why the University was not doing it? He directed the Registrar and the Deputy Registrar (General) to bring all the relevant record and sit with them to sort out the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on the one hand, they are saying that they should not waste time and on the other hand, they are suggesting this. What they want to prove whether it was resolved that the complaint of sexual harassment relating to former Vice-Chancellor be sent to the Chancellor's Office, Chancellor being the employer of the former Vice-Chancellor or it was not resolved. Now, let they presume that it was not resolved. This is what he (Registrar) wanted to prove. Without wasting

time, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) concedes that it was not resolved, then what would be the situation.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what was resolved in the Syndicate in the month of September 2018, action was not taken on that. Shri Ashok Goyal wrote a letter, which was not taken into consideration. He again wrote a letter and the same was also not taken into consideration. In this way, six months elapsed. Why this has happened? Why it has not been taken into cognizance by the Panjab University authorities.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is the second issue, which has emerged. He suggested that in the first instance, the first issue should be resolved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not do that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Don't do that". Let them take a conscious decision that they would not send that complaint to the Chancellor's Office.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not do all this. They have to spend time on this issue – whether they call it wastage of time or utilization of time, it does not matter. They should sit together and sort out the issue, and should not run away.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, perhaps, he (Vice-Chancellor) is not understanding. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying that either decision in this regard has been taken in the September 2018 meeting of the Syndicate or has not been taken. If the decision had been taken, they had not implemented the same. However, if the decision had not been taken, what is to be done now? He has told that the reply to it is that with reference to the discussion in the meeting of September 2018 on the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor intervened to say that perhaps, he is unable to make them understand. What he meant to say is that what has been resolved and how it has been resolved, they should verify it from the records from September 2018 onwards. He would get it resolved today - what would be the wording and how it would be done. Maybe, a member had spoken on this issue and they are also able to get some input from the video recording. In this way, they would be able to write in a better way. He ensured that they would get it done today itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has already told that except one member, who had said that it should not be sent to the Chancellor, all other said that it should be sent to the Chancellor. Thereafter, he had prepared the transcript and sent the same to the University authorities.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to be frank, he is not remembering it.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired "Has he not received the transcript"? Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi had said...

The Vice-Chancellor intervened to again say that to be very frank, he is not remembering it at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would try to get him (Vice-Chancellor) remember. An item was brought to the Syndicate that this is the complaint and a letter has come from the office of the Chancellor. On that, all said in one voice that they had nothing to do with it and they could not even comment on it, it should be sent to the Chancellor and the issue got settled. Only one person said as to why it should be sent to the Chancellor, they would get it resolved here. All other said, "No, No, since his employer is the Chancellor, it should be sent to the Chancellor". The concern of the Vice-

Chancellor on that day was that this letter has been dealt with, but this issue, i.e., complaint of the girl against a boy, should also be got settled. Discussion started on that issue and thereafter, it was said on that, that this item is not on the agenda, the item on the agenda was only relating to the complaint along with the letter from the Chancellor's Office. Then it was resolved that this item should be brought to the Syndicate again. The original item, which was on the agenda, it was not written "Resolved: That this complaint be sent to the Chancellor. Further Resolved: That item relating to complaint against so and so be brought to the Syndicate". The recorded the resolved part relating to the issue, which was not on the agenda and the item which was on the agenda, nothing was mentioned about that in the resolved part. Now, the Vice-Chancellor might have remembered. Since no discussion took place on the issue, he is not remembering it. The other issue on which a lot of discussion took place, is in his memory.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now it should be told as to what is to be done.

It was informed that now they are going to resolve that the pending complaint, which is against the former Vice-Chancellor, would be sent to the Chancellor. The concern of the Vice-Chancellor is that they should once sit together and see how the letter is to be drafted keeping in view the legalities involved in the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that was why, he has said that with reference to the discussion...

It was said that they should sit together only for drafting the letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no problem in that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if something is received by the University again on the issue, what would be done?

The members said that it would be dealt with as and when the same is received.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, in this context, she would like to tell that she had sent a report to the UGC on 8th January 2018. She has received the reply of that only yesterday.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that there is a Government procedure in this. This item was under active consideration and discussion.

Dr. K.K. Sharma remarked that it is better late than never.

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Dr. Santosh Kumar Upadhyay, Assistant Professor, Department of Botany, on his having been awarded the Young Scientist Award by the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences;
 - (ii) Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry, on his having been nominated to the Editorial Advisory Board of "Neurochemistry International";

- (iii) Dr. Tamanna R. Sahrawat, Assistant Professor, Centre for System Biology and Bioinformatics, on her being adjudged second with a cash award of Rs.5,000 in the poster competition at Conference of the Society for Vector Ecology (Indian Region), in Goa;
- (iv) Mrs. Renuka B. Salwan, Director, Public Relations, on her having been conferred with 'Chanakya' Award for corporate reputation during 13th Global Communication Conclave 2019 organised by Public Relations Council of India at Jaipur;
- (v) team headed by Professor D.K. Dhawan, Department of Biophysics, on being granted Patent No. 306804 on 4th February, 2019 for the research "A radioactive trimer complex for the detection of tumors";
- (vi) Professor Nishtha Jaswal, Vice Chancellor, Himachal Pradesh National Law University, Shimla, and former Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, on her having been awarded Amity Academic Excellence Award by Amity University;
- (vii) Professor P.S. Jaswal, Vice Chancellor, Rajiv Gandhi National University of Law, Patiala, and former Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, on his having been awarded Amity Academic Excellence Award by Amity University;
- (viii) Dr. Dipti Sareen, Department of Biochemistry, on getting a project titled "Structure-activity relationship studies of a novel two-component lantibiotic roseocin" from DST-SERB, Government of India, amount to Rs.19.75 lacs for equipment and Rs.12 lacs for manpower, travel, contingency, etc;
- (ix) Dr. Kashmir Singh, Department of Biotechnology, on getting a project entitled "Genome-wide identification and functional analysis of long non-coding RNAs associated with biotic stress in vitis (grapevine)" from Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB), New Delhi, amounting to has been sanctioned a grant of Rs.50 lacs;
- (x) DAV College, Abohar, on being granted the status of "Star College" under Star College Scheme of Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India;
- (xi) MCM DAV College for Women, Sector 36 A, Chandigarh, on winning 3rd Rank in Best Citizen Led Initiative in Swachh Survekshan 2019 under Swachh Bharat Mission;
- (xii) Professor Rajeev Patnaik, Chairperson, Department of Geology, Panjab University, on his having been elected Fellow of Indian Academy of Sciences.

2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. (1-(i), (ii), (iii), (xii), (xiii), and (xvi), be noted;
3. appreciation of the Syndicate be conveyed to Professor Kulwant Gill, former Chairperson, Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, and M/s Mohan Fiber Private Limited, for donating a sum of Rs.54.14 lacs and Rs.14.5 lacs, respectively;

RESOLVED FURTHER:

1. a circular be issued to the Chairpersons/Heads of all the Departments and Regional Centres of the University and Principals of the affiliated Colleges that the information about any achievement of faculty members/Department/Colleges be reported to the Director, IQAC, with a copy to Dean Research, and SVC, Panjab University, for felicitation;
2. all the Memorandum of Understandings (MoUs) be routed through Dean Research. After legal vetting the same be sent to the Registrar, being an authorized signatory on behalf of Panjab University. However, Dean Research shall be the ex-officio contact person, if required. After execution of MoU, Dean Research will be the custodian and a copy of the MoU be sent to office of Director, IQAC. Further, all MoUs already executed will be re-examined for modification, if any, in the light of this decision;
3. the Internal Complaint Committee (ICC) is to be constituted in all the affiliated Colleges as per the provision of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. The Dean, College Development Council, is to issue circular in this regard to all the affiliated Colleges immediately;
4. A complaint of sexual harassment dated 20.07.2018 of a woman research scholar against the former Vice Chancellor (Professor Arun Kumar Grover) to the Chancellor, was referred by Chancellor's Office to the University. The complaint placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 23.9.2018, was discussed. It was now decided that the said complaint be sent to the Chancellor's Office as the Chancellor is the employer of the then Vice Chancellor for appropriate action at the end of His Excellency; and
5. the Action Taken Report in respect of the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 08.12.2018 (**Appendix-I**), be noted.

At this stage, Professor S.K. Sharma said that he would like to know as to what decision was taken on the Item I-(iii) in the Syndicate meeting dated 18.02.2019 and the item related to deduction of money from the teachers. It was decided that it should be applicable to the teachers also. Has it been resolved or not?

It was said that it would be checked.

2

The Vice Chancellor said that, in view of the Model Code of Conduct, Item 2 {2(i) to 2(xlv)} on the agenda relating to Selection Committees proceedings for promotion of faculty members, under CAS, be treated as withdrawn.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, on this, she would like to make a request that the Election Commission should be written to allow the University to go ahead with these promotions.

The Vice Chancellor said that a request in this regard has already been made to the Election Commission.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that they had been provided a huge bundle containing proceedings of various Selection Committees relating to promotion of faculty members, under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) of the University Grants Commission (UGC), and he had spent about a week in going through these proceedings minutely. He has found a lot of inconsistencies - inconsistencies in the sense that for the same particular lapse, one person has been rejected and another has been selected. Tomorrow, the aggrieved person might approach the Court, which would have a big repercussion on the University. Hence, it required scrutiny. Secondly, 4,200 journals have been withdrawn by the UGC. As such, they have to ensure that the situation, which is there, is in accordance with the application or not, because people have not paid much attention on it. Thirdly, it is a pathetic situation for this University that except for 12 candidates, it is such a worse kind of situation even for Professors. There are teachers, whom they are promoting, who had published only a single paper during a span of 12 years. The University, instead of in first 100, the way they are moving, would to go to one thousand. Resultantly, it would become one of the worst Universities because only 1/4th of the teachers are worth, who had publications in reputed journals; otherwise, nobody had given the impact factor. He remembered in 1988 he was the Head of the Department, there was for the selection of a Lecturer, instead of five persons, six persons sat in the Selection Committee, including two external experts as one external expert had come, whom the University had written, but he/she had not informed that he/she would be attending the meeting of the Selection Committee, and that selection was declared infructuous because in the Calendar it had been written that the Selection Committee should be comprised of five members. In these Selection Committees (Item 2), somewhere it is four, somewhere it is 6 and somewhere it is 7. He requested the Vice Chancellor to check these kinds of anomalies; otherwise, tomorrow they might be in a big problem and certain people might approach the Court. He had asked her (Professor Rajesh Gill) also that as President, Panjab University Teachers' Association (PUTA), it is her duty to look at the interests of the teachers and it is the duty of the teachers also to look at the interest of the University. Why should one work and publish papers, especially when he/she knew that with only two-three worthless papers, he/she could get promotion? They are going to put a nail in the academic coffin of this University and they have to find out that the interest of the teachers should be safeguarded and at the same time, the interest of the University should also be safeguarded. What is happening is that everybody is looking at particular case and research is at the minimum. This is how they would be getting research funding from various funding agencies. The audit might also put audit objection(s) on such things. He requested the Vice Chancellor to ask the Dean Research to look at publications, etc. Now, he (Vice Chancellor) had time with him to get this homework done and put the things at the right track before the item is placed before the Syndicate again.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she just wanted to say that there is no uniformity in the pre-screening and screening as they did not have uniform parameters. They do pre-screening/screening keeping in mind the face of the candidates. There are several teachers, who have not been made eligible, whereas their colleagues with same

qualifications and API score had been made eligible and shortlisted. As such, this needed to be streamlined.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that when he was the Dean of University Instruction, he had directed that, in future, for Ph.D. one examiner should be within 250 kms. and another from outside. He urged the Vice Chancellor to ensure that one of the examiners for Ph.D. should be at least 1000 kms. away. The policy of patting one and another back should be discouraged.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to inform them that he had said in one of the meetings of the Chairpersons that for Ph.D. there should only be one examiner from one State and it would be appreciated one examiner is accommodated from abroad. They were asked to pay special attention that the panel of examiners for Ph.D. should be spread all over India and it should not be there that one examiner is from Punjab, another from Haryana, another from Himachal Pradesh and so on.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that though Item 2 on the agenda has been withdrawn, he would like to point out that there are certain teachers of Departments of Chemistry and Physics, in whose cases the meetings of the Selection Committees had not been convened. He urged the Vice Chancellor to conduct the interviews in their cases.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had taken up the issue before his (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) pointing it out.

- 3.** Considered the following recommendation (except No. 3, 5, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 20 & 26) dated 26.10.2018 (**Appendix-II**) of the Regulations Committee:

ITEM 1

That amendment in Regulation 11 meant for Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.) examination appearing at page 388 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2018), **be made as under** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
11. The minimum number of marks required to pass the examination shall be 45 per cent in each paper.	11. The minimum number of marks required to pass the examination shall be 45 per cent marks in paper/subject (both theory and internal assessment collectively).

ITEM 2

That change in the nomenclature of the course "Special Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing Speech impaired and Mentally Challenged" to that of "**Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Divyang, be made as under** and given effect **to** in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/ publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<u>EXISTING NOMENCLATURE</u>	<u>PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE</u>
Special Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing Speech impaired and Mentally Challenged.	Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Divyang.

ITEM 4

That amendment in Regulation 2 for Certificate Course in Persian appearing at Page 259 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2018-19), **be made as under** and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

EXISTING REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join the course:-</p> <p>(a) The Higher Secondary examination of the Panjab University before 1970 or the board of School Education of Punjab/Haryana or of the Central Board of Secondary Education, Delhi.</p> <p>(b) The Pre-University examination of the Panjab University.</p> <p>(c) An examination of another University/Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a) or (b).</p>	<p>2. A person who has passed one of the following examinations shall be eligible to join the course:-</p> <p><u>(a) Minimum +2 examination of the board of School Education of Punjab/Haryana or the Central Board of Secondary Education, Delhi.</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(b) Deleted</p> <p>(c) An examination of another University/Board recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (a).</p>

ITEM 6

That –

- (i) deletion of Regulations 31.1 and 31.2 appearing at pages 22-23 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the academic session 2018-19) **be made as under** and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATIONS	PROPOSED REGULATIONS
<p>31.1 A candidate shall be entitled to have his answer-books rechecked on payment of a fee, as prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time, per answer-book, subject to the following :</p> <p>(i) Application for rechecking is received by the University within 30 days of the date on which the result is declared by the University;</p> <p>(ii) Rechecking will be done only to see if the marks awarded to various answers have been correctly added and if all the answers have been assessed by the examiner.</p>	<p>31.1 Deleted</p>

<p>31.2. If any mistake is discovered as a result of rechecking of answer-book, as provided for in Regulation 31.1, the Vice-Chancellor shall have power to rectify the result. In such a case the fee paid under Regulation 31.1 shall be refundable.</p>	<p>31.2 Deleted</p>
---	---------------------

- (ii) an Explanatory Note be appended requiring the necessity to do away with the Regulations concerning Re-checking of the answer-books.

NOTE: Earlier there existed two provisions for the students to have access to their answer books i.e. re-checking and re-evaluation of the answer book. With the introduction of RTI Act, 2005, the students now can have the photocopy of their answer book too. The RTI provision is somewhat the duplication of the facility of re-checking of answer sheet. Most of the times, the candidates make use of all the three facilities simultaneously. Due to this, because of the limitations of the preservation system of answer books, it becomes difficult to keep track of the answer sheet as it is supposed to be at three different locations simultaneously. This all cause unnecessary delay in the declaration of the results. The Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor (18.01.2018) vide point No. 5 has recommended to do away with the provision of re-checking and seeing the answer books. Hence the provision available under Regulations 31.1 and 31.2 appearing at pages 22-23 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 has been decided to agree with the Proposed Regulation.

ITEM 7

That change in the nomenclature of the course i.e. “**Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech impaired and Mentally Challenged**” to that of “**Diploma in Fine Arts for Divyang** (effective from the session 2018-2019), **be made as under** and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<u>EXISTING NOMENCLATURE</u>	<u>PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE</u>
Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing and Speech impaired and Mentally Challenged.	Diploma in Fine Arts for Divyang.

ITEM 8

That –

- (i) amendment in Regulation 11.3 for M.A. Women's Studies appearing at page 92 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2017-18), **be made as under** and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>1.3 For Women Studies course:</p> <p>A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join -</p> <p>(i) Bachelor' degree in any Faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(ii) B.A. (Pass) with at least 45% marks in Women's/Gender Studies or Public Administration or Political Science or History or Economics or Sociology or Psychology or Gandhian Studies or Geography or Philosophy. The candidates with these subjects shall be given preference in admission.</p>	<p>1.3 For Women Studies course:</p> <p>A person who possesses one of the following qualifications shall be eligible to join -</p> <p>(a) Bachelor degree in any faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(b) B.A. (Pass) with at least 45% marks in Women's/Gender Studies or Public Administration or Political Science or History or Economics or Sociology or Psychology or Gandhian Studies or Geography or Philosophy or Human Rights & Duties.</p>

- (ii) the following be made the part of the **Rule** and not that of the Regulation:

Subject weightage shall be given to those candidates who have studied any one of the Subjects as mentioned in Para (b) above at Undergraduate level for Three years or six semesters consecutively (except as provided in Rule 7.3 (b) of Handbook of Information 2016 Page No.245 which reads as "some Universities award B.A./B.Sc. degree on the basis of aggregate marks of B.A./B.Sc. 2nd and 3rd years. In that case the aggregate marks and the marks of the relevant subject in which the applicant is seeking admission, shall be considered on the basis of marks obtained in B.A./B.Sc. 2nd and 3rd years only for calculation of the basic merit marks and in the relevant subject.)"weightage for Honours would be given to those candidates who have got B.A. with Honours degree in any one of the following subjects only- Women's/Gender Studies or Public Administration or Political Science or History or Economics or Sociology or **Psychology** or Gandhian Studies or **Geography** or Philosophy or **Human Rights & Duties.**

ITEM 9

That amendment in Regulation 3 for MBA for Executive Programme at UBS (effective from the session 2018-19), **be made as under** and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>3. The minimum qualification for admission to the first semester of the course shall be:-</p> <p>(i) A Bachelor's degree in any discipline of the University or a degree of any other University which has been recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto with not less than 50% marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>Provided that in case of candidates having Bachelor's degree of the University through Modern Indian Languages [Hindi/Urdu/ Punjabi (Gurmukhi Script)] and/or in a Classical Language (Sanskrit/Persian/ Arabic) or degree of any other University obtained in the same manner recognized by the Syndicate, 50% marks in the aggregate shall be calculated by taking into account full percentage of marks in all the papers in Language excluding the additional optional paper, English and the elective subject taken together;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>A pass in the final examination conducted by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India or England/Institute of Cost Accountants of India or Chartered Institute of Management Accountants of England Institute of Company Secretaries of India;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Diploma in Personnel Management and Labour Welfare or Diploma in Marketing Management with not less than 60% marks in the aggregate, provided the candidate holds a Bachelor's degree.</p>	<p>3. No Change</p> <p>(i) No Change</p>

<p>(ii) Two years whole time executive experience in a commercial or industrial establishment after having passed the qualifying examination as given above. Members of All India or State Administrative/Technical Services and Defence Personnel holding administrative positions with not less than two years of executive experience will also be eligible. Organizational sponsorship is essential.</p>	<p>(ii) Two years whole time executive experience in a commercial or industrial establishment after having passed the qualifying examination as given above. Members of All India or State Administrative/Technical Services and Defence Personnel holding administrative positions with not less than two years of executive experience will also be eligible. No objection certificate from the organization, where the candidate is employed is essential. The cut-off date for considering the executive experience of two years will be 31st July of the year for which admission is sought by the candidate.</p>
--	--

ITEM 11

That –

- (i) addition in Regulation 1 for Master of Philosophy at page 184 of P.U. Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2018-19) **be made as under** and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<u>EXISTING REGULATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u>
<p>1. A candidate for the degree of Master of Philosophy in the Faculty of Arts, Languages, Education, Science, Design & Fine Arts and Business Management & Commerce should have passed the Master examination from the Panjab University or any examination which has been recognized as equivalent thereto, by this University in the first or second division (55% marks in the subject concerned). For M.Phil. in Gandhian Studies, Master's degree in the subjects will be determined by the fControl (with the approval of the Dean of University Instruction). For M.Phil. in Guru Granth Sahib Studies, the candidate should have obtained a Master's degree in any Faculty with at least 55% marks in the aggregate from the Panjab University or from any other University examination of which has been recognized as equivalent to the corresponding examination of this University. For M.Phil. in Sociology, a candidate should have obtained Master's degree in the subject of Sociology or Anthropology (Social Anthropology) with 55% marks.</p>	<p>1. No Change</p>

	<p>For M. Phil. Course in Public Administration:</p> <p>A candidate should have obtained Master's degree with 55% marks in the Social Science subjects i.e. Human Rights & Duties, Police Administration, Social Work, Women Studies & Development, Economics, Defence and National Security Studies, Gandhian and Peace Studies, Geography, History, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Public Administration, Sociology, Social Science and Journalism & Mass Communication from Panjab University or from any other University examinations of which has been recognized as equivalent to the corresponding examination of this University.</p>
--	---

- (ii) the subject of **Commerce and Management** also be included in the M.Phil course list of Public Administration.

ITEM 13

That amendment in Regulation 2 for B. Architecture (effective from the session 2016-2017), **be made as under and given effect to**, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<u>PRESENT REGULATION</u> (effective from the session 2014-15)	<u>PROPOSED REGULATION</u> (effective from the session 2016-17)
<p>2. The admission shall be open to a candidate who has passed 10+2/Equivalent qualifying examination with the following subjects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language 2. Physics 3. Mathematics 4. Any one of (Chemistry, Biology, Biotechnology, Technical Vocational Subject), 5. Any other subject. With at least 45% (40% in case of candidate belonging to reserved category*) marks in above subjects taken together. <p>*The candidates belonging to Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribes and Persons with Disability (PWD) shall be eligible on the basis of relaxed criteria determined by CBSE for the year 2014 for Central Counselling as indicated above.</p>	<p>2. The eligibility criteria for admission to B. Architecture shall be:-</p> <p>No candidate, with less than 50% marks in aggregate, shall be admitted to the Architecture course unless he/she has passed an examination at the end of the new 10+2 scheme of Senior School Certificate examination or equivalent with Mathematics as subject of examination at the 10+2 level;</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>or</u></p> <p>10+3 years Diploma with Mathematics from recognized Board.</p>

*The candidates belonging to Backward Classes shall be eligible on the basis of relaxed criteria determined by CBSE for the year 2014 for Central Counselling for Other Backward Class (OBC) if they belong to Non-Creamy Layer (NCL).	
--	--

ITEM 17

That amendment in Regulations 11(I) STUDY LEAVE (i) to (xv) appearing at Pages 140-141 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007 (effective from the Senate decision dated 29.9.2013) **be approved as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 18

That –

- (i) amendments/additions in Regulations for Bachelor of Homeopathic Medicine and Surgery (B.H.M.S.) (effective from the session 2015-16), **be approved as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.
- (ii) Migration or transfer of students from one college to another, be made part of the **Rules**.

ITEM 19

That Regulation for Certificate Course in Governance and Leadership (effective from the session 2017-18), **be approved as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 21

That (i) Change in nomenclature of Masters in Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems to Masters in Geoinformatics (effective from the session 2019-2020), **be made as under and be given effect to**, and (ii) Regulations for Masters in Geoinformatics (Semester System) w.e.f. the academic session 2019-20 **as per Appendix, be approved** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<u>PRESENT NOMENCLATURE</u>	<u>PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE</u>
Masters in Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems.	Masters in Geoinformatics.

ITEM 22

That Regulations for Masters in Disaster Management (effective from the session 2019-2020), **be approved as per Appendix**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 23

That Regulations for Bachelor of Business Administration Semester System) (effective from the session 2014-15), **be approved as per Appendix**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

ITEM 24

That Regulations for Choice Based Credit System B.Sc. (Honours) under the framework of Honours School System (effective from the session 2016-2017), **be approved as per Appendix** and given effect to, in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

ITEM 25

That amendment in Regulation 6.2 meant for M.Sc. (System Biology & Bioinformatics), **be made as under** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
6.2 The evaluated answer booklets would be shown to the students, according to a schedule announced by the department within 15 days of the completion of examination. Answers would be discussed and the rationale of assessment explained to the students. After discussing the answers with the students, the teacher would finally submit the award list to the Head of Department/Coordinator. Answer booklets would be retained by the concerned teacher for one year after the declaration of the result. There would be no provision for re-evaluation.	6.2 The evaluated answer booklets would be shown to the students, according to a schedule announced by the Centre , within 15 days of the completion of examination. Answers would be discussed and the rationale of assessment explained to the students. After discussing the answers with the students, the teacher would finally submit the award list to the Head of Department/Coordinator. Answer booklets would be retained by the concerned teacher for one year after the declaration of the result.

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

Referring to Sub-Item 1, The Vice-Chancellor said that first and foremost his concern is that whether it is the College or the University Department, as he has to get ranking, etc. got done. Whenever any Committee is constituted by him, they should be very-very meticulous and very honest to the academics and research. He is making members even the senior persons, but somewhere they are diluting the academics. He is regretting this very painfully. When the system is already there that the students have to obtain these marks in theory and these marks in practical. Now, they are merging it and asking that these marks are to be obtained in both theory and practical.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that though he was the Chairman of the Regulations Committee, the job of the Regulations Committee is to give the legal wording to the regulations recommended by the Boards of Studies and Faculties. As members of the Regulations Committee, they only ensure that there is no conflict, but they could not go into the merit.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that, but at the Syndicate, level they could discuss it and could also refer back to the Faculty/Board of Studies concerned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor S.K. Sharma.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is thinking that such issues are settled at the level of Regulations Committee itself. The Chairperson or the Coordinator is instructed that one should be meticulous and honest. When a better system existed that the student has to qualify both in theory as well as practical, why they are tinkering with that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that originally the regulation, which has been proposed now, was there, but the same was amended/changed, which is existing now because somebody felt that it is not right. And when this regulation came into existence and implemented, several students got failed. The students made a lot of hue and cry. Ultimately, the Board of Studies reverted back to the previous regulation. Now, whether they wanted to approve the amendment in the regulation is a separate issue. Professor S.K. Sharma has rightly said that they have to take the decision here in the Syndicate.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that a clarification should be sought as to which system is in vogue at the moment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has now got the sense that whenever some pressure is exerted, they succumb to the pressure without caring for the academic excellence and research. If the students stage a dharna in front of the office of the Vice-Chancellor, they would see to it. People would question him (Vice-Chancellor) as to what he is doing for the students who are sitting on the dharna. The students would allowed when he would go out of station after giving charge to someone, and a photocopy of the decision would also be given to the students. He remarked that the Vice-Chancellors come and go, but the Institution survives. He urged the members not to do like this. So far as staging of dharna, slogan shouting, etc. by the students is concerned, the entire responsibility for the same is of the Chairperson and the Dean Student Welfare and not the Vice-Chancellor. Is the Vice-Chancellor supposed to stop the dharnas, etc.? He is here for the academic excellence, bringing funds to the University and other important activities. In the case of Laws also, the students are immediately approaching the Court because no system existed there. He had called one of the persons from the Department of Laws and talked to him. He is going to evolve a system, but they have to communicate with and involve several other persons. He is happy that when the students staged a dharna there, he discussed the matter in the Syndicate and got that resolved. Shri Ashok Goyal had made a statement immediately on the issue. Why did they not make the statement?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the regulation, which has now been proposed, was in fact the original regulation. Now, the Vice-Chancellor should suggest as to what is to be done.

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Why should be suggest"? This might have come from the Chairperson, who could have called a meeting of few persons for this purpose. Should they allow such a loose system? Is it the job of the Syndicate to see all this?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that generally, the Department concerned suggest through the Board of Studies and the recommendations of the Board are placed before the Faculty concerned for consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that why the Department suggest such things. The Regulations Committee should have referred it back to the Faculty/Board of Studies.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they had referred back certain regulations to the concerned Faculties/Boards. They did not refer it back because originally this was the regulation, i.e., which has been proposed now. They though perhaps a mistake had occurred at some level.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what he sees is that there was a pressure for amending the regulation in this manner. It is just to confuse the Vice-Chancellor. Some of the members would tell outside that they were in favour of the amendment, but only the Vice-Chancellor was adamant.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor is right that if the regulation, which has been proposed now, existed earlier, why the same was changed. If the same had been changed, why they are reverting to that regulation again? For the first time, the regulation was changed because the students used to get 18 marks out of 20 in internal assessment and only 27 marks or more out of 80 in theory and qualify the examination. They felt that it is wrong, and changed it to which is existing now, i.e., 45% marks in each meant one has to obtain at least 45% in theory and internal assessment separately. Then majority of the students started failing, and the students agitated for the implementation of the old regulation, which is beneficial for them. But to say that the Regulations Committee members should not have done this, is perhaps wrong as they were not competent to do this. It seemed to him that this is subject to confirmation, but he is not sure. Regulation could not be sent to the Regulations Committee for legal vetting unless and until the same is approved by the competent body. If the decision with regard to this proposed regulation has already been taken by the competent body, the Regulations Committee could only give the legal shape. However, in some cases, the regulations are directly sent to the Regulations Committee after the approval of the Faculty concerned. If it has happened in this case, it meant that the Syndicate has not taken a call on it. So far as regulations are concerned, they did not come to the Syndicate only and they would go to the Senate also and from Senate, they would go to Government of India for approval. Under the garb of one letter, which was received probably in the year 2009 or 2010, they have started implementing the academic regulations, in anticipation of approval of the Government of India and this has also happened in the regulation under consideration. They would be surprised that they are not only implementing the academic regulations in anticipation of approval of the Government of India, but have also published several regulations in the P.U. Calendar, Volume II, which related to examinations and admissions, the approval of which is yet to be received from the Government of India. These regulations are also being quoted in the Courts also. Tomorrow, if somebody points out that it is yet to be approved by the Government, what would happen? It was started with a view that since the approval would be delayed, they should implement the regulation(s) in rare cases, in anticipation of approval of the Government of India, but what is happening is that even in the case of elected bodies, they have started implementing the amended regulations, in anticipation of approval of the Government of India. Now, it needed to be seen that the Faculty/Board of Studies/Department, which had sent this amendment, what justification they had given. So the answer to the question, which he (Vice-Chancellor) is trying to find, must be there. If the file is

here, it could be verified or since the Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor is sitting here, he might be knowing the background of the case.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that it should be referred back to the Faculty concerned.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that no, he had been the Chairman of the Regulations Committee and a large number of regulations were sent back.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they had also sent back certain regulations.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked Professor S.K. Sharma to clarify whether they had sent back the regulations saying that they did not agree.

Professor S.K. Sharma replied that the regulations were sent back for modification.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the regulations are sent back with the remarks that there is some gap, and they did not challenged the decision of the Boards/Faculty concerned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if there is any confusion, the regulations are sent back.

Shri Ashok Goyal, endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, said that they did send back the regulations if there is any confusion and not that they did not agree with the amended regulation(s). As such, the job of the Regulations Committee is to give the legal wording and not to see whether they agree with the regulations or not.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to tell him as to what is to be done.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that the proposed amendment should not be approved, and sent back to the Faculty/Board of Studies concerned. When he was a student, if one obtained 20 or less marks in a subject, he/she has to repeat the whole year. Now, they have diluted the system much.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the amendment of regulation under consideration should be sent back for reconsideration with the observation of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is only of the opinion that they should not waste much time on this issue. Why the matter has been placed before the Syndicate?

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that as per the set procedure, it has to be placed before the Syndicate. So far as merit is concerned, the same could only be considered here in the Syndicate. Since there was no deficiency/confusion in the word of the proposed regulation, he, as Chairman of the Regulations Committee, they could not disapprove and send it back.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that in future, the Regulations Committee must record their comments on each and every proposed regulation, so that the members of the Syndicate could understand the issue apply their minds.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that when the agenda item is considered in the Syndicate, they raised several ifs and buts, but when they considered academic

matters, which are most important, they take them lightly on the plea that it is beyond their jurisdiction.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the regulation was proposed by the Board of Studies in Law and recommended by the Faculty of Law which comprised of legal experts.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is the root cause of the problem that they did consider it on merit.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they say that it is necessary to qualify in the internal assessment also, several students are deliberately failed here. This is very serious as they could not change it. As such, to qualify in both theory and internal assessment combine, is needed to be done. He reiterated that if they make it compulsory to qualify in the internal assessment, it could lead to a very serious problem. There are instances where the students had been deliberated failed in the internal assessment owing to which they could not get the degree.

Shri Naresh Gaur, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, said that the students would always request the teachers with folded hands to qualify them in the internal assessment.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that they should look at the issue holistically and should not focus on few cases. Aberrations are everywhere. So they should not make their regulations for small aberrations.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that if they did like this, each and every regulation would be discussed on merit. In fact, this is not a big problem. There is a simple way to this.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that presently also the proposed regulation is in operation.

It was informed that the proposed regulation is in vogue since 2016.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that then on what issue they are holding the discussion.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua, Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Naresh Gaur jointly said that if the proposed regulation is already in operation, why the matter has been brought to the Syndicate?

It was informed that the procedure for award of internal assessment in the affiliated Colleges has been prescribed out of 10%, 5% is based on House Tests, 3% on the basis of attendance and 2% for other activities. So the internal assessment is not awarded arbitrarily. Letter in this regard had been sent to the affiliated Colleges by the Dean, College Development Council a number of times. The marks of internal assessment are awarded in accordance with the given components. If this procedure is defied, the responsible lay with the Principal of the College concerned for send the wrong internal assessment. More or less, the students of the Colleges are complaining against it. Secondly, the marks of internal assessment is to be displayed and while sending the marks of internal assessment a certificate is enclosed that none of the student has raised any objection to the internal assessment. Out of 2 lacs students, they hardly received 2-4 complaints. As such, the complaints against internal assessment are negligible. They are not revising the marks of internal assessment at all.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the complaints against internal assessment are not received, it is good.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the proper bifurcation of marks internal assessment is displayed on the notice board of the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should be told as to how the regulation, which has been placed before the Syndicate now, had been implemented w.e.f. 2016. This was the real question, but the reply is that the Colleges could not award the marks of internal assessment arbitrarily. The proposed regulation is only meant for Law course and there could hardly be two-three affiliated Colleges for the LL.B. course. This regulation is yet to be approved by the Syndicate and it would also require the approval of the Senate, whereas they are saying that it has been implemented from 2016. What is this joke? As such, this has been enquired as to how this regulation came into effect without the approval of the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be told as to why this issue should come to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that amendment of regulation is required to come to the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Regulations Committee should have sent it back saying that it is not justifiable.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that his proposal is that it should be referred back to the Faculty of Law for reconsideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that since it is a law domain, let the SVC, who is a Professor of Law, give his opinion.

It was informed that when this system of internal assessment was introduced in the year 2006, the students were required to qualify both in theory and internal assessment separately, i.e., 36 marks and 9 marks respectively. In the year 2010, it was diluted and the students were required to qualify both theory and internal assessment collectively as majority of the students were getting failed in accordance with the old system. In the year 2016, when the syllabus was revised and the evening classes were discontinued, it was recommended that the previous system of qualifying in both theory and internal assessment separately be reintroduced. When the result for the year 2016 was to be declared in 2017, the students came to know that again majority of them got failed, and they made representations to various quarters and succeeded in reverting back to the previous system of qualifying in theory and internal assessment collectively.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have been told that from 2006 onward, the students were required to qualify both in theory and internal assessment separately. And in the year 2010, they amended the regulation to say that the students are required to qualify both theory and internal assessment collectively. Thereafter, in the year 2016, they again reverted back to the previous system of 2006, but it is not that because now the students are required to qualify both theory and internal assessment collectively.

It was clarified that though in the year 2016, they had reverted back to the system of 2006, but the same could not be implemented as the students made a lot of hue and cry on their getting failed in the examination. How and by whom it has been done, is not known.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that the regulation was amended in the year 2016, why the same was not implemented? If it was not amended, it meant that they are following the regulation which was prevalent in the year 2010. If it is so, then it should not have come in the present form as the regulation, which has been shown “Existing”, did not exist as the same had not been implemented.

It was informed that at the moment the regulation of 2010 is in vogue.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the existing regulation is the one, which has been shown as proposed regulation, and a note should have been given that the amendment was made in the year 2016, but the same could not be implemented, and it is recommended that the same be kept in abeyance.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that Shri Ashok Goyal is right that if the amendment of regulation was approved, why the same was not implemented and who is responsible for the same. The process is going on for the last two years and they are not aware of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that the regulation amended in the year 2016 had been approved as it has been mentioned that the present regulation is this one.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested the matter should be referred back to the Faculty/Board of Studies concerned for reconsideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the proposed regulation is in vogue, there is no hurry. At the moment, it should be kept pending and let them see under what circumstance it has come again. According to him, the amended regulation of 2016 has not yet been received from the Government of India after approval. If it is so, and they wanted to go back to the regulation of 2010, they could write a letter to the Government of India requesting that the amendment of regulation sent in the year 2016 is treated as withdrawn.

It was informed that as per the wording of the item, the proposed regulation has been implemented with effect from the session 2018, maybe in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate and Senate. If the proposed regulation is in vogue, they have to approve this item at least for this year because they have implemented it from the last year.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has not been implemented from the last year, rather it is running since 2016.

It was requested to see the language.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they should leave aside the language. The language of the Sub-Item-1 is “That amendment in Regulation 11 meant for Bachelor of Laws (LL.B) examination appearing at page 388 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-II, 2007 (effective from the session 2018)...” According to this, it meant that in Calendar Volume which was printed in 2007, it is written that this regulation would be effective from the year 2018. So, they should not go after the language. It is being said that this regulation would be effective from the year 2018, which gives an impression that before that the present regulation was in vogue, but which is not so. The regulation was effective in 2010, they deviated from it in 2016, but that was not implemented and without implementing they would like to come back to the previous regulation. If the regulation was not amended in 2016, then what amendment they would like to make. This regulation was sent by the department and the through the process it reached the Regulation Committee and the Regulation Committee might have thought that it is right and the only difference is that instead of passing the

examination with 45% marks separately in theory and internal assessment, it has now been proposed to pass the examination both in theory and internal assessment collectively.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar asked as to what is the solution to it as they have already spent an hour on this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is already operative.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they should withdraw the **Sub-Item 1**, this would save time.

Shri Ashok Goyal; however, suggested that it should be kept pending. If this regulation has already been approved by the Government, then they have also to approve it and it has not been approved, they could send a letter for its withdrawal.

Referring to **Sub-Item 11**, Professor Rajesh Gill said that in all the disciplines they could do M.Phil. only in those subjects in which a candidate has done his post graduation so that a candidate could become eligible to teach in that subject. In the proposed regulation, it has been said that a candidate is eligible to do M.Phil even if he has done his master's degree in any subject. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor, Professor Rajesh Gill said that the item about which she is talking is at page 31 of the agenda papers.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar intervened to say whether all the other sub-item before sub item 11, have been approved?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could speak about the previous items also if he (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) would like to speak.

Referring to **Sub-Item 6**, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that some things have been diluted regarding the re-checking/re-evaluation system of answer sheets while giving the reference of RTI. It has been said that one answer sheet has to be sent at various places simultaneously due to which the results are declared late. To his mind, by doing all this, the University has tried to finish this whole system. They have snatched away the democratic right of a student to have access to his answer book. He added they could find some other mechanism for this. But the withdrawal of these democratic rights at once would send a wrong message in the society, especially, in the students' community. He stressed that they are doing a wrong thing and requested to reconsider this item.

Shri Sandeep Singh while endorsing the view point of Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that it is hundred per cent wrong.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first of all they should read the note given in the item, only then they should speak.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should also have the feedback from Controller of Examinations in this regard.

Briefing about the issue, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier there was no provision of R.T.I. The student was not able to know whether the answer sheet which had been evaluated belonged to him or someone else. The purpose of rechecking was also the same. In re-checking also, the student remained under doubt that the answer sheet which was checked might not belong to him or some questions remained unchecked. Now this activity has come under the purview of RTI. The fee for seeking information under RTI is less than re-checking and the student is able to receive a copy

his answer book at the earliest. So, in order to escape from duplication, this provision has been proposed. The purpose of re-checking is also to see the answer sheet, which would be served by seeking the information under R.T.I.

Shri Sandeep Singh said if the answer book is shown to the candidate, what purpose would it solve?

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they brought the R.T.I. in this process, the confusion is created due to two words, i.e., rechecking and re-evaluation. He said if they hold a survey, 99% of the students resort to re-evaluation. 90% of the people did not know the difference between re-checking and re-evaluation. It is right that the students get access to their answer sheet through R.T.I., but in rechecking a student did not see his/her answer sheet. The mind-set of the students is to get the re-evaluation done. If the marks of a student get increased more than the specified percentage, then the answer sheet would be sent to the third examiner. So, in the system what has been said and what is done in practical, there is lot of difference.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the CBSE Board did not have the system of re-checking and re-evaluation and there was a problem last year. The people went to High Court and got relief from there, so why they are denying this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the process of re-evaluation is already in vogue.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they should let the existing system work. The problem of re-checking is because of the fact that the teacher to whom the answer sheet is sent did not send it back in time after checking. He suggested that they should resort to table marking, this would automatically solve the problem.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the right of the students should not be snatched from the students. There are already so many complaints in this regard. There is so much fluctuation in the marking that a student getting 8 marks, is getting 42 marks after re-evaluation. This is happening with many students. He has raised this issue in the last meeting. He does not know as to how the papers are being checked? So, he urged that they should not deny him the right of having the answer sheet under R.T.I., rather they should streamline the system. It is an insult to the University also if the marks of a student are increased from 8 to 42 after re-evaluation. If such a student did not seek re-evaluation, his career would spoil.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to ask the Controller of Examination to brief them as to why they would like to change the regulation.

It was informed (by the C.O.E.) that the reason for constituting this Committee was that there were frequent complaints that the results of re-evaluation is not declared well in time. They did want to know the genesis of this problem, whether it is at the end of the teacher or the Controller office or at the end of the Secrecy Branch. When the Committee studied this problem, they came to know that there were three mechanisms running. These mechanisms were running from the time when there was annual system of examination. At that time they were having ample time. The results were declared in the months of May or June and the supplementary examinations were held in the month of October or the candidate has to appear in the month of March. So, at that time there was no problem as to when the result of re-evaluation was declared because the students could get time for re-evaluation, rechecking etc. But with the introduction of the semester system, the time has squeezed. Now just after the declaration of the result, a candidate send an application under R.T.I. to get his answer book. There is only one store where the answer sheets are preserved and it is given to the candidate. Simultaneously, the candidate applies for the rechecking also. The rechecking is not done by the teacher, rather it is done by the Controller of

Examinations personally. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor, the Controller of Examinations said that in rechecking the totalling of marks is done. It is also seen if any question has been left unchecked. Thirdly, the candidate also applies for re-evaluation. The Committee has also recommended that since online system has been introduced, there is no need to wait for the Detailed Marks Card and hence the time to apply for re-evaluation has been reduced from 21 days to 15 days. All the three activities i.e. R.T.I., rechecking and re-evaluation are done by different branches. When a candidate applies to take a copy of his answer sheet under R.T.I., that answer book is not sent back in the catalogue immediately after getting it photocopied. If the answer sheet is taken for rechecking, it is not sent back with that degree of efficiency because they do not know whether the candidate has applied for three things or for one only. As has been said by Shri Jagdeep Kumar, they are getting very less students seeking re-checking and the marks usually remained the same. There are complaints when the answer sheet is taken under R.T.I. The students do complain that his/her answer sheet has not been evaluated properly, but they do not know as to what has to be done in such cases. The other agenda of the Committee is as to what the University should do after the copy of answer sheet is taken under R.T.I. Further, when they have to do re-evaluation, the answer sheets are requisitioned from the store for coding. If one hundred copies are asked for, only ten copies are sent. It took 2-3 months to trace the other ninety copies. So, they thought that if much purpose is served by re-checking, let they should concentrate only for the re-evaluation in the semester system. The second part of this is R.T.I. If they could strengthen R.T.I., it would reasonably improve the system because accountability could be fixed in R.T.I. However, in the evaluation, if the increase of marks is more than 15%, the answer sheet is sent to the third examiner. But, they are not fixing the responsibility of the Controller of Examinations or the teachers or where the mistake has occurred. This was the purpose. That was the mandate of this Committee to find out as to where the mistake has taken place, how it has to be improved and how it could be made time bound.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the system of getting an answer sheet through R.T.I., Professor R.C. Sobti was the Vice Chancellor. At that time, if the marks of a candidate get increased, his fee was also refunded.

It was informed that the same provision is there in re-evaluation if the marks get increased by 15% and it is written in the P.U. Calendar also.

Shri Sandeep Singh, however, said that the fee is not refunded.

Continuing, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when this was introduced, he remembered, it was in this format.

With the permission of the Chair, the Controller of Examination said that the Syndicate is the Governing Body of the University and he would like to put on record that two years ago, there was no cataloguing in the Secrecy Branch. Now they have put racks in the Ranjit Chandra Hall and the answer sheets have been put there subject-wise and class-wise. The cataloguing has been done in the same way as it has been done in the Main Library. The Hon'ble Vice Chancellor has also visited it three times. Earlier, the situation was that only one person who had been working there could know as to where the answer books are lying. After his transfer, a mess was created there, but now any employee could work there. The Vice Chancellor asked him yesterday about the pendency of results to which he has informed that up to May 2018, they have zero pendency and they will be able to declare the December results well in time. This was appreciated by the members

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is another very important matter relating to Secrecy Branch. Yesterday, she made seven question papers. She received a telephone call from the Secrecy Branch about those question papers. She told them to receive the question papers from her. A gentleman came and she put the papers before him. He picked up the question papers. She asked him as to who is he? He told his name. She

asked him how could she know that he had come from the Secrecy Branch and will he give some receipt to her? He said, there is no such system and the receipt is issued from the Controller of Examinations Office. Then she called up the girl who had rung her from the Secrecy Branch. She asked her that how would she know as to who is taking question papers from her. So, this is very serious and they should do something about it.

The Vice Chancellor enquired if any receipt is given after receiving the question papers from a teacher?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that no receipt is given. She, then had a snapshot of his identity card because somebody could question her as to whom she had given the question papers. Then she herself wrote a receipt and got his signatures. It had come to her mind to get his signatures; otherwise, it was a routine activity.

The Vice Chancellor said, had the person carrying his identity card with him, this problem might not have been there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that under the R.T.I. Act, they are required to give a copy of the answer sheet within 30 days, but after 30 days the time to apply for re-evaluation and re-checking gets over. Now, they are stopping the facility of re-checking. The situation would be that rechecking is stopped and the time for re-evaluation is over. He asked whether the R.T.I. is for helping the student or to make him fool.

The Vice Chancellor said that till now they were thumping the tables. Till now, they were saying that everything is good. He requested to tell as to what is the right thing.

Shri Sandeep Singh said they were appreciating only those things which were good.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever suggestions have been given, these have been given keeping in mind the delayed declaration of results and also given some solutions. But the members said that it would not solve their purpose. He is confined only to the agenda which is there for consideration. Besides that, if the Controller of Examinations, Registrar or the Finance & Development Officer has done something which is for the welfare of the University, students, teaching community of the University and all the sections of the society concerned, he thinks that the Syndicate must not escape the responsibility of appreciating. The agenda which is with them, is nothing but the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor. The reservation which the Vice Chancellor is giving here, he should rather say that he would not like to put these items before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that now he has got it and would do like this.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said, on a serious note, the agenda is to consider the recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor and as a Vice Chancellor, he is nowhere in the picture. The Vice Chancellor approved the proceedings of the Committee which were confirmed by the Chairperson of the Committee. The moment the proceedings are signed and approved by the Vice Chancellor, these become the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor to the Syndicate. So, the scrutiny should be at that level. If the Vice Chancellor is not satisfied with any of the recommendations of the Committee, why to leave it to the wisdom of the Syndicate, or the Vice Chancellor should say that his opinion on the issue is divided and, thus, he wanted to seek inputs from the Syndicate. Now, they think if the regulations are placed before the Syndicate, at least the Vice Chancellor is satisfied with it and the Syndicate could give only a small input. From the view point of the Vice

Chancellor, it seems correct that rechecking is not substitute of R.T.I. and vice-versa. The other thing, which the Controller of Examinations has said, if his memory serves him correctly, somewhere in 2010 or 2011, it was decided by the Syndicate, if after re-evaluation there is a difference of more than 15% marks, the re-evaluation fee deposited by the candidate would be refunded. He doubts whether they have refunded the fee even to 2% of the cases. They might not have refunded it because the candidates might have not applied for this, perhaps they might not be aware of it. But, he knows about some such cases where the students have applied, but the fee was not refunded to them.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to note it as it has to be checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, another decision which was taken was that punitive action be taken against those examiner in whose evaluation the marks increased from 8 to 42. They should be black-listed as it affects the career of the students. But, not a single teacher has been penalised even after the decision. Why? Because sometimes there come a Vice Chancellor who is liberal and says that for the students, the career of teachers could not be spoiled. If a teacher is blacklisted, he would not be able to do examination work for whole of his life. Thus, a teacher is just asked to be careful in future. Till today, he could not understand whether the career of a teachers or a student is more important or the career of both is important or not any of them. This conscious decision was taken as only 2-5% teachers commit such type of carelessness, but the image of all the teachers is maligned. So, they have to send at least some message. There is not only the increase of marks from 8 to 42, he knows some of the cases where the marks have been increased from 8 to 55 and vice versa. So, someone is at fault. So, they should at least take some action. Secondly, if there is so much variation, the fee should be refunded to the students. If they have to discontinue the mechanism of re-checking, then they have to give some solution to the candidate that after having a copy of the answer sheet under R.T.I., within so many days, he could apply for re-evaluation, so that it becomes the substitute of re-checking.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that as stated by the Controller of Examinations that in re-checking the student is called to check his/her answer sheet. He wanted to know whether it is done practically.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, yes, it is done whereas Shri Sandeep Singh and some others said that it is not done.

It was informed that under category-1, answer sheet is shown to the candidate. In 2010, rechecking was also added. The practice of showing answer sheet is undertaken only in the teaching departments and it is not extended to affiliated colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to how the candidate would ensure that the answer sheet belongs to him.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that in the departments, the teacher has to show the answer sheet to the students.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the whole world is moving towards the transparent system.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said, it seems to him that the rechecking is just like a formality. To obtain a copy of the answer sheet under the R.T.I. is best, but they should think to supply the copy in 15 days, if feasible, instead of 30 days. With this a student could see whether his answer sheet has been checked properly or any question has been left unchecked. Where has he committed the mistake, etc.? He

could show this answer sheet to his teacher, so this is the best thing for him. After that, he could be given time to apply for re-evaluation.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what should be resolved in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be asked from the Controller of Examination whether he is able to supply the answer sheet within 10 or 15 days.

The Vice Chancellor said that all this has to be done as the entire system is for the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked in case they are not able to supply the copy within 15 days, then what should be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to do it and they would do it.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that there are two systems for supplying the answer sheet. One is that the copy is handed over to the students and the other by sending it through post. The answer sheet, which is sent through post, sometimes remains stuck up in the office and many a times they do not have even postal stamps.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to resolve this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to how much time is given for getting the re-evaluation done to which it was informed that 15 days time is given for it.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested to get the issue examined again.

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the checking process should be modified and when a candidate applies for checking, he should be given a copy of the answer sheet as has been given under the R.T.I.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this the era of information technology. They should scan the answer sheet and send it to the Principal with the request to call the concerned and get it marked and send it back to them. In two day's time, they could do that thing and reduce the time. On being informed by Shri Sandeep Singh that the number of students seeking re-evaluation is much more, he said there could not be more students seeking re-evaluation.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Jagdeep Kumar suggested that this consideration of this item should be deferred.

Shri Navdeep Goyal suggested that this issue should be got examined properly.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to constitute a Committee to consider the issue where college teacher should also be included as a member.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be got reviewed. The members have been telling very good things, but again they came back. As stated by Professor Rajat Sandhir, they should not deprive anyone from the facility already being given to him for just for their own sake. Now issue has been summarised and they would be reviewing it. The Vice Chancellor said that now it has been resolved to revisit the entire thing by adding some new members. First, they give very good inputs, but after that they get affected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in case they have the intention to reach at some conclusion, it is done, but if it is intended to not to reach on any conclusion, the issue is dragged to some other direction. One suggestion was given by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, one by Professor Navdeep Goyal, one by Professor Rajat Sandhir and some suggestion was given by him also.

The Vice Chancellor said the Professor Rajat Sandhir has given a very good suggestion that they should not deprive the students from this facility.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in rechecking there are two provisions, one is to check the total and the other to check whether all the questions have been checked. If after doing this, the copy of the answer sheet is given to the candidate, as they have to give under R.T.I., the problem would be solved.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would do it. The Vice Chancellor further said that if they visit the offices of the University, they would find a lot of change there. He started from the Office of the Controller of Examinations because this office is very important. The problems of 200 colleges started from there only. For making entire seating arrangements etc., the Controller Office did a lot of hard work, so they must appreciate it. At the same time, besides the Controller of Examinations' Office, they have to improve the conditions of other offices also. There is a need of proper coordination and management on which they could not give much stress. As Professor S.K. Sharma has talked about the role of information technology, if all this is done, everything is possible. The things could be centralized the activities. There are so many other ways also. He would appreciate if they come and deliberate upon the issues. Their stress always remained on the students and teachers. As Shri Ashok Goyal has said that the provision for penalising the teachers who do not mark the answer sheets properly, is a very good suggestion. Such teachers should shown displeasure or they could be advised to be careful in future. So, something should be done. It would definitely affect the teachers. When they talk about students and teachers, in between there is non-teaching staff also. It is usually said that such things do happen in Panjab University. There is need to have time management. They should speak in a precise manner, maximum of the people should speak. There failure is in time management. If they cooperate, many things could be discussed. In P.G.I., in a very short meeting, they approve the items of Purchase Committee worth Rs. 300/- crore. They are very well prepared, very positive, know what to do, very fast and it takes only 40-45 minutes.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he went to the Office of the Vice Chancellor, it was very neat and clean.

The Vice Chancellor said that same is the conditions of the office of the Registrar and Controller of Examinations.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested to take up Sub Item 11 at page 31 of the agenda papers.

The Vice Chancellor asked if all the items before it are okay to which the members said 'yes'.

Referring to **Sub-Item 11**, Professor Rajesh Gill said that a student does M.Phil. in the same subject in which he has done his/her master's degree. But in the proposed regulation several subject have been mentioned including Commerce & Business Management and if a student has done his Master's Degree in any of these subjects, he could do M.Phil. in Public Administration. She said now only Mathematics, Chemistry and Physics have left, these should also be included. If a student does M.A. in a

subject other than Public Administration and does his M.Phil. in Public Administration, what he would do. What would be his/her career? Why this is being done? She said that M.Phil. is done in the same subject in which one has did his/her Master's degree, except some interdisciplinary courses like Gandhian Studies, Women Studies. This is very strange and it is detrimental to the students as there is no rationale.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that there would be no benefit to the students. Only the University would get fee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he agreed to what Professor Rajesh Gill has said, so it should be sent back for reconsideration.

The Vice Chancellor said, why this should be sent back?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is a simple logic that if a student has done Master's degree in a subject, when there is provision for doing M.Phil. he should do his M.Phil. in the same subject. There could be a small difference, such as the nomenclature could be somewhat else, as in the allied subjects. But here in the proposed regulation, almost all the subjects have been included and no subject has been left.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, does it mean that they are not getting students in M.Phil.? Here it is applicable, as has been stated by him (Vice Chancellor), they are ruining the students for their own interests.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said, perhaps, this issue was raised in the Academic Council meeting also.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the students preparing for IAS, examination, join such courses as they get hostel etc. So, this is for those students only and not for the academics. A student who is good in Sociology, he would like to go ahead in that particular area. He would do his/her Ph.D. as a career.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what was the earlier regulation?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier it was, "concerned subject".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier it was in the subject concerned.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it has been written that there should be 55% marks in the subject concerned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the Faculty of Arts, it is written that one should have Master's degree in the subject concerned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is there since the beginning.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there should be uniformity. They could not make a separate provision for this subject only, when all the others have uniformity.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the teacher teaching the subject are also like this to this Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that he should not speak like this for the teachers. He said that he is not talking of the past, this is what is there at present. There are such teachers who have not studied this subject themselves and they are teaching Public Administration.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that there are no teachers of Public Administration. A Public Administration teacher is teaching Geography subject.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that if it is right, then they should hold an enquiry in this matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that as they have stated that a person should go ahead in the same domain. They are also saying that Public Administration is a very good subject. He does not know, but it could be possible, that they might not be getting adequate number of students. He requested the members whether they could think about interdisciplinary approach in this subject. Though he agreed that a candidate should do his/her M.Phil. in the same domain, at the same time they are promoting the Choice Based Credit System (CBCS), so they should also think in the light of this. This would become dynamic, though he did not know, how much right, it would be. He is looking for the five years ahead. If they have to bring interdisciplinary system here, by adding a subject, they should also think in the light of this. This subject is very popular and if they have to introduce interdisciplinary system in this subject, how they could do it. They should think on this also. The Vice Chancellor requested the members to give their opinion, one by one.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if there is a subject which is somewhat the same to the Public Administration, such as Police Administration, then it is okay, but when there is a proposal to include all the subjects, it did not seem appropriate, though he is not a subject expert in the subject. But at the same time, there should be some justification. If a student has not studied anything related to Public Administration in his Master, degree, how he could do M.Phil. in that subject.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is the only concern, but they should tell him whether they should make an opening of interdisciplinary system or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at least 50% course content should be there if someone has studied a subject other than Public Administration.

The Vice Chancellor said that it means, according to him (Professor Navdeep Goyal), the Police Administration subject could be included if the syllabus content are somewhat the same i.e. 50% or more than 50% as that of Public Administration.

Principal Rakesh Mahajan said that if they talk about Commerce & Business Management, they teach some content of Public Administration also, so this could be included to which the Vice Chancellor said it is okay.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the interdisciplinary system should be introduced.

The Vice Chancellor asked him (Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma) to say something specifically for this subject, in case they intend to do something. He is just taking the ideas. If they arrive at a consensus, only then they would go ahead.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the list of subjects given in the proposed regulation, there could be one or two subject which would be common, such as Methodology Research, Sociology, however in other subjects, some course content i.e. about 50% should be that of Public Administration.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that as has been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal and some other members that there are some interrelated subjects such as Political Science, Sociology and Psychology. On the other hand they are talking about the interdisciplinary approach. When they look at the IITs, there is an impression in the

minds of the people that the IITs are Engineering Institutes, but when they thoroughly see, they could know that even the subjects of Sociology and Social Sciences are also taught in the IITs. He, himself could know about it after rendering five years of service. So, they could do whatever they like in this direction, he has no objection to it.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said they should not become so flexible, however, they should say that one could be eligible if he has studied Public Administration and allied subjects. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor, he said that in the allied subject a student must have studied be at least 50% syllabus of Public Administration.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that it was being done 20-25 years ago, but if they talk of the present, there are full-fledged Departments of Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, etc. In all the subjects mentioned here in the list, M.Phil. and Ph.D. is already being done in these subjects. However, there was problem 20 years back on this end. There are a very few Professor who had got their education from Jawaharlal Nehru University, they got job in the Department of Gandhian Studies, as they won the case in the Supreme Court due to interdisciplinary system. He was of the opinion that the students who have not studied the subject of Public Administration in their Master's degree, be not allowed to join M.Phil Course.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to what was the case which they won in the Supreme Court?

Professor Navdeep Goyal while clarifying this, said that the UGC says that one should have the same subject. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor, on which level they should have the same subject, he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) said that when one has to take a job.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that after a long fight of ten years, though those teachers were able to win the case, but the teachers belonging to the subject of Public Administration were very much disappointed. He again reiterated that the students intending to do M.Phil. in Public Administration should be from the same subject. Suppose, there is one paper: Constitution of Law, this paper is taught at 3-4 places, but this is not needed. So, he thinks that only the students of Public Administration should be allowed to join the M.Phil. Course.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he also has the same view as that of Dr. Harjodh Singh. If a student has not studied the subject of Public Administration, how he could study himself further and what he would teach to the students.

The Vice Chancellor asked, would he not intend to allow a student to join M.Phil even if he has studied 60% of the Course content of Public Administration?

Shri Naresh Gaur said that basically, there should not be such a provision to allow the students of other subjects to join M.Phil. in Public Administration. As stated by Dr. Harjodh Singh, every department subject has the provision of doing M.Phil. in respective subject, so there is no need to club the different subjects.

The Vice Chancellor said that when they go to the UGC, they say that the University should introduce interdisciplinary system so the system of CBCS could go ahead.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if they start interdisciplinary system, then the other departments would get blocked and they would experience problem.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when they join M.Phil. for specialization, there are two contents. The first semester belonged to research methodology and the

second to the subject concerned. In the research methodology papers, there are some theory papers and other content is different. Now when one has to take the research ahead, he has to study and mention in his/her thesis what has been done so far in this field. If one has not studied the basics of that course, how they could go ahead.

The Vice Chancellor asked if 50% course contents are the same.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that 50% course content cannot be same in different subjects. Had it been there, the subjects would have been merged even earlier.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they should see as to what is the pattern in the University because they cannot have different patterns for different departments. Secondly, when a candidate has to join M. Phil. he/she must have studied the core subject in his/her Master's degree. Thirdly, it is not the question of M.Phil. only. An issue is already running in this department for the last two year even before his (Vice Chancellor) joining the University that Guest Faculty was engaged continuously for Semester-I, II and III from the Departments of Laws, Economics and Commerce & Business Management to teach the subject of Public Administration. She asked, would the Law Department or Economics Department appoint Public Administration persons to teach Law Course? How could they justify it? The students and teachers of Public Administration had given representations against it as to why injustice is being done to them. The students say that they are without job, whereas the persons from other disciplines are being given job. At the same time, this proposal of M.Phil. was also received. Perhaps, there would be a plan to allow those students to do M.Phil., it may be a hunch. It is good when they talk of interdisciplinary research, but there is a level for it. When they talk of CBCS, it would be done at undergraduate and postgraduate level. It has a logic and a uniform structure and it has been prescribed by the UGC. But, here, it is an M.Phil. Course which is for some particular purpose. If a student does his M.A. and M.Phil. in different subjects, what would be his/her career? There have been cases in their University where a person has done Ph.D. in a subject and got the job in some other department and thereafter, asked for promotion under CAS. He was not given promotion and rejected. So, there is also some system for interdisciplinary approach, it cannot be introduced everywhere. Lastly, she would like to say that they are making a uniform structure of courses at the UGC/national level. Could the UGC allow different things for different departments in their University? She added that the benefit of the students should be at the central stage.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he is in favour of interdisciplinary approach, but with a rider. What has been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal is right because M.Phil. is basically a step forward towards Ph.D. There is also a rule in their University that those who have done M.Phil., they can go to Ph.D. level. Now the question is, in which particular subject, the person is going to do Ph.D. So, basically, domain knowledge is very-very important. If there are subjects, where one has that particular domain, then he/she could go for Ph.D. in that domain. But if the domain is completely different, then one is neither this side or that side.

The Vice Chancellor asked if 60% course contents are the same, could it be done to which Professor S.K. Sharma said, then it could be done. This was also endorsed by Dr. K.K. Sharma.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that in this process, the students are misguided. They are not aware as to what benefit would they get in future. Suppose, a student has done his master's degree in History and M.Phil in Public Administration, when he would appear for interview, his M.Phil would not be consider for that job.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that a letter has been issued by the UGC stating that a person after doing M.A. in Public Administration has cleared the NET, he is eligible to teach the subject of Political Science in whole of India. This is a very important letter. Actually, there are very less posts in the subject of Public Administration because this subject is not taught in most of the colleges. If a person with Public Administration qualification is made eligible to teach Political Science, it means something wrong has been done at the level of UGC also. So, they trying to catch different trains at the same time which could not be done. They have to do some in a crystal clear manner. One should go either to this side or that side. They know how the decisions are taken at the UGC. When they have to adjust someone, they allow it, otherwise not. This is a very important issue and they should also keep this in mind.

The Vice Chancellor asked him (Shri Jagdeep Kumar), would he be in favour of it if 60% Course contents are the same, to which Shri Jagdeep Kumar nodded in the affirmative.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that before looking into this issue and before looking into purely from a scholar's point of view, as he (Vice Chancellor) is giving or from academic view i.e. interdisciplinary, it is very attractive point. He would like to say that a person who has done M.A. in Economics and M.Phil in Public Administration, for which subject he would eligible for the post of Lecturer? They have to see it first. They have to take care of students also. Shri Jagdeep Kumar has informed that the the UGC has issued a letter wherein it has said that the person with Public Administration qualification is eligible to teach the subject of Political Science. It meant that the UGC has equated it. Dr. Harjodh Singh has said that some teachers won the case from the Supreme Court. But he did not know anything about it. He could know as to what has been done in his University. In this University, a person having Economics qualifications was appointed as Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Administration and the issue was challenged in the Hon'ble High Court. The High Court struck it down and the decision of High Court was upheld in the Supreme Court also. The person about whom he is talking about, is now a Vice Chancellor. Because he was teaching in Public Administration, thereafter, he was promoted under CAS in Public Administration. At that time, he realized that he has spoiled his whole life, because in the qualification, it is written that it should be in the subject concerned. When they issue the advertisement, there also, it is written that the qualification should be in the subject of subject concerned i.e. M.Phil. and Ph.D. in subject concerned and UGC NET in subject concerned. Thereafter, the persons who plunge into these things, bring letters of equivalency. Then such things are left to the discretion of the concerned University or colleges, whether it is to be accepted or not. Then the candidate says that he was not told all these things when he did his M.Phil. that he has to face all these difficulties. Now the second question comes that when they have the full-fledged departments of specialized subjects, then why this issue is gone only for Public Administration Department. Why all the subjects should be included for making one eligible to do M.Phil? Why not for other departments? If the Master's degree holders in these subjects could do M.Phil, in the subject of Public Administration, why not vice-versa? Then they should be allowed to go in English, University Business School or anywhere. So, he meant to say that this proposition would not stand the scrutiny at the time when the real effect has to come. Professor Navdeep Goyal has said that it should be sent back for reconsideration. They should at least be told as to what is the justification of doing all this. Is there any dire need to the department or are the people suffering because of not doing M.Phil in Public Administration. There could be a possibility that one has done M.Phil in Economics and now he wants to do M.Phil in Public Administration. To say straight away that for them all are eligible is not correct. If they see at the last in the existing qualifications, it is written, for M.Phil in Sociology, a candidate should have obtained Master's degree in the subject of Sociology or Anthropology. Here the person with Public Administration qualification is not eligible. Even the persons with the qualification in the subjects of Economics, Political Science,

Psychology etc. which are actually totally interrelated subjects, are not eligible as they have specifically written there. Instead of going into the details regarding 60% or so as has been said by him (Vice Chancellor), he thinks that they are capable enough for saying as to which subjects seem to be the interrelated, for example, Gandhian Studies, Political Science and Police Administration, these could be written as interrelated.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that here they are talking about the employability of the students. He said that this is preparatory course leading to Ph.D. The candidate would do Ph.D only in the subject in which he had done his M.A. This is not the final qualification. For Lecturer's post, the qualification is NET or Ph.D.

The Vice Chancellor said that for Lecturer's post, his/her qualification in the Master's degree would be considered.

Professor Rajesh Gill asked, why a candidate would join M.Phil Public Administration after doing M.A. Economics?

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

The Vice Chancellor said that in the Banaras Hindu University, for such courses, they start from M.Phil. and take them up to Ph.D. There, they make two categories and give complete autonomy. For instance, they say that the candidates would apply for M.Phil. and their core subject is Public Administration. Then they observe that if the candidates in the core subject are not available, then they could go for the candidates of allied subjects having more than 60% same course contents. However, the priority would be given to the students having qualification in the Core subject. Secondly, as has been said that there should be uniformity. In order to promote research and higher education, they allow this discretion in the interdisciplinary studies.

The Vice Chancellor while discussing the issue of M.Phil. Course in Public Administration said that allied subjects should be considered in all courses, initially in M.Phil Course. At the Panjab University if one wants to do Ph.D., the main subject is Business Administration or Business Management and it is said that allied subject will not be considered. For Ph.D. (Psychology), the core subject is M.A. (Psychology) and the allied subjects could be M.B.A., M.A. (Sociology) or M.A. in Personnel Management and Industrial Relations. There is one more subject of Engineering where there is opening for doing Ph.D. There could not be much problem as it is in the operational mode. Whenever new things happen, there is resistance to change, but if they take it in global perspective, this has to be done one day. The specialities are taken care of at the entry point for appointment of Lecturer i.e. the Master's degree in so and so subject. For example, for teaching M.B.A. a candidate with Master degree in Business Administration and allied subjects, but in Management they do not allow it, because they know that they get very few people with Master's degree. At this level a person gets the salary of Rs.50,000/- or if someone is appointed Director then he will get the package of Rs.1.5 Crore, then why he will come to the Panjab University for Rs.3 Lacs. They did it all for their own convenience and not for the convenience of others. He said that the system is going on, it is not that a new thing is happening and all is under the operational mode and majority of persons are of the view that this should be done. Eight persons are proposing that this should be done and new system has to be evolved, there is great problem in it. Whatever system is running, they are just doing it and there is no uniformity in it. He asked, what is uniformity? If a candidate has done B.Sc. and wishes to do M.B.B.S. then it is to be done by studying the two years course by completing the credits in two years. Therefore, the system is very dynamic.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said that in Panjab University, the inter-disciplinary system is not been introduced today. He has got done Ph.D. in Chemistry Chemical Engineering,

Mechanical Engineering and Home Science. The Research Degree Committee, which had been constituted, included Dean, Faculty of Science, Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Dean, Faculty of Business Management and Commerce were made members of the Committee. It is also being done in CIL and a Committee was constituted by the University, the permission of the Vice Chancellor was obtained.

The Vice Chancellor said that this change is already operational in almost all Universities.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the feedback from all Social Science Departments might be obtained to pass the same. This was also endorsed by Shri Ashok Goyal who said that inputs be taken from the departments.

The Vice Chancellor appreciated the feeling of the House of their being so dynamic.

Professor Rajesh Gill said she has one complaint that Vice Chancellor says that this was being done in their place but now the Panjab University is his place.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that now when the Vice Chancellor would go to Banaras Hindu University, he should say there that this is being done in his University i.e. the Panjab University.

The members of the House said that flexibility should be there.

Prof. Rajesh Gill that flexibility should be there but not at the cost of the interest of the students

Dr. S.K. Sharma that the Chemical Engineering Department is the first department of Panjab University which has the same model as that of Banaras Hindu University in the year 1958. These were the only two places where the subsidiary subject teachers were part of that department whereas at other places the subsidiary teachers came from outside.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that if the admission to M.Phil. course has to be done in this manner, then it should not be done at the cost of M.A. Public Administration students. Weightage could be given to the students having Public Administration as their core subject.

Dr. Harjodh Singh and Sh. Sandeep Singh said that it should be applicable to all language subjects. He said that in the University Geography and Political Science are the full-fledged departments and there is no common content between geography and Political Science.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a Committee may be constituted and inputs of the members of the Syndicate be placed before the Committee. The Committee should also consider the employability aspect and admission test along with what Dr. Rajat Sandhir has said. The Committee might also look into subject test required for admission to M.Phil.

Prof. Rajesh Gill proposed that Dr. Rajat Sandhir should be included in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee consisting of 3-4 members would be constituted to look into the issue and Professor Professor Rajat Sandhir would be one of the members of the Committee. The exercise will be done by taking the inputs of the

House to deal in the matter. If needed, some scientists from outside could also be made members of the Committee to consider the issue comprehensively.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said that inter-disciplinary system should not be implemented till the time credit system is executed.

Sh. Ashok Goyal and other members were of the view that this matter may be dealt with all subjects not only with the subject of Public Administration. He further said that it should be resolved that a Committee would be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the issue in its totality keeping in view the observations given by the Syndicate and not only from the view point of one subject only but all the subjects of Social Science and also keeping in view the interest of the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee would consider the proposal itself.

While moving towards another sub items, Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that sub item No. 12 is withdrawn and they have to take up sub items No.13, 17 has to be taken up.

Referring to Sub-Item 17, Prof. Rajesh Gill, at page 42 of the Appendix of the Agenda, said that Sr. No. 1 under the proposed regulation, Study leave may be granted to entry level appointees as Assistant Professor/Assistant Librarian/Assistant Director of Physical Education and Sports/College DPE & S or Professor of a University/College/Institution who is otherwise eligible for sabbatical leave after a minimum of three years of continuous service. The term is to be changed from two to three years.

The Vice Chancellor said that the proposed changes are there in the UGC guidelines and they cannot supersede these guidelines.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that the regulations/guidelines on the basis of which the changes are proposed, be submitted along with the item. It should be noted against the item that the amendment in the regulation is being proposed on the basis of U.G.C. guidelines. As in this case the guidelines of U.G.C. are the basis, due to which the said change is proposed.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that earlier it was notified that if a teacher is getting more than 10,000 dollars as fellowship, then he/she will not get salary from the University. In the regulations of 2013 this provision was changed saying that these two are independent of each other and it was decided that both fellowship and salary will be paid. This should be specified that it will be effective from 2013 in Panjab University on the basis of U.G.C. guidelines.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal informed the House that there is only one case which has been approved by the Syndicate and Senate for payment of both fellowship and salary, that had been adopted but accordingly the regulation was not changed. Now the audit has raised an objection that the same has been adopted but it has not been made the part of the regulation, therefore, this regulation is to be amended as per the guidelines of U.G.C.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be implemented from the date of U.G.C. guidelines, i.e., 2013, in principle, but it will be implemented while keeping in view the financial burden.

While referring to Sub-Item No.19 at Page 61 (**Appendix**), Professor Rajesh Gill said that in 1.4 it is mentioned that different certificate courses will be provided under Summer Certificate Courses and Winter Certificate Courses in accordance with the papers provided by the Department of Masters Course in Governance and Leadership and will be notified in the Handbook of Information every year. She said that if

someone completes in summer or winter vacation different certificates will be provided. She pointed out that in Department of Women Studies in the Master course in two semesters when the students pass in summer or winter period, the certificate course will be different.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal explained that in both the semesters, two courses are separately being run then there are different courses.

Prof. Rajesh Gill pointed out that when two students completed the same courses, how can the course is different in both summer or winter period as the certificate course is of 6 months duration.

The Vice Chancellor explained that two separate courses are being run by one department for example one in animal husbandry while the other in poultry.

Prof. Rajesh Gill pointed out that the nomenclature is different in both the courses.

The Vice Chancellor explained that separate courses are being run every year with different nomenclature.

Professor Rajesh Gill while pointing out at point No.2 of the Appendix that the word "examination" is correct or otherwise. She said the correct word should be admission instead of Examination.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Winter and Summer courses are to be initiated in the University and whosoever brings the proposal for the same be motivated to do so. This should be done by all the departments.

The Vice Chancellor interrupted and said that these are very very important things through which the dignity of University will be prepared. There are summer and winter courses and their theme is different, there is autonomy in it. So he stressed that if any Chairperson or any domain starts or initiates that should be motivated and at the later stage if some corrections is required, then the same can be done. He said that these are the very vital matters and that should be motivated as it is our strength.

Sh. Ashok Goyal felt that this is not the issue that this course is to be started or not but it is to be corrected. It is mentioned at 1.4 that in every semester there are separate courses in accordance with the papers of Masters level. The apprehensions in the Courses should be corrected. It is not known to anyone that the admission guidelines are being discussed or examination guidelines are being discussed. He further said that if the case has come for discussion then the separate theme be added in its nomenclature. The name of theme should be added in brackets for example Certificate course in governance and leadership (name of theme) so that one is able to differentiate.

Professor Rajat Sandhir that it should not be restricted only to humanities and it should be applicable to all departments. He said this course is for M.A. only and a science also wishes to do the course then when a science student can study, it should be opened in evening studies so that the persons who are working or doing jobs can be benefitted from the same.

Professor Rajesh Gill further pointed that the clause of 50% is applicable for examination or for admission.

The Vice Chancellor further clarified that the same will be sent for re-structuring.

Professor Rajesh Gill at point (c) it has been mentioned that 50% marks is required in the aggregate.

Sh. Jagdeep Kumar said that the subjects are specified in clause (b) whereas in clause (c) it is mentioned that 50% marks is required, which are contradictory.

Prof. Rajesh Gill pointed out to re-look the point (e) of the sub item.

Dr. S.K. Sharma further said that the members of the House spent many nights on the agenda

Sh. Ashok Goyal suggested if the Vice Chancellor agrees that Registrar should re-consider the Agenda with the dealing and give their inputs on the agenda item that will save the time. If the course is working from the year 2017-18 and difficulties are not coming then it will not happen in future.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that this will be published in P.U. Website and it reflects the image of the University and it is not understood from this whether it is admission or examination. It has been mentioned at point no. (e) that a candidate has been rolls either of any of the University department or of a college affiliated to the University for the purpose throughout the year whereas this certificate course is for six months.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to explain in the matter.

It was explained that the item No.6 and 11 which has been submitted to review has been implemented and these are in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate now for the next academic session i.e., 2019-20, whatever regulation has been made that has been made for example a candidate has appeared in the papers and certificate course has been completed the same can be done by the University from the next academic session. He said that in the system of regulation firstly department starts the course then the same is sent to the Faculty and later on sent to the Syndicate.

Sh. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when a decision is for the anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate then why it is assumed that this will be approved.

The Vice Chancellor said that what decision has been taken, that has been implemented.

Sh. Ashok Goyal interrupted that there is no provision that anything can be implemented in anticipation of the approval of this body. The only decision which was implemented in anticipation of the approval by the Government of India, that academic regulations can be implemented in anticipation of the approval of the Government of India. It comes after two years and Syndicate cannot do anything, it can only be done for future.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said that the House should appreciate the people who have read and brought it but if the same is on University website, what sort of message University is going to give for the same. The University should be very careful in this and all those people who are raising their objections, the University should be grateful as they are sparing their valuable time for the same.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that it should be kept in reviewing part with inputs for the year 2019-20.

Prof. Karamjeet Singh, Registrar said that in the Item No.3 of Regulation, four items have to be identified, Item No. 1, 6, 11 and 17 have to be reviewed. The same were approved but for the previous session.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that these items should not be approved; otherwise, these would be termed as regularised.

Registrar said that for example a candidate passes the examination and the regulation in the previous was approved and if the regulation with current status is not approved, what the candidate will do in that situation if the regulations are not approved.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that regulations are not required by the student to pass the examination.

Registrar said that the candidate will pass under the regulations.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that the copy of regulation is not required to be attached with the certificate.

The Vice Chancellor while justifying the statement of the Registrar asked Sh. Ashok Goyal then what is to be done in the case of the candidate who passes the certificate course.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 26.10.2018 (Sub-Items 4, 7, 8, 9, 13, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24 & 25) relating to amendments/additions/deletions in the regulations, be approved;
- (ii) the recommendation of the Regulations Committee dated 26.10.2018 (Sub-Item 17), be approved, and made effective from 07.06.2013, i.e., date of notification by UGC. However, the financial aspect, occurring due to approval of this Regulation, will be examined; and
- (iii) the recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 26.10.2018 (Sub-Items 1, 2, 6, 11 and 19) relating to amendments/additions/deletions in the regulations, be referred back to the Faculties/Boards of Studies concerned.

4. Considered if, letter No.F25-1/2018(PS/MISC.) dated 28.01.2019 of Secretary, University Grants Commission, regarding revised guidelines for enhancement of honorarium of Guest Faculty, be adopted. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

Dr. Rajat Sandhir asked if a person is already working as Guest faculty, will they go for Selection Committee, or exemption should be given to them.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the Selection Committee should be constituted again as per the norms of the U.G.C.

Registrar said that the regulation should be approved in toto, regulation should not adopted in parts that one part is adopted and the other part is not adopted.

Moreover there is a requirement of minor amendment that it should be both for the University and Colleges. In the Selection Committee it has been mentioned at point No.4 that the Vice Chancellor or his nominee be added for University, it should be added that for the Colleges, the Principal or his nominee should be added in the Selection Committee.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that for the constituent Colleges, Vice Chancellor or nominee be added in the Selection Committee.

Registrar said to read at Page 88 (Appendix), this rule is applicable to affiliated Colleges, it has been mentioned at point No.4 that Head/ Chairperson/Principal will be added in the Selection Committee.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it will be applicable after the implementation of 7th Pay Commission.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that the 7th Pay Commission will be applicable from 01.01.2016 whereas for the Guest Faculty who are working, then it cannot be applicable for them from the back date, therefore, if they change the emoluments and conditions as per the 7th Pay Commission, then the University should adopt the same and implement with immediate effect by giving this logic that it cannot be applicable from the back date.

Vice Chancellor asked whether it can be implemented keeping in view the election code of conduct.

Prof. Rajesh Gill submitted that 7th Pay Commission was passed in the Board of Finance and she suggested that it should be implemented with the 7th Pay Commission.

The members of the House deferred the item and asked to submit the same to the Board of Finance.

RESOLVED: That **Item C-4** on the agenda be treated as withdrawn.

5. Considered if, circular No. F.No. 2-16/2002(PS)Pt. FI.II dated 16.10.2018 (downloaded from website) (**Appendix-III**) of University Grants Commission regarding extension of the date of participation in Orientation/Refresher Course in respect of Teachers/Assistant Registrar/Assistant University Librarian/College Librarian/Deputy Librarian/Assistant Director of Physical Education/College Director of Physical Education for promotion under CAS upto 31.12.2018, be adopted.

The members were of the view that the circular should be adopted and a letter be sent to DPI (Colleges), Punjab and Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh in this regard.

RESOLVED: That –

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

- (ii) a copy of the decision taken at (i) above, be sent to the Director Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Director Public Instructions, (Colleges), Punjab by the Dean College Development Council.

6. Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 29.01.2019 (**Appendix-IV**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the UGC Regulations dated 18th July, 2018 and suggest modification in the templates and application forms for direct recruitment as well as Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) promotions, that:

- (i) the application forms for promotion under CAS, (a) for teachers in Panjab University as per **Annexure** and (b) for teachers in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University as per **Annexure**, along with the minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 16.10.2018 (**Appendix-IV**), be approved; and
- (ii) the UGC Regulations dated 18.07.2018 (**Appendix-IV** not adopted earlier) be also adopted, which contains clause 6.3 prescribing that:

“The criteria for promotions under Career Advancement Scheme laid down under these Regulations shall be effective from the date of notification of these Regulations. However, to avoid hardship to those faculty members who have already qualified or are likely to qualify shortly under the existing Regulations, a choice may be given to them, for being considered for promotions under the existing Regulations. This option can be exercised only within three years from the date of notification of these Regulations.”

RESOLVED: That –

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

7. Considered minutes dated 26.12.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine and recommend the 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. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 42 (x))DS had approved the guidelines 2017 for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree (which are in conformity with UGC Minimum Standards and Procedures for the award of Ph.D. degree) Regulation 2016 and the said guidelines will become effective from the date of issuance of circular i.e. 29.06.2017 and the same was read out and unanimously approved by the Senate in its meeting 10/24.09/16.12.2017 vide Para XXXIII (I-101).

2. A copy of the decision (Para XXXVII) of the Senate dated 03.11.2018 was enclosed.
3. A copy of the minutes of Branch Coordinators, UIET dated 29.01.2019 was enclosed.

RESOLVED: That Item C-7 on the agenda, be referred back to the Committee to review its recommendation in view of the discussion in Syndicate.

- 8.** Considered recommendation dated 07.02.2019 (**Appendix-V**) of the Board of Control, UILS, that an additional seat already created for Ms. Aishwarya Jagga to take admission in LL.M. one year course, pursuant to the orders dated 20.12.2018 of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide CWP no. 27423 of 2018 filed by her, be treated for the session 2019-20 instead of 2018-19 and the fees paid by her for whole one year course of the session 2018-19, be also adjusted.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2018 vide Para R (vi) has ratified the orders of the Vice Chancellor with regard to creation of an additional seat to Ms. Aishwarya Jagga for taking provisional admission in LL.M. One Year Course, pursuant to the orders dated 20.12.2018 of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide CWP no. 27423 of 2018.

Dr. S.K. Sharma while speaking on Item No.8 informed that in the University with the interference of the Court, the admission seats are created with the co-ordination of Lawyer and Judge and University is not able to disagree on it.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to explain in the matter.

It was informed that the Court has given the decision to give admission to Ms. Aishwarya in L.L.M. (One Year) as she has passed B.A. LLB (Hons) and according to the norms of the University, 15% weightage is to be given for Hons. Studies and candidate went to the Court to define the meaning of Honours as in the Handbook of Information the word "Honour Like" is written and the Court had summoned the Registrar. The Court defined the meaning of "Honours Like" and ordered to give admission to her and now the candidate has been admitted in the 2nd Semester. The candidate now requested to give admission to her in the 1st semester instead of 2nd semester so that the continuity can be prepared. In that situation the University has two options, the first is that to give admission in 2nd Semester but there is no 3rd Semester examination in December and there will be a gap period.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said that from the last many years the racket of sports cases is going on, the people go to the Court and court gives order to give admission subject to sports then after 1.5 years he pleads that 1st year has been passed with 75%, even our lawyers mix with them for the same and this is a back door entry to this University.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that this is the high court order firstly it was ordered in August, 2018 and then in the month of December, 2018 and directed the University to consider the same and ordered that she may be admitted provisionally which she had. In the year it was challenged that the Court had admitted her for the session 2018-19 and the Board of Control has recommended that it may be treated as 2019-20.

The Vice Chancellor said that these orders were for the session 2018-19 then how it can be moved to 2019-20 then the candidate is required to plead the court again to consider the same.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that an application be sent to the Court seeking clarification on the issue, how can the University say that it is implemented in the year 2019-20 because of the orders of the Court. He further said there is not much problem in creating the additional seat in LL.M. as the University can create the additional seat. But the University should follow the same under the orders of the Court and not according to at its own level.

Registrar said that Page No.197 the Court has written that the same is left to the University to consider the same in their second order.

Sh. Ashok Goyal while referring to Page No.197 intimated that the “admission process is concluding today and the petitioner states that there are 9 seats vacant and we could not comment on the availability of seats and the likelihood of their going waste but direct the University to consider the claim of the petitioner regarding her assertion of the seats being available or merit today itself” and these are the orders of 31st August, 2018 which is the first order of the Court. Now when the University did not entertain her claim, she again went to the Court and the Court passed another order on 28th December, 2018 while admitting and directed to give admission to her in the session 2018-19 and the University was left with other option but to give admission to her so she was admitted. This writ petition is to be filed that as now the issue has been delayed so much that even the Court allows the admission it will not serve the purpose, as an alternative the candidate should be allowed to be admitted next year i.e., 2019-20 because the University has not entertained the claim because of no fault of her so she should not be penalised. Now when the practical difficulty is raised then they are requesting the University to treat the orders of the Court of 2018-19 as 2019-20. Now in the request it has been written that the same may be considered as 2019-20 instead of 2018-19. The University gave the provisional admission to her in the mid of the session, the provisional admission means that after the hearing, the degree will not be awarded to her till the final outcome of the Court.

The House rejected to consider the admission for the session 2019-20.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that this item does not pertain to the orders of the Court, it pertains only for the recommendation of the Board of Control.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation dated 07.02.2019 of the Board of Control, UILS, Panjab University, be **not** approved.

- 9.** Considered request dated 23.01.2019 (**Appendix-VI**) of Mr. Vansh Singla (SG-15848) final year student of IT Branch, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, that he be allowed to attend one Semester training, as a special case on medical ground.

- NOTE:** 1. The joint meeting of all faculty members of Training and Placement Cell and Coordinator in its meeting dated 23.01.2019 (**Appendix-VI**) had considered the request of Mr. Vansh Singla and resolved that the application of the student be forwarded to higher authorities for approval and recommendation of one semester training.
2. The DUI has observed that “No specific rule, may be considered by the Syndicate on humanitarian ground of the student as a cancer patient”.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said in the last meeting the House spent half an hour on this item.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

Sh. Harpreet Singh Dua and Prof. Rajesh Gill informed the body that he is the cancer patient.

RESOLVED: That the request dated 23.01.2019 of Mr. Vansh Singla (SG-15848) final year student of IT Branch, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, to attend one Semester training, be approved, as a special case on medical ground.

- 10.** Considered if, the fee concession and financial assistance, be given, to the persons with Physical Disability (PWD), as is available to the blind students available as at Page 13 and 36 of Handbook of Information of 2017 (**Appendix-VII**).

NOTE: Request dated 07.05.2018 of Dr. Sanjeev Gautam, Coordinator and Grievance Officer, EO Cell, Persons with Disability along with the observations of the FDO is enclosed (**Appendix-VII**).

RESOLVED: That the fee concession and financial assistance, as is available to the blind students at Page 13 and 36 of Handbook of Information of 2017, be also given to the persons with Physical Disability (PWD).

- 11.** Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following faculty member, be confirmed in his post w.e.f. the date mentioned his name:

Name of the Faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of joining	Proposed date of confirmation
Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar Department of Library & Information Sciences	Assistant Professor	20.12.1983	22.01.2018 (A.N.)	23.01.2019

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Khushpreet Singh Brar was appointed as Assistant Professor in terms of judgment dated 20.12.2017 passed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No.1104 of 2014 as on a year's probation (subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Court in LPA No. 62 of 2018 and CWP No. 17501 of 2011) in the University Department and he joined the Department on 22.01.2018 (A.N.).
 2. The confirmation of the above faculty member is subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, CWP 17501/2011 and LPA No.62 of 2018.
 3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-VIII**).

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

12. Considered if, the period of absence from duty of Shri Amandeep Singh, Programmer (Sr. Scale), UIET, P.U. i.e. w.e.f. 14.03.2016 to 01.04.2018 (without sanction of leave of kind due by the Competent Authority), be treated as Leave (without pay). Information contained in office note **(Appendix-IX)** was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The Senate in its meeting dated 03.11.2018 (Para X) **(Appendix-IX)** accepted the resignation of Shri Amandeep Singh, Programmer, UIET, w.e.f. 02.04.2018 (instead of 14.03.2016).
 2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2019 as Item No. C-44, but the same could not be taken up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since they did not have any alternative, they should treat Shri Amandeep Singh, Programmer, on leave without pay. The person remained on leave authorizedly and disciplinary action was to be taken against him, but they did not initiate any action against him. Now, they have placed an item before the Syndicate that his absence be treated as leave without pay. As such, instead of taking disciplinary action against him, they are regularizing his absence.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to go through the papers thoroughly and give their input, so that it might not be quoted as precedent in future. He urged the members to find some via-media to solve the problem; otherwise, there could be a problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that the person has already tendered his resignation.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar suggested that the issue should be decided on merit. If it could not be done, it should not be done.

The members of the opinion that the item be not approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why the above item was placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that since several things were already approved, the Vice Chancellor also marked it to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that here the members emotionally suggest either to approve the item or not to approve the same. He has told that this person remained on leave unauthorizedly, i.e., without the sanction of competent authority. In fact, he should not have been allowed to retire as disciplinary action against him was required to be taken. After initiating disciplinary action, the person should have been allowed to retire, whereas they had allowed him to retire merely on the basis that he has submitted his resignation. If any disciplinary action is pending against someone, he/she could not be allowed to retire. In spite of this, they allowed him to retire. Now, another issue has come that the period for which he remained on leave unauthorizedly, should be treated as leave without pay. This meant, the period which they were terming as unauthorized till today, is being regularized. This period would itself remain without pay.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they treat this period on leave without pay, he might claim benefit(s).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that was why, he was saying that its implication(s) should be gauged; otherwise, such cases would be repeated.

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

RESOLVED: That the period of absence from duty of Shri Amandeep Singh, Programmer (Sr. Scale), UIET, P.U., i.e., w.e.f. 14.03.2016 to 01.04.2018 (without sanction of leave of kind due by the Competent Authority), be **not** treated as Leave without pay.

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

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate and Senate in their meetings dated 29.6.2010 vide Para 2(xxxix) and 10.10.2010 vide (Para III) respectively (**Appendix-X**) have approved the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor. But the appointment letter was not issued as he was not NET qualified.

2. In terms of the decision dated 12.11.2013 of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.2974 of 2012, the Vice-chancellor has approved the appointment of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biochemistry in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/-.

3. Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura submitted his joining on 15.01.2014. His appointment was also got noted by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 15.03.2014.

The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.09.2015 (Para 29) and Senate dated 05.12.2015 (Para XI) (**Appendix-X**) respectively approved the notional date of joining as 29.06.2010 of Dr. Naura.

4. Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura has joined as Associate Professor on 08.04.2016 in the Department of Biochemistry through direct recruitment.

5. The Senate in its meeting dated 10/24.09.2017 (Para XV) considered the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 6) (**Appendix-X**) with regard to confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura as Assistant Professor and it was resolved that the recommendation of the Syndicate be approved. However, it was further resolved that the matter to decide the deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura keeping in view the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja be referred back to the Syndicate.

6. Dr. Puja Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Institute of Education Technology and Vocational Education appeared for interview on 01.08.2011 for the post of Assistant Professor. As she was not selected, she filed CWP No.19285 of 2011 in Punjab and Haryana High Court challenging the recommendations of the Selection Committee. The Hon'ble High Court had passed interim orders dated 14.10.2011 and directed the University to keep one post of Assistant Professor as reserved. The Hon'ble Court on final hearing of the case on 19.12.2014 (**Appendix-X**) had passed the following orders:

“the action of the respondent University is held to be bad in the eyes of law and the petitioner is held entitled to appointment to the post of Assistant Professor subject to her fulfilling other conditions that may be accompanying such an appointment. Necessary exercise to appoint the petitioner be carried out within four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Needless, to say that the petitioner would be entitled to seniority etc. from the date when the appointment pursuant to the same selection were made. However, no monetary benefits will be given to the petitioner as she has not worked during that period”.

Pursuant to the orders of the Hon'ble Court the appointment letter was issued to Ms. Puja Ahuja vide orders dated 22.01.2015 mentioning that she will be deemed to have joined as Assistant Professor on 01.10.2011

7. The Senate in its meeting dated 09.10.2016 (Para XI) approved the deemed date of confirmation of Dr. Puja Ahuja as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 01.10.2012 i.e. after one year from the deemed date of her joining as such i.e. 01.10.2011 (**Appendix-X**).
8. Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate vide legal opinion dated 07.09.2018 (**Appendix-X**) has written that Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, Assistant Professor (now Associate Professor) can be treated as deemed confirmed on his previous post as Assistant Professor w.e.f. 29.06.2011 i.e. one year after from the date of his joining on notional basis, as has been done in the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja.
9. The Senate in its meeting dated 03.11.2018 (Para XII) (**Appendix-X**) while discussing the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 14.10.2018 (Para 3) regarding confirmation case of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura, Professor, (now Associate Professor), Shri V.K. Sibal said that this person ought to be given a notional benefit on the basis of a Court decision, but that Court decision is not before them. How could he say anything on it? Secondly, the Court decision is in regard to a different person. As such, this item should be withdrawn, and should be placed again with proper background and documents and it was resolved that in view of the discussion, Item C-9 on the agenda, be withdrawn and

placed again with proper background and relevant documents.

10. A copy of the orders dated 12.11.2013 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana in CWP No.2974 of 2012 is enclosed (**Appendix-X**).
11. A detailed office note containing the comparative brief history of the case of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura and Dr. Puja Ahuja is enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, earlier, the Syndicate had recommended the confirmation of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura in view of the orders of the Court. When the issue went to the Senate, all members except one, were in favour of his confirmation. Nobody came to know, only one member, who usually sits in the front row and speaks without mic, said that it should be examined. However, it did not come to their notice and it had been recorded that the matter be referred back to the Syndicate. As such, the matter has come to the Syndicate again. There is nothing in the case to discuss as it is in accordance with the orders of the Court. Everything has been done as per rules and the direction of the Court. **Now, it should be recorded that the matter has been reconsidered and found in order, as it would again go to the Senate.**

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

14. Considered if –

- (i) Dr. Ajay Guleria, System Administrator, Computer Unit be granted extension in Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) for one year more w.e.f. 7.3.2019 to 6.3.2020 (as recommended by the Director, Computer Centre, PU) & also allow him to retain lien in his substantive post of System Administrator, Computer Centre.
- (ii) Dr. Guleria be informed that he may request to his present employer at I.I.T., Delhi for sending his CPF contribution to Panjab University during his above said leave period.

NOTE: 1. Dr. Ajay Guleria System Administrator, Computer Centre, P.U. was granted EOL (with pay) for a period of one year i.e. 7.3.2017 to 06.03.2018 to enable him to join as Senior System Programmer/Manager in Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi which was ratified by the Senate in its meeting dated 26.3.2017 (Para XXXIX(R-13)).

2. Dr. Ajay Guleria, System Administrator, Computer Centre, P.U. was further granted extension in E.O.L. (without pay) for one-year more w.e.f. 7.3.2018 to 6.3.2019 (as recommended by the Director, Computer Centre, P.U.) and also allow him to retain lien in his substantive post of System

Administrator, Computer Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.03/21.04/ 29.04.2018 (Para 27).

3. Regulation 12.2 (C) at page 125 of PU Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, reads as under:

(C) EXTRAORDINARY LEAVE

The competent authority, may in its discretion for any special reason, grant an employee extraordinary leave of absence but such leave –

- (a) shall be without pay;
- (b) shall not ordinarily exceed 3 years at a time; and
- (c) shall be without pay and shall not count for increment except in the following cases:-

(i) to (iii) ~~xxx~~ ~~xxx~~ ~~xxx~~

(iv) **Leave granted to accept a post outside the University.**

Provided that the maximum period for which such leave may be availed of shall not exceed 5 years during entire service.

- 4. Request dated 17.11.2018 of Dr. Ajay Guleria is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).
- 5. An office note was enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).

The Vice Chancellor said that though he did not know the story, it has been brought to his notice that Dr. Ajay Guleria is a very competent person. He is willing to come back to the University even as System Administrator.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that his is a ticklish issue. Earlier, he was working in a pensionable job. Later on, he joined Panjab University as System Administrator, but here he is not sure whether he would get pension here or not because the revised Regulations relating to Pension has not yet been approved by the Government of India. Naturally, everybody is afraid of leaving a pensionable job.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that for utilizing his services, he could be invited to the University in visiting capacity.

Sh. Ashok Goyal explained that there are two type of cases, he is very competent person and he want to stay in Panjab University but he cannot stay here because of fear of not receiving the pension therefore he went to Delhi after taking leave from Panjab University, his residence is here, he wishes to come back, instead of coming back, he is applying for extension in leave. There are such persons sitting in Panjab University of which even the Syndicate/ Senate members have no knowledge about who

is the authority of deciding about who is on deputation in this University. Neither he is taken in the University on deputation nor he was sent on deputation. How is this deputation? Mr. Ajay Guleria is on deputation but till the deputation he cannot be confirmed. Therefore it is better neither to get the confirmation, nor to complete the probation, selection has been made on open selection and it is being said that the deputation is going on. He felt that there are such persons who have completed 9 or 10 years of service on deputation and they are managing. It has also been noticed that the name of the person on deputation has been shown in the seniority list of Panjab University. Can a person on deputation be part of seniority list of regular staff, this is also being done. But that seniority list has not been agreed to. That seniority list has been uploaded on website and marked with star and objections were solicited on the same. After receiving the objections, new seniority list has been prepared which has not been approved by the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that seniority list of the faculty of the University is applicable as per practice but seniority list of the faculty of the concerned department is not applicable but here at that serial number where there is dispute regarding seniority and in later cases as and when it will be decided.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said that the seniority list has been prepared and approved.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that the seniority list has not been placed before the Syndicate for approval as the same is not being produced to the Syndicate inspite of repeated reminders as this list was prepared in June, 2018.

The Vice Chancellor said that consolidated list of seniority list of faculty has not been approved.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that 8-9 months have passed and approval of the Syndicate is pending on the same.

Dr. S.K. Sharma asked that one information is sought by him if there is one or two seniority lists are available in this University. One seniority list is according to U.G.C. for the persons who are appointed through open advertisement but the turn for being the Head of Department then the different seniority list is being followed.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal clarified that according to the new guidelines of U.G.C. the same were combined with CAS and according to which the pending seniority list is common and before that no seniority list is different but for making the HODs the rules were changed.

The Vice Chancellor interrupted that seniority list will always be one and it is the one.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that there is confusion in the seniority list or appointment of Chairman, seniority list according to the Vice Chancellor is same as combined by U.G.C. and Open. But for the purpose of appointing the Chairman, the Panjab University follows the separate rules. When there are separate rules, then how it can be said that the same seniority is to be followed which are based on the length of the service.

The Vice Chancellor said that the regulatory/apex body of the University is U.G.C. and that cannot be over-ruled.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that rules which are framed by the University are not available in the U.G.C. There is no rule in the U.G.C. that Chairman is to be made on

rotation. Rotation policy is implemented in the Panjab University and to implement the same a new criteria has been made in which the length of service in the cadre has been considered. That seniority has been prepared since the rotation system has been started. He pointed out to Dr. S.K. Sharma and said that if it is wrong, that can be reviewed. These rotation cases were sent to the High Court in the past for decision.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) Dr. Ajay Guleria, System Administrator, Computer Unit, be granted extension in Extra Ordinary Leave (without pay) for one year more w.e.f. 7.3.2019 to 6.3.2020 (as recommended by the Director, Computer Centre, PU) and also allow him to retain lien in his substantive post of System Administrator, Computer Centre.
- (ii) Dr. Guleria be informed that he may request to his present employer at I.I.T., Delhi for sending his CPF contribution to Panjab University during his above said leave period.

15.

Considered status report dated 08.03.2019 (**Appendix-XII**) regarding rental properties under the jurisdiction of the Panjab University along with office comments and take a decision if the following suggestions made in the report be approved:

- (i) That the Auction Notice & its conditions and Lease Deed Terms & conditions, duly vetted by Senior Law Officer, PU and Sr. Advocate (University Counsel).

(Auction Notice & its conditions for Shops (Auction Notice of Canteen & its conditions Lease Deed terms & conditions.
- (ii) That the renewal of new lease deed with those Lessees who have already registered their lease deeds for another period of five years after the expiry of present term @ 10% increase in the last paid rent and 5% p.a. increase of the remaining four years in accordance with the extension clause No. 19 in the new lease agreement for shops/booths having registered lease deeds.
- (iii) That to register all old lease deeds of shops/Booths (which were not registered) with the appropriate Govt. for the remaining period i.e. up-to 30.6.2019 and 31.12.2019 immediately. Once the lease period of 5 years is over, then the lease deed be allowed to be extended for another period of 5 years with 10% increase in last paid rent at the time of renewal of lease deed and 5% p.a. increase for remaining four years.
- (iv) That if Shopkeepers fail to clear all the pending arrears of rent, the eviction orders be passed after following the due legal process for shops/booths with rent agreements/lease deeds.
- (v) That the Vice-Chancellor to constitute a Committee to resolve and to take decision in respect of the following two major issues of the tenants/occupants of Shops/Booths etc:
 1. Anomalies in the charging of rent of the Shops/Booths
 2. Anomalies in the imposition of penal interest on the accumulated arrears of rent of the Shops/Booths, as requested by the lessees for waiving off the penal interest.

The Vice Chancellor asked first he will give his input in the matter. He would like state the agreement of e-rickshaw which was held was not clear, how it happened.

Dr. S.K. Sharma pointed that the House spent on three hours on e-rickshaw agreement and it is the weakness of the office that deliberation of 3 hours has not been recorded. The 3 hour meeting was held without taking lunch which Sh. Ashok Goyal was also present. No proceedings were given. Only the proceedings indicating therein that in the next meeting the Registrar will be invited in the Committee were given.

The Vice Chancellor said he himself asked the Registrar to look into the rental properties of the University and submit its status report, the detailed report will be intimated by the Registrar about the agreement of the rental properties of the University.

The Registrar said that when joined in the month of October he observed and called a meeting with the shopkeepers of the University, one of the person pointed out that the University only frames the rules but nothing is being done, this is the projection that University is spineless and cannot take any action and the dealing person of the Rent Recovery was transferred to F.D.O. Office. There are 70 shops and 4 towers are available with the University. One agreement was done with the Spice Company and the Spice has sold its own Company to some other Company and the tower was sublet by Spice Company and University had no knowledge and this was brought to the knowledge when the arrear soared to Rs.77 Lacs and then Company was called, they informed about their visit many times but the account cannot be reconciled. The Registrar called the Company to his office about pending arrears and asked to reconcile the arrear amount, failing which the University will take action. If the University is at fault, the same will be paid and if the Company is at fault, the Company will have to pay. The Company did not agree to it, after three meetings with them and the BSNL agreed to pay the arrears on 31.03.2019 and the University said if the same is not received till 31.03.2019, the Company will be penalized. The second Company (Indus) deposited the amount of Rs.30 Lacs with the University and reconciliation is being done. The A.T.C. Company had arrear of Rs.16 Lacs owing to which the Company was asked to pay Rs.16 Lacs. They did not agree to pay according to the terms and conditions, which the University have laid down for payment for other companies. The University constituted a five member Committee and the connection of the tower of the said Company was cut. When their tower connection was cut, the Company was in trouble and they met the Registrar that the Company informed that they had paid Rs.8 Lacs which is to be adjusted. Ultimately, they reconciled and deliberated and paid Rs.11 Lacs and their connection was restored. The things which unfolded which he (Registrar) wants to share with the hon'ble members of the House were that the Company gave a list in which there is one official, the questions is that the cheques from the last five years were given by the Company and tax was also deducted at source and that cheques were not deposited and the official said that these are the cheques which are left by him and the same were not deposited. These cheques were again re-issued by the Company and the Registrar asked whether any action was taken against the official for not depositing the cheques. Now the arrears has been recovered from the tower companies. Highlighting, the Registrar informed that there is situation that there is no uniformity with the University, for some Company there is an increase of 10% for other there is increase of 5% for another Company there is no increase. The lease deeds of the towers are not registered with the University. Similarly the lease deeds of the shops are not registered and nobody is paying rent. Last month the Registrar and F.D.O. worked on it and to deal with it through online system after meetings with SBI. The issue is that to streamline this system the University is of view that the shops which are vacant that should be auctioned the lease deeds are to be executed from the current year. The lease deeds have been prepared in consultation with the Advocates by vetting the same. There are three categories of shops one is that they are paying the rent, their lease deeds are also available but the registration of their

lease deeds are completing in the month of June, 2019, that are to be reviewed. The second category are the old shops who have completed 4 or 4.5 years years but their lease deeds are not registered. There are four things which are to be considered that are the owners of the shops have given the proof of paying the arrears of the rent of which the University is levying the interest. The proof of paying the rent was shown to the University along with their cheque number and date, along with the details of the TDS payment. The shopkeepers said that why they were being penalized to pay the interest of that period when they are not at fault. Now the guidance of the House is required on these three major issues. The shopkeepers had a meeting and submitted a memorandum to the Registrar that the shopkeepers are having their bad name in the market and they will reconcile the matter with the University authorities. The issues of penal interest and rent anomalies have to be resolved through the guidance whether a committed is to be constituted or otherwise.

Sh. Jagdeep Kumar while seeking clarified said that the cheques have been given by the Companies but the cheques were not deposited, in that matter, the responsibility be fixed and action should be taken in the matter so that the other officials in the Administration block will not repeat the same thing.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said that a local member of Syndicate who have knowledge of finance should be included in the Committee.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that the House should authorise the Vice Chancellor to constitute the Committee including Prof. Rajesh Gill, Dr. Keshav Malhotra and Committee should be free to take help of others as per their requirement. He further want to place on record that the deep efforts of the Registrar and appreciated the same under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor asked to give appreciation to the University administration.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that the word "University Administration" is added under the leadership of Prof. Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor and Dr. Karamjeet Singh, Registrar, Panjab University. It is due to the same that the eyes of the House are also opened as it has been brought to the knowledge of the members of the Syndicate/Senate. He further said that responsibility has to be fixed and this action is very serious that cheques given by the shopkeepers are not deposited in the University. TDS is no proof. The Committee which has been constituted has to be given the work. The cheques may be of 10 or 12 crores which have not been deposited but in their place this amounts to 1000s of crores. The lakhs of amount is given for keeping the cheques in the drawers. Has it been verified that the person, who has received the cheques, has received the cheques and given the receipts. When he has received the cheques, under which authority he has returned the same to the shopkeepers for re issue of cheques. This was done only to escape the penalty. Clearly giving the cheques does entitle them to any benefit. How can a Company of 15000 crore have no knowledge that cheques issued by them are not being produced for payment.

While responding the same the Registrar said that he is surprised that the agreement of the University was made with Spice and Spice company was taken over by some other company as per the orders of the Court and there is no agreement available with the University.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that when merger is done, the agreement is not transferred automatically. How the rent was being charged without the agreement. The rent was being received from the new Company which means that the change of the Company has been accepted by the University. A detailed note be prepared by the Registrar and submit to the Committee but this issue needs to be taken seriously at it

deserves to be and the persons who are involved in receiving the cheques, their responsibility is to be fixed and strict disciplinary action is to be taken against them.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that now they are demanding exemption but can exemption be granted to them when got the interest of 4 years of the University and penalty should be levied against them. He further enquired whether increase of 10% or 5% is being written in the lease agreement by the University.

The Registrar informed that in the Campus out of 70 shops, there are 40 such shopkeepers, they came to University for paying the rent but nobody was available at that time, therefore, their penalty should be waived. He further informed that 10% increase is final which is to be charged.

Dr. Rajat Sandhir as informed by the Registrar that cheques were received before 4-5 years and the same were lying with the University by mistake but there is a policy of the Company that at the end of financial year the bank accounts have to be reconciled which means that cheques were issued but not realised and this was known to the Company.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that this case is an eye opener and she want to congratulate the Vice Chancellor, Registrar and F.D.O. to detect the same. But it comes also in the mind how it was detected by the officers of the University before.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that House has not observed and he already said this responsibility cannot be escaped. House in fact expresses a serious concern that why this issue has not been brought to the notice of the House. The House is completely shocked to see this. It was informed that the previous Registrar has done a commendable job in the past 5 years.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that in the past years the meetings of the same Committees were held and the things were discussed but why this was not detected then.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that this has to be resolved that the things which cannot be discussed in the House that should be come in the form of recommendations of the Committee already constituted. The matters such as lease deed, enhancement of rent and fixing of responsibility should be included in it. That Committee should be enlarged to look into the lease deed issues and regarding fixing of responsibility.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said if two Committees submit their different recommendations then the new problem will arise.

The Vice Chancellor said that the process has been initiated and it will mature very soon.

The Registrar said that this item should be approved as it is already mentioned that a Committee is to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to deal with these issues. The issues are anomalies, charging of rent, anomalies in the penal rent.

It was informed that there are major cases of sublet and in the cases of sublet increase of 10% increase is not be allowed.

The members of the House were of the view that all the matters be discussed by the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that Registrar will be made Chairman of the Committee whereas Sh. Ashok Goyal said that Registrar will the overall incharge and therefore he

should not be made the Chairman of the committee for the purpose. He further suggested that Prof. Rajesh Gill be made the Chairman of the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor that the House authorised the Vice Chancellor to constitute the Committee and so much of autonomy is to be given to him to deal with the case. He said that one or two members of the Syndicate will be included in the committee.

Sh. Ashok Goyal showed his dissent on the issue and Dr. Rajat Sandhir also seconded the same.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that in the prerogative of the Syndicate the Vice Chancellor is denying by making a ruling that they will not listen, that is wrong. Then the Vice Chancellor should suggest the names and constitute the committee on this serious issue himself.

The members of the House said that all the 15 members of the House are equal and all are saying on behalf of each other.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that a very important thing was told by the Vice Chancellor which he want to underline that some persons informed the Vice Chancellor that why only these persons are included in the Committees and he further suggested that those members should be included in the Committee who came to the Vice Chancellor for inclusion of their names.

Sh. Sandeep Singh enquired as to under which authority those persons are saying the same.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor initially agrees the name of Dr. Keshav Malhotra and other members, why he is denying now.

The Vice Chancellor said to Sh. Ashok Goyal that he should hold for some time, whatever he wants that will be done.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor authorise the Registrar and the Registrar after submitting the entire matter asked to constitute the Committee and the members of the Syndicate suggested the names of the members and the Vice Chancellor is now saying that names are not be given.

The Vice Chancellor said that names are not to be given.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that why the names of the members are not to be given.

The Vice Chancellor said that the name of one member has been taken by him.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that no name suggested by him is to be taken.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that she did not want to include her name in the Committee. She said that the objection is always raised particularly at her name by the Vice Chancellor. She said that she will serve the University at her own level she does not require to be included in any Committee.

Sh. Naresh Gaur said it was observed by him many times in which one thing which has been told by the Vice Chancellor that people are coming to pressurise him and every committee has its own value, whenever they were the members of the Syndicate the decisions were taken according to their requirement and now the present members will play their role. The statement given by the Vice Chancellor is wrong that other persons raised objections. He said that the word pressure should not be used as

this is the unanimous decision of the Syndicate and the other thing what Prof. Rajesh Gill has said that is seconded by him whenever the name of Prof. Rajesh Gill comes, there is a objection to the Vice Chancellor.

Sh. Ashok Goyal asked the Registrar to intimate the resolved part of the same.

The Registrar informed the House that Vice Chancellor will constitute a Committee to resolve and take decision on the following two major issues of lease deeds, anomalies in charging rent and any other issues raised by the members.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said that he approved what Sh. Ashok Goyal has said, the first auction was got done by him in consultation with D.U.I. and he knows the kind of pressure of work to him. He had to face so much of difficulty in getting the work done.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said if the Vice Chancellor wants ifs and buts on the decision of the Syndicate then it is ok. He wanted that time is to be saved and if Vice Chancellor does not want that time to be saved then there is no problem in it. He said that the Vice Chancellor is saying that he consult the members of the Syndicate but will not made them member of the Committee. He said that is of the strong view on the recommendation that Vice Chancellor should be authorised constitute a Committee, he said that Vice Chancellor is putting words in the mouth of the Syndicate.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that after doing preparation she will give in writing.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) A Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the issue in its entirety and make recommendations to resolve the following issues:
 - (a) Anomalies in the charging of rent of the Shops/Booths;
 - (b) Anomalies in the imposition of penal interest on the accumulated arrears of rent of the Shops/Booths, as requested by the lessees for waiving off the penal interest; and
 - (c) Any other issue related to the rental properties.
- (ii) The Committee be requested to submit the report in a time bound manner.

16.

Considered request dated 24.01.2019 (**Appendix-XIII**) of Dr. Devinder Dhawan, Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for further extension of one year w.e.f. 1st June 2019, under Regulation 17.4 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 17.4 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

“A whole-time Medical Officer of the University shall retire on reaching the age of sixty years; provided that extension may be granted for a period up to two years in special cases, on the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor”.

2. Dr. Devinder Dhawan, CMO, BGJ Health Centre, P.U., was retired on 31.05.2018 on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years. He was granted extension in service for a period of one-year beyond the age of 60 years by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.3.2018/21.4.2018/29.4.2018 (Para 32) which was approved by the Senate in its meeting held on 27.05.2018 (Para X) **(Appendix-XIII)**.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said while explaining the Agenda item No.16 that previously the CMOs of Health Centre were given two years extension. Earlier the request of the extension of the Dr. Devinder Dhawan, CMO was received at the time of the previous Vice Chancellor, the same was firstly recommended by the then Vice Chancellor but later on he rejected the application and not did not recommended the same. The item was placed on the Agenda and after discussion, finally one year extension of service was recommended but when it was being discussed in Senate, the members of the Senate with the strong majority were saying that it should be extended for two years then the previous Vice Chancellor said that it has come from the Syndicate that should be referred back to Syndicate. As previously two years extension was given to all the CMOs therefore, one more year extension be granted to CMO Dr. Devinder Dhawan.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said that such things should be blind so that the officials of the Panjab University do not have to run for the same. But it will be in the interest that any official gets the extension.

The Vice Chancellor asked to give more inputs on the issue and the representation should be considered whether the rights should not be deprived. The Vice Chancellor if the Syndicate gives the extension, then the financial and administrative powers may be given to him.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said that this will be conflicting and will be a fighting situation everyday.

Sh. Naresh Gaur said he is basically against the extension to anyone as there is lot of unemployment but in the Panjab University, there is a ritual to give extension of one or two years, it is ok but it has been noticed that there are huge complaints of this Doctor. He said that he will always raise objection to any case of extension as this is a natural injustice as there is unemployment in our country and proper counselling is required to be done.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that as explained by Dr. Navdeep Goyal it is right that it should be got extended from the Syndicate for the period of two years. Keeping in view the overall sentiments of the Campus it should be extended for one year but at the same time whatever apprehensions are there that should be taken care of while conveying to him regarding the extension of service. The extension should be given to him as it was being given in the past to other Doctors but as far as unemployment is concerned it is good as a slogan but is it being guaranteed by the Vice Chancellor that after the retirement of the said Doctor, new Doctor will join immediately on the very next day. That is not possible, do the authorities want to deprive the University people from medical facility in the absence of the services of the Doctor. So in view of the exigencies of services, the extension of one year should be granted to him on the recommendation of Syndicate only. He is in favour of the same.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that it should be done as per Regulations.

The Vice Chancellor said that these cases are placed before the Board of Finance where there are clear cut remarks of the MHRD and U.G.C. to fill this post. Till now it has been sent that due to exigencies of services, the same may be allowed and the process for recruitment has been initiated.

Dr. K.K. Sharma asked that if one year extension is not given then no one will be appointed for the same.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal explained that firstly the approval from U.G.C. is required, advertisement is to be published and it is very fortunate if the said process is completed in one year.

Dr. K.K. Sharma asked if the person is not appointed in one year then is the House will consider it for 2+2+1 year extension.

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

- 17.** Considered if, permanent affiliation be granted to Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Women, Village Kala Tibba, Abohar Punjab for B.A./B.Sc. (Non-Medical), B.C.A., B.Com., M.A. (Hindi), M.A. (Punjabi), M.A. (History) and PGDCA courses.

NOTE:1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 37) has resolved that permanent affiliation to Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Women, Kala Tibba, Abohar, **subject to the appointment of required number of regular teachers, as recommended by the Sub-Committee dated 10.05.2017, and endorsed by the affiliation Committee dated 05.07.2017, be granted.**

Accordingly, a letter vide No. Misc./A2/4130 dated 22.11.2017 was sent to the Principal, Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Women, in this regard.

2. The Principal of Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Women, Village Kala Tibba, Abohar, has informed through letter No.BSKC/4474/17 dated 4.12.2017 and letter No.BSKC/4681/18 dated 10.07.2018 that the college had appointed the required ten teachers.

The College was informed vide letter No. Misc./A-2/7333 dated 27.07.2018 that before finalization of permanent affiliation case of the College, the Management shall have to appoint a woman Principal on regular basis at the College.

3. The Chairman, Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Woman, Abohar vide letter dated BSKC/ 4294/18 dated 17.10.2018 has requested that the College has appointed Dr. Karamjeet Kaur as Principal of the College on regular basis with regard to permanent affiliation. The case has received the approval of appointment of Dr. Karamjeet Kaur as Principal of the said College on permanent basis and the same is under process.
4. An office note is enclosed.

While discussing the Agenda Item No.17, Dr. Navdeep Goyal informed that this committee was constituted in the year 2017 and several objections were raised during the inspection before giving the permanent affiliation. In the permanent affiliation, the teachers of the courses are to be appointed on permanent basis. 10 teachers were appointed and in the meantime the Principal was also retired and they were asked to appoint the Principal, which has been done. Dr. Navdeep Goyal believed that as of today all the objections which were raised by the University, were complied with by the College.

Sh. Jagdeep Singh said that as has been explained all the conditions for the fulfilment of permanent affiliation have been complied with but he has some doubts regarding the same and he is of the view permanent affiliation should not be given to the College due to the reason that list of the teachers provided are working at present in the College. He told to look at Page 357 wherein the list of the teachers have been provided, out of which some of the teachers have left the College and joined in some other Colleges that should be cross verified immediately. Secondly the teachers of the College are not being paid full salary, thirdly the provident fund of no teacher has been deducted as per University Calendar. Despite these major irregularities, the House should not give permanent affiliation to the College.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that he is certifying what Sh. Jagdeep Kumar has informed. Some of the teachers of Physics, Chemistry and Commerce left the job of the College and joined in Government department. This relates to the first list.

Sh. Harjot Singh said that this is absolutely right that as on the basis of appointment of lecturers, the Committee is giving report that affiliation is to be granted. There are three major irregularities which the College have to fulfil and University have to consider while granting affiliation. As the College is not complying with these three major conditions therefore the University should not give them the permanent affiliation.

Sh. Harpreet Singh said that he is not aware whether the teachers have left the job but he is very much concerned about the two things one is the salary status, the document of which is not attached and secondly the P.F. structure.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said he is not very much aware on the issue.

Prof. Rajesh Gill that the condition in the Colleges is very worse and teachers are very badly exploited, salary is not given and being terminated according to their wish. Therefore in such type of Colleges one should think for ten times for granting permanent affiliation.

Dr. S.K. Sharma said that he agreed on this. He want to know that whether the list provided is on the rolls of the College or not and what is their replacement.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that his submission is that if the P.F. is not properly implemented and salary is not being given and teachers have left the job, then the College should not be given permanent affiliation.

Sh. Sandeep Singh said that he is in favour as informed by other members that some teachers have left the job and joined in Government Sector. A person who gets better opportunity will leave the job and join there. The inspection was held in the year 2017 and looking into the current status of the College, it should be regularised. It should be checked and affiliation may be granted.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they are in favour of granting permanent affiliation to the Colleges. The inputs which are given by the members be got verified by the D.C.D.C and item should not be rejected. The record of P.F. and salary is to be demanded from the College.

D.C.D.C said in the committee headed by Dr. Navdeep Goyal it was said that when the College recruit the teachers, the College will get affiliation.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that if the case is placed before the Syndicate in 2019 the updated status upto 2019 is required to be submitted.

The Vice Chancellor asked Sh. Ashok Goyal to submit the resolved part.

Sh. Ashok Goyal submitted that there is the specific provision of granting affiliation to the College. D.C.D.C. should verify all the conditions laid down for granting the affiliation and the submission made by the Selection Committee be verified by the D.C.D.C. These conditions may be confirmed and after confirmation that should be brought to Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the Compliance Report submitted by Bhag Singh Khalsa College for Women, Village Kala Tibba, Abohar, with regard to grant of permanent affiliation be verified by the Dean College Development Council and the case be placed before the Syndicate again.

18.

Considered request dated 29.01.2019 of Chairman of Rayat Educational & Research Trust (Regd.), for grant of temporary affiliation to the newly proposed College namely Rayat Degree College, Railmajra, Distt. SBS Nagar for the session 2019-2020. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: Survey Report dated 23.05.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to grant of temporary affiliation to the newly proposed college namely Rayat Degree College, Railmajra (Nawanshahr) Distt. SBS Nagar for the certain courses for the session 2018-2019 was placed before the Syndicate meeting dated 7.7.2018 vide item C-63, but the meeting of the Syndicate could not be held and no business was took place.

Principal Gurdip Sharma while discussing on Agenda Item No.18 submitted that the information sought therein is not provided in the agenda. The NOC received from the Department of Higher Education is subject to nine conditions, these conditions have not fulfilled.

Sh. Jagdeep Kumar said according to his off the record information that they are not ready to open the College.

Sh. Harpreet Singh submitted that the salary is not being given and University have to think over a lot while granting affiliation.

The Registrar said that it will be completed and after completion it will again be placed before the Syndicate.

Principal Gurdip Sharma that the College should have applied the fresh. The House wants fresh NOC from Punjab Government where they have clarified those nine points.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred and in the meantime, the Chairman of Rayat Educational & Research Trust (Regd.), be asked by the Dean College Development Council, to submit reply to the points raised by the Survey Committee in its report dated 23.5.2018.

19. Considered minutes dated 15.02.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to evaluate the applications of the students (**as per Annexure-A**) of Law Courses for attending classes/transfer from one institution to the other within the Panjab University System of Institution.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 15.02.2019, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

20. Considered if, the extension of affiliation earlier granted for M.Sc. IT-I and B.A. I (Functional English) to Guru Gobind Singh for Women, Sector 26, Chandigarh be discontinued from the academic session 2019-2020 in a phased manner as per Regulations 13.3, 13.4(b) & 13.5 appearing at page 161 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The College if wants to restore the extension of affiliation for courses/ subjects in future, the college will have to apply for the same along with the requisite extension of affiliation fee as applicable at that time.

2. Minutes dated 16.10.2018 of the Local Managing Committee was enclosed.

RESOLVED: That **Item C-20** on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn.

21. Considered recommendation dated 14.2.2019 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor (on the recommendation dated 21.12.2018 (**Appendix-**) of the Administrative and Academic Committee of the P.U.R.C. Kauni) to increase the seats in the following courses for the session 2019-2020:

Name of the course	Existing seats	Proposed seats
B.A.I	160	240
B.Com	40	80

Principal Gurdip Sharma submitted that there are 70 seats of B.Com. per unit, that should be enhanced to 70 as per U.G.C. norms and it should also be verified about the availability of teachers in Kauni.

Sh. Ashok Goyal said that all the teachers are the members of the Academic and Administrative Committee and these are total 4 teachers who are teaching 320 students of B.A. and 80 students of B.Com. Existing seats of B.Com are 40.

The Vice Chancellor explained that the focus of the University is to strengthen the constituent Colleges and regional centres.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it should be strengthened and the information about the faculty should be provided. After the verification the item may be brought again in the Syndicate.

It was informed that one units of B.Com. comprised of 70 seats.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired as to how many teachers are working in this Constituent College.

It was informed that in Constituent Colleges, fortunately or unfortunately, no permanent teachers have been appointed and classes are being run with the help of Guest Faculty on payment basis at the rate of Rs.1000/- per lecture. Principals of all Constituent Colleges are facing this problem. The Vice Chancellor has convened a meeting for Monday (i.e. 18.03.2019) to deliberate upon the problem. They follow the same rules and regulations in their Constituent Colleges, which are followed in the University. All the students are promoted. The Senior Clerks are also promoted. Thus, to say that there is no system. After discussion with all concerned, they came to the conclusion that they need to frame a permanent policy and the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor is also going to talk to the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Punjab in this regard. He said that we have also enquired from Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and Punjabi University, Patiala, about what they are doing with regard to the matter. As they are aware, in B.Com. the students are allotted in units.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Constituent Colleges were opened under a particular policy of the Government of Punjab. At the time of opening these Colleges, they had the apprehension that the Government of Punjab will not fill the posts. At that time a lot of discussion was held on the issue and it was opined that these colleges be not granted affiliation meetings because the whole burden would be put on the University and it happened so too. He further said that if there are already six Constituent Colleges and if two-three more are added, no permanent faculty is going to be appointed by the Government in those colleges also. They are running their aided and unaided college on the same structure and they have full right on them. He said if the Government of Punjab is not interested in running these Colleges then these should be closed down and they should not appoint Guest Faculty for these Colleges.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said they are already paying full salary to their staff, which is being paid by the Government. He further said that the posts have already been advertised and screening has also been done. The only thing is that posts have to be filled and the Punjab Government has already accorded approval for the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is convening the meeting of Principals of Constituent Colleges for the purpose. There is no issue in filling up the posts of teachers in Constituent Colleges. They could fill the vacancies and they are going to do this. The Vice Chancellor asked Prof. Devinder Singh, Secretary to Vice Chancellor to give input to the members about the seats.

Prof. Devinder Singh said they had taken the input that whether more seats are required. It was informed that even the existing seats do not get filled. The problem, which is being faced, at the time of admission is that the students seeking admission under General Category outnumber the available seats. And the seats earmarked for reserved categories can't be filled before the issuance of notification by the University on 18th August. Hence, if the number of seats are increased the seats meant for General Category would get filled.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has been assured that if permission is granted to Constituent Colleges in time then they can fill these seats too.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that faculty is not adequate in any of the Constituent Colleges, especially in English. One teacher is taking 5 to 6 periods and for

rest of the classes, there are no teachers and he did not know whether he (Vice Chancellor) is aware of it or not

The Vice Chancellor said that it is in his knowledge.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked as to how the students would study.

The Vice Chancellor said he has convened the meeting of Principal of Constituent Colleges for this purpose and he would get the things reviewed.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the enhancement of Unit is okay but he (Vice Chancellor) should ensure the availability of adequate number teachers in Constituent Colleges. The teachers may be appointed on *ad hoc* basis. Four teachers are required for one unit but the same are not there.

Professor S K Sharma said that it was 19th and he mentioned it wrongly earlier. They had discussed the issue of those students coming for study to the University from other institutions. If the students have to study here, then they should close down those institutions and grant pension to their teachers.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, on the one hand they talk of promoting Regional Centers and on the other they are allowing those students to study at the Panjab University which is a back door entry.

Professor S.K. Sharma endorsed it and said they themselves ruining these institutions as Teachers are sitting idle over there and taking tuitions.

Professor Rajesh Gill said this matter is placed before the Syndicate in every meeting.

Professor S K Sharma while agreeing to it and said classes are not held over there and here they are talking of the student teacher ratio.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that only 3-4 students are there.

Dr K K Sharma asked the enquired whether 80 seats have been approved or 70 to which he was informed that 70 seats have been approved.

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

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

22.

Considered minutes dated 17.01.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the cases of appointment on compassionate grounds for the year 2019.

Shri Naresh Gaur said they had discussed about the case of Professor A.K. Bhandari in last meeting of Syndicate and they should have brought it in this meeting too. Why it has not been brought in this meeting? He was apprised by the members that the case was approved in the last meeting. The members asked about action taken report on the same from the Chair. The Vice Chancellor apprised the members that as the Code of Conduct is in force the administration will have to examine the matter before issuing the necessary orders. The members apprised him that there is no problem in issuing the required orders as the case was approved prior to the code of conduct came into force. Hence, the University should issue the required orders with regard to the matter.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 17.01.2019, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

23. Considered request dated 28.11.2018 (**Appendix-XVI**) of Shri Naresh Sabharwal Superintendent (under suspension), U.I.P.S. that:

- (i) subsistence allowance under Rule 29.2 (i) at page 92-93 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 be enhanced from 50% to 75% retrospectively from 28.03.2016; and
- (ii) to revoke his suspension be kept pending till the final outcome of the court case.

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

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.08.2017 (Para 21) (**Appendix-XVI**) has resolved that –

- (i) the status of actions/court proceedings/ departmental enquiry against Ms. Pooja Bagga and Mr. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), Pension Cell with regard to misappropriation of funds by Ms. Pooja Bagga, Ex-Daily wage, Clerk, Pension Cell, be noted; and
 - (ii) the subsistence allowance being paid to Mr. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), Pension Cell, be continued to be paid as earlier.
2. The above decision of the Syndicate was noted and approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 16.12.2017 (Para XXXIII (I-87) (**Appendix-XVI**).
3. Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent (under suspension), UIPS was suspended on 28.09.2015.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University had a big scandal of pension funds and it reached up to the office of the Chancellor of the University. So, the House must deliberate on it.

It was informed that revocation of suspension of Shri Naresh Sabharwal can be kept pending till the final outcome of the Court case. They are not under obligation to enhance his subsistence allowance from 50% to 75%

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he was Chairman of a Committee wherein Shri Naresh Sabharwal was indicted for alleged transfer of students of a Law College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they must be objective and we should do, what is in our hands and it should not be based on personal liking/disliking. It was a very big fraud and there is no doubt in it. But, it does not mean that we can ignore the provisions. Registrar Sir says that we are under no obligation to enhance Shri Naresh Sabharwal's subsistence allowance from 50% to 75%. He should tell me where it is written that we are under no obligation. Because, as I have seen, it is nowhere written in the Office Note, which has been supplied along with the Agenda, that it is our wish to do it or not to do it. You will not find it too because it can't be so.

It was replied that it could be enhanced.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked the Registrar to share with the House anything additional, if he is having with him on the matter.

Shri Naresh Gaur said it is law of the land.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that actually this case also came up for discussion in a meeting of Syndicate in 2017 and in it the observation, which came was that we should leave it. He further stated that at that time neither the Syndicate took note of it nor the then Vice Chancellor as well as the then Registrar that the decision on the matter has to be taken by the Vice Chancellor. It is not a matter of Syndicate. Now, the matter has again come up for discussion in the Syndicate on the application of Shri Naresh Sabharwal, which he has given again. Quoting a line from page no. 409 of the Agenda, i.e., "*where the period of suspension exceeds six months, the suspending authority,*" he asked, who the suspending authority here is. He said the Vice Chancellor. Quoting further he said, "*the suspending authority shall be competent to vary the amount of subsistence allowance for any period subsequent to the period of the first six months as follows:*" He further stated that this decision was to be taken by the then Vice Chancellor in 2017 though the Vice Chancellor did not take it, it was taken by the Syndicate. It has again come to the Syndicate in 2019 though it should have been stopped at the level of the suspending authority but still since it has already come up in Syndicate in 2017 it was thought that it be brought before the Syndicate.

Speaking further on the matter, he stated that it is written in (i) "*Subsistence allowance may be increased by a suitable amount, not exceeding 50 percent of the subsistence allowance admissible during the period of the first six months, if, in the opinion of the said authority, the period of suspension has been prolonged for reasons to be recorded in writing, not directly attributable to the employee.*"

Under the above quoted Rule, the University employee, who is placed under suspension and his period of suspension exceeds six months, is entitled for enhancement in subsistence allowance from 50% to 75%. According to this rule, it is the discretion of the authority to enhance subsistence allowance or not. However, in the instant case, the delay in proceedings is not attributable to the delinquent employee, as the matter is sub-judice. So, we should allow 75% subsistence allowance to him. He further stated that where the University has went wrong, is the decision taken in the meeting of Syndicate, held on 12.07.2014, which is as under: -

"That all those employees who have been placed under suspension for more than two years and are getting 75% or more of the salary

as subsistence allowance be reinstated pending the outcome of their respective cases and Vice-Chancellor be authorized to assign appropriate duties to these employees.”

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is of the opinion that as at that time the University was paying 75% subsistence allowance to its suspended employees and was not taking any work from them, it was decided to reinstate them and to post them at seats where financial matters (where financial bungling was there) and public dealings are not involved. Now, we are saying that he is not entitled for 75% subsistence allowance. He is under suspension for the last more than two years and is not getting 75% subsistence allowance & hence he can't be reinstated. Shri Naresh Sabharwal is saying that I am entitled for 75% subsistence allowance, as per this rule, and we are saying that we will not give it to him. Why? Because, we are afraid that a fraud was committed. The matter is sub-judice and is thus pending subject to the outcome of the Court. He said subsistence allowance is basically meant for sustainable life and it can't be denied & that is why Shri Navdeep Goyal has said that there is no choice in it. He further said that if we forget that who the person is and what the case is, we will have to give him 75% subsistence allowance. It is written in some service rules, but it is not there in ours, that if the case is delayed due to it being pending with the outside agency, in that case we can say that Court is outside agency and hence Shri Naresh Sabharwal can be denied grant of 75% subsistence allowance. But, as we don't have any such provision, we will have to give him 75% subsistence allowance, whether it is to our liking or not. He further stated that what happens is, it is construed that Syndicate is supporting such a scoundrel person.

Professor Rajat Sandhir seconded him and said it will be the message that will go out.

Shri Ashok Goyal, said no, but, why should it go. We don't have any option.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal seconded Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal further said, the moment we increase the subsistence allowance to 75%, which we are under obligation to increase, Shri Naresh Sabharwal will file an application that he be reinstated as per the said Rule. So, what is needed to be seen is that whether we have to reinstate him or not. Rule is there for it, but, in it we can use our discretion. In case he is reinstated he will have to be given 100% salary.

It was said you are right, but, what he read was, “may be,”

Shri Ashok Goyal said in this pretext Prof. Devinder Singh, will agree with me that *may be means shall be*.

It was said it is right for this case but can't they amend rules prospectively wherein such delinquent officials, committing big frauds, can be denied such benefits.

Shri Ashok Goyal said rules can only be amended within the purview of the law of land and not as per our wish. He further stated that amendment, which can be incorporated in the rule is, “*provided the case is not pending with some outside agency including any court of law.*”

The Syndicate members unanimously decided to enhance subsistence allowance of Shri Naresh Sabharwal to 75%, but, his request for reinstatement was not acceded to by the members.

Shri Naresh Gaur asked Professor Devinder Singh whether the departmental inquiry and Court case could run simultaneously, and the reply was given in affirmative. If it is so, the Departmental Inquiry Committee should give its report that as Shri Naresh Sabharwal has committed a fraud, he should be dismissed from the service. He further stated that outcome of the Court case is a separate issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he is not sure, but, the provision is there, that again is the law. It is not different law in the University. Law is the same, but, he has been given to understand, though he is open to correction –He is sure, that there is some stay by the Court on the Departmental Inquiry.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that there is a judgement of Supreme Court, as per which, the Departmental Inquiry as well the Court Case can go on simultaneously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in that case they will have to get the order of the Court revised. He further stated that perhaps there is a Court order and as per him Shri Naresh Sabharwal may have stated in the Court that my defence will be disclosed. So, keeping in view the merits of the case, the Criminal Courts are entitled to grant stay also on Departmental Inquiries.

The members requested to throw light on the matter of stay, on Departmental Inquiry, by the Court.

It was informed that the charges in the case have been framed and trial has also got started in the Court. He further stated that the Court has stayed Departmental Inquiry in respect of common grounds and common witnesses concerning the fraud/case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it amounts to stay, as the inquiry can't be completed. If inquiry is going on for more than six months, it means inquiry is on and as per rule the subsistence allowance would have to be increased from 50% to 75%. The members seconded it. However, the House has been requested whether it has to be increased retrospectively or otherwise. The members including Shri Ashok Goyal unanimously decided to increase the subsistence allowance from now onwards. However, the members were of the unanimous opinion that in case Shri Naresh Sabharwal demands enhancement in subsistence allowance retrospectively, then legal opinion be taken from the University Counsel, on the matter.

RESOLVED: That subsistence allowance to Shri Naresh Sabharwal Superintendent (under suspension), under Rule 29.2 (i) at pages 92-93 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016 be enhanced from 50% to 75%, retrospectively, i.e., w.e.f. 28.03.2016. However, before issuance of orders in this respect, legal opinion be obtained.

24

Considered –

- A. deferred Item No. 6 of the Syndicate meeting dated 08.12.2018, regarding co-education status of National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, as forwarded by the affiliation Committee dated 07.09.2018.

NOTE: 1. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.12.2018 (Para 6) and it was resolved that –

1. for the time being, the case for grant co-education status to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, be deferred and the same be placed before the Syndicate along with the Enquiry Report and other comprehensive details;
2. the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) be asked to explain as to how the meetings of Affiliation Committee were convened on 1.10.2018 and 5.10.2018 without issuing any notice and how the minutes have been got confirmed from a person who was not present in the meeting and comments from all other concerned officials be also obtained and placed before the Syndicate; and
3. In the light of the discussion, it be enquired as to how the Examination Centre was granted to Satyam Girls College, Village & Post, Office Sayadwala, Fazilka on 30th November when the Committee was to visit that College on 1st December.

2. An office note containing the brief history of the case is enclosed.

- B.** Report dated 10.11.2018 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter of non-payment of salary and attendance of non-attending students at National Degree College, Chowarianwla, Distt. Fazilka, Punjab.

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the consideration of this item should be deferred.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it should not be deferred as it was deferred in the last meeting too.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua also said that it should not be deferred and we should see the position of teachers, who are not getting salary for the last many months. The other members seconded it.

After brief deliberation on the matter, it was decided that Part A of the Item, be deferred.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that it requires a very lengthy discussion and hence it should be deferred.

Shri Sandeep Singh was in favour of discussion and said that we should resolve the matter as the persons concerned are paying visits to authorities repeatedly.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the Item be brought in the next Syndicate meeting.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the issue has two aspects, one, which the persons concerned are asking for, should not be discussed now. He further stated that the second aspect, which needs to be discussed, is about the removal of teachers, which is still going on and they should be stopped from removing the teachers.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that if students' strength is less, what the teachers would do.

The Vice Chancellor said, it is a matter of thinking that what the agenda Item is and what is being discussed. He further said that the House should discuss the agenda Item and the matter of removal of teachers may or may not be discussed.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that notice under 11.1 should be issued to the concerned.

Dr. K.K. Sharma seconded the opinion of Prof. Navdeep Goyal and said that the Inquiry about the matter has already been conducted and its report was also placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held in December. Hence, everything has been done.

Shri Sandeep Singh desired the Registrar to explain the issue briefly.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said the Item is lengthy and the House will not be able to discuss it in today's meeting, hence, its first part/item should be deferred for next meeting of Syndicate.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that if the issue is of Centres, then we should give them the Centres and should not trouble the students.

As there was some difference of opinion amongst the members about the matter of the Item, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Item is to consider request for granting status of co-education. He further stated that since the issue of co-education has come up, teachers are being removed. What it means is, it is a "**Danda**" that either you do it or teachers one after another will be removed from service. The concern of teachers is that the issue be decided, but, as one teacher after another is being removed, what business the College has to do. So, the issue is divided into two parts.

He was corrected by Shri Naresh Gaur that Agenda too has two parts.

On perusal of the Agenda, Shri Ashok Goyal said it has part B too and it can be discussed. He further stated that part A concerning grant of co-education status can be deferred.

Some other members seconded it, particularly Dr. K.K. Sharma and he also said that Part A can be deferred as the admissions are to be done in July and we will be having sufficient time. Second part is the concern of all teachers.

On this, the Vice Chancellor asked the members about the action to be taken in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as we have received the letters of teachers, explanation of the College be sought by writing a letter that a very serious view has been taken by the Syndicate, duly quoting the report of the Inquiry Committee.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that teachers be reinstated.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that teachers be reinstated, full salary be paid to them and PF be also deducted.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the teachers and the Committee be called together and asked that what the matter is. He further asked whether students are studying in the College, if yes, then where they give their exams. In reply to it, Prof. Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations, said exam centre is there for girl students only and not even for private candidates. Shri Sandeep Singh further stated that students should not suffer, and rest whatever the House desires, can be done.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked whether boys are also studying in the College.

It was replied that the boys are there in the College but their examination centre is not made there. On this, contradictory assertions of members came, i.e., some were in favour that College is a Co-Educational Institution and some were against. At this point of time Shri Ashok Goyal asked from Dr. Gurdeep Kumar Sharma then what the College is asking for, if it is already a Co-educational Institution.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Affiliation Committee has denied but later on the exams were allowed to be taken. Now, the College is requesting to withdraw the letter vide which the information regarding withdrawal was conveyed to it.

Addressing Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Shri Ashok Goyal said you are talking about 2017-18. He further stated that co-education status was withdrawn in 2017-18 and he won't go into the merits of decision. But, as students have already got admitted in 2017-18, so permission was granted to take their exams in April, 2018. And it was for 2017-18 only. As far as 2018-19 (the current session) is concerned, the College does not have the Co-education status. He further stated that as per him boys are not over there and if they are there then it is beyond their jurisdiction i.e. in violation of the decision of the University.

It was got confirmed from the Dean, College Development Council that boys are not there.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that a strong letter from University seeking reply within 10 days of receipt of letter should go to the College that Syndicate has taken a very serious view of the matter, narrating therein the College is not paying full salary and DA to its teachers. The College is also not deducting Provident Fund from their salaries. And serious of all is, we have received a report that the College has removed these much teachers from the College. So, give reply of all these. And in the meantime, please ensure and confirm that all the removed teachers are reinstated immediately. He further stated that it should be done after accepting the report.

Dr. K K Sharma said that the College remove the teachers because it makes it happen with non-attending students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said we don't have to say this. Let the College say it.

Dr. K K Sharma said it is written there in the report.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that teachers should be reinstated immediately.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that last time too they had sought the similar reply from three colleges of Ludhiana. But nothing has happened till date.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that time limit should be given for it, i.e., reply must be given by this date.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that last time fifteen days' time was given to three colleges of Ludhiana for giving reply, but no reply has been received.

The Dean, College Development Council was entrusted with the responsibility of writing the letter. However, on enquiry by him (DCDC) that whether letter should be issued after approval of Resolution Part of the meeting, he was told that letter be written on Monday without waiting for it.

On further enquiry from Dean, College Development Council that whether the letter, which was to be written to the said three Colleges of Ludhiana, has been written or not, it was told by him to the House that in the absence of receipt of Resolution Part, it has not been issued so far. The members shown their resentment to it and were of the opinion that the letter should have gone by now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it was decided in last meeting that it would be done immediately on SOS basis. But, DCDC is also justified in his assertion that how can he act in the absence of Resolution Part. At the same time, members of the Syndicate are also justified in saying that we had instructed to do it by tomorrow but it has not been done. However, after brief discussion, it was decided that the letter to said three Colleges of Ludhiana be also issued along with by DCDC on Monday.

Addressing the Vice Chancellor, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the harm of not sending the letter to said three Colleges of Ludhiana and receiving their reply is that you are attending Convocation of one of the Colleges on 20th of this month.

The Vice Chancellor confirmed it. The members were of the opinion/suggestion that the Vice Chancellor should not go to attend the function of the College (DD Jain College).

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Vice Chancellor should not visit any College in respect of whom complaints are there.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if the Vice Chancellor wants to visit, then the letter should be got delivered to the College before his visit.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said mockery is made of the Syndicate, as it has been seen in the complaint, which has come after the Report. Hence, if the Vice Chancellor wants to go, he should go after saying that the report is not justified, as it is based on fake facts and is denied.

Shri Sandeep Singh said we all should wear black badges and stand there, if the Vice Chancellor visits the College.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that which point of that Committee is not correct, he be told.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, he will inform all about what is happening. Six years ago, excessive fight took place in a College, a high level committee was sent from

here, video recording was done, and everything else, required, was done. The then Vice Chancellor took a very serious note. However, after four days, the Chairperson of the said Committee came here to meet the Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor took a u-turn and the whole Committee was quashed. The Vice Chancellor said, "save me from this Syndicate and Senate," as these do not allow him to work. The Chairperson recorded the version of the Vice Chancellor and presented it before the concerned, stating that you are saying that the Vice Chancellor has taken a serious view and this is what he is saying i.e. he is perturbed from the Syndicate and Senate. And when it was asked from the Vice Chancellor, he said, "see how mean these people are."

The Vice Chancellor took note of their suggestion/assertions.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the consideration of Item 24(A) on the agenda, be deferred;
- (ii) the report dated 10.11.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter of non-payment of salary and attendance of non-attending students at National Degree College, Chowarianwali, District Fazilka, Punjab, be accepted; and
- (iii) a reply be sought by the Dean, College Development Council from the College within 10 days covering aspects such as non-payment of full salary, Dearness Allowance, etc., non-deduction of P.F. as per the provision of P.U. Calendar and reasons for dismissal of teachers.

25.

Considered reply dated 12.02.2019 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of Mrs. Neelam Kumari, Deputy Registrar (Colleges) and Shri Nirmal Paul, Senior Assistant, College Branch in response to Memo No.2391-2392/Estt. dated 06.02.2019 (**Appendix-XVIII**) issued pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 08.12.2018 (Para 6) (**Appendix-XVIII**) with regard to co-education status of National College Chowarianwali, Fazilka. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.12.2018 (Para 6) considered the matter relating to co-education status of National College Chowarianwali, Fazilka, as forwarded by the affiliation Committee dated 07.09.2018 and it was resolved:

That -

1. for the time being, the case for grant co-education status to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, be deferred and the same be placed before the Syndicate along with the Enquiry Report and other comprehensive details;
2. the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) be asked to explain as to how the meetings of Affiliation Committee were convened on 1.10.2018 and 5.10.2018 without issuing any notice and how the minutes have been got confirmed from a person who was not

present in the meeting and comments from all other concerned officials be also obtained and placed before the Syndicate; and

3. In the light of the discussion, it be enquired as to how the Examination Centre was granted to Satyam Girls College, Village & Post, Office Sayadwala, Fazilka on 30th November when the Committee was to visit that College on 1st December.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That, so far as shifting of students from a Government College, Sector-46, Chandigarh, to another College is concerned, since now 2nd semester is commencing, the students be brought back to the College and an Inspection Committee be sent to the College. However, a penalty be imposed on the College, for which the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

2. **Pursuant to the above decision at Sr. No.1 of the Syndicate dated 08.12.2018, an item regarding co-education status of the National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka and report dated 10.11.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the matter of non-payment of salary and attendance of non-attending students at National Degree College, Chowarianwali, Fazilka was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2019 (Item No.28) and the same was deferred.**

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that some particular information was sought by someone from the Syndicate for a purpose i.e. how a particular office is working. Drawing attention of the House towards Page no. 464 of the Agenda, he reiterated, *“on 5th October, 2018, one member i.e. at Sr. No. 5 (a Syndicate member of that time) came in my office and then two more members, which are at Sr. No. 6 and 7, of the Affiliation Committee, who had attended the meeting dated such and such came to my office i.e. Deputy Registrar (Colleges), Administrative Office, Panjab University, Chandigarh. I called the Superintendent and Senior Assistant in my office, the Affiliation Committee member at Sr. No. 5 asked me that so far affiliation cases of so many colleges have been decided but affiliation case of National Degree College Chowarianwali, (about which we were talking just now), District Fazilika, has not been decided and a meeting be held that day. He further stated that suddenly someone comes and orders that a meeting be convened on 5th and it is convened too. He stated that it is wrong on our part, even if we are Syndicate members, to come into the office and threaten.*

Addressing Prof. Navdeep Goyal, the Vice Chancellor stated that you are talking about me. And it is my version that I had to give it in observation and it really pained me. He further stated that members of both the Houses and officials are really esteemed & honourable. It is my request to all of you that if you want to meet officials then you should meet the Deputy Registrars, Registrar and the Senior Officers & not the officials less than that. The Vice Chancellor further stated that, he was told that some

people go and sit in front of the Chair and he don't know whether it should be said or not, what they say, God knows. He stated that Prof. Navdeep Goyal has expressed and conveyed all the things directly to me. He also said that the House has some dignity and the members are experienced & hence we should remain away from all these things. And the persons, who have been named that they have gone on this date

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to suggest some solution for it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he can request only.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that like us, you are saying that he can request only. He further stated that you must be having something in your mind, as you have suggested to not to meet the officials below the level of Deputy Registrars. On this, the Vice Chancellor reiterated his statement of seeing the Senior Level Officers only.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the Chairperson was not there but the Chairperson said that he/she will sign the papers and all other related things were pointed out. He further stated that very strange things had happened but it has got clarified now.

The Vice Chancellor stated that recently he went to Shimla to check the status of renovation work going on at Shimla Guest House. He further stated that everything is fine there. Further referring to what Prof. Navdeep Goyal has said, the Vice Chancellor said, these types of things are also going on at Shimla Guest House. There too, the staff is threatened, e.g., why the food has not been cooked/ cook this particular item in breakfast, or book rooms for these much people. These should also not be allowed.

Speaking about what the Vice Chancellor had said in context of Shimla Guest House, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this much liberty should be there to Senate/Syndicate members. He further stated that arrangements over there have been made in such a way so that Senate/Syndicate members should get everything.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not denying it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said the problem exists there.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the Attendants at Shimla Guest are very arrogant. The staff over there thinks that we have come to stay free of cost and they are giving us something. He further stated that arrogance is on both the sides.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said we should not take these things seriously.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that Mrs. Neelam Kumari, Deputy Registrar (Colleges), she is going to retire soon and hence her retirement benefits should not be stopped unnecessarily. The other members seconded his opinion. However, Prof. Rajesh Gill said that she too wants that her retirement benefits be released, but, everything is not fine in the University. She said, nowadays it has become very difficult to work in Committees. She further stated that some very important/prestigious Committees were there, wherein the Committees had to write time and again to the Registrar and the DCDC, because of inefficiency of non-teaching staff. She said that she will not name anyone because confidentiality is required to be maintained. She said things are not in a very good taste and there is a need to do something. Some accountability needs to be fixed and the officials have to take a stand and just don't pass the buck from one side to the other. By doing this repeatedly, we have spoiled the University a lot. She said it is only a few, who have the guts to give in writing that things are not in a good way. Hence, it should be honoured. Otherwise, no one will work in the Committees. She

further stated that this particular thing be done on humanitarian grounds. The other members seconded her and it was approved.

Addressing to Prof. Rajesh Gill, the Vice Chancellor said that he has taken note of what she has said.

Shri Ashok Goyal said as she is retiring, we all have agreed to release her retiral benefits, but, do we regularize the actions also, which have been taken by her.

The Vice Chancellor asked, is it part of that.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it is connected with the other pending matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, it is not connected and the letters, if any, which have been issued by her under undue influence of the Syndicate members, should be treated as withdrawn. Shri Naresh Gaur seconded it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, there is a solution to it. It may not be to the liking of Syndicate Members, but let the officials be conveyed, as they have said that we are duty bound to obey the members of the Syndicate. He further stated that even if it is the President of India, he is not under obligation to follow unlawful instructions of the President of India. If Syndicate/Senate members ask her to lift the files and handover these to them, is she is under obligation to oblige? It is not so.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said, it is not so and all officers/members should know it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, she has written in her reply that she has shown due respect to the Syndicate members.

The Vice Chancellor said, they will take care.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that her retiral dues be released and the staff should be respectful to the members of Senate and Syndicate, but at the same time, they should be firm and polite.

RESOLVED: That the reply dated 12.02.2019 of Mrs. Neelam Kumari, Deputy Registrar (Colleges) and Shri Nirmal Paul, Senior Assistant, College Branch, in response to Memo No.2391-2392/Estt. dated 06.02.2019 issued pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 08.12.2018 (Para 6) with regard to co-education status of National College Chowarianwali, Fazilka, be accepted.

26.

Considered the requisition of 19 Fellows to convene a Special meeting of the Senate, regarding strict enforcement of Regulation 7 of Chapter VIII (E) at page 28 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that meeting of Senate is to be held in the month of March and hence there is no such issue in it.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked the Vice Chancellor that when the meeting of the March month is going to be held.

The Vice Chancellor said that it will be fixed as per the convenience of the members.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said the next meeting of the Senate will be held as per the schedule.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members should think over the difference between the regular and special meeting of the Senate.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that there is nothing in it, as only the item will have to be put up.

Dr K.K. Sharma said that we must respect the 19 Fellows, who have given the requisition, and at least it should be done, as it is a matter concerning various colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is ready to convene the special meeting of the Senate as per the wish of the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr K K Sharma believes in self-respect, as he is one of the signatories amongst the 19, hence, in a way, he is seeking respect for himself.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members that what should be done in the matter, as per rule.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the requisition for convening special meeting of the Senate has been received, but no office note mentioning the violation of Regulation 7, has been appended to it. Simply, because of 10-20 people/teachers give something in writing, is it not needed to be evaluated, to enable the Syndicate to take the decision. He further asked, what the violation is. Hence, an office note should come, so that the Syndicate may apply its mind to decide and actually that is the purpose of intimating the Syndicate, otherwise, what is the purpose.

The Vice Chancellor addressing Shri Ashok Goyal said, so, according to him, a detailed office note should come.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied, obviously, and he further said that Shri Harpreet Singh Dua is getting double the salary, so to discuss this issue, a special meeting of the Senate be called. In reply, you (the Vice Chancellor) will say that he is not getting double salary and for it you (the Vice Chancellor) will not call a special Senate and tell there that he is not getting double salary. Hence, we should know the facts, i.e., what the violation is.

The Vice Chancellor sought the opinion of others also.

Speaking on the Item, Dr K.K. Sharma said that he has written an email to the Registrar seeking a copy of the document/letter through which the approval, in respect of proposal of Syndicate, for amendments in these Regulations has come from the Govt. of India. The copy of the document was sought, so that, we get convinced that whatever is being done, is right. Because alone, it is an incomplete concept. And if it is complete, a copy of it be supplied. But, the office of Registrar failed to supply the copy. It is the reason that why the requisition for convening a special meeting of the Senate was given.

The Vice Chancellor, addressing Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, asked what else should be done in the matter.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said as Shri Ashok Goyal has said, a detailed note should be prepared on it, i.e., whether violation is there or not. He further stated that this is not extension, this is re-employment.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is not against the spirit of the letter.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

The Vice Chancellor then sought the opinion of Prof. Rajat Sandhir on the matter. He was also of the opinion that an office note should be brought for discussion. The Vice Chancellor then asked other members for additions, if any.

Dr K.K. Sharma said that re-employment of Principals is allowed and document concerning it should also be put up along with the office note, besides the copy of the document, about which he spoke earlier.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that it is feasible if the meeting of Senate is convened after a long time. In addition to it, the meeting of Senate is due.

Dr K K Sharma said that the item can be brought as an Agenda in the due/forthcoming meeting of the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the meeting of the Senate, which is due, is a separate issue and currently we are considering the requisition for convening a special meeting of the Senate. In response to this, Shri Ashok Goyal in a lighter vein said that the meeting of the Senate, which is due, is going to become undue.

The Registrar said that he is unable to understand as to what could be the office note.

Interrupting the Registrar, Shri Ashok Goyal said, now you don't ask from us that what could be the office note.

The Registrar said, let me complete first. The Vice Chancellor seconded him and asked Shri Ashok Goyal to listen to him. However, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the office agrees with whatever is written, then there is no need of any office note. And if the office feels that something is right and something is not, then the note be made accordingly. And if the office feels that it is not right at all, then the office note be made accordingly. He further stated that I think it is advisable, we don't discuss it on merit here, reason being, it is not the purview of the Syndicate.

At the end, it was decided that a detailed note on the issue be put up for consideration of the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That a detailed office note with regard to convening of Special Senate meeting requisitioned by the Fellows, regarding Regulation 7 of Chapter VIII (E) at page 28 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, be prepared and brought to the Syndicate again.

27.

Considered following recommendation dated 06.03.2019 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to re-consider the issue of online admission for the academic session 2019-20:

1. One year extension be given to CRISP, as the previous agreement between Panjab University and CRISP provides that initial contract of 2 years be extended by another one year with prior approval of the appropriate authority of the University.
2. Director Computer Centre, be advised to submit proposal/budget and other requirements well in advance to conduct admissions from next year.

NOTE: Centre for Research and Industrial Staff Performance (CRISP), Shyamla Hills, Bhopal (M.P.) was granted

extension in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate for conducting Online Cloud Based Admissions, for one year i.e. for the session 2019-20 and an item R-(vii) was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2019 for Ratification and it was resolved that so far as Sub-Item R-(vii) is concerned, the same be treated as withdrawn.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that it is essential to do it immediately because last time we have declined it. But, the concerned officials, be it the Director Computer Centre or the Dean Research, all were of the opinion that if they don't do it now, then they are into a problem. Considering it, we had approved it.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked, what was the duration of the contract?
It was informed that the contract was of two years, extendable by one year.

Shri Ashok Goyal speaking about the item said, last time too nothing like it had happened. Actually, no explanation was given and as we were in a hurry, it was decided not to take any action.

Prof. Rajesh Gill seconded him and said no discussion was held.

Shri Ashok Goyal further stated that we could not understand its implications or others could not make us understand.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal and Shri Ashok Goyal were of the opinion that one year extension be given to the CRISP and for the next year, the Director Computer Centre, be advised to submit a proposal and other requirements, well in advance, to conduct online admissions for next year. And decision w.r.t. implementation w.e.f. next year, will only be taken after getting prior approval of the Syndicate. The members agreed to it unanimously. However, Prof. Rajesh Gill stated that it should be brought to the Syndicate much in advance.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma stated that Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua had come up with a "free online admission system" and asked, why it has not been implemented.

Prof. Rajat Sandhir asked Dr. Dua, whether it is implementable this year. He replied in affirmative.

Speaking about the "free online admission system" of Dr. Dua, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Dr. Dua put up the proposal three years ago and gave presentation on it in the Syndicate too. He asked Dr. Dua whether there is any problem in its implementation. Dr. Dua replied that there is nothing like it. At this stage, the Vice Chancellor stated that it be put up before the Syndicate, next time, after evaluation. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that everything has already been got done and it was approved too. Money has been spent and recurring expenditure is also being incurred every month& nothing is pending, except that we are not implementing it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it will save Rs.50 lakhs of the University. Professor S.K. Sharma seconded him.

It was enquired whether the said system has provision for admissions too, as he is of the impression that it is meant for management of colleges. Dr. Dua replied that it is extendable and within a week, everything can be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that as far as he remembers, he had talked with some Professors of Computer Science, and they have desired to go through the system to get

first-hand information about it before reverting back to him. The Vice Chancellor further stated that ultimately a group of scientists and technocrats have to be satisfied.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that Prof. Singla has been doing this work for the last 20 years, so, why don't you ask him to evaluate this and do it. We will save Rs. 50 lakhs in this way.

Addressing the Vice Chancellor, Prof. Navdeep Goyal asked him to seek authorization from the members' w.r.t. the action to be taken, i.e., to extend the contract of CRISP or to go for "free online admission system" of Dr. Dua, so that we don't get into trouble in the absence of any of these two.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that contract of CRISP has been extended for one year. However, in order to save so much money, the "free online admission system" of Dr. Dua will be made operational from next year. He further stated that according to him, however, he does not vouch, the University will save at least Rs. 40 – 50 lakhs per year.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will look into it and will inform the members on Monday about the team, which will look into the matter.

Prof. Rajat Sandhir told that earlier the Computer Centre of the University was doing online admissions of the University and it was doing better than the Company. He further said that by giving contract to outside Company, the University has paid Rs.50 lakh per year to them and the University is wasting the money.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that this time the contract be given to the Company.

The Vice Chancellor asked Prof. Navdeep Goyal to give his comments on this.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the online admissions are being done for the last 20 years. He further said it will not be good if the admissions are done totally offline and the people will face problems. The employees at Computer Centre are very less and they have already expressed their inability to do online admissions.

In the meantime, majority of the members said that they are with Prof. Rajat Sandhir.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is no requirement of 50 persons to handle the admissions. This work can be done by 2 persons. Shri Harpreet Dua said that it is not the question of Rs.5 lakh. It is the question of Rs.50 lakh and Rs.50 lakh can be saved.

Prof. Rajat Sandhir said that they are not approving it but they are authorizing the Vice Chancellor to take final decision on it.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 6.3.2019 regarding online admission for the session 2019-20, be approved as under:

- (i) One year extension be given to CRISP, as per the previous agreement between Panjab University; and
- (ii) Director Computer Centre, be advised to submit proposal/budget and other requirements well in advance to conduct online admissions from 2020-21 onwards.

- 28.** Considered minutes dated 27.02.2019 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to various issues relating to admissions for the academic session 2019-2020.

RESOLVED: That recommendations dated 27.02.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to various issues relating to admissions for the academic session 2019-2020, be approved.

- 29.** Considered minutes dated 12.02.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to increase in number of seats/additional courses in various Departments, for the session 2019-2020. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that the fee of Rs. 300/- of Evening Studies which was reduced to Rs.200/- by the former Vice Chancellor may again be increased to Rs.300/-.

The members said this would be done next time.

RESOLVED: That consideration of Item C-29, be deferred.

- 30.** Considered minutes dated 12.03.2019 (**Appendix-XXI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding guidelines for NRI admissions framed by the working Committee dated 21.11.2018 (**Appendix-XXI**).

Dr. Gurdip Sharma told that since the members have not read this item, so it should be discussed next time.

On this item, Prof. S.K. Sharma said that the University should need teachers, infrastructure and everything.

The Vice Chancellor said that the proposal has been forwarded by the Academic and Administrative Committees of various Departments after due consideration of the situation in their individual Departments. Wherever the Departments were facing hitches, the Departments were advised to propose the increase as per their comfort levels. He added that senior functionaries of the University like Director IQAC, Dean and he himself had held consultations with the Departments on this matter. Further he requested that the University be allowed to go ahead with this proposal.

Prof. S.K. Sharma said that one section has 130 students and there is no place to even stand. There used to be 25 students and they should not do it blanket. The members said that since there is no urgency, so it could be discussed in the next meeting. It should not be done in haste.

Prof. S.K. Sharma said the because of the student-teacher ratio, the grading of the University will fall in NAAC. There are no facilities in the Science and Engineering Departments.

The Vice Chancellor asked the SVC to explain it. It was explained that the Chairpersons have held meetings with the Joint Academic and Administrative Committees. Seats of only those departments have been increased which have requested to increase but the seats of those departments have not been increased who have not requested to do so.

Prof. S.K. Sharma said that they will look into the matter otherwise theirs is no requirement as if the University authority has to do it then what for the Syndicate is. He further said that the Academic and Administrative Committees were under pressure that the Vice Chancellor has said that the seats have to be increased, so they have increased. They are here to see whether the applicability of this particular issue is there, what will be the future effect, what is going to be the NAAC situation and how many students and whether the seating arrangement is there.

The Vice Chancellor said that this proposal has been made by the concerned Academic and Administrative Committees. Wherever the Departments were facing hitches, the Departments were advised to propose the increase as per their comfort levels.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that information regarding item No. 29 is also a part of the prospectus. While discussing on NRI seats he said that the basic idea of creating NRI seats is to raise revenue and they are doing it as per the policy of the Government of India. He further said that although the University has prepared criteria for fee structure as also prepared fee structure for various courses but no seat of NRI has been created in the said course. For example, no seat of NRI has been created either in the UILS or in the Department of Laws but a fee of \$2260 has been mentioned.

It was informed that UILS and the Department of Laws have abolished the NRI seats.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if the UILS and the Department of Laws have abolished the NRI seats then what they are approving. He said that 45½ % or 46½ % seats are reserved in the Law Department and in his view the same percentage of reservation of seats is also there in UILS. The University cannot go beyond 50% meaning thereby the University has a margin of 3½ % and why not that margin is reserved for NRIs.

The Vice Chancellor said that when this item is incomplete, they will not discuss it in that meeting. He further said they will get the NRI seats approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Guidelines are approved and the NRI seats along with fee can be approved in the next meeting. Similarly, there is no mention of seats for Ludhiana Regional Centre.

So, it was decided to take up this matter in the next meeting.

While speaking on Item No. 31, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is a very serious matter. In this matter, Shri Jhingan's case has been quoted.

The Vice Chancellor asked why there is urgency in the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it involved the orders of the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that time management should be adhered to.

It was informed that the University has not allowed commutation to any pensioner. If they allow commutation, then a payment of Rs.15-16 lakh is to be made to each pensioner. If the University starts allowing commutation, the corpus will be exhausted very soon. The University not allowed commutation. There was one Deputy Registrar Mr. Jhingan who had brought direction from the Court that the commutation be given to him and the payment was made to him under Court orders. Now, the second person has approached the Court and the Court has passed orders that the

University should take decision in the present matter in the light of the judgment passed in Mr. Jhingan's case.

The Vice Chancellor said if anybody who is getting late and wants to go can go.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they would go after discussion on zero hour.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that he was not associated with any item in the table now.

Prof. S.K. Sharma asked as to why this item was not brought in the last Syndicate meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one concern of all the members is very genuine. One person may know about anything, but what about other persons? Everybody is supposed to apply their mind. Else, University should say that they have given everything. He further said that the University is not listening to them. He said that the authority should see when this order was passed. This order relates back to April 1, 2018 and year is about to complete. He said that this item was included in the agenda of July, 2018 Syndicate meeting and they took all pending urgent items in the next meetings but this probably most urgent item was not taken up and now in March, 2019 i.e. after 8-9 months, the members are being told that this is contemptuous matter. Now, as Prof. S.K. Sharma ji said, if the University would like to file an appeal, it cannot because the limitation period has expired. But by the grace of God no appeal lies in this case. When the referred court order in Jhingan's case was passed 10 years back, he had said that the University should take conscious decision otherwise other people would approach the Court. At that time, the then Vice Chancellor had said it became the duty of everybody of them to request the people not to approach the Court and further the members should think positively and not negatively and now the other case has been filed.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to how it got late.

To how many people they can stop from approaching the Court. There is a regulation in the University that the commutation is to be given and all the members are saying that they should take a conscious decision on it.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether it is contemptuous.

Prof. S.K. Sharma said why this item was not brought earlier and this is no excuse that they bring at the last moment.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would look into it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this item was brought in the Syndicate meeting of July, 2018 but could not be discussed. It had to be taken up along with other pending items in the next meetings.

Prof. S.K. Sharma asked as to what is going to be the impact of this on the pension of the other people or the corpus have they calculated it. Let they suppose, if the next day 20 more persons come then what would happen. Whole of the pension scheme will fall flat and nobody will get the pension. This is going to affect 100 people. Even the arrears of the pensioners have not been given.

The Vice Chancellor said these people are afraid of the contempt. The contempt is filed after one year and the University has time.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not worry about it. But the fact is that the contempt has already been filed and the next date is 29th May, 2019 which is very far.

The Vice Chancellor asked why was not he told earlier.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had read it just now and they can do it in the next meeting.

It was informed that a 2-3 member Committee may be formed to look into the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item brought on the agenda reads 'to consider if the amount to be paid' and further asked whether the Syndicate members have any authority to say no.

It was informed that there is room in the regulations. The University had to make rules of commutation which the University did not make.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that because once the regulations are in place and if one regulation says that rules are to be framed, and then, are they framing rules partly? If they are not framing rules, then it means they have conscious design to deny something which is available to somebody else under the regulations. He further asked whether the University has made any rules.

It was informed that the University has not made any pensionary rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if the University has not framed rules then how the people are getting pension. If they are giving pension in the absence of pension rules then why the commutation cannot be given in the absence of commutation rules.

It was informed that the regulations are self-operative and they do require any support.

Prof. S.K. Sharma said that there should be one retired teacher in the Committee otherwise every retiree would be on road.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would not like to be on the Committee since Prof. S.K. Sharma has told that a retired member should be on the Committee and he is not person who has to get pension from the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal further said that as the University has said that it can deny the commutation as per the regulation and if the commutation is to be denied then a speaking order has to be passed.

Shri Ashok Goyal further said that since on-the-spot decision is not to be taken, so a Committee be constituted and the recommendations of the Committee may be put in the next Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are doing this.

Prof. S.K. Sharma proposed the name of Shri Naresh Gaur for inclusion in the Committee as he knows the finances.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

It was decided that the item be referred to a Committee to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor whose recommendations will be brought to the Syndicate in the next meeting along with this item.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations dated 12.03.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding guidelines for NRI admissions for the session 2019-20, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: 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.

31. Considered if, the amount of commuted value of pension in accordance with Regulation 7.1 of the Pension Regulation 1991, be paid to Shri P.S. Mehta (PPO No.1815), Technical Officer (Retd.), Department of University Science Instrumentation Centre/CIL, P.U., Chandigarh, pursuant to the order of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High court dated 19.04.2018 passed in CWP No. 9354 of 2018 filed by him..

- NOTE:**
1. The matter was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 07.07.2018, but no business was took place. However, this Agenda item was not taken up by the Syndicate in its subsequent meetings till date.
 2. An office note containing recommendations of FDO and opinion of SLO, P.U., is enclosed.

RESOLVED: That the matter be referred to a Committee to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor and its recommendations be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

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

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Ruchi Vashisht was appointed as Assistant Professor on compassionate ground for the period of three years at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016 (Para 6) (**Appendix-XXII**) and she joined as such on 04.04.2016 (A.N.) and her term as Assistant Professor (temp.) on compassionate ground will end on 04.04.2019.
 2. The recommendations of the Joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 18.01.2019 (**Appendix-XXII**) considered the request of Dr. Ruchi Vashisht and resolved that:
 - (i) Dr. Ruchi Vashisht, Assistant Professor (Temp.) appointed on compassionate ground after the death of her husband Dr. Rahul Sharma (who worked as Reader in Oral/Maxillofacial Surgery, be taken up with the University authorities for

regularization of her service as per University rules; and

- (ii) Dr. Ruchi Vashisht, Assistant Professor (Temp.) be granted extension in service as per University rules.

3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

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

33. Considered minutes dated 13.03.2019 (**Appendix-XXIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to finalize the Academic Calendar to be observed by the Teaching Departments/Regional Centre of the University and its affiliated Colleges (Arts, Science & Commerce) and Education having semester system of examination for the session 2019-2020.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma told that they have not seen the calendar. He asked how many Principals were in the Committee and further said that there was none from the B.Ed. Colleges. He said that the Committee which has to be constituted should include all types of representatives.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members to give some names from the Colleges.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there should be one member for the B.Ed.

The Vice Chancellor suggested the name of Dean Arts.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma asked the name of the Dean.

Shri Sandeep Singh told he is Dr. Jatinder Grover.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma told that Dr. Jatinder Grover is not from the College. He further asked how many Principals were from the Arts Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal told that the Principals of Government College, Sector-11, Chandigarh A.S. College, Khanna and Government College, Sector-46, Chandigarh were from the Arts Colleges.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar told that only one teacher has been taken from Punjab.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma told that minimum 2-3 teachers may be included from Punjab.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua told that he has seen last agenda as also the supplementary agenda and it has been noticed that 70% names of the members of the Committees are the same. He is required to name any person. He suggested that some changes are required.

Shri Sandeep Singh told that the University has record of all teachers. He told the Vice Chancellor that when they suggest the names, he (Vice Chancellor) says that

he will constitute the Committee and when they do not suggest the names, then he (Vice Chancellor) asks for the names.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that whether there is College Development Council or any other Committee there are only three names and these names should be changed.

Regarding item No. 33, it was informed that whatever problems were of the last calendar of 2018-19 they were discussed at length. Number of holidays they are not changing, number of academic days they are not changing, Annexure-A is for teaching Departments of the University and Annexure-B is for the Affiliated Colleges. They have not made any change. They have not changed the dates.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma asked the number of days.

It was informed that the normal admissions will start from 8th July, classes to be started from 23rd July, academic term will be from 23 July to 30 November (105 days) (total days 198).

Dr. Gurdip Sharma asked the number of academic days of the University.

It was informed that academic days of the University will be 181 days.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma asked why the academic days for the University are 181 and for the Colleges are 198.

It was informed that the University has 5 days week whereas the Colleges has 6 days week.

RESOLVED: That recommendations of the Committee dated 13.03.2019, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

34.

Considered deferred Item No. 41 of the Syndicate meeting dated 26.05.2018 and request dated 19.01.2019 of Director (Planning), Rayat and Bahra Group of Institutes-An Educational & Charitable Society, with regard to grant of temporary affiliation to new proposed Degree College namely-Rayat Bahra Degree College at Village Bohan, Tehsil & Distt. Hoshiarpur (Pb.) for (i) B. A. I English(C), Punjabi (C), History and Culture of Punjab, Mathematics, Hindi, Economics, Adult Education, Education, History, Political Science, Human Rights and Duties, Statistics, Physical Education, Psychology, Ancient Indian History, Computer Science, Sociology, Agriculture and Environment Conservation, (ii) B.Sc. I (Agriculture) - 4 years course, (iii) B.Sc. I (Medical), (iv) B.Sc. I (Non-Medical with Chemistry and Computer) and (v) B.Com. I (One unit), for the session 2019-20 instead of 2018-2019..

- NOTE:**
1. Request dated 23.04.2018 of the Chairman, Rayat Bahra Degree College at Village Bohan, Tehsil & District Hoshiarpur (Punjab) is enclosed.
 2. Survey Committee Report dated 18.04.2018 is enclosed.
 3. The deferred Item No.41 of the Syndicate meeting dated 26.05.2018 was again placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 10.06.2018 as an Item C-15, but no business took place. The item is still pending.

4. An office note is enclosed.

RESOLVED: That, in view of the discussion taken place on Item C-18, being similar issue, consideration of the Item, be deferred.

35. Information contained in **Items R-(i) to R-(vii)** was read out and ratified, i.e. –

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

NOTE: 1. Dr. Kushwinder Kaur was appointed as Assistant Professor purely on temporary basis in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules in the Department of Chemistry for one year w.e.f. 01.03.2017 against the vacant sanctioned post or till the post is filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 vide Syndicate decision dated 25.02.2017 (Para 3) and the same was approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 26.03.2017 (Para IX).

The Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 36) had re-appointed Dr. Khushwinder Kaur for another one year w.e.f. 05.03.2018. The recommendations of the Syndicate was noted by the Senate in its meeting dated 06.05.2018 vide Para VIII (I-4).

2. A copy of minutes of Joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 11.01.2019 along with request of Dr. Khushwinder Kaur was enclosed (**Appendix-XXIV**).

3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXIV**).

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

NOTE: 1. Ms. Sumit Kaur was appointed as Technical Advisor (Architect) for one year w.e.f the date she joins duty, on fixed honorarium of Rs. 15000/- p.m. by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.07.2016 (Para 18) and the same was noted by the Senate in its meeting dated

16.12.2017 vide Para XXXIII. Accordingly, she accepted the assignment and joined on 30.03.2017.

Her tenure of appointment was extended for further period of one year w.e.f. 30.03.2018 to 29.03.2019 vide office order No.7422-25 dated 08.06.2018 (**Appendix-XXV**).

2. Request dated 21.01.2019 of Ms. Sumit Kaur, Technical Advisor (Architect) is enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**)

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the minutes dated 21.12.2018 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to consider the desire of Dr. (Miss) Kulwant Gill, former Professor & Chairperson of the Department of Laws, P.U. to donate Rs.50 lakhs for the construction of Lecture Theatre (s) in the Department of Laws in the sacred memory of her younger brother Late Shri Manjit Singh Gill, Advocate, who was alumnus of the Laws Department.

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

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-employed Shri Jagan Nath Dhiman, Senior Scientific Officer (Cartographer) (G-I), University School of Open Learning (who retired from the University service on 31.07.2015) on contract basis for the academic session 2018-19 (i.e. upto 30.05.2019) or till the post is filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, under clause 2.5 of the approved procedure, whichever is earlier, on fixed emoluments of Rs.20000/- (Twenty thousand only) per month w.e.f. the date he reports for duty. His salary be charged/paid against the vacant post of Senior Scientific Assistant/Scientific Officer (Cartographer) (G-I) USOL.

NOTE: 1. Shri Jagan Nath Dhiman was retired on 31.07.2015 as Senior Scientific Officer (Cartographer) (G-I) on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years.

Shri Dhiman was re-employed by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Chairperson, USOL. The detail is as under:

Sr. No.	Period of Re-employment
1.	22.09.2015 to 21.12.2015 (3 months)
2.	23.12.2015 to 22.06.2016 (6 months)
3.	24.06.2016 to 23.12.2016 (6 months)
4.	01.07.2018 to 31.12.2018 (6 months)

2. The Chairperson, U.S.O.L. has also been informed that the Vice Chancellor has ordered that the process to fill up the post under

36. Information contained in **Items I-(i) to I-(xi)** was read out and noted, i.e. –

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor R.K. Singla, Chairperson, Department of Computer Science & Applications, P.U. as Dean Research with immediate effect, in addition to the his own duties, on an honorarium of Rs.4000/- p.m. till further orders.
- (ii) The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXX**) between Universal Scientific Education and Research Network (USERN) and Panjab University, Chandigarh, has been executed, to expand collaboration on scientific programs, exchanges and training of scientists and researchers, sharing of information and technology in support of educational and research activities, sharing of best practices meetings, workshops and scientific conferences, according to the mutual interests and benefits.
- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor Ashish Jain, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U., as Director of IQAC (additional charge) and Professor Anuradha Sharma, Department of Education & Disability Studies, P.U. as Associate Director/Secretary of IQAC (additional charge) for a period of three years and they be paid an honorarium of Rs.3500/- p.m. and Rs.2500/- p.m. respectively, as per budgeted provision.
- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor Meena Sharma, University Business School, P.U. as Honorary Director in the Central Placement Cell, P.U. in place of Professor Suresh K. Chadha, UBS and Professor Sarbjeet Singh (Department of Computer Science & Engg.), UIET, P.U. as Associate Director in the Central Placement Cell, P.U. in place of Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U. with immediate effect, till further orders in addition to their own duties. They will be paid honorarium as was paid to earlier Honorary Director & Associate Director.
- (v) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to release the following retirement benefits up to the age of 60 years to the nominee (Mrs. Neelam Bhandari) wife of Late Dr. Ashwani Kumar Bhandari, Department of Mathematics (who expired on 11.02.2019), subject to the final outcome of the Hon'ble Court in CWP No.8368 of 2017:
 - (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007;
 - (ii) Furlough as admissible under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 121 of Calendar, Volume-I, 2007; and
 - (iii) In terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013, the payment of leave encashment will be made only for the number of days Earned leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Laxmi Wd/o Late Shri Babu Lal, Cleaner, Construction Office, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 23.12.2018, while in service:

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 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 has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Tula Devi (Wife) 50% and Shri Radhey Shyam (Son) 50% of Late Shri Ramjit, Security Guard, Boys Hostel No.1, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 29.10.2018, 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.

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits, in respect of Shri Jai Pal, Cleaner, Construction Office, P.U. who expired on 03.1.2.2018 to (i) Smt. Sushma (50% share) W/o Shri Jai Pal Cleaner, and (ii) Shri Rudransh (minor son) (50% share) through Smt. Sushma wife of Late Shri Jai Pal, Cleaner, P.U. Construction Office:

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. Earned Leave Encashment up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. (Ms.) Reeta Grewal Professor Department of History P.U.	09.10.1989	31.12.2018	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

				(ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.
2.	Dr. Upinder Sawhney Professor Department of Economics, P.U.	08.10.1984	31.03.2019	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. (ii) Furlough as admissible under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 121 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. (iii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

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

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Dharam Vir Sharma Assistant Architect Architect Office, P.U.	02.04.1980	31.01.2019	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Dhruv Chand Patial Senior Assistant General Branch	21.09.1981	31.03.2019	
3.	Shri Surinder Kumar Sharma Superintendent Account Branch	29.06.1984	31.03.2019	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
4.	Shri Satya Pal Superintendent USOL	04.09.1989	31.03.2019	
5.	Ms. Sunita Bhatia nee Sunita Rani ASO (Stenography) Department of Alumni Relations	29.10.1982	28.02.2019	
6.	Shri Rikhi Chand Senior Technician (G-II) CIL	01.04.1986	31.03.2019	
7.	Shri Surinder Singh Senior Assistant Conduct Branch	15.06.1990	31.03.2019	
8.	Shri Ram Singh Electrician Construction Office, P.U.	02.04.1993	31.03.2019	
9.	Shri Labh Singh Security Guard Security Staff	02.11.1987	28.02.2019	
10.	Shri Parkash Chand Library Restorer UIET	17.09.1991	31.03.2019	
11.	Shri Ram Singh Cleaner Department of Chemistry	28.02.1975	31.03.2019	

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

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

General Discussion

1. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a golden chance be given to all the students, who could not complete their degree because of compartment/re-appears as they were giving earlier. So, all the members requested that on the 550 birth centenary of Shri Guru Nanak Dev Ji those candidates who could not clear their degree be given one golden chance to complete the same. The members further told that by giving them golden chance the University can generate funds. Prof. S.K. Sharma told that the fee for golden chance is Rs. 10,000/-.

Prof. Gurdip Sharma said that told that if they are given golden chance on the birth centenary of Shri Guru Nanak Dev Ji, the fee should not be more than Rs. 5000/-.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that the past practice of charging fee for golden chance should continue.

It was agreed to that all the students of Panjab University Departments and its affiliated colleges, who could not qualify their compartments/re-appears examination due to one reason or the other and have exhausted all chances, be given a golden chance to complete their degree.

Shri Sandeep Singh told that this golden chance for those students who could not clear their papers in the annual system. This should also be extended to the semester system students. He said that those students who were admitted in the year 2014 in B.Sc. Agriculture whose chances have been exhausted, they may also be given chance to clear their exams. To this, it was told that this golden chance will be given to all the students.

The Vice Chancellor said there should not be any violation of regulation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said had there been any regulation, then there was no requirement to discuss this matter here.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal said that there is an issue of girls of Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur that their hostel gate is closed at 9 p.m. which leads to lot of problems. He further said there was a girl of their research group who is doing research at Hoshiarpur with the Faculty who had to close her experiment, but she was not allowed by her supervisor. It was further told that the main gate should be closed but they may be allowed to move within the campus.

Prof. S.K. Sharma while discussing told that one more thing be added here that the Director of Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur has written a letter to the University that there is a big campus but it lacks proper lightening and the

security is also very less and this should be done otherwise there could be a problem for the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said whether the decision has been taken regarding opening of hostel gate for 24 hours on the pattern of Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma told that the girl students of P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur are not demanding anything else. Their main issue is that within the campus, the main gate should not be locked but the problem is that there is no proper light and security. It should be resolved that they may be provided with 10-12 lights and security, especially female security. This should be sanctioned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it should be resolved that keeping in mind the demands of the students of P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, the same rule which has been applied here in P.U. Campus, will be applicable there also within the campus. However, immediately lighting systems (halogen lights) and 5 to 10 lady security guards be provided.

The Vice Chancellor said they should make arrangement of security guards at their own level at Hoshiarpur.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they can keep security guards on contract. He further told that as Prof. S.K. Sharma has told that first we should provide them proper lighting and lady security guards.

It was informed that the normal rule of attendance which is applicable at P.U. Campus, Chandigarh be made applicable at Hoshiarpur along with lighting system and security.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that pending all this, the rule be made applicable there. The University should try to issue letter to this extent as early as possible at the students at Hoshiarpur are agitating till late night.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma told that their immediate issue is that the internal gates should not be closed.

This was agreed to.

Prof. Rajesh Gill told that there is confusion. First of all, they should study the demands of the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal told that the students have demanded that they should be allowed to roam about within the campus.

2. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan told that he would like to talk about Yoga Day. Letters are received from the Panjab University, UGC or Punjab Government for the promotion of Yoga. They had filled the entry in the month of July and the competition was got done on 31st March. They are winning gold medal for the last 26 years but this time their team did not go for inter-university which took place on February 4, 2019 and the reason behind this is not known to them. Now there is nothing to do when the inter-university are over and their team did not go, though they were winning gold medal for the last 26 years. He further said when GNDU and Punjabi University are sending their

teams for inter-university why the Panjab University is not sending and our points are reducing for final trophy.

This matter will be looked into.

3. Prof. Gurdip Sharma told that those children who are doing B.Sc. (Agriculture) from the college affiliated to Panjab University are being denied admissions in M.Sc. in other Universities especially in Haryana. They are demanding approval of Indian Council of Agriculture Research (ICAR) and they have to check it up whether it is mandatory. If it is necessary, then the degree is not valid. It may be got examined and should be got done and if it is not the requirement of the Panjab University, then it is OK. This should be got verified.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether the Punjab Agricultural University (PAU) is giving admissions. If yes, then where is the requirement of ICAR. He further said Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana and Hisar Agricultural University (HAU) both are ICAR. When one body is accepting it and giving admissions, then why the other is not accepting it. If PAU is saying yes, then the HAU cannot say No. Now, come to the point of ICAR. If at this stage they go to get B.Sc. (Agriculture) recognized from the ICAR then they will ask for the information of agriculture fields and no college is having agriculture fields.

Prof Gurdip Sharma told that the requirement of ICAR is 4 Acre.

The Vice Chancellor said the former Vice Chancellor of Punjab Agricultural University Dr. S.S. Chahal had come. He had said that there is a confusion in the Panjab University and they (ICAR) will say that since the Panjab University had entered into their jurisdiction, they (ICAR) will stop the courses in different colleges if not today then tomorrow.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if the PAU is admitting our students, then we should contact HAU and will ask them when PAU is admitting students without ICAR, then why they are not admitting the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a conflict that the Panjab University has no mandate that it can start agricultural courses. It is a basic issue. Dr. Chahal is very senior person and he is the member of various Committees like ICAR etc. He had come to meet him.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua told that at the time of starting of the course this was told by Shri Ashok Goyal that this is not their course, it should not be started and if it is started, there may be a problem. He further told that if the students will not get admission further, they may not be able to get job.

Prof. Gurdip Sharma told that the students are getting government jobs.

Shri Sandeep Singh told that 10 students from their College at Hoshiarpur have got government job after doing this course.

Prof. Gurdip Sharma told that many children have gone to foreign countries and this degree has been recognized in foreign also. He told that it has been discussed many times, that a Committee has to be constituted for the new courses. He asked whether the Committee for the new courses has been constituted. He further demanded the list of the new courses which are being run in the GNDU and the Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor asked the DCDC to constitute a Committee to look into the matter.

4. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said there is one important issue of college teachers. There is a College in Hoshiarpur namely, S.M.S. College, Miani. The whole college is self-financing and no grant is being received from the Government. All the teachers in that college do not get full salary. Now, the problem is that one teacher is there who was selected as Punjabi teacher and the university had given his approval as PG teacher for M.A. Punjabi. Now, what the Principal has done is that since the strength of their college is less so they are discontinuing M.A. Punjabi and the teachers should make their own way.

The Vice Chancellor asked why they are stopping?

Shri Jagdeep Kumar replied that because the strength is less. There are one History teacher, one Music teacher and one Punjabi teacher who are getting salary between Rs. 22000/- and Rs. 23000/- and the Principal has given them salary of Rs. 16000/- after deducting their salary for the months of January and February. Though their salary has been credited to their account yet the teachers have not accepted the salary nor have they signed on the register. It is a very serious issue and the Principal has threatened them that she would remove them from the services of the College and they will shut the college. Full deduction of their PF was not being made and they were not given full salary and they were being given salary of Rs. 22000-23000 and now even their salary has been deducted and they are being threatened that their services would be removed from the college and the college would be closed. The Punjabi teacher is being threatened that her qualification is PG. There is an old decision of the Syndicate of 25 years back that if a course is to be stopped and if there is a workload, then the incumbent teacher is to be adjusted there. There is a teacher to teach General Punjabi at graduation level. There are Elective Punjabi, B.Com and BCA courses in the College and the workload is very much there. So, the College may be directed not to take any adverse action. The College would also be asked regarding deduction of salary and there is a need to take strict action. The teachers are very afraid of.

The members suggested that the Committee be constituted and Shri Jagdeep Kumar may be included in the Committee.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar requested that he may be informed what has been resolved in this matter. He has two more points. He further said that a letter may be written to the Principal that a Committee is visiting their College.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that surprise check can also be made.

Dr. K.K. Sharma told that there are many similar colleges which are increasing their workload but reducing the salary.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to which are those Colleges.

Shri Sandeep Singh there are three Colleges in Ludhiana which the Vice Chancellor had visited.

The Vice Chancellor said whenever he has some interaction with the Punjab Government Administration it is conveyed to him that many people are working on half salary. Even SDM and Deputy Collector are also working on half

of the pay. So to which extent the threat is right, Registrar would explain about it.

It was informed that issue is this that one or two persons approach from the College side. There are across the board problems of the Colleges which have to be shown, across the board PF is not deducted, across the board salary is not given. The University has the provision of periodical inspections. What does the University do is that they constitute a Committee for one College and they start action. The University should take the decision across the board for all the Colleges.

5. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that he has already given a suggestion in the Senate. Present DCDC as also previous DCDC are also sitting here. I had requested that an undertaking may be sought from each College whether they are giving full salary and retiral benefits and that they have maintained separate Bank Account. The undertaking should be sought in a time-bound manner and in case any College fails to provide the undertaking, that College should not be given any new course. It should be decided and in case they do not take any decision, the Colleges would take them lightly.

Shri Sandeep Singh told that the issue should be seen from both the angles. The strength of the Colleges is reducing day by day. It is very big issue.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua told that the College are 25 years old and the strength is reducing today.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar told that Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur is very old but till date the retiral benefits have not been released to the teachers by it.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan told that he wanted to add a small thing here. The DCDC is sitting here. He had written a letter requiring statement of retiral benefits from the Colleges and he has full data. That data should be analyzed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that now the situation is this that when they go to the College to give affiliation, our eyes get closed. And when there is no salary, why to open the College. Everybody is saying that the strength has reduced but if the strength has reduced why four colleges have been opened.

The Vice Chancellor said that periodical inspections would be done and asked the DCDC to do the needful.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma told that now the temporary affiliation is going on and let it go and in the next session all periodical inspections may be got done.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the University asks for charging of Rs. 2040/- per student towards retiral benefits. If 2000 students are studying in a college, then the total amount of Rs. 40 lac per year gets deposited directly into the account of the Management and when a teacher retires, he is given some Rs. 2 lakh or sometimes 3 lakh only.

Now dispute arose between members whether it is separate account or it is a separate head. Some members said it is separate account and some members said that it is separate budget head. To clarify this, Dr. K.K. Sharma read the letter dated 25.5.2018 of the University wherein it has been mentioned

that a College should maintain a separate account and will report to the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that every time he raised the issue that a certificate may be taken from the College that there is separate account.

6. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that in the last Syndicate meeting he had told that some Principals do not allow them journey day and the Registrar had told that they would reply it on Monday. He also told that in the Colleges when a teacher completes 10 years service he becomes entitled to 15 days casual leave and if a teacher completes 15 years service he is not given the benefit of 20 days casual and benefit of 20 days casual leave is given to him on completion of 20 years service. So, he has a suggestion that either a Committee may be formed or the matter should be sent to the Regulation Committee which may decide that if a teacher in a college completes 15 years of service he may be given the benefit of 20 days casual leave instead of 15 days.

Dr. K.K. Sharma told that it is also necessary that now-a-days a person gets job at the age of 35 years and after 15 years service, the teacher would become 50 years of age.

It was informed that the University would bring on agenda item first regarding casual leave.

7. Prof. Rajat Sandhir said that last time it was decided that the CRIKC Bus which is running in the tricity should be stopped but no action has been taken.

Prof. Rajat Sandhir further said that teachers are being put on election duty. So, the University should write a letter to the Election Commissioner. Earlier in 2014 all the teachers were exempted from election duty. But this time all teachers are being deputed. They should write a letter in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that what they are thinking he is doing more than that. He had a direct talk with the Hon'ble Governor as well as he also sent the Registrar to discuss this matter. There are guidelines from Chief Election Commissioner and they have to follow them.

8. Dr. Harjodh Singh said that last time also he had requested that the condition of the teachers of the Constituent Colleges is very bad and they are working on low salary. This may be taken seriously. These teachers may be given as much as salary as is being given in the Punjabi University. The Punjabi University is giving salary of Rs. 44000/-.

9. Shri Naresh Gaur pointed out that he has two issues. One issue is related to the University that the charge of Chief Security Officer was not an appointment, it was a charge given to a Professor. If a Professor or an academician taking the charge of Chief Security Officer, it does not look nice as it conveys a wrong message. He further requested that the charge of the Chief Security Officer be given to any security related officer and the charge given to a Professor be immediately discontinued and the charge should be given to the next security related officer.

Shri Naresh Gaur second issue is that the issue which has been raised here that the college teachers are not being given this or that. In this context, the Managements of the Colleges have also become proactive. Postings of some of the teachers are at a distance of about 50 kms. or 60 kms. and the

Managements have started to discourage them by saying that they cannot leave the headquarter. University rule or regulation is silent on it but when the rule of the Government was made the distance requirement was 25 kms., cities were small, transport facilities were not available. Now, the University should make a rule and increase the distance from 25 kms. to 50 kms. or 100 kms. so that the Managements cannot exploit the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor told that the University administration is an academic administration which is entirely different. In the University we talk with very sensitive and educated people. Who is how much sensitive, everybody understand it and it should be understood by all of us. He further told that in BHU they also had thought of giving the charge of Chief Security Officer to a retired police or army personnel. He was also involved in security there. Like this University, many security officers are also there in BHU. Our experiment of giving charge to retired police or army personnel proved to be entire failure. It is his personal experience. For example, if one is the Professor and 400 students start crying and he says them that he is their Professor and they would listen to him but they would not be ready to listen to the Security Officer in dress.

10. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua told in the last meeting a decision was taken regarding Committee for fee structure and for the new admissions prospectus has to be printed and now the month of March has come but the Committees have not been communicated to them.

It was informed that the process regarding formation of Committees has initiated. Earlier the formation of Committees was done by the Accounts Department and this time the onus has been shifted to the DCDC.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua further requested that it should be time-bound. He further asked whether the Affiliation Committees have been formed.

It was informed that every Committee has been formed about 10 days back and communication in this regard has been sent to all the Colleges and there may be one or two Colleges which may not have received the communication regarding formation of Committees.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua also asked whether the University has any plan to start Choice Based Credit System from the ensuing session.

The Vice Chancellor asked him whether they would like to bring or not.

The members replied that they would not like to introduce CBCS.

Dr. K.K. Sharma told that even the semester system should be converted into annual system.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua wanted to know about the latest update on the CBC System.

It was replied that CBCS is not going to start from the coming session.

Shri Harpreet Singh further enquired that if a new teacher joins the University and he has no place to construct a house in Mohali or Manimajra and if he constructs the house in Kharar i.e. beyond the jurisdiction of Mohali

whether he would be required to submit station leave or not to which Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma told that it should be an agenda item.

It was informed to the members that the University has noted one of the points out of of 4-5 points discussed here. Affiliation Committees, Choice Based Credit System issues have been discussed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is peculiar situation here. There are two types of recognized courses in the Colleges one is unaided course and the other is aided course but the service conditions are the same. The only difference is that college is paying fee from its funds collected from students, but as far as the selection procedure and as far as the teacher concerned is there he has nothing to do from where the money is coming and he is getting full salary but the source of fund could be different. One man is working in unaided post and he has completed 10 years regular service and his appointment is approved by the University. But one system is prevailing here that when a grant-in-aid post of same subject in the same college is advertised, the person having 10 years service in unaided post is asked to apply afresh for coming into grant-in-aid post. So, the person who is already getting salary of Rs. 40,000/- having 10 years service has to apply for the grant-in-aid post, face the Selection Committee and is then selected at a salary of Rs. 21,600/- i.e. half of the salary he is getting earlier. Why this is being done is not known to him. The University should inform the Colleges that if any College has any such aided post, then the person working on the unaided post should be shifted to aided post and in this way the salary of that person will have to be protected. It is not that the salary may be reduced. Contrary to this, a case came to his notice where such a candidate was being dealt with by the University at the time of second approval, a phone call was made to college that before the case for second approval is dealt with, the College should get resignation from the person from the first post in which he has already worked for 10 years and the same be sent to the University so that past service be discontinued and only then the University will give approval to that appointment whereas he has already been approved. In response to the same, a letter was sent from the College mentioning therein 'with reference to your telephonic message, we hereby annex the resignation letter of the teacher'. Thereafter, the salary of the teacher was reduced and he was told that his old experience, seniority etc. all gone. He further said that it has also come to his notice that he is saying that this is the first time that this has been done. This is being done in all the Colleges. He further said that his earlier full service should be considered for seniority and every other purpose. The only difference is when a person shifts in grant-in-aid post that money would come from the Government and there will not any other difference. If such a thing has happened in any case, then the University should issue a circular to the College that they cannot do like this. The teacher should be given at least as much as salary in grant-in-aid post as he was drawing in unaided post. Now, what the College managements have started to do. They were giving Rs. 50,000/- to a teacher in unaided post. Now, with the shifting of the teacher to grant-in-aid post the teacher he would get Rs. 21,600/- from the Government. But the managements which was earlier giving salary of Rs. 50,000/- in an unaided post are not ready now to give the balance of Rs. 28,400/-.

Dr. K.K. Sharma told that on resignation, the College Management gets back three months salary.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the three months notice period salary in addition to his knowledge as the management of the college whose case he is discussing had not taken three months salary. So, the University should be the

savior of such type of exploitation of the part of the management. The second thing is that regarding Constituent colleges, the University is saying that they are talking to the Punjab Government. There is no requirement to talk to the Punjab Government. The University is getting full salary against the entire staff. They are taking money of the non-teaching staff. When any issue is discussed then the issue of only teachers is discussed but the issue of non-teachers of the Constituent is never discussed. None of the person is regular in the Constituent colleges. Colleges are being run on their shoulders. If they cannot recruit regular teachers, at least the University should start giving them full salary and everybody is saying here that their salary would increase to Rs. 50,000/- but he can say their salary cannot be increased until Seventh Pay Commission is not adopted. He further said that the persons who are being given Rs. 15,000/- or 25,000/- is not right, at least who are qualified persons should be given full salary by the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one issue which he had raised is very pertinent though he as an individual against him that as per the decision of the University anybody who is on deputation cannot be given any administrative charge which is clear. Which was reiterated earlier was also reiterated in the Syndicate meeting of February. There is only one person who is on deputation for one year he has been made Director Computer Centre in violation of that. Latest, it has come to notice that the deputation person has been given the charge of Officiating Chairperson who does not fall in the seniority in spite of the clear cut directions to all the Departments. He further said that he would not call it unintentional, he would call it intentional. When he was given the charge of Director Computer Centre, he could understand that the Vice Chancellor did know the provision and he was given the charge as nobody would be affective. Now, the charge of Officiating Chairperson to a person who is on deputation after ignoring the senior most Professor who is also the Secretary of PUTA. Today it has come to his knowledge that in the meeting of the Professors, he has not been called.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether he has been given the charge of Chairperson.

Prof. Navdeep Goyal told that when a Chairperson proceeds on leave he gives the charge to the next eligible person and it becomes wrong if the charge is not given to the next eligible person.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the charge has been given to the person who is on deputation. He further said the person who is being discussed here is his friend and if he does not raise this issue here then everybody would say that he is favouring that person. Had it been done so, that would have the approval of the DUI as the DUI as the Chairperson may not have mentioned the name of the next eligible person. This person was earlier given the charge of Chairperson but now it has been stopped.

11. Dr. K.K. Sharma said that in Samrala College sometimes retiral benefits of Rs. one lakh or sometimes fifty thousand is given though there is a separate account and money is lying therein. The Syndicate decision was taken in 2017 but they were not provided with the decision. This should be looked in synchronized way. One thing more that from the year 2012 the earned leave has increased from 8 to 12 and the University is requested to circulate that letter again as in some colleges this has been applied and in some colleges this has not been applied.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Syndicate and the Senate members work very hard despite many constraints. So his opinion is, if the members agree, that when they give farewell to the Syndicate or the Senate, on completion of a year if any Syndic has done his best throughout the year, he/she may be honoured.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it a good suggestion and he welcome and support it with one condition that he may not be one among them.

The Vice Chancellor said to Shri Ashok Goyal that if he is selected then.

Shri Ashok Goyal told that he cannot be selected.

The Vice Chancellor said that the best Syndic or the Senator may be honored and will be given citation. A Committee may be constituted which will prepare the parameters how much participation one has made, how businesses were done and will also take the record and give numbers. In this Committee, there will not be any Syndic or the Senator and only the teachers would be in the Committee. The Committee would talk to the Syndic or the Senators.

12. Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is provision to control the Colleges there is Regulation 15 at page 162. It is mandatory provision that in the month of July or August or in such other month as the Syndicate may, from time to time determine, the Principal of every affiliated college shall submit annually a report to the Syndicate indicating - (a) the changes in the management (b) the staff (c) changes in the teaching staff and qualifications of new members (d) number and distribution of students (e) income and expenditure of the previous financial year (f) results of examinations (g) scholarships (h) condition of library, and (i) number of students in the college hostel. This information has to be given. When this information has been given, if one says that they have no finances and they cannot afford then it is easy for the University to evaluate. These regulations have been made as per Section 27 of Panjab University Act and as per Panjab University Act Section 27 the procedure of affiliation is granted and thereafter the detailed procedure is granted to Chapter related to the affiliation. In that if at all there is an opportunity or there is exigency that a College is not doing well, then Regulation 11, 11.1. 11.2 and so on the University can put its men in the Committee and the University can disaffiliate the College, their results, their approval and whatever. All actions are available. But somehow, the University started asking information from them, thereafter what the College said, the University started to accept it and moreover, whatever the University wanted to do, it started to write this is done subject to this or this. There is no provision of subject to.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said she had sent a mail to the Vice Chancellor during late night and a copy to the SVC which Shri Ashok Goyal was talking about Dr. Goswami which is very serious and she lodge her protest on the part of PUTA.

Secondly, there is no provision of teacher in PU-ISSER and the cream of student is coming there. The children having high percentage of marks and belonging to well of families take admission there. How the course can be run without the teachers. First year Professor took the classes, thereafter they sent the junior persons. Nobody is coming because there is no payment. They are cheating the students.

13. Prof. Rajesh Gill further said that she had met the Vice Chancellor some time back and had given the case of Deputy Director (Physical Education) Dolly

Khanna and thereafter she met the Secretary to the Vice Chancellor many times and thereafter she sent reminder. Her case is that she is at Stage-IV Deputy Director. UGC Regulations are clear that the post of the Director is open but Stage-IV to Stage-V her promotion under CAS.

The Vice Chancellor asked that promotion has not been done.

14. Prof. Rajesh Gill told that a Committee was constituted and that Committee wrote to the UGC which was not required. When there is clear cut regulation of the UGC that she will not be given the designation but the scale is to be given which is her entitlement. Instead, 3-4 days back she received a letter from the Registrar Office that it has been written to the UGC (but she does not know how long back) and when the reply is received, they would look into the matter. This is not fair.

It was informed that in the University, there are two such posts one is of Librarian and the other is Deputy Director (Physical Education) and the third post of Deputy Director, Academic Staff College. In the year 2010, two templates were available. Grade Pay of Rs.10,000/- is given to a Professor. It was further informed that the UGC Secretary who is also a sports person had categorically told that the designation of Director cannot given to the Deputy Director and accordingly Deputy Director cannot get the pay scale of Director.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that there is a provision and she would provide the copy of the same. She further told that she has submitted a representation attaching all the documents.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma told that there is a provision.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that there is a provision of 2010. The University should look into it and she can again give the papers. It is the provision of 2010 that designation can be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether the University has given designation to Deputy Director, Academic Staff College.

It was informed that in the Syndicate has changed the designation of the Deputy Director, Academic Staff College to Associate Professor and the Deputy Director, Academic Staff College has become Associate Professor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate or the Senate cannot change the designation of Deputy Director, Academic Staff College to Associate Professor.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma told Shri Ashok Goyal that that he remembers that he was a part of that proceedings in which designation of Deputy Director, Academic Staff College was changed to Associate Professor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was done in 2017 and he has not seen the decision of the Senate. He further told that either he had not attended the meeting or he had not seen the decision. He further told that if the Senate has done so, then the Senate can hang anyone under 302. It would be seen whether the Senate has the power to change the designation. Whether UGC permits to change the decision or whether our calendar permits to change the designation and what are they doing. If the provision is there and the rules permit, then the Deputy Director (Sports) should also be made Associate Professor and the

Deputy Director, Academic Staff College designated to Associate Professor be made Professor and then there is no problem.

Prof. Rajesh Gill said that she is their colleagues on the campus for so many years and they cannot do anything for her.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not against anyone. If by changing the designation of Deputy Director, Academic Staff College to Associate Professor the University has done wrong, then they should do one more wrong by changing the designation of Deputy Director (Sports) to Associate Professor otherwise the earlier decision be reversed. He further said that in his view she can be given scale if not the designation subject to the regulation.

15. Shri Sandeep Singh said that he will speak keeping in view the sentiments of the House. Addressing to the Vice Chancellor he said that last time he (Vice Chancellor) told that all certificates have been given. The students getting Post-matric scholarship have the problem. Their DMCs are lying pending in the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the DMC should be given and reiterated that all examinations results should be declared in time both in University and Colleges.

16. Shri Sandeep Singh told that the FDO is saying that the certificates cannot be given till the money is not received and he is right at his place, government is also right at its place and the children are grilled between the two. Yesterday, a handicapped child came to Government College, Hoshiarpur to get his DMC as he had come to know that the DMCs have arrived. When he asked the child to which category he belonged, he told that he belonged to SC category. So, he told him that the DMCs of the SC category students have not received. He further said that he felt very sad to see that child who is unable to walk. He had a month back requested the University to prepare a policy in this regard but they have not taken it seriously. He further requested that he may be told what decision has been taken in this regard. The result of M.A. Punjabi has been declared and the result has been displayed in the Government College and it has been mentioned a fee of Rs. 4575/- is pending of all the students. He further told that the at the time of admission the SC category candidates may be told that they cannot be admitted without taking fee and it will depend upon the child. If he has money, he will study and if has no money, he will not study. The University stops their result and the child comes to take his result after incurring at least Rs. 1000/-. It is folded hand request that it is not his problem.

It was informed that more than crore rupees are pending and the University has sent to the notices. The reimbursement is between the Government and the College and the University has no role. The College should pay the fee and if they do not pay the fee then how the work of the University will run.

17. Shri Sandeep Singh told that he is not talking about one particular student or the College. He is talking about all the colleges. He further said it should have already made clear that the admissions are not to be given.

Shri Sandeep Singh further requested to look into the fee of Hostel 10. He further requested that the fine slab of Rs.25000/- for late application is very high. It should be reduced to Rs.5000/-.

The Vice Chancellor told that it is very clear that they cannot change the slab and bear with him.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that the University should review and rationalize the slabs as the same are very high.

Shri Sandeep Singh told that the children say that they cannot pay such a high fine. Rather they are ready to waste a year.

18. Shri Sandeep Singh also raised the issue of participation of President of Students Council in the Senate. He further told that the President of the Non-teaching Association is the member of the Senate, PUTA President is also a member of the Senate and why they deny the membership to President of Student Council. No University or the college can run without the students. So, their major involvement is required in the Senate is necessary.

The Vice Chancellor talked about the JCM.

19. Shri Sandeep Singh wanted to know about the decision on the post-matric scholarship.

The Vice Chancellor told that Government has no money. He has talked to Shri Sampla ji.

He further told that from the next time a clear cut policy be framed that the University will not give admission to SC candidates till the money is received and the University is holding the DMCs.

The Vice Chancellor said how they can say so.

20. Regarding JCM Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should have been explained to them at the level of the Vice Chancellor or the Registrar. Had the meeting of the Syndicate been held in January, the JCM could have been constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are talking about 2-3 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they are threatening then this Syndicate is not responsible for 2017-18. Why the meeting could not be held, they know and the authority knows. Regarding constitution of JCM, it may be informed to them the Syndicate meeting could not be held in January otherwise JCM could have been constituted. In the Syndicate meeting of February, the JCM Committee has been constituted and yesterday it was given to the office and he does not know why the office has not conveyed it to them.

Dr. Gurdip Sharma told that during 2017 five meetings of the JCM were held.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 16th March 2019

It was informed that the non-teaching union is talking about 2018. They have said that only one meeting was held in 2018 that too in the month of December.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the JCM for the year 2019 has been constituted and Dr. Gurdip Sharma is the Chairman of the JCM.

(Karamjeet Singh)
Registrar

Confirmed

(RAJ KUMAR)
VICE-CHANCELLOR