

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Monday, 18th February 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. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
4. Shri Harjodh Singh
5. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
6. Dr. Inderjit Kaur
7. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
8. Dr. K.K. Sharma
9. Shri Naresh Gaur
10. Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu
11. Professor Navdeep Goyal
12. Professor Rajat Sandhir
13. Professor Rajesh Gill
14. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
15. Shri Sandeep Singh
16. Professor S.K. Sharma
17. Professor Karamjeet Singh Registrar ... (Secretary)

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 greeted 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) Dr. Pushpa Chaudhary, former Professor, Department of Education, Panjab University, on 18th December, 2018;
- ii) Sardar Kuldip Singh, father of Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Fellow, Panjab University and Chairperson, Department of Hindi, Panjab University, on 25th December, 2018;
- iii) Mrs. Swaran Kaur, mother of Professor Swinder Singh, University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, on 27th December, 2018;
- iv) Smt. Vimla Grover mother of Professor Arun Kumar Grover, former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, on 28th December, 2018;
- v) Dr. B.R. Kandoi, former Professor, Department of Economics, Panjab University, on 1st January, 2019;
- vi) Shri Ajmer Singh, father of Dr. Rajiv Kumar, Department of Environment Studies, on 20th January, 2019;
- vii) S. Jagjit Singh, father of Shri Prabhjit Singh, Fellow, Panjab University, on 21st January, 2019;

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

- viii) Dr. R.K. Gupta, former Professor, Department of Physics, Panjab University, on 26th January, 2019;
- ix) Shri Raghbir Dyal, Fellow, former Syndic and member of Board of Finance, on 27th January, 2019;
- x) Mrs. Prabha Verma, mother of Professor Archana Bhatnagar, Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, on 30th January, 2019;
- xi) Mrs. Mato Rani, mother of Dr. Ashok Yadav, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, on 2nd February, 2019;
- xii) Professor A.K. Bhandari, Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, former Fellow, Dean of University Instruction, Controller of Examination, Registrar, and Dean, College Development Council, on 11th February, 2019;
- xiii) Professor S.M. Handa, former Professor, Department of Zoology, Panjab University and former Fellow, Panjab University, on 11th February, 2019; and
- xiv) Dr. Avtar Singh, Department of Zoology, Panjab University, on 12th February, 2019.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. Pushpa Chaudhary, Sardar Kuldip Singh, Mrs. Swaran Kaur, Smt. Vimla Grover, Dr. B.R. Kandoi, Shri Ajmer Singh, S. Jagjit Singh, Dr. R.K. Gupta, Shri Raghbir Dyal, Mrs. Prabha Verma, Mrs. Mato Rani, Professor A.K. Bhandari, Professor S.M. Handa, Professor Avtar Singh and also paid tributes to the martyrs of Pulwama, Jammu & Kashmir 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.

At this stage, Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that some of these persons were their colleagues. He is of the view that some of the members would like to pay their tributes to them individually. He would also like to put on record something about these members particularly about Shri Raghbir Dyal and Professor A.K. Bhandari.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not aware whether such a tradition existed or not.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they had been paying their tributes to the members. Once they had paid their tributes to late Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath in the meeting of the Senate individually. As such, the tradition do exist.

The Vice Chancellor said that then the members could go ahead.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that so far as Shri Raghbir Dyal is concerned, he was a member of the Senate for the last two terms. This time, he was also elected as a member of the Board of Finance. Most importantly, he was working very hard for the construction of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. The land has been allocated for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, but somehow the same is still pending. He thought that it would be a best tribute to him (Shri Raghbir Dyal)

from the Panjab University would be, if they immediately take up the issue and start the construction of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. So far as Professor A.K. Bhandari is concerned, he believed that he was continuously working for the University for the last about 15 years occupying one position or the other. He also believed that whenever anyone had any doubt about anything, he/she had sought guidance from him. In his (Professor A.K. Bhandari) case, his children are still not settled. He suggested that they must do something for his family on the lines whatever they had been doing in the past. What they had been doing in the past is that one of the children of the deceased employee, is generally appointed to a post, for which he/she is eligible. If the child is eligible for Class 'A' post, he/she is appointed on a contract basis. So far he knew, his (Professor A.K. Bhandari) daughter is going to complete her Ph.D. in the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences. It would be in the fitness of things, if she is offered the position of Assistant Professor on contract basis for a period of three years, under Regulation 5(b) at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. He added that this they had been doing in the cases where the members of the teaching staff died during service, as the University had been doing something for them.

Professor Rajesh Gill, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, stated that the last few days have been very unfortunate as they have lost some their colleagues, who are very precious to them. As said by Professor Navdeep Goyal, she is yet to see such a sincere and committed person like Shri Raghbir Dyal, who used to be so passionate about what he said and he worked very hard. He was through, especially with the financial aspect, i.e., Budget, etc. The kind of passion which he had with his place/region, i.e., Sri Muktsar Sahib, none else could have. They had gone to participate in his Kirya, wherein his wife made an appeal to him as Vice Chancellor that the last message, which he sent to the Fellows, the University must honour that. They must do something for which he had been fighting for a long time. Since P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, is in a very bad shape, she would request him (Vice Chancellor) to take it up. Secondly, they could also think of raising a memorial by naming a building/Institute at Sri Muktsar Sahib in the name of Shri Raghbir Dyal because the people of Sri Muktsar Sahib were also very passionate about him as he was representing the region in the Panjab University. Thirdly, Professor A.K. Bhandari is a big loss to the whole University and they all knew about it. In fact, he was not a single person. They all always turn to him (Professor Bhandari) for all kinds of advice. He was not holding all such kinds of administrative positions during the last about 15 years not separately, but simultaneously, and he could make such a balance. He was such an Administrator that he was able to perform the duties in such a fine manner. The way he worked for the University, he worked at the cost of his family. Many a times, when they do so much for the Institution, it is always at the cost of their children and wife. Therefore, if they accommodated his daughter, who is eligible, as Assistant Professor, it would be a very nice gesture on the part of Panjab University.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill. He had the privilege in working with Professor A.K. Bhandari. He had been the Chairperson, Department of Mathematics, Controller of Examinations, Registrar, Dean, College Development Council, and Dean of University Instruction. He was the finest person. In fact, it is a personal loss to everyone. He served this University with great degree of honesty and with greatest possible dedication, which is very rare to find. It is very difficult to fill the vacuum which has been created with his death. Professor S.K. Handa was also a Fellow of this University and was a very fine person. His contribution to the Department as well as to the University is very great. They pray to God that He should grant peace to the departed souls.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma stated that he also endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor S.K.

Sharma. Shri Raghbir Dyal was really a financial wizard, excellent human being and an asset to the University. They must do whatever they could for him.

Dr. K.K. Sharma also endorsed the viewpoints expressed by his colleagues. He suggested that since Shri Raghbir Dyal had been making extraordinary efforts for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, his name should be inscribed on the building of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, and it would be a good tribute to him.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by the members, Shri Naresh Gaur stated that it was the second term of Shri Raghbir Dyal as a Senator. He had also got an opportunity to work with him in the Syndicate. When they went to Sri Muktsar Sahib besides the sentiments of his family members, the sentiments of the people of the region were that Shri Raghbir Dyal was making extraordinary efforts for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib and was canvassing for donating funds for construction of building of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. People were saying that they were ready to collect money for the purpose of construction of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. Since the University had already a grant of Rs.2 crore, the work of construction of the building should be started immediately and the building should be named on his name, i.e., Shri Raghbir Dyal Bansal as people of that area knew him as Shri Raghbir Dyal Bansal. He added that people of that area are ready to contribute for this cause as they like to pay tribute to Shri Raghbir Dyal in real sense. So far as Professor A.K. Bhandari is concerned, he was an extraordinary person for the University. People use to seek guidance from him irrespective of whether it was a financial matter, administrative or any other. It would be the best tribute from them, if they appointed his (Professor A.K. Bhandari) daughter as Assistant Professor on temporary basis as she is eligible for this post. It is important for the University to see that the family of such dedicated persons is taken care of by the Syndicate and Senate.

Professor Rajat Sandhir stated that the last words of Shri Raghbir Dyal were for construction of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. In fact, he was very passionate for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. They had allocated about Rs.2 crore for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. However, the work for the construction of the building could not be started owing to one reason or the other. They needed to address this issue as their first priority and fulfil his (Shri Raghbir Dyal) prime wish. So far as Professor A.K. Bhandari is concerned, he would like to endorse the viewpoints expressed by other persons.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that he had also got the opportunity to sit with Shri Raghbir Dyal in the meetings of the Senate, Syndicate, Faculties and various other Committees. The last words of Shri Raghbir Dyal have already been shared. Now, it is their duty to get the work of construction of building of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib started at the earliest possible and dedicate the building to him (Shri Raghbir Dyal). He has not only worked for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, but also work a lot for the upliftment of his College, i.e., Government College, Muktsar. There is no course in the University, which has not yet been offered at Government College, Muktsar. In fact, during his tenure, he has introduced so many courses at Government College, Muktsar, including M.Sc. (Computer Science), B.Sc. (Agriculture), which was the need of the area. The people of Muktsar region are ready to contribute funds for the construction of building of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. The construction of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib would not only be a tribute to him, but would also meet the requirement of that region. Therefore, the Regional Centre should be established there in a best possible manner. He added that the relationship between Professor A.K. Bhandari and Shri Raghbir Dyal was of teacher - student. Shri Raghbir Dyal was a student of Professor A.K. Bhandari and he still remembered that once Shri Raghbir Dyal had offered his seat in the election of the Syndicate to Professor A.K. Bhandari. He had withdrawn his name and had requested Professor Bhandari to get elected to the Syndicate first as he (Professor Bhandari) is his

teacher and he would seek election next time. Whatever is being done to support his (Professor A.K. Bhandari) family is fully supported by them. The children of Professor A.K. Bhandari are themselves intelligent, and his daughter is going to complete her Ph.D. However, they themselves should take her services and appoint her as Assistant Professor on temporary basis.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to express his heart-felt condolences not only to the families of bereaved, but also to the University as they had lost many stalwarts during the period when the last meeting of the Syndicate was held and today when the next meeting of the Syndicate is being held. The loss of Shri Raghbir Dyal ji, who was Fellow, former member of the Syndicate and sitting member of the Board of Finance, actually breathed his last on the day when the meeting of the Syndicate was to take place, i.e., on 27th January 2019. He understands that the Vice Chancellor, who had hosted a dinner on 26th January 2019 itself, they had been told that most of the time, it was only Shri Raghbir Dyal who was being discussed and his passion for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, and the will of the University expressed by the Vice Chancellor and other members of the Syndicate, who were sitting there to go ahead and bring the dream of Shri Raghbir Dyal true by doing whatever work was required to be done by the University at the earliest. Probably, after the meeting and the dinner ended, Shri Raghbir Dyal also came to know that the Vice Chancellor is taking his urge very seriously. He does not know, maybe it was the will of God, he got satisfied with the efforts which were being put in by the University to make his dream come true, and he decided or the God decided to take his away from them early in the morning on 27th January 2019. Though all the people here were so much disturbed/grieved and the meeting of the Syndicate, which was supposed to be held at 11.00 a.m., was also not held because of such a big tragedy. When they went to Muktsar on 8th of January, they found the kind of love he earned here in the University in more than last six years, he was equally loved by one and all in Muktsar also because the kind of passion he showed here in the University in working in the Senate, Senate and other University bodies, probably was part of his daily course in Muktsar also. He personally felt that it is a personal loss to him and personal loss to all the friends because the kind of contribution he used to make during deliberations in the Senate and Syndicate, the kind of thorough study he used to come with after going through the agenda papers, is unparallel. He thought that the person like him always used to feel that why could not these things come to his mind, which could come to Shri Raghbir Dyal Bansal's mind. The words are not enough to express except to say that the University has lost a very-very important functionary from whom they expect that he would be serving the University for years to come. Anyway, nothing could be done before the God's will, but it would be the real tribute if they are able to bring up the building of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib and name that Regional Centre in the name of Shri Raghbir Dyal Bansal. He thought that they must resolve here today that the building of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, be treated as first priority and the Regional Centre be name as "Raghbir Dyal Bansal P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib" or whatever way it could be done. He thought that this is the unanimous expression of sentiments of the House.

This was agreed to.

Principal N.S. Sidhu said that he seconded the above-said resolution proposed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

At this stage, the members in one voice said that the above-said resolution is from all of them, and the same should be approved.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Professor A.K. Bhandari, he thought all of them, if he is permitted, he would say even Professor Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor, they have lost a real friend, philosopher and guide. The University has lost one of its

biggest stalwarts, who till his last breath was serving the University, its fraternity, faculty, the Syndicate members, the Senate members. He was always ready to guide everybody and anybody without any kind of bias. Somehow, he remembers that when he got the news that he was to be immediately shifted to the PGIMER, it was around 10 o'clock, he spoke to Professor Rajesh Gill and she told him that she had spoken to him at 8.30 requesting him to do something, and Mrs. Bhandari told her that immediately she telephoned Professor Bhandari, though it was a holiday, being the Sunday, that Professor Bhandari told her that Professor Rajesh Gill has assigned him some job, for which he has to go to the Department after taking the bath. That was his commitment. Instead of going to the department, neither they knew nor he knew that he is to be rushed to PGI. He went to PGI where Professor Rajesh Gill and so many other colleagues, including Professor Devinder Singh (SVC) and Professor Karamjeet Singh (Registrar), were already there. When they met him in the evening, they were given to understand that he was improving and there was nothing serious to worry. However, again they got the news early in the morning, as was in the case of Shri Raghbir Dyal, that he was no more. As such, it linked as if there was a big vacuum and how the University would run now. That was the immediate reaction, which everybody felt. So it is something very small, which have been suggested that only as a matter of gesture of good will to take care of the family, his daughter, who is otherwise eligible, should be appointed on compassionate ground as Assistant Professor, as has been suggested by other members. The Ph.D., which is an additional qualification for the post of Assistant Professor, of his daughter is going to be completed very soon. Actually, he had been told that her viva was fixed on 20th, but it had to be postponed due to some unavoidable reason. Now the same is going to be conducted very shortly. As they had been doing in the past, though he did not know whether there is some agenda item or not, but he has been given to understand that the Departmental Committee has recommended that the daughter of Professor A.K. Bhandari be appointed as Assistant Professor on temporary basis for a period of 3 years as she is eligible. Therefore, it should also be resolved that the appointment be offered to her in terms of the recommendations of the Departmental Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would look into the issue in the light of past practice, rules and regulations of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal further stated that he had also got an opportunity to work with Professor S.M. Handa also in the Senate, though it was probably in the mid or late 1990. He was one of the most wonderful persons he had come across. He was a very pleasant personality, who use to be always smiling. He felt, please don't mind if he use words, he has found very rare Professors, who know how to smile 24 hours, and he was one of those. He had never been in any kind of tension because most of the Professors are always interested with research, teaching and extension activities. But having all these three things in him, he knew how to enjoy the life. They could not do anything except to express their condolences.

The Vice Chancellor stated that as the Chairman of this Syndicate and Vice Chancellor of Panjab University he fully value their feelings as well as the suggestions, which they had given. Although he had a very small/short term association with both of them (Shri Raghbir Dyal & Professor A.K. Bhandari). So far as Shri Raghbir Dyal is concerned, it was hardly of 2-3 meetings. Sometime he had to call to talk to him. It is a matter of touching to their feelings, which matters. Whenever he talked to Shri Raghbir Dyal, he felt as if he is known to him for the last so many years. He had got an SMS at 8.58 a.m., which showed the same concerned as is being shown by them right now, and the SMS is still with him. The person had very strong feelings and dedication relating to P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, which is very difficult to find in any other person. Shri Raghbir Dyal had been saying to him that he should start the construction of the building of P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib at the earliest and he should not worry for the finances as he (Shri Raghbir Dyal) would

be easily able to collect funds amounting to Rs.1-2 crore from the people of that region, who are ready to give donation for this noble cause. This gentleman had such feelings about the University and about P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib. He would leave no stone unturned for the establishment of that Centre. Very shortly, he going there and he value his (Shri Raghbir Dyal) feelings. Man comes and goes, but only these things are to be said, discussed and recorded. What relation he (Vice Chancellor) had with him (Shri Raghbir Dyal), though they (the members) might have sat with him for a long time. However, he had relation with him only for two-three months. He would like to tell them one more thing that he was very well versed with the financial matters. Though he is a man of management, he was able to recognize him within few minutes. He was so well versed with the financial matters, which is nowadays very much required by the University. It is a personal loss to him (Vice Chancellor). He would do for him whatever is possible under the provisions of the University, as they are with him. Not only that, he would like to do much more in his memory of these souls. So far as his other friends/colleagues are concerned, Professor A.K. Bhandari has really impressed him a lot. He had no intimacy with them, but somebody requested him to interact with a person named Professor A.K. Bhandari. He asked his office staff to call Professor A.K. Bhandari as he would like to interact with him and they would be surprised to know that he requested him at about 7.00 o'clock saying that he would be reaching office a little bit early and if he comes it would be better. They would be astonished to know that Professor Bhandari was present in his office by 6.55 o'clock. He got busy in a meeting and he forgot that he had called Professor A.K. Bhandari today, and that man continued to sit there up to 8.30 o'clock. Thereafter, he felt very sorry for this, but he could not express it in words. Thereafter, when he called Professor Bhandari to come in and told him, "Dr. Sahib, I have committed a mistake owing to which you have to sit here for such a long time", but he (Professor Bhandari) said, "No, No, Sir nothing to feel sorry". He said while laughing that Sir, he knew how much busy he (Vice Chancellor) could be. He told him (Professor Bhandari) that he is not feeling comfortable while talking to him as he had made him to sit for one and half hours. He requested him to work with him (Vice Chancellor) as he had been earlier doing with other Vice Chancellors as he would like to take the University forward irrespective of the fact to which group of people he belong to and he is least concern to it. He told him that he would be with him wherever he wished. He would like to tell them that whatever problems/legal problems/shortcomings were there in the selection process of teachers under the CAS, including the anomalies, court cases, etc., all of them have been removed with the help/guidance of Professor A.K. Bhandari. That fellow has given presentation with him a number of times. Now, everything has been streamlined in accordance with the regulations/rules/norms of UGC and MHRD. This is a very big thing, which he had given to him (Vice Chancellor). He would do whatever he could, but he should not be restricted to a limit. He had an experience that such persons are always remembered. Whatever they would do for such persons, it would be much less in comparison to their contributions. He prayed that persons like Professor A.K. Bhandari ji and Shri Raghbir Dyal ji come to the university to help them to take the University forward. With these words he paid his tributes to both Professor A.K. Bhandari ji and Shri Raghbir Dyal ji.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to say one thing that Professor A.K. Bhandari ji has helped them a lot in the affairs of PUTA. She added that when UGC Regulations, 2018 came, and the input which they had sent to the UGC, Professor A.K. Bhandari was the guiding force behind that, but they have not adopted the UGC Regulation, 2018 so far. Now, it is high time to adopt UGC Regulation, 2018, which would also be a tribute to him.

The Vice Chancellor said that they might not be aware and sometimes they are not able to do certain things. The two increments for Ph.D., which have been granted, perhaps they might not be aware as to how much he has to put in. Only he knew as to

how much efforts he has to put in. He could say or would continue saying with full responsibility that none was able to get this work done.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they put on record their thanks for the efforts made by the Vice Chancellor for getting the issue of grant of Ph.D. increments to the teachers resolved.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor stated that all are scholars in the University. A case was to be presented there, and the presentation was given by him. When some confusion arose, as Professor Rajesh Gill was continuously in touch with him, she requested him (Vice Chancellor) that if he does not feel bad, being the President, PUTA, she should be allowed to take Professor A.K. Bhandari, which touch his heart as he was also of the same opinion. They must appreciate the feelings of Professor Rajesh Gill. Professor Rajesh Gill is a Professor and he honour her, she could not present the thing, which Professor A.K. Bhandari presented there.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is absolutely true.

The Vice Chancellor said that a lot of patience is required in such matters. The decision, which he has taken today, certain people of other Universities are very angry on accepting the advice of the Vice Chancellor of Panjab University. The informal relations, which they had, actually mattered in the long run, and the relations of chair ends with the chair. He, therefore, requested that they should have informal relations. He would like to again tell them that he is much concerned for them, for their Pay Commission, Pension, and other issues. He is raising their issues at the level, which they could not even imagine. In this manner, he is very much selfish. Wherever he discusses their issues, somebody known to him is found to be available there. The Principal Secretary to the Advisor to the Scientific Secretary and Principal Advisor to the Government of India, have assigned him a major project. All these things would be done slowly and steadily. Now, the University would function smoothly and nobody could stop it because people like them are with him. He has no ill-will against anybody. He has come here to perform and he is performing. They are aware that the outsiders have also started to praise him. Perhaps, earlier this was not happening. They would be happy to know that he has been able to improve the image of both the Houses, i.e., Syndicate and Senate, which was somewhat tarnished earlier. The day he joined this University, 32 complaints were there from the Chancellor's office for comments, etc. Now, complaint is received after months, and when he gets them investigated it is found that the same is related to a College, which is not mentioned there. He talked to the concerned Principal as there were no signatures of the Principal on the complaint. It is all about feelings and attachment. Their attachment to the University is a big strength for him. In fact, the family of the University is a big strength for him. He had 60-60 deliverable with him, which none of the University has. Whenever he visited the Prime Minister's Office, he got respected there. The Professors of Department of Physics and Department of Energy are unparallel in the world. When he had such a strength, why should they leave behind from other. They would continue to leap forward.

Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that the Syndicate should adopt the UGC Regulations, 2018.

The Vice Chancellor said that the formality/formalities would be completed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to see as to how many days before the UGC Regulations, 2018, have been received.

It was clarified that under Regulations, 2016, they had the option. They had a meeting with Professor A.K. Bhandari and perhaps, he might also been there in the

meeting. In fact, Regulations 2016 are more convenient to the teachers. They should adopt them and thereafter, the same would be implemented.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they did not adopt the UGC Regulations, the Audit might say that how they have made the promotions/appointments of teachers in accordance with the old Regulations because they are part of those very regulations (in built). If they adopted them as such, they are free to make promotions either in accordance with the old regulations or new regulations.

It was said that they would definitely adopt the UGC Regulations, and if not, the same would be adopted.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it should be checked and if it is found that the UGC Regulations have not been adopted, the same should be got adopted, on behalf of the Syndicate.

This was agreed to by the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal further said that as far as the template is concerned, the same should be brought to the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members of the Syndicate that-
 - (i) Mr. Shyam, NSS volunteer, a student of BA-III in Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, participated in the Republic Day Parade held on 26th January, 2019 in New Delhi, which is a big achievement.
 - (ii) Two papers entitled "Alcohol use and burden for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2016: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016" and "Measuring performance on the Healthcare Access and Quality Index for 195 countries and territories and selected subnational locations: A systematic analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016" of Dr. Kewal Krishan, Chairperson, Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, have been published in high impact factor medical journal "**The Lancet**".
 - (iii) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, and Fellow, Panjab University, has been bestowed upon with the Fellowship Award 2018 by Indian Pharmaceutical Association.
 - (iv) Dr. Neelima Dhingra, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, has been conferred upon with "Bharat Ratna Mother Teresa Gold Medal Award 2018" by Global Economic Progress and Research Association, Tamil Nadu in Chennai on December, 22, 2018.
 - (v) Shri Sanjay Tandon, Fellow, Panjab University and President, Balramji Dass Tandon Charitable Foundation, H.No. 1636, Sec. 18-D, Chandigarh, has donated an amount of Rs.10 lac to the University for creating an Endowment Fund for organizing Annual Memorial Lecture in memory of his father late Sh. Balramji Dass Tandon.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

- (vi) Dr. S.M. Kant, former Director, Youth Welfare, Panjab University, has been awarded Lifetime Achievement Award at the 34th North Zone Inter University Youth Festival held at Panjab University.
- (vii) Prof. Jayant N. Pethkar, School of Communication Studies, Panjab University, has been awarded as Good Teacher Award by the Chandigarh Chapter of Public Relations Society of India.
- (viii) Professor Harsh Nayyar, Department of Botany, Panjab University, has been sanctioned a grant of 30,000 US Dollars by International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), Morocco, for a 2-Year collaborative research project on "Screening Lentils for Heat Stress under Controlled Conditions".
- (ix) Mr. Akash Rai, a student of the University Business School, Panjab University, has got the highest package of Rs.53 lac p.a. in Tolaram Group in the recent campus placements conducted at UBS.
- (x) Mr. Radha Kishan, R/o H.No. 362, Sector-9, Panchkula, has donated an amount of Rs.1 lac for the purchase of books and payment towards scholarship to the poor and needy students.
- (xi) Professor Chaman Lal, Fellow, Panjab University, has been appointed as Honorary Advisor of Bhagat Singh Archives and Resource Centre of Delhi Archives of Government of NCT of Delhi.
- (xii) Smt. Kirron Kher, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), Chandigarh, has recommended the purchase of one bus and construction (expansion) of community centre for Panjab University, Chandigarh, out of her MP Local Area Development Fund.
- (xiii) Dr. Dalip Kumar, Fellow, Panjab University, has been awarded commendation certificate by Chandigarh Administration for his contribution in the field of higher education.
- (xiv) Dr. Manjit Kaur Brar, Principal, Government College of Commerce and Business Administration, Sector-50, Chandigarh, has been awarded commendation certificate by Chandigarh Administration for her contribution in the field of higher education.
- (xv) Panjab University NSS Contingent for the first time got first position in U.T. State Level Republic Parade. Prior to this, the contingent had been getting second position during the last two years.
- (xvi) Dr. Prabhdeep Brar, University Institute of Fashion Technology and Vocational Development, Panjab University, won the best presentation award for her paper entitled "Observing sustainability: Case studies of Chandigarh boutiques and their textile waste reuse" at the 21st International Conference on sustainability in fashion and textiles' held in Rome, Italy from January 17-18, 2019.
- (xvii) Panjab University successfully conducted the 34th North Zone Inter University Youth Festival from 27-31 December, 2018 in collaboration with Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi. About 36 Universities from northern India participated in this mega festival. It is also a matter of honour that Panjab University, Chandigarh, placed on 2nd runner-up in overall championship of this festival.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

- (xviii) Dr. Nisha Bhargava, Principal, MCM DAV College for Women, Chandigarh and Fellow, Panjab University, has been nominated as a Member of the State Legal Services Authority, U.T. Chandigarh for a period of two years.
- (xix) A research proposal titled “Plasmonic hot electron pockets as exciton luminescence promoters and regioselective chemical triggers” submitted jointly by Dr. Jadab Sharma, Centre for Nanoscience and Nanotechnology, Panjab University, and Dr. Erik Dujardin, CEMES, France, has been approved under CEFIPRA which will be jointly funded by India and France;
- (xx) I have met:
- (a) Shri Satyadeo Narayan Arya, Hon’ble Governor of Haryana, on 4th and 22nd January, 2019 regarding Saraswati River Project.
 - (b) Professor V.K. Paul, Member, NITI Aayog, New Delhi, on 10th January, 2019 regarding AYUSH and 100-bedded hospital Project.
 - (c) Shri Rajiv Gauba, Home Secretary, Government of India, on 10th January, 2019 to apprise about University.
 - (d) Shri Suresh Prabhu, Hon’ble Minister for Commerce and Industry, Government of India, on 18th January, 2019 in connection with the grants for setting up of a Centre for Intellectual Property Rights.
 - (e) Dr. I.V. Subba Rao, Secretary to Vice-President of India, on 15th February, 2019.
 - (f) Professor K. Vijay Raghavan, Principal Scientific Advisor, Govt. of India, on 15th February, 2019.
 - (g) Dr. Arabinda Mitra, Scientific Secretary to Principal Scientific Advisor, Govt. of India, on 15th February, 2019

Referring to participation of Mr. Shyam, NSS volunteer, a student of BA-III in Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, participated in the Republic Day Parade, the Vice Chancellor said that he wishes that the members should come out of the Syndicate and Senate and sometimes call such students to sit with them and pat on their backs for participating in such events. In this way, the students would come to know as to what the Syndicate and Senate are.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu and Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma has also got Rajdhani Gaurav award, he should also be felicitated.

The Vice Chancellor informed that he has also been appointed a member of Governing Board of Inter-University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics. He thought that it would help the department of Physics, Centre for Nano-science and Nano-technology. Whenever he would go to the meeting of this board, he would like to take a delegation of scholars like them along with him so that they could put their viewpoints there. Secondly, whenever he would meet the Chairman of the UGC next time, he would take along some of the people of the colleges so that they could tell him the problems faced by them in the Colleges. It would be a big achievement if they get

the IPR Project as Shri Suresh Prabhu, Hon'ble Minister for Commerce and Industry, Government of India, is taking a personal interest in this matter. This University is being made a Nodal Centre of this project. For the time being, they have been given a sum of Rs.20 lacs for holding the Conference. He has also been told that a Chair for the Centre is also being established in the University for which the Centre would give the recurring grant.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that Panjab University, hitherto, is not the depository of patents. At the moment, Mahatma Gandhi State Institute of Public Administration, Sector 26, Chandigarh, is the depository of patents. Tomorrow, if they have to work on patents, the depository is the first requirement. It takes about 5-6 months to obtain depository for patents. If they tell that they wanted to file this patent, the requirements for the purpose should be given to them, the regulatory body for patents would take time. What should they immediately do is that they should get the depository. Whenever somebody has to work on a patent, he/she is required to go through the software to ascertain whether somebody else has not worked on that and filed the patent. Meaning thereby, they have to ascertain as to what are the patents which are already available as he/she has to quote them in his/her application. As such, it is absolutely necessary. In fact, they are the depository for whole of the northern India.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor S.K. Sharma should meet him so that they could discuss the further plan of action in the matter.

Continuing, Professor S.K. Sharma said that, in fact, it is to be obtained from the Department of Science & Technology, Government of India. However, in the University, the Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP) is there, which could be given direction for the purpose. He urged the Vice Chancellor to direct the CIIPP to get this depository for the University. Along with the depository, the USA's Patent Site is free. So before this comes, they at least have a link up with the USA IPR. Not only for patent, but also for teaching as these patents is excellent material for teaching. After going through the same, their students/scholars would at least come to know as to what are the areas and how could they modify them. Patent is an area which is only restricted to filing of patent alone. In fact, patent is that they could make a patent and get it modified and file a new patent, and this is what all the Pharmaceutical Companies do. When their patent is like to expire, what they do is that they add another radical and get another patent. As such, it would be better if they ask the CIIPP to work in this direction.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he would like to share with them that the CRIKC was almost non-functional. However, after his taking over as Vice Chancellor of this University, he is getting weekly activities conducted of the CRIKC. CRIKC has been established taking together certain Institutes of the region. The activities of the CRIKC are also being discussed in the PMO. He had met Principal Scientific Advisor as well as Scientific Secretary to Principal Scientific Advisor, Government of India, and had discussed several things with them, and he is hopeful that they would get most of the things. Panjab University in fact is the founder of CRIKC. Due to one reason or the other, the CRIKC, which had earlier become almost non-functional, is now made functional. The benefit of his Delhi visit is that they would get money for CRIKC.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that so far as CRIKC is concerned, the students of Panjab University went to other institutions in a bus. University would get benefit only if they do joint project with the CRIKC institutions. So it is the responsibility of Dean, Research to that they submit projects jointly with institutions like, ISSER, IMTECH, etc. It would definitely help them to get the money.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that he (Vice Chancellor) has raised a very important point. Earlier, it has also happened that the projects of crores of rupees, which should have been allotted to the ex-officio positions, but the persons concerned have obtained them in their names and are working on those projects. Whether it was the former Vice Chancellor, the project, which was in collaboration, should have been given to the Vice Chancellor and not to Professor Arun Kumar Grover. In fact, it is a huge project. This practice has to be discouraged, and these things should be institutionalized.

Professor Rajat Sandhir enquired, "Could something be done in this regard"?

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to what has been done in this regard. She pleaded that they should do something. The persons should not be allowed to misuse the name of the University for their personal gains. She urged the Vice Chancellor to see the file and ascertain as to how it is possible. She added that it is an international collaboration, which has been given to Panjab University. It should have been allotted to an ex-officio position and not to Professor Arun Kumar Grover, former Vice Chancellor. If the Vice Chancellor, Dean Research and other persons holding the important positions, would do like this, the University would not be able to get anything as the persons concerned would be benefitted personally. Since this is a long time project, it needed to be looked into.

Referring to Sr. No. (v) of the Vice Chancellor Statement, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is for creation of an endowment fund for organising Annual Memorial Lecture in the memory of Late Shri Balram ji Das Tandon. He thought that before instituting such an endowment for memorial lecture, the matter is placed before the Syndicate. He had read it in the newspapers. It is not that somebody given the cheque and the endowment is instituted. The procedure for creation of endowment fund existed in the University. As such, whatever the proposal is, the same has to come to the Syndicate for consideration. It is good that it has been done, but he just wanted that the procedure should not be by-passed.

Professor S.K. Sharma intervened to say that it is a part of the agenda.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if it is a part of the agenda, it should not have been a part of the statement of the Vice Chancellor as it is subject to the approval of the Syndicate.

Referring to Sr. No. (xii) of the Vice Chancellor statement, Shri Ashok Goyal said that Smt. Kirron Kher, M.P., Chandigarh has recommended the purchase of one bus and expansion of Community Centre, Panjab University out of her MPLAD fund. He thought that she must also have mentioned the amount which she had allocated for the above said purposes. He enquired does anybody knew as to how much fund she has allocated for this projects.

It was informed that a letter has been received stating that the proposal of the University has been accepted and the same has been recommended to the IAS for processing. As per the proposal Rs.20 lac has been sanctioned for the purchase of bus.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this recommendation is not enough because the money is to be spent through the Deputy Commissioner. Even if the funds are to be allocated from the MPLAD funds, and MP has to tell as to how much money is to be spent for these two purposes, not that the money has been sanctioned for bus and for expansion of Community Centre. If the balance amount in the MPLAD fund is Rs18 lac and the project amounted to Rs.32 lac, what would the recommendation mean? He suggested that such type of vague statement should not be brought to the Syndicate.

Referring to Sr. No. (xx) of the Vice Chancellor Statement, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, of course, they (members of the Syndicate, Senate and the Vice Chancellor) are greedy persons because they are starved of the funds and starved of support from the various Governments, i.e., both State and Centre Government. They are always looking for all kinds of support, which could be obtained from various quarters and the Vice Chancellor is putting all kinds of efforts right from day one to move in the right direction. In accordance with Sr. No. (xx), the Vice Chancellor had met these dignitaries with regard to so many projects and he (in fact Syndicate) would like to know as to what is the latest position and outcome of these meetings. Earlier also, the Vice Chancellor had continuously been meeting with the dignitaries and assurances had also come. Is there any concrete deliverable products, which could be seen by the Syndicate? Now, it is not too much to expect as it is almost 7 months which the Vice Chancellor has spent here. He is sure that so many things must be in the pipelines. He requested the Vice Chancellor to make them aware of the latest position.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he would like to tell them that every proposal is going in a positive way. When he met the Governor, he had given him Rs.20 lac for Conference. Thereafter, he was thinking that he should sanction them a Chair. Earlier, he was seeking a lump sum grant for the Chair, but he said that he would not be in a position to give this, and he asked him (Vice Chancellor) to prepare recurring proposal for every year, which he would give. So far as Professor V.K. Paul is concerned, the proposal of 100-bedded Hospital Project is lying with him. Since he is from here, he is saying he would do something on this, and he is very positive. So far as Shri Suresh Prabhu, Hon'ble Minister for Commerce and Industry is concerned, he has already told them that the case of Intellectual Property is with him (Shri Suresh Prabhu). Perhaps, they have got about Rs.24 lacs for the purpose. And he (Shri Suresh Prabhu) is saying that he would allot them the Nodal Centre for conducting the training programme. So far as Dr. I.V. Subha Rao is concerned, he would like to tell them that they had executed a Tripartite (Punjab Government, Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD), Panjab University) MoU in the year 2010-11 and wherein it had been decided that (i) more than 1600 posts be down sized to about 1378 posts; and (ii) that 90% of the grant would be given by the MHRD and the remaining by the Punjab Government. One mistake which was committed on their part was, though he did not know how it has happened because the then Vice Chancellor might also had been an intelligent person, that they forfeited the grant of Rs.32.87 crore which was being received from the U.T. Administration. They did not discuss this, whereas the paradox is that the University is in the demography of Union Territory of Chandigarh, and 11 degree Colleges are affiliated to it. Several vehicles come to the University, it being a public place. However, the U.T. Administration did not give them even a single paisa. He dug out it and met the Governor and requested him that earlier they were getting a sum of Rs.32.87 crore and he said that they might still be getting the same. The Governor asked called the Secretary, who told that they have now stopping giving them this grant because they have not demanded this and they had told that they would manage without this. He drafted a letter and sent the same through the Union Territory Administration to Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) as the jurisdiction of Union Territory falls within the purview of MHA. He had moved the letter by writing to the Chancellor. This time, he met Dr. I.V. Subba Rao to discuss this issue. With the God will they are moving on the issue very positively. He has got it converted and had requested for an annual grant of Rs.50 crore for development and maintenance. Salary component is to be given by the Central Government and the remaining grant would be given by the Punjab Government, although a restriction of 6% has been imposed on them and they have also been asked to hike the fees by 6%. Hence, this is the overall scenario.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to which is the grant of the U.T. Administration, which has been forfeited by them. Whatever he has understood that the grant, which was being paid by the U.T. Administration, has been stopped and they have not taken it

up with them. In fact, earlier they used to get the grants from the Central Government through the U.T. Administration. However, now the same is being received by the University directly. As such, there is nothing which they had foregone. Rather, he would like to share with the Syndicate that, that year, they have not acted honestly and whatever they were receiving through the U.T. Administration, made an arrangement to receive the same directly from the Central Government and also got the said amount from the U.T. Administration as well. As such, they have not foregone anything; rather, they received money from both sides.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that his (Shri Ashok Goyal) interpretation is another. However, his (Vice Chancellor) interpretation is another that why should they forego that amount as they are serving the University so much?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would be too happy if it is proved that they had done something wrong. After all, they had foregone a sum of Rs.32.87 crore annually since 2011-12. Meaning thereby, they had forfeited a sum of about Rs.300 crore. Earlier, the contributory agencies as per the MoU were MHRD and Punjab Government and they used to get grant in the ratio of 60:40, i.e., 60% from the MHRD and 40% from the Punjab Government. Since they were moving for creation of a Budget Head, they sought grant from the Central Government directly instead of through U.T. Administration. Even the U.T. Administration was getting the same from the Central Government. Earlier, the Central Government was giving the grant through the U.T. Administration, and now they are giving the same through the UGC. Hence, the same money is being received by the University from the UGC instead of U.T. Administration. However, the Vice Chancellor is trying that the U.T. Administration should also start giving some grant to the University as they are serving the U.T. also. It would be a great help to the University. Creating a new channel of funding from U.T. Administration, would be a great help to the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that had the persons like him (Shri Ashok Goyal) given advice at that time that they grant from the U.T. should continue to be given to them because they are serving the U.T. He (Vice Chancellor) has taken this stand. Do they not require the buildings, labs., etc. When questioned by Shri Ashok Goyal, the Vice Chancellor said that his stand is very clear that even though they are getting grant from the Central Government, which they earlier used to get through the U.T. Administration, the U.T. should give them an annual grant of Rs.50 crore for development and maintenance as they are serving the U.T. His question is, why should the U.T. not give?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that is very well understood and very well appreciated. He requested that the Finance and Development Officer might be asked to clarify the issue.

It was clarified that it is true that they were receiving salary grant from the Centre Government through U.T. Administration. They requested the Centre Government to release the grant to the University directly so that they could be considered as a Central Institution. However, the Vice Chancellor is of the opinion that they should see the issue from a different perspective.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that whatever the Finance and Development Officer has said, he should say like this. However, he has been asked to clarify whether they had foregone anything.

To this, it was told that they had not foregone anything.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his concern to the issue is that he was also a member of the Syndicate and Senate and he knew that they were not ready to forego anything so easily. He could not pardon himself and that is why he is arguing.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that where is Rs.32.87 crore. He is not accepting the interpretation given by Shri Ashok Goyal. Having another interpretation, he is seeking a lump sum grant of Rs.50 crore per annum from the U.T. for serving the people.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever is said by Shri Ashok Goyal is true, but the U.T. had also played a trick. The amount under the budget head "Education", which they were earlier getting from the Centre Government, has not been reduced by them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the amount which the U.T. Administration was receiving earlier from the Centre Government has been cut by the Centre Government. However, they as a member of the Syndicate and the Senate should know as to what he (Vice Chancellor) is doing and they are fully with him.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the internal maintenance of other institutions situated in Chandigarh is being done by the U.T. Administration. He urged the Vice Chancellor to get the internal maintenance of the Panjab University Campus also done by the U.T. Administration. The former Vice Chancellor had also made a representation that it is the responsibility of the U.T. Administration to carry out the internal maintenance of all the educational institutions situated in Chandigarh. In return to the service which they are doing for the people of union territory of Chandigarh, they must at least to this. He suggested that they must prepare a chart and request the U.T. Administration to carry out all the internal maintenance, including cleaning, electricity, street lights, etc.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that this is the interpretation. They should not remain in the law and written documents.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is interested in something else. He is only interested in what they are getting and not in making the statement. Whatever is said by Professor S.K. Sharma, is not said for the first time; rather, it is being said for the last so many years, but in response to this what is being said by the U.T. Administration, should not be ignored. If they are maintaining the other educational institutions, they could themselves see as to how much control they had on them. They (U.T. Administration) say that alright, handover the control of all the internal roads and parks to them, they would themselves take care about them. The place is of the University and it would be maintained by them (U.T. Administration), its way should be found. As said by him (Professor S.K. Sharma) that since they are serving the people of Union Territory of Chandigarh, they should come and take care of this.

Shri Ashok Goyal further stated that though it is not a part of the Vice Chancellor's statement, it is an important issue, i.e., CRIKC, which according to him was started for the first time in the year 2013. At that time, apprehensions were expressed in the Syndicate that finally it would become the baby of Panjab University. Why should all the participating institutions not equally contribute for the development of CRIKC? And it was said at that time everything would be taken care of. The then Member of Parliament had given about Rs.1crore for purchase of two buses for CRIKC. In this Syndicate it was questioned that alright the buses had come, where from the drivers would be appointed. Had they funds for making payment of salary to the drivers. Wherefrom the buses would be maintained and wherefrom the fuel would be provided? Had they funds for these purposes. It was given to understand that it was a big project. Whatever apprehensions were expressed at that time, have remained as such even after a period of six years. The drivers have been provided by the Panjab University, and the expenses on fuel, as he understood, are being met from the amalgamated fund, which could not be done. As such, they are committing a very big

blunder, and the buses are running from one institution to another without even a single person, simply because they wanted to show that the CRIKC is functioning. Now, Professor Rajesh Gill has pointed out that certain projects have been obtained individually instead of against the post concerned. In the beginning, a society was created in the name of CRIKC and they did not know that as to what relation the society has with Panjab University. They did not know as to what the formation and bye-laws of the society are and what the latest position of the society is. From the newspapers, it has come to their notice that perhaps a proposal is there to convert the Society into the company. Since he (Vice Chancellor) is a man of management, they are learning for the first time that an attempt is being made from the Government side that though the company yet to be formed, the name of the person, who is to be appointed Chief Executive Officer (CEO), is being discussed. Could the CEO be appointed by somebody who is not even a part of the company? It is to be done by the Board. Hence, they have to be careful about such proposal and also that one should not misuse the name of Panjab University in this way, owing to which the University instead of getting benefitted suffer a loss. For this, they have to be very-very careful and they have to put across their viewpoint as to how the Panjab University could be the biggest stakeholder. He urged the Vice Chancellor that whatever expenditure is incurred, if it is necessary to incur, they should create a separate budget head for that. If not, they should stop the bus and save the daily fuel, which is being consumed.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the buses should go only when there is/are event/s. The dry run of buses should not be there. Meaning thereby, whenever there is a lecture or event, the buses should go otherwise not. According to him, the dry run of the buses in the morning or the evening is criminal wastage of money.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, as said by Professor Rajat Sandhir, dry run of buses in the morning and evening is a criminal wastage of money, and that too, money belonging to the students.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the dry run of buses should be curtailed immediately.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever Shri Ashok Goyal has said is true that the expenses on the running of buses are being met from the amalgamated fund of the Dean Student Welfare Office. He knew it as earlier he was the Dean Student Welfare. A couple of times, it had happened that the Director of one of the Institutions had asked for the bus. One thing good they had done was that they had fixed the charges for the buses, if somebody wanted to use the bus(es). When somebody questioned that the buses are for CRIKC, he as Dean Student Welfare argued that their Institution is not paying anything even though the buses are for CRIKC, from where the expenses of fuel, etc. would be met. Ultimately, he had not allowed the buses without charging the money. Whenever they used the buses, they were made to pay. However, sometimes they refused to seek the buses. In the end, he said that it is a fact that no other Institution, other than Panjab University, paid a single penny for the expenses incurred on buses.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there is a fee for membership of CRIKC. All the members of CRIKC are paying membership fee for the CRIKC. Where that money is being spent?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the Society was formed, the Society took membership fee.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu suggested that a Committee should be constituted to study the entire case.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu pleaded that the dry run of buses should immediately be stopped.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it related to knowledge innovation. Could the knowledge innovation occur only in the Sciences? Did it not happen in the Social Sciences, especially when they always talk about inter-disciplinary approach? She enquired, "Why the Social Sciences have been left out of this"? In fact, these have become person centric Projects, and when the person centric projects would be there, the University would not be benefitted.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was why, he had shared with them so that they could have the fair input.

Professor Rajesh Gill urged the Vice Chancellor to see that the Social Sciences subjects are included in the knowledge innovation projects.

Shri Ashok Goyal urged the Vice Chancellor to resolve that from tomorrow onward, the plying of buses be stopped.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that the buses should not be stopped immediately; rather, a notice should be given to the students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would be very happy to accept the proposal made by Professor S.K. Sharma, if he is ready to give a statement that student(s) travel in the buses. When no student travelled in the buses, whom to give the notice?

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that it is a personal legacy, which is to be broken by the present Vice Chancellor.

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Mr. Shyam, NSS volunteer, a student of BA-III in Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, for participating in the Republic Day Parade held on 26th January, 2019 in New Delhi;
 - (ii) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, and Fellow, Panjab University, on his having been bestowed upon with the Fellowship Award 2018 by Indian Pharmaceutical Association.
 - (iii) Dr. Neelima Dhingra, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, on her having been conferred upon with "Bharat Ratna Mother Teresa Gold Medal Award 2018" by Global Economic Progress and Research Association, Tamil Nadu;
 - (iv) Dr. S.M. Kant, former Director, Youth Welfare, Panjab University, on his having been awarded Lifetime Achievement Award at the 34th North Zone Inter University Youth Festival;

- (v) Professor Jayant N. Pethkar, School of Communication Studies, Panjab University, on his having been awarded Good Teacher Award by the Chandigarh Chapter of Public Relations Society of India;
 - (vi) Professor Chaman Lal, Fellow, Panjab University, on his having been appointed as Honorary Advisor of Bhagat Singh Archives and Resource Centre of Delhi Archives of Government of NCT of Delhi;
 - (vii) Dr. Dalip Kumar, Fellow, Panjab University, on his having been awarded commendation certificate by Chandigarh Administration for his contribution in the field of higher education;
 - (viii) Dr. Manjit Kaur Brar, Principal, Government College of Commerce and Business Administration, Sector-50, Chandigarh, on her having been awarded commendation certificate by Chandigarh Administration for her contribution in the field of higher education;
 - (ix) Dr. Prabhdeep Brar, University Institute of Fashion Technology and Vocational Development, Panjab University, on winning the best presentation award for her paper entitled "Observing sustainability: Case studies of Chandigarh boutiques and their textile waste reuse" at the 21st International Conference on sustainability in fashion and textiles' held in Rome, Italy;
 - (x) Dr. Nisha Bhargava, Principal, MCM DAV College for Women, Chandigarh and Fellow, Panjab University, on her having been nominated as a Member of the State Legal Services Authority, U.T. Chandigarh for a period of two years;
 - (xi) Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma, Fellow, Panjab University on his having been conferred upon Rajdhani Gaurav Award;
 - (xii) Professor Raj Kumar, Vice Chancellor, Panjab University on his having been appointed a member of Governing Board of Inter-University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. (1-(ii), (v), (viii), (ix), (xii), (xv), (xvii), (xix) and (xx), be noted.
 3. the information contained in Vice Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No.(x) and, be approved;
 4. thanks of the Syndicate be conveyed to the donor, i.e., Mr. Radha Krishan, R/o House No. 362, Sector 9, Panchkula for donating a sum of Rs.1 lac for purchase of books, etc.
 5. Since the dry run of CRIKC buses in the morning and evening is a criminal wastage of money, the plying of buses without any specific purpose, be stopped.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

When the Vice Chancellor said that now, they should take up the agenda items for consideration, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that in either the agenda is prioritized with the permission of the Vice Chancellor or somebody else. It seemed to him that either one of the items has been placed before the Syndicate or it has been placed before the Syndicate deliberately. The Item is C-30, which related to consider if Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma K. Sharma, Principal (retired on 31.12.2018) G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector 32-C, Chandigarh, be re-appointed, being peculiar situation as such on contract basis for the period till the new Principal is appointed after holding the interview.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Jagdeep Kumar to raise the issue when they consider Item C-30.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar remarked that they have spent an hour to discuss certain things beyond the agenda, and also spent half an hour on CRIKC. Now, they should listen to him as it is an important issue.

It was said that Shri Jagdeep Kumar should raise the issue when the Item is taken up for consideration.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that they should go by the agenda.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar remarked that earlier the bus of CRIKC was running. Whether that on the agenda?

When a couple of members suggested that he (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) should be heard as he would like to raise an important point, the Vice Chancellor said that to him, everything issue on the agenda is important. He said that it is a matter of principle. He urged Shri Jagdeep Kumar to have patience as he is not running away from the meeting. All present here in the meeting are Scholars.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that, according to him, the item has wrongly been placed on the agenda of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that when the item would come, they discuss the matter and take appropriate decision. If need be, the Item would be withdrawn. He urged the members to maintain the dignity of the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked Shri Jagdeep Kumar that if the item has wrongly been placed before the Syndicate, then he should discuss the issue when the item is taken up for consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that sometimes they are not available and when his office tried to contact them on phone, some of them, including Shri Ashok Goyal, do not pick up the phone, which is wrong. He urged the members to pick up the phone as his office telephoned them only when it is absolutely necessary. He respected all of them and they should also respect the office of the Vice Chancellor. If somebody did not pick up the phone of his office, it did not look nice to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to say nothing about that who did not pick up whose phone. Better it is that they discuss this issue outside the House. So far as the meeting is concerned, every person had same heart irrespective of the place he belonged to, and the size and colour of the heart is also same. One day, he went to the Vice Chancellor's office to attend a meeting, and the Secretary to the Vice Chancellor (SVC) had especially asked him to meet the Vice Chancellor before the leaving. He had also been asked to take a cup of tea with him after the meeting. He told him that he would do both the things. Immediately after the meeting, he went to the office of the SVC and one of the staff members informed him that he (SVC) had gone

for the lunch. He asked to him to tell the SVC that he had come and would be here in the University itself. Thereafter, he went to his (Vice Chancellor's Office) and Professor S.K. Sharma was sitting inside. He told that he did never disturb as he himself did not want to be disturbed if he is inside. He would be in the University until evening and would come again and on that day, he remained in the University up to 8.00 p.m. and the Registrar is witness to it as he remained in his office. He had also gone through the pain that he neither received any phone call from the SVC nor the Vice Chancellor despite his telling them that today he would be in the University itself until evening. Since it did not come to the notice of the Vice Chancellor, none could complain. Even if he attended to 10% of the phone calls, it is good. For this, the Vice Chancellor should not complain, but he could say that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should improve.

The Vice Chancellor said that before this event, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) did not pick up at least three phone calls made by his office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it had never happened.

The Vice Chancellor said that the phone calls were made from the landline phone of his office.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that if there is a miss call from a mobile number, he always called back. Once he had received a call from the landline number and after 5 minutes when called back and he was informed that the Vice Chancellor had gone and it is known to the Vice Chancellor. He asked the person, who attended the phone, as to when he should phone and he requested him to make a phone call after 15 minutes. He again made a call after 11 minutes but nobody picked up the phone and that time he was on the wheels of the car. He had tried at least ten times. Ultimately, he felt that there might not be any urgent issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that it had not been brought to his information.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when they met for the first time, the Vice Chancellor had told them that nobody in between as he believed in one to one talk. He had made phone calls to him (Vice Chancellor) for 3-4 times when there was emergency. The Vice Chancellor either did not respond or the phone call got disconnected after sometime. From that, he felt that these things only for speaking and not actually meant for practice. It might be owing to his wrong interpretation

The Vice Chancellor said that all this has happened owing to a communication gap. He urged the Hon'ble members to pick up the phone whenever the call is made from his office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor has still not told as to why he was not called when he remained in the University until 8.00 p.m.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could only be told by the SVC.

It was said that the information to this effect was not given by the office staff.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it the information was not given by the office staff, the matter is more serious because he had told the person present there that it must be told to him (SVC). The persons, who are sitting outside the Vice Chancellor's office, were also asked that the Vice Chancellor be informed he is here until evening and he would come again.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is popular saying that the forest guard(s) sold the entire forest, but it is not know the King.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the age of technology, the King himself has to talk to others and with that there could not be any communication gap.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that from this, one thing has emerged that the office is not conveying all the messages. He requested the Vice Chancellor to ask his office people that if any phone call is received from the Fellow(s), the same should be brought to his (Vice Chancellor) notice.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to tell that the staff of the Vice Chancellor's office is afraid of him (Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said that one should not be afraid of him, but it is true that his staff has to do a lot of work with him, and they have to come 7 days a week.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he gone through the Action Taken Report, but could not find as to what action had been taken on the decision of the Syndicate taken in its previous meeting about appointment of Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Rajat Sandhir to make the members aware about the issue of appointment of Dean Research.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the issue was discussed and they were making a plan as how should they appoint the Dean Research as the issue of seniority was involved.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the said issue would be taken care of by him. He would like to tell them that two things are very important in the University system, i.e., (i) Research and Innovation; and (ii) IQAC. At the moment, everything, including ranking of the University and grant, has gone to the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC). Even if they continue to say that the Panjab University is about 136 years old University, none is going listen to them and the grant could also be withdrawn. Hence, he is strengthening the Research & Innovation and IQAC. So far as IQAC is concerned, the entire verticals have been prepared, which would be announced on any day. So far as Research & Innovation is concerned, which is almost taken care of by the Dean Research, the verticals have almost been prepared. The scientists are on the job and one of them is present in the Syndicate.

Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that perhaps, a decision had been taken in the meeting of the Syndicate in regard to appointment of Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor stated that decision was taken in the meeting of the Syndicate and he is not saying that no decision was taken in this regard, but there are certain apprehensions. Therefore, a Committee has been constituted and they could see it. He is not concerned whether 'X' or 'Y' or 'Z' is appointed as Dean Research, but Research and Innovation is first and foremost priority and they should not play with it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired whether the Committee is to made recommendation as to who would be next Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that the Committee is formulating the guidelines. The Committee had met once and majority of the verticals have been prepared. The Committee is going to meet shortly.

Professor Rajat Sandhir intervened to say that the Vice Chancellor has asked him to identify the verticals.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that last time, it was decided as to who would be next Dean Research. When the Dean Research is appointed and if the verticals are

prepared in consultation with the Dean Research, it would perhaps be better. Hence, he felt that this issue (appointment of Dean Research) should not be delayed any more.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that, in fact, the Dean Research is the Convener of the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue should not be taken partially. They should allow the Committee, which has been constituted, to undertake some job. Professor Rajat Sandhir is present here and these people had done majority of the work. Some of them, including Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan, should sit with the members of the Committee and look into the verticals. In fact, they had received 21-22 proposals, and they had prepared certain verticals after putting in a lot of labour. He (Vice Chancellor) is working with them and is also making presentations at different places. They should allow them to work on it a little bit. They are just focusing on the appointment of Dean Research. They could appoint anybody as Dean Research and he would not have any ill-will against them. However, if they appoint Dean Research on the basis of seniority, they should keep in mind that one would come as Dean Research for one month, one for two months and so on. He urged the members to see all these things. That was why, he is getting the verticals formulated. If one person is senior, there could be 4-5 more to carry out the work. The senior person should be designated as Dean Research and others should help him in carrying out the work. The total circle is of five years. He requested Professor Rajat Sandhir to explain the other things.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he had been asked by the Vice Chancellor to identify the verticals.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that his query is not this. He appreciated what he is saying and he appreciates in advance what he would like to say. Basically, when they tried to deviate from the issue in the name of that he should clarify or she should clarify, then probably, they did not reach to the conclusion. The question is that the Syndicate has decided unanimously that the senior-most person be appointed as Dean Research. Could somebody able to tell him that why that unanimous decision of the Syndicate has not been implemented, which he wanted to know from this Action Taken Report? Only then, of course, he is ready to hear. However, if somebody is trying to explain that they had done this and that, which is beyond his understanding because he is not a Scientist, and he neither knew Science nor Arts. He only knew that a decision was taken. Whether there is any sanctity of the decision of the Syndicate? If Professor Rajat Sandhir is ready to explain that, he is ready to hear, but if he explained like that they did not have the seniority list. When the Vice Chancellor tried to intervene, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he should be allowed to put his point of view. Professor Rajat Sandhir did not know as to what was decided by the Syndicate in its previous meeting. He urged the Vice Chancellor not to interrupt him as he is talking about the sanctity of the decision of the Syndicate, which is a very-very serious issue. He (Professor Rajat Sandhir) is trying to explain something, which has not been asked. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) did not know wherefrom he (Professor Rajat Sandhir) is making the statement that the seniority list of teachers is not available. How could it be possible? If the seniority list of teachers is not available, how could they appoint the Dean of University Instruction? Professor Rajat Sandhir intervened to say that he is not, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that then he should not reply because it is the Vice Chancellor, who knew the background. As he had been given to understand, he would like to be proved wrong, that as per the decision of the Syndicate, an offer of appointment as Dean Research was sent to senior-most Professor, i.e., Professor Dinesh Gupta, which meant the decision of the Syndicate was implemented. It did not warrant any guideline or procedure to be laid down by any Committee. The decision was not kept pending keeping in view the deliberations to be held in the meeting of the Committee. In fact, he was very happy. Then he was given to understand that the senior-most Professor declined the offer. Thereafter, the next senior-most Professor,

who is on leave without pay and is presently the sitting Vice Chancellor at Shimla, was sent the offer of appointment as Dean Research, she also declined the offer. To his understanding, she declined more than one and half months back. He just wanted to know that thereafter, why the same offer of appointment was not made to the next senior-most Professor. He is not saying that he (Vice Chancellor) should do it, but he they have the plausible reply to that, then yes. He would be very happy because what is to be done in this situation. As Professor Navdeep Goyal has said, had the offer of appointment as Dean Research to the next senior-most given, maybe, what he (Vice Chancellor) is saying, i.e., the concern of the University about the research, the things might have proceeded in a faster way because the Dean Research was also part of the same. If the Vice Chancellor or for that matter any of his friends have any reservation about the decision, which was taken by the Syndicate, and they wanted to review it, he could understand. However, they should not send a message that the Syndicate meets and takes the decisions, whether they are implemented or not implements, it is not the concern of those who had taken the decisions. As Chairman of the Syndicate, he (Vice Chancellor) would also not like that the authority of the Syndicate is undermined under any circumstances. He said that if it has not been done, let them not discuss the past and let them appoint; rather, he proposed that Professor R.K. Singla, Department of Computer Science & Applications, be appointed as Dean Research with immediate effect.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu seconded the proposal made by Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice Chancellor stated that whatever has been told by Shri Ashok Goyal is equally true. His intention is absolutely fair, but they could take otherwise. Had his intention not fair, he could have withheld even the first offer. He would not like to take along only a couple of persons. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) is there in the Syndicate and the Senate is also with him. Several Scientists are working day in and day out in the University. They all are with him, and even the Heads of 78 Departments and Directors & Deans are with him. He has also to take into consideration their feelings. That was why, the appointment of Dean Research has been put on hold. He did not want to dishonour the decision of Syndicate and Senate in any manner, and would keep on honouring their decisions. If at some stage, it is pointed out by any Scientist, Syndicate or Senate member that the University would be at loss due to this decision, as Vice Chancellor of the University and Chairman of the Syndicate and Senate, it becomes his duty to take into consideration their feelings. Now, they should listen to Professor Rajat Sandhir as these persons had put in strenuous efforts.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that they would like to be guided by him (Vice Chancellor) as to what are the problems viz-a-viz 76 Scientists and the faculty members, so that at least the Syndicate could be in a position to review its own decision. Let the Syndicate is also directed by the Senators.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they are not questioning.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Sir, don't say they. Say only he."

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he would say that whatever was discussed was – whether it was on seniority or whatever is the procedure, they were only identifying the verticals. That meant, there should be number two person. There should be other people because Research Promotion Cell is involved in a lot of activities. As such, they were not discussing that the appointment of Dean Research should be based on seniority or selection. That was not the point under their consideration. It could be Dean, it could be Associate Dean and else. As such, they were identifying the other verticals as well. He is not saying that whatever has been decided by the Syndicate should be set aside.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is saying that they could have verticals in any number. They could have any number of persons, but did that stop them to appoint one as had been decided by the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is an integrated issue, and not that they should implement and the other should be examined and implemented later.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Yes, Sir".

The Vice Chancellor said, "No, No".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) is indirectly saying that he does not go by what the Syndicate has decided.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter is not discussed in this manner. He urged Shri Ashok Goyal to understand the issue. In fact, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has caught up an issue and is not ready to leave it. He would accept whatever is being pleaded by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Why it has taken three months"?

The Vice Chancellor said, "Because it related to research".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the matter related to research, does it mean that it would take years.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could not be said.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then how could it be said. He enquired, "Who is he"?

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Rajat Sandhir) is a Professor.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that here all are Professors except him.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that it does not mean that they could insult anybody.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not allowing to work, those who are working.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Professor Rajat Sandhir) is one member and he has explained. They had appreciated him and received him. The Vice Chancellor himself has said that there was no intention of stopping the implementation of the decision of the Syndicate. That is what he has understood.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are two apprehensions. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) should just try to understand. To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he should clarify the same. The Vice Chancellor said that he is explaining, but he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is not trying to understand. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying that first it should be done and thereafter, the other things should be done, whereas it is integrated. He requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to insist upon this.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to tell them as to what is problem in implementing the decision of the Syndicate as the same has not been implemented for the last couple of months.

The Vice Chancellor said that firstly, they have to prepare the verticals, which is almost ready. Secondly, the formality that the Dean Research was to be appointed on seniority, that has also been done. Thirdly, because some of the members of the Syndicate and Senate met him and told that the designation should remain as Director, Research Promotion Cell and the person should not be designated as Dean Research. This apprehension had come from several corners and they are debating on the issue. As soon as the consensus is arrived on this issue, the matter would be placed before them. He has no ill-will. Moreover, owing this the research work of the University is not held up anywhere. All the Scientists are working. He is the first Vice Chancellor, who is himself going and getting the presentation done. He is also identifying the areas. All this should also be appreciated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are appreciating it, but he (Vice Chancellor) is not telling as to what problem was being faced while appointing Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is problem, which he had told them just now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that is what he was apprehending that there is some parallel authority, which is working to question the decisions of the Syndicate, and that could not be accepted. There are some sections, which want that it should be Direction only. That meant, the decisions of the Syndicate are subjected to scrutiny by somebody else, who is prevailing upon the decisions of the Syndicate. He would understand if he (Vice Chancellor) has appointed Dean Research and thereafter, whatever apprehensions were expressed by different quarters, those could have been brought to the Syndicate for reviewing its decision, but not to implement the decision of the Syndicate, and that too, half heartedly. On the one side, he (Vice Chancellor) had sent the offer of Dean Research to two senior-most Professors, and on the other hand, he is not implementing it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) would say this because he is looking at it with biased point of view.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he took exception to this. He is only saying that what was decided by the Syndicate, has to be implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Ashok ji, the matter is not discussed like this".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is biased. Does he think that he is saying correct? Had he said that he (Vice Chancellor) is biased?

The Vice Chancellor said that biased meant that he should go with the subjectivity, and he is not saying that they should not go for seniority. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) should try to understand him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not talking about the seniority. He is saying that whatever decision the Syndicate has taken, should be implemented.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that he thought that they are confusing the thing. What he asking is that whatever decision has been taken by the Syndicate, what has happened to that?

The Vice Chancellor said that he should be allowed to revisit the issue.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be revisited later on, maybe in the next months, but first, the decision of the Syndicate should be implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that the verticals are coming and the decision would be implemented along with that. At least, this has to be borne.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is to be borne by them. He is not going to get anything from this.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University would be benefitted from this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the University is going to be benefitted, it is not to be seen by the Vice Chancellor, but also by the Syndicate, which is also equally responsible.

The Vice Chancellor said that where he is not saying so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the University is saying that the Dean Research should be appointed.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is the University part, which is saying that it should be taken care of a little bit.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to which part of the University is saying that it should be taken care of.

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

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if somebody is appointed against a position on temporary/*ad hoc* basis, and if it is felt that something is needed to be included, should the appointment of the person concerned be cancelled. If the Vice Chancellor would like to include certain things in the laid procedures, it could be done even after implementing the decision of the Syndicate on the basis of seniority, i.e., appointing the Dean Research. The seniority list of the teachers is not prepared/ approved by the Syndicate. The seniority list of the Professors has been prepared in accordance with the procedure laid down.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) is right, but the basic thing is that on the decision of the Syndicate itself, an opinion had come that if they appoint Director, Research Promotion Cell instead of Dean Research, what is the harm in it.

To this, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur said that it could be done later on.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that the position of Director is an executive position and he (Vice Chancellor) had the choice to pick one or the other. The Dean of University Instruction could also be appointed in this manner, but the practice to appoint Dean of University Instruction on seniority basis started, so that there is no heart burning amongst the teachers. According to him, any such appointment should be blind, and the best appointment is one, which is blind. Even the selection/admission made in this way, is the best. Similarly, if they made the appointment of Dean Research blindly, none would have ill/bad feelings. Question is – whether the Dean Research is unable to deliver. What they could do is that they could do some things under him; otherwise, what happened is that the Scientists are very touchy. Everybody felt that he is top person. If he (Vice Chancellor) picked one and it would basically antagonize 10 others, which would not be in the interest of this University.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not at all in favour of adopting the policy of pick and choose, and they should trust him.

Continuing, Professor S.K. Sharma stated that he thought that he is the oldest person in this House. He joined the University as Lecturer in the year 1965. He had seen that the moment one adopt the policy of pick and choose, this University got into the problem and nothing came out. Some people would like to take the University up and the others would like to bring it down. So it is in the best interest of the University, because the senior-most Professor has no axe to grind. Resultantly, the senior-most Professor is made the Dean of University Instruction. He (Vice Chancellor) could choose him. They all are good people and are ready to help him. But he should choose one and the four people could be attached with him for help.

The Vice Chancellor said that he must appreciate his feelings. He; however, clarified that he is not going to adopt the policy of pick and choose under any circumstances. About whom they are thinking that he would be appointed as Dean Research, they should remove it from their minds. How they are thinking that one, who is in their minds, would not be appointed? They should have some patience. They should allow him to integrate research and grant. Whatever they wanted, only that would be done later on, if God wishes. It seemed that they have lost patience.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the decision taken by the Syndicate is not implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was why, he saying that it should not happen that the decision taken here in the Syndicate is turned down by the Senate.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they are not doubting his (Vice Chancellor) intentions. They are just asking as to whether the decision taken by the Syndicate has any authenticity or not.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua requested the Vice Chancellor to disclose as to what is in his mind owing to which the decision of the Syndicate could be turned down by the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that only he knew that the voice of many people is suppressed. He urged the members to help him in this matter as he has no ill-will in his mind. They all are here for excellence. Whatever they are thinking, is actually going to happen, but they did not have the patience.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that the Vice Chancellor had said a very good thing in the beginning that the reputation of the Syndicate and Senate, which was tarnished outside, he (Vice Chancellor) had tried to control the damage. However, much the damage control in that manner could not be done as much as could be done by honouring the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate. Whenever the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate are not implemented, there is much damage. When the decision with regard to appointment of Dean Research was taken in the Syndicate, as President, PUTA, she had received so much feedback that it is a good decision of the Syndicate, and the teachers had been waiting for this. She has asked Secretary to the Vice Chancellor (SVC) several times that as to why the Dean Research is not being appointed and this is being enquired from her by the teachers. The teachers are asking her as to why there is so much delay. On the one hand, they are so much concerned about the research and the University is functioning with the Dean Research. Every time she has been told that a Committee is on the job and whosoever would be appointed by the Committee, they would accept him/her. How is it possible? The decision has been taken by the Syndicate and if the same is not implemented, it would nothing else but the insult of the Syndicate, which is their governing body. She

stressed that the decision of the Syndicate relating to appointment of Dean Research should be implemented. The entire University fraternity is of the view that this decision of the Syndicate should be implemented, but she did not know whom he (Vice Chancellor) is referring to. The entire University is asking as to what are the intentions for not implementing the decision of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that look, he is the Vice Chancellor and several things are brought to his notice in the group meetings. Similarly, several things are told him in one-to-one meetings, and those things are very touchy.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice Chancellor to follow the rules and regulations as well as on the advice of the Governing Body of the University and he would not face any problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not go beyond the rules and regulations and it is his commitment to the best of his knowledge. However, he is also to see the apprehensions expressed by the senior Scientists, other members of the Senate and former Vice Chancellors.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to who those persons are. They wanted to know about them.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Rajesh Gill not to go into the breakage.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that if any decision of the Syndicate or the Senate is not to be implemented, the decision should not be taken.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that, it meant, there are people in the University besides Syndicate.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that now the issue is that whatever decision the Syndicate has taken, it should be implemented. If it is not to be implemented, then there is no purpose of this Syndicate.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the previous Syndicate has unanimously taken this decision that the next senior-most Professor should be appointed as Dean Research and this Syndicate also unanimously approves that the next senior-most Professor should be appointed as Dean Research.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that if the staff of the Vice Chancellor did not obey him, what would be its impact on him. He added that if his order of one month before is not obeyed by his subordinates, how much it would affect him.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that if they took up the agenda items for consideration and took certain decisions, what is the guarantee that those decisions would be implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University and the Vice Chancellor would go by the decisions taken by the Syndicate. Being the Executive and Academic Head, he has to see various other things and those would be in the interest of this entire teaching community.

Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that the Governing Body has the right to know all those things. She added that one member of the Syndicate, who was earlier part of that decision, if he now says as to why that decision of the Syndicate is not being implemented, he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that he is biased. Rather what he (Vice Chancellor) is telling, reflects biasness?

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that he is not biased at all.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that he (Vice Chancellor) is not implementing the decision of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is in the larger interest of the University and they must think about it. Committee is considering the issue and would probably make its recommendations within a couple of days and thereafter they should appoint the Dean Research.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to bring to the notice of all the 13 members who have been added to the Syndicate this year that the things, which the Vice Chancellor is saying now, that all these things were discussed in the Syndicate before taking the decision that senior-most person be appointed as Dean Research. The post of Director was also discussed threadbare in the Syndicate. Everything else was also discussed. The verticals, which Professor Rajat Sandhir has talked about, were also discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the verticals were not discussed and in fact, for verticals, they had authorized him.

Clarifying, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, he was going to say that for verticals a Committee was constituted, for which the Vice Chancellor was authorized. A Committee has been constituted by the Vice Chancellor for the purpose. However, there were no ifs and buts about the appointment of senior-most person as Dean Research. That is what, he is saying. For that, he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that he is talking bias. Now, the question is, if he (Vice Chancellor) is at his (Shri Ashok Goyal) place, if somebody asks him as to what happened to the decision, which was taken by the Syndicate three months back, what is the reply with him.

The Vice Chancellor said that that is what, he is saying in the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he (Vice Chancellor) should tell him that if as a Syndicate member, somebody asks him this what should he tell him/her – that he would tell him/her after asking the Vice Chancellor. Either he should say, and he is ready to receive that also, whatever is the concern of the Vice Chancellor and he had made request several times that believed every member of the Syndicate and Senate has the same concern. Whether something is liked by the Vice Chancellor or not, should they believe that even after the decision taken by the Syndicate and Senate, is it the decision of the Vice Chancellor to implement or not. If it is not, then the answer which they are looking for is why the decision which was taken more than three months or two months before, why it has not been implemented. Now, he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that there are some ifs and buts in that decision, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that the right course would be to implement the decision, so that this Body does not feel that there is no validity or sanctity of the decision. Thereafter, whatever concerns, that too, the concerns which are documented not that somebody share his/her views with him in private and he did not want to share by naming, that probably would not lead them to take right decision in the Syndicate and Senate. So far as his (Vice Chancellor) apprehension that he did not want any decision of the Syndicate to be turned down by the Senate, this is also part of the Statutes of the University that the Senate is authorized to turn down the decision(s) of the Syndicate. Any recommendation could be accepted or could not be accepted.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to differ with him here.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he (Vice Chancellor) might differ and he has every right to differ because they are here to sit, differ and only then reach a decision. His

simple submission is that is there any answer as to why the decision of the Syndicate is not got implemented, and the answer as he received – that the decision of the Syndicate itself is questioned and that is why he received. If it is questionable, they did not know as to who has questioned. The President, PUTA, is saying that in one voice she is receiving the feedback that it is a wonderful decision. The members of the Syndicate and Senate, who are representatives of different sections of the society, are also saying that it is a wonderful decision. He is sure that the Vice Chancellor is not misleading the Syndicate. There must be some individuals, who must have given the feedback. He is not ready to accept, as member of the Syndicate, that those individuals have to be given more importance than what has been decided by the Syndicate. This could not be accepted – whether he (Vice Chancellor) call him biased or what it is. He would like to review his own decision(s) or revisit his own decision(s), but he would not like to accept that some third force crept in and say not to implement the decision. So his request to him with folded hands is that since in the best interest of the University just because he is the Chairman, it is nobody's discretion not to implement the decision(s), which has/have been taken by the Syndicate. So without going into the past as to why it has not been done, let they appoint Professor R.K. Singla, Department of Computer Science & Applications as Dean Research.

To this, Vice Chancellor said, “No, they should not name anyone”. Even if Professor R.K. Singla is the next senior-most Professor, his name should not be taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is talking about the name because in their history, Professor Rajat Sandhir has said that the seniority list is not ready.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Professor Rajat Sandhir) has given his own viewpoint.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he has given just his own viewpoint.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let they accept that whosoever is the senior-most Professor after those who have declined the offer of Dean Research, is appointed as Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that they should say like this.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they endorsed this. She added that whosoever is the next senior-most Professor be appointed as Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor said that everything should not be put in his mouth. He would not like to stretch this issue anymore. At the same time, he would also not like that they take a decision and the same is turned down at the higher level. Even if a decision of the Syndicate is turned down by the Senate saying that it is a wrong decision, he would not like to repeat that during his tenure, whereas they are saying that even if the decision of the Syndicate is turned down by the Senate, it does not matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his (Vice Chancellor) apprehension is that it could be turned down by the Senate, but they are sure that it would not be turned down by the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the Committee make the recommendation, and signalling towards Professor Navdeep Goyal, said that he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is in the Committee and he does not know as to why he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is worrying. He could tell him that it is very bad. They are wasting time. He is saying why could they could sit and see the issue in its entirety – that whether Dean Research is to be appointed or Director is to be appointed, and the matter would end.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that earlier there was Dean Research and thereafter, the Syndicate and Senate decided that there would be Director and not the Dean. When certain people felt that this experiment is not proved to be right, the matter was discussed in the previous Syndicate, which decided that they should revert back Dean Research instead of Director. Now, this Syndicate is also saying that whatever has been decided by the previous Syndicate, the same should be implemented.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested to Vice Chancellor to make them understand.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Why they are becoming so impatient?"

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is also a member of that Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that then why he is worrying so much.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is worrying because this is not the mandate of that Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal also said that this is not the mandate of that Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the Committee submit its report.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what should they submit when this is not the mandate of that Committee? The Committee has nothing to do whether it is Dean Research or Director.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should first conduct the meeting of the Committee by day after tomorrow.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first this issue should be clinched.

The Vice Chancellor said that his (Shri Ashok Goyal) viewpoint is that it should be done right now.

Professor Rajesh Gill said, "No Sir, it is a very important issue".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is talking to his fellow members.

The Vice Chancellor said that since he is the Chairman, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should address to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Vice Chancellor is becoming touchy.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that he is not becoming touchy at all; rather, he is thinking about the welfare/interest of the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that their interest is also welfare of the University and nothing else.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has said to the extent that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is talking bias. In the previous meeting of the Syndicate, it was decided that the senior-most Professor be appointed as Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was decided and he is not denying it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why the process has been halted after offering the appointment to two persons.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was why, he is sharing with them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had no one any objection up to two persons.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Right".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then why the letters of offer were issue up to two persons.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that then it was biased.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua remarked it meant somebody is stopping him (Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said, "No, No". It is not like that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) should say that they could take decision whatever they wanted, but he would not implement the same.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Why should he say that"?

Shri Naresh Gaur said that then the decision of the Syndicate should be implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should meet day after tomorrow.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that frankly speaking he is making a statement in the House that any decision, which has been taken in the Syndicate, unless and until it is implemented, he is not going to attend the meeting of any Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could not be done like that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since he is subordinate to the Syndicate and not above the Syndicate, he could not sit in the Committee to review the decision taken by the Syndicate. He could say that the Syndicate is requested to review.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that from the time they had come here, they tried their level best that the authority of the Syndicate and Senate is not challenged.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to tell him (Vice Chancellor) they are thankful to him for saying that he has made a lot of efforts to improve the image of Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that where they are allowing him to improve the image.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that if the image is not improved, it did not matter, but he would like to tell that the extent they had worked for improving the image of the institution of the Vice Chancellor, they are not boasting of that.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is saying so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are saying so, but they have not told him. However, if the Syndicate wishes that despite the best efforts made by the

Vice Chancellor, they did not want to improve the image, then nobody could help them. If the position of the Vice Chancellor wished that despite the efforts of the Syndicate and Senate, he is not interested in improving his image, then nobody could help. The concern, the Vice Chancellor has about the University, the others also had that much concern about the University. Today, he has undergone a lot of pain that till today, nobody in the history of the University said that Shri Ashok Goyal has said something biased, but the Vice Chancellor has said. He would like to be enlightened from where the Vice Chancellor has felt it biased – only because he has said about the implementation of the decision of the Syndicate, and he (Vice Chancellor), who is supposed to implement the decision of the Syndicate and not implemented owing to the reasons best known to him, is entirely impartial. And they are saying about the sanctity of the Syndicate, have become partial/biased.

The Vice Chancellor said that difficulty is that they are not listening to him.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that though he is not much aware of the issue, but he should tell him whether Shri Ashok Goyal is getting any illegal/wrong work done from him.

The Vice Chancellor said, “No, No”.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that why the three months’ old decision of the Syndicate is not being implemented.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that he has very high respect for Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that the respect should be of the Syndicate, and while doing so, even if they did not get any respect, it did not matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that in how many deliberations, such lively discussions took place. However, he would like to say that it is not good to stuck on an issue.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is applicable to both side as he (Vice Chancellor) is also sticking on the issue.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that it depended as to who is sticking.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if any reservation is there, the same should be brought to their notice.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it is the unanimous decision of the Syndicate, it should be implemented.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan requested the Vice Chancellor to inform his decision, if he has any.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice Chancellor to implement the decision of the Syndicate, which it had taken in its previous meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that the decision of the Syndicate would be implemented once the verticals are finalised, which have been prepared by the senior scientists of the University, would be unbiased.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that the scientists are not above the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that their thinking has stuck up on the seniority alone.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice Chancellor to settle the issue in accordance with the wishes of so many members of the Syndicate as it is a unanimous decision of the Syndicate.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that whatever decision/s the Syndicate has taken, they should implement the same. However, if he (Vice Chancellor) wished to expand the Committee by adding 3-4 members of the Syndicate, he could do so.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that recommendations of the Committee should be brought to the Syndicate.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that such things had happened in the last 6 years also

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma clarified that the Committee could suggest certain names.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should go ahead in a democratic way.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that perhaps, in the beginning, he has said that the Committee, which is working should be allowed to continue and its recommendations should be placed before the Syndicate. At the same time, the decision of the Syndicate, which it has taken in the previous meeting, should be implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that first of all, they should remove from their minds that they would go by the seniority.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said what should they remove from the minds? In fact, they did not have anything in their minds.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they did not know anything as they had just come.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are talking only about the seniority time and again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they recite the name of anyone, he (Vice Chancellor) says don't take the name; rather, they should talk only about the seniority. If they talk about seniority, he says that they are talking only about the seniority again and again. What should they talk about?

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that there is sanctity of the decisions of the Syndicate in the University. PUTA is also in favour of appointment of Dean Research on the basis of seniority.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this is a very ticklish issue. Citing an example, he said that if there are four horses, but there is no chariot, everything would be finished. Hence, there must be pivot and the Dean Research would be the pivot and the others could help him. Otherwise, everybody would have his/her own verticals.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would not be like that.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that if they accept the suggestion made by Professor Navdeep Goyal, the decision of the Syndicate would be implemented and the verticals would also be taken care of.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the unanimous decision of the Syndicate is that the old decision of the Syndicate should be implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that this issue needed to be deliberated more.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is already saying that they would not do anything in haste.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that perhaps, the Vice Chancellor did not know as to how many telephone calls she has been getting about the appointment of Dean Research.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is also receiving so many telephone calls. He requested the members also to think something about the post with open mind. They should appoint one and qualify senior-most with him/her. They should get it qualify whether there should be Director or Dean Research. He is reiterating this again and again, but they did not like to agree.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired whether they had zeroed on the Dean.

The Vice Chancellor said that, this is what, is to be revisited.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since the entire Syndicate, except two members, is new, he (Vice Chancellor) knew that the question paper is not before them and if the question paper of last year is placed before them, they would do the calculations with the pencils and take that much time. Through the Vice Chancellor, he would like to inform these thirteen new members that deliberations had already taken place on the issue – whether there should be Director or Dean Research. And a decision had been taken that instead of Director, they would appoint the Dean Research. Thereafter, it had been resolved that the senior-most Professor be appointed as Dean Research, and then it was thought as to how they would make it function and strengthen. At that time, it was also discussed and felt that the Supervisor Committee on the Controller of Examinations is not right. However, if there are certain shortcomings/deficiencies, a Committee should be formed to laid down guidelines as to how the Dean Research and Controller of Examinations should function, but the person, who is likely to work, is not there. They are saying that first the guidelines/verticals should be formulated and until then the Dean Research be not appointed, but they are of the view that all these things had been discussed and it had been decided that the Dean Research be appointed, and expected that the Committee, which was to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor; otherwise, the Syndicate could also appoint the Committee, would comprise of the newly appointed Dean Research, and then Committee would formulate the guidelines. He requested the Vice Chancellor to tell them as to what apprehensions are in his (Vice Chancellor) mind, though the Syndicate has as much concern as the Vice Chancellor has, which would not be met in this process. Now, it is his prerogative to disclose or not to disclose the names of the individuals, including the Scientists, Senators, who have met him and conveyed certain apprehensions. However, unless those apprehensions are not shared, how would the decision be revisited? Though the Vice Chancellor is suggesting that the deliberations should be held, the entire issue has already been deliberated and the Syndicate meant Syndicate irrespective of the individuals, who were part of the Syndicate, and the individuals, who are the part of the Syndicate now. If today they did not obey/implement the decisions of the previous Syndicate, tomorrow the next Syndicate would also not obey/implement the decisions of this Syndicate. They should not forget that tomorrow they would also be at the place where the former members of the syndicate are. Hence, they did not want that the fate they are meeting today, is met by them. This is all which is their concern. Thereafter, it is an ongoing process, and if the experiment failed, the Syndicate and Senate are

there to take care of issue. They had also reviewed the decision relating to Director, Research Promotion Cell after a period of 4-5 years as that experiment got failed and they had gone back to Dean Research. They could always review their own decision and nobody stopped them from doing so. So far as his (Vice Chancellor) apprehension that it would be turned down by the Senate he concerned, the Senate would not turn down it like this, at least it would enlightened/ guide them. At least they could say that whatever decision has been taken, the same should be implemented. Usually, the meeting of the Syndicate is held either on Saturday or Sunday. Fortunately, the meeting is been held today, i.e., Monday, why could the orders relating to appointment of Dean Research be not issued today.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that Shri Ashok Goyal has given his conclusion.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that since the issue about three months' old, they have to finalize it. If the Vice Chancellor would not like to implement the decision of the Syndicate, the reason thereof must be disclosed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if a huge disaster is not going to fall on the University, the Vice Chancellor should not be so rigid.

The Vice Chancellor said that after coming here one could sense as to who could speak here and who could not. He said that they should also take into the consideration the feelings/input, which he has received from different quarters.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to make them aware about the feelings, which he has received from different quarters.

The Vice Chancellor said that how could he convey those feelings without disclosing the names of the persons.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the names of the persons should also be disclosed. It is upto the Vice Chancellor to disclose the feelings either with names or without names.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that this decision has been taken by the previous Syndicate and not by the present Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that his apprehension is – whether Director, Research Promotion Cell is to be kept revert to Dean Research.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if the question is only about the post, later on the Dean Research could be called Director and vice versa.

The Vice Chancellor signalling towards Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is in the Committee. They should meet day after tomorrow and make the recommendations. The very next day the orders would be appointed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not the mandate of the Committee.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that the terms of reference of the Committee could be extended.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the terms of reference of the Committee could not be changed.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Committee could not alter the decision of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could remain in the Committee and he has no objection to that.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that why should they convene the meeting today? What would happen to their decision(s)?

The Vice Chancellor said that he is saying that today, they should note that taking into consideration various observations received from the different quarters.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill said that they did not know as to what observations are. Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that even tomorrow the decision(s) of the Syndicate would not be implemented on the plea that there are certain reservations.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that discussion would only be held if the Syndicate is of such an opinion, whereas the Syndicate is of the unanimous view that the decision of the previous Syndicate be implemented.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is saying that why are they not ready to meet day after tomorrow.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they would meet as is being suggested by the Vice Chancellor, but the purpose of that meeting is something else.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Vice Chancellor along with Professor Karamjeet Singh and Professor Rajat Sandhir should meet separately and they all would go outside for half an hour. They should arrive at a decision because he is observing that the Syndicate is not going to prevail here. Here only the opinion of Professor Rajat Sandhir and Professor Karamjeet Singh would prevail. He; however, would like to bring to their notice the opinion of the House that today the decision would have to be taken whether the Dean Research would be appointed or not.

Hereinafter, the meeting was adjourned for lunch.

When the meeting resumed after lunch, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had made a request to the Vice Chancellor, but he did not accede to their request.

Professor Rajesh Gill urged the Vice Chancellor to accede to their request as it is a very good decision.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members not to intervene when Shri Ashok Goyal speaks. He asked Shri Ashok Goyal as to why he gets impatient.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is nothing for impatient as he had no interest whether 'A' or 'B' is appointed as Dean Research, and he is not biased. Even if none is appointed as Dean Research, he is least concerned, but what problem he has perhaps he had not been able to make them understand. Though all of them are wise, he himself could not explain the issue properly. In fact, the Calendars Volume-I, II and III are the Bible to them, and according to these, if any decision is taken....

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that let they should conclude as he had already discussed the point.

It was said that now it is being concluded that the next senior-most Professor, be appointed Dean Research of Panjab University, and the Vice Chancellor be authorized to prepare the verticals.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that a message should not go that whatever they had said, it is victory for them or a defeat for others. In fact, it is victory for the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is victory of research and innovation.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that so far as the verticals are concerned, as had been told by the Vice Chancellor a Committee had already been constituted or is to be constituted, whatever verticals are prepared, the same should be placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that after approving the verticals, the same would be got noted from the Syndicate. The verticals have already been prepared and the same would be reported to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether only one Committee or two is/are constituted for preparation of verticals.

The Vice Chancellor said that at that time, they had told that the senior-most person should be appointed as Dean Research, and thereafter, he had said that there would be several verticals; and they had said that it is his (Vice Chancellor) domain and they would not be able to do much in this. Some Scientists would decide the verticals in consultation with the Vice Chancellor because the Vice Chancellor has vision as to how to run the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that they are also his people. Hence, he should not say like this.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would report the verticals to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the verticals would form a part of the rules, the same should not only be reported to the Syndicate, but placed before the Syndicate for consideration as the Syndicate is empowered to frame the rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the verticals should be taken to the small Committee, which has been constituted by the Vice Chancellor. If need be, the verticals could be polished there, and the same would be done in consultation with the Vice Chancellor, so that when the verticals are placed before the Syndicate, the same are approved without any difficulty.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the names of Professor Rajat Sandhir, Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Harpreet Singh Dua should be included in the said Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would expand the Committee himself and this be left to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are making his job easy, and requested that the Vice Chancellor should keep a liaison with them.

RESOLVED: That the next senior-most Professor, be appointed Dean Research, Panjab University, and the Vice Chancellor be authorized to prepare the verticals, and the verticals be placed before the Syndicate for information.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 18.11.2018, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

- 2.** Considered deferred Item 2 of the Syndicate meeting dated 08.12.2018 with regard to appointment the following Committees for the period noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
1.	Revising Committee	Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32, P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007	Calendar year 2019, i.e., 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019
2.	Regulations Committee	Regulation 23.1 at page 33, P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007	Calendar year 2019, i.e., 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019

- NOTE:**
1. Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 for composition of Revising Committee along with present members of the Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018 enclosed.
 2. Regulation 23.1 for composition of Regulation Committee along with present members of the Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018 enclosed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that his proposal is that a Committee of Syndics comprising Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma should be constituted to appoint these Committees, on behalf of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that why they are constituting a Committee to appoint other Committees. They should appoint the Committees here as well, as they have to remain on the Committees.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier also they were following the same practice.

The Vice Chancellor said that earlier, sometimes they also authorized the Vice Chancellor to constitute these Committees. As such, there have been all such traditions. In fact, he had been trusting upon them. He suggested that they should constitute the Committees here itself and should not constitute a Committee to appoint other Committees.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that does the Vice Chancellor meant to say that they should appoint the Committees here itself.

The Vice Chancellor replied in affirmative and said that he is least interested that he should be authorized to appoint these Committees, and he would be more than happy.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they should seriously think about these Committees as these are very important Committees.

RESOLVED: That a Committee of Syndics, comprising Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, be constituted to appoint the following Committees, on behalf of the Syndicate:

1. Revising Committee for the term beginning from 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019, under Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007; and
2. Regulations Committee for the term beginning from 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019, under Regulations 23.1 at page 33 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the Vice Chancellor would go outside after the meeting, he should feel that the decisions has been taken, which should have actually been taken, because e.g. Item 4 is "To nominate members of various Committees to discharge the function of Board of Studies/Conveners, under Regulation 4 and 6 at page 56-57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007".

It was suggested that since Items 3 and 38 on the agenda related to appointment of members on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2019 to 31.01.2020, these should be taken up together.

3. Item 3 on the agenda was read out, viz. -

- 3.** To appoint two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2019 to 31.01.2020, under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

After some discussion, it was unanimously -

RESOLVED: That the following Syndics be appointed on the Board of Finance for the terms 01.02.2019 to 31.01.2020, under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007:

1. Professor Navdeep Goyal
2. Shri Ashok Goyal.

38. Item 38 on the agenda was read out, viz. -

- 38.** To appoint one member of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2019 to 31.01.2020, one seat vacated on the sad demise of Shri Raghbir Dyal, under Regulation 1.2 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 1.2 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar Volume, I, 2007 is reads as under:

"1.2 If a vacancy amongst membership of the Board occur during the term, it shall be filled by the Syndicate."

2. The Senate in its meeting held on 15.12.2018 (Para V) had resolved that the following two Fellows (Non-Syndics), be declared as members of Board of Finance, for a term of one year, i.e. from 1.2.2019 to 31.01.2020, under Regulation 1.1(iv) at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Dr. Dalip Kumar

- Associate Professor
P.G. Govt. College for Girls
Sector-42, Chandigarh.
2. Shri Raghbir Dyal
Near Dr.Madan Mohan Hospital
Bathinda Road Bye Pass Chowk
Sri Muktsar Sahib
Punjab

3. An office note was enclosed (**Appendix-II**).

Professor Rajesh Gill proposed the name of Professor Keshav Malhotra for appointing him on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2019 to 31.01.2020, on the seat which fell vacant on the sad demise of Shri Raghbir Dyal.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu seconded the above proposal made by Professor Rajesh Gill.

The Vice Chancellor enquired whether the members to be appointed on the Board of Finance should a member of the Syndicate or the Senate.

The members in one voice said that he/she should be a member of the Senate.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that in the Item it has been written, "To appoint one member of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2019 to 31.01.2020, one seat vacated on the sad demise of Shri Raghbir Dyal", which should be corrected to read as is to "To appoint one member of the Senate on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2019 to 31.01.2020, one seat vacated on the sad demise of Shri Raghbir Dyal, under Regulation 1.2 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007."

There being no other proposal, it was unanimously –

RESOLVED: That Professor Keshav Malhotra, Fellow, be appointed on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2019 to 31.01.2020, one seat vacated on the sad demise of Shri Raghbir Dyal, under Regulation 1.2 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

4. Item 4 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

4. To nominate –

(i) members of various Committees to discharge the function of Board of Studies/Conveners, under Regulation 4 and 6 at page 56-57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, in the following subjects for the term 1.4.2019 to 31.3.2021:

1. M.Tech. Energy Management
2. M.Tech. (Instrumentation)
3. M.Tech. (Microelectronics)
4. Applied Sciences Engineering
5. B.E./M.E. (Information Technology)
6. B.E. (Food Technology)
7. B.E. (Bio-Technology)
8. M.E. (Electronics & Communication Engineering)
9. B.E./M.E. (Computer Science & Engineering)
10. M.E. (Construction Technology & Management)

11. M.E. (Instrumentation & Control)
12. M.E. (Manufacturing & Technology)
13. M.Tech. (Engineering & Education)
14. Human Genomics
15. Vivekananda Studies
16. Women's Gender Studies.
17. P.G. Diploma in Health, Family Welfare & Population Education
18. Human Right and Duties
19. M.Sc. Solid Waste Management
20. M.Tech. Nano-Science & Nano-Technology
21. Nuclear Medicine & Medical Physics
22. Social Work
23. MBA CIT
24. Geology
25. Ayurveda
26. Environmental Education
27. Social Sciences
28. Homoeopathy
29. Public Health
30. M.Sc. Forensic Science & Criminology
31. M.Sc. Instrumentation
32. Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering
33. Law (PG)
34. Governance & Leadership
35. NSS
36. Vocational Agriculture
37. Combined Committee of Tourism Management and Hospitality & Hotel Administration
38. **Any other (If any).**

(ii) members of various Board of Studies/ Conveners, under Regulation 4 at pages 56-57 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, in the following subjects for the term 1.4.2019 to 31.3.2021:

1. Arabic
2. Architecture & Planning
3. Bengali
4. Chemical Engineering
5. Chinese
6. Civil Engineering
7. Dental Surgery
8. Electrical Engineering
9. Electronics & Electrical Communication
10. French
11. Gandhian Studies
12. German
13. Indian Theatre
14. Mechanical Engineering
15. P.G. Medical Education & Research
16. Mass Communication
17. Postgraduate in Nursing
18. Nursing
19. Persian
20. Pharmacy
21. P.G. in Pharmaceutical Science

22. Physical Education (Post graduate)
23. Russian
24. University Institute of Legal Studies
25. Tibetan
26. Tamil
27. Telugu
28. Kannada
29. Malayalam
30. Assamese
31. Slovak
32. Urdu
33. Sindhi

NOTE: An office note is enclosed.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Committee, which has been constituted for Item 2, has actually been constituted to appoint Committees, including members of various Committees to discharge the function of Board of Studies/Conveners (**Item 4**), Joint Consultative Machinery (**Item 5**) and Standing Committee/s to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations (**Item 6**).

RESOLVED: That a Committee of Syndics, comprising Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, be constituted to nominate members/Conveners on the above-said Boards of Studies, on behalf of the Syndicate.

- 5.** Considered the formation of Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 1.1.2019 to 31.12.2019.

NOTE: 1. The composition of Joint Consultative Machinery is as under:

(a) Chairman	To be nominated by the Syndicate from amongst its members
(b) One member of the Syndicate	To be nominated by the Syndicate
(c) Two non-Syndic Senators	To be nominated by the Syndicate
(d) Registrar, the Member-Secretary	
(e) Controller of Examinations	
(f) Finance & Development Officer	
(g) Five Office Bearers of P.U. Staff (Non-teaching) Association (PUSA)	
(h) President and General Secretary of P.U. Stenographers' Association (PUSTA)	
(i) President and General Secretary of P.U.C.C.S.A.	
(j) President of Laboratory & Technical Staff Association	

2. An office note is enclosed.

RESOLVED: That a Committee of Syndics, comprising Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, be constituted to form Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 1.1.2019 to 31.12.2019, on behalf of the Syndicate.

6. Item 6 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

- 6.** To appoint the Standing Committee/s to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations for the year 2019, i.e. 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019, under Regulation 31 at page 14 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 31 for composition of Standing Committee along with list of members of the last Committee for the Calendar year 2018 i.e. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018 is enclosed.

2. An office note was enclosed.

RESOLVED: That a Committee of Syndics, comprising Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, be constituted to appoint, on behalf of the Syndicate, the Standing Committee/s to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations for the year 2019, i.e., 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019, under Regulation 31 at page 14 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007.

- 7.** Considered minutes dated 19.12.2018 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to frame the guidelines/ rules for providing concession of full fee/tuition fee and examination fee to the transgender students.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on this Item he has to give an observation, although, he thinks, more or less, including the Vice Chancellor, had agreed. But it is a very-very serious matter that how such a recommendation has come. It is mentioned in the minutes that the transgenders would be given all the facilities being provided to other categories of students provided they do not participate in any dharna and protest. He suggested when such a Committee is constituted, there should at least be, such a member who is society conscious. Whatever has been published in the newspapers about this, the image of the University has maligned, as if they are going to grant some undue benefit to the transgenders on the condition that they will have to forego their fundamental right of protesting and organising dharnas. This line should be deleted and they should also be careful in future. One thing which gives some solace is that one of their member, namely, Dhananjay Chauhan was also present in the Committee. But it is not clear whether it is known to Mr. Dhananjay Chauhan. If the line prohibiting them to take part in dharnas or protest, he thinks, all the other things are in order.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that it seems this line has been added afterwards as it is handwritten.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said, what has been pointed out by Professor Rajat Sandhir, it meant that whatever handwritten has been added, it might have been added afterwards and, perhaps, Dhananjay Chauhan might not be knowing about it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it is wrong, how they can deny their fundamental right. He requested that this line should be deleted.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the minutes of the Committee held 14.2.2019 have also been attached where it has been decided that “after detailed discussion, the Committee unanimously recommends that the guidelines for grant of Full Fee Concession in admission fee/ Examination Fee as applicable to other categories of

students be followed in toto for Transgender Category also". She said that this meeting was held in response to the letter sent by Professor Chaman Lal and the Finance & Development Officer was also present in the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue is that if such a letter had been received, it should have been referred to the same Committee. Now the scenario is that the recommendations of the main Committee were something else, but on the letter of someone, another Committee was constituted. As members of the Syndicate, they do not know which recommendations they have to consider.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the meeting of the Syndicate was to held on 27.1.2019, but it could not be held. The meeting of this Committee was held on 14.2.2019.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to which item the papers (minutes of 14.2.2019) which have been supplied to them concerns. That means there are two recommendations. He asked which recommendation they are to implement.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should consider the original minutes of the meeting dated 19.12.2018 as those are more detailed and better. This was also endorsed by Shri Naresh Gaur.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the language of minutes dated 19.12.2018 needed to be corrected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has to become a part of the rules.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that another meeting of the Committee could be called for.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are very responsible officers and they need to be very careful before taking any decision. He went outstation after giving charge to the gentle man and he without knowing anything, he constituted a new Committee. This is what he could anticipate. On being asked if this Committee was not constituted by the Vice Chancellor, he (Vice Chancellor) said that he could not do so. He has given charge to Professor R.K. Singla, perhaps, he may not be knowing about the previous Committee, so he might have constituted a new Committee.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it was the duty of the office to give the feedback about it.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what should be done as two Committee have been constituted to consider this issue.

The members said that they should consider the original minutes of 19.12.2018.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should understand the concern of the Vice Chancellor as to how two Committees have been constituted on one issue. He would like to bring it to the notice of the Vice Chancellor that this is not the only issue where two Committees have been constituted. There are many such issues where more than two Committees have been constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a very serious problem. Such things should not happen as all these things are in the public domain.

It was clarified that two Committees have been formed and in order to resolve this issue, they could revisit the original minutes.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be better to revisit the minutes as they have enough time.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that some transgender students contacted her and informed that they cannot live in Boys' or Girls' hostels. The students have desired that they should be given some separate apartment where they could live. If the Committee has to revisit the minutes, it should consider this issue also.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that if it is done for one student, the other would also ask for the same.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that earlier also a Committee was constituted under his Chairmanship to consider this issue. All these issues were discussed in that meeting long back. They had decided that one Teachers' Flat be given to them as the students had been using this earlier also.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are only 4-5 such students and the said recommendation should be given to the Committee.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they have signed many MoU with foreign Universities and they would be requiring the Foreign Teachers Flat for that purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the new Committee has not been constituted by Professor R.K. Singla as the minutes have been signed by him. In office note sent for fixing the date of the meeting, it is written "in this regard, the Vice Chancellor has constituted the following Committee to review the guidelines".

The Vice Chancellor said, it is possible that the Committee may have been got constituted from him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the recommendations have to be re-examined, he suggested that one or two Syndicate members may also be included in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should add more members. Let him do it after revisiting the recommendations. The sentence which the members have asked to remove, will be removed. As desired by the members, the language would also be corrected.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said at point No. 4 (ii) of the minutes of the meeting dated 19.12.2018 it has been written "Total income from all sources not exceed Rs.2.5 lacs per year". If they are facing many problems and they (University) intend give them some benefit, this rider should not be there. This was endorsed by Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Naresh Gaur.

RESOLVED: That the item be referred back to the Committee for re-examining the guidelines and *inter alia* decided that the words "moreover, they should not be involved in any Dharna & protest" in the minutes dated 19.12.2018 at Point No.2, be deleted.

- 8.** Considered if the students admitted in 2014-2015 in B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5-Year Integrated course, having re-appear in their even semester/s, i.e., 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th and 10th semester, be allowed to appear in the re-appear examination with odd semester examination/s as has been allowed to the students of previous batch of 2013-2014, as recommended by the Academic Committee of UILS dated 03.01.2019 (**Appendix-III**). Information contained in office note (**Appendix-III**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Senate in its meeting held on 29.03.2015/ 26.04.2015 (Para XVIII) has resolved that the reappear examination of both odd and even semesters shall be held with the regular examination of each of respective semester.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know as to why this item has been brought to the Syndicate.

It was informed that the Syndicate has taken a decision that after 2015-16 that engineering students having re-appear in odd semester would appear for that paper in odd semester examinations and the students having re-appear in even semester would appear in the even semester examination. Before 2013-14 the odd semester students could appear with even semester examination and the even semester with odd semester. The same position was for 2015-16. So, the 2013-14 and 2015-16 batches are clear. But the students of 2014-15 batch said that they could not be benefited with the decisions taken in 2015-16, so this is being done for these students.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if they have enquired it from the Examination Branch whether it is right or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said there was a problem for those students who were having re-appear(s) in the final semester as they have to wait for one year to appear in the re-appear paper.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua wanted to know whether this condition is applicable in the case of UILS or it is for all the other students also.

Principal Gurdi Kumar Sharma and Shri Sandeep Singh said that if they want to do it for UILS, it should be extended to the other students studying in other classes/courses.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said they should do it as a policy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in case they want to do it for all, they should first take the opinion of the examination branch. He asked the Controller of examination if he (C.O.E.) could conduct the examination for all students if this decision is taken.

It was informed that this item is related to the Faculty of Law only, so they should discuss this only. As regard extending the facility to other students, the possibility could be explored. A note is there on the students of 2014-15 buffet. The intimation was not given in the prospectus. As such, they deserved the benefit. The possibility for giving this benefit to all other students could be explored and if a decision is taken, the benefit could be extended to all the students.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked, why this benefit could not be extended to other students?

Shri Ashok Goyal said if the Examination Branch is not able to do it, it would be a problem for the University.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that some re-appear students were asking to get the examination conducted, but when the examination is going on now, they do not appear in the papers. He suggested that they should give the chance only to those who request for it and not to everyone.

RESOLVED: That the students admitted in 2014-2015 in B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5-Year Integrated course, having re-appear(s) in their even semester/s, i.e., 2nd,

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

4th, 6th, 8th and 10th, be allowed to appear in the re-appear examination with odd semester examination/s as has been allowed to the students of previous batch of 2013-2014.

- 9.** Considered the amendment, in Rule (vi) at page 267 of Handbook of Information 2018, as proposed by the F.D.O. vide note dated 10.01.2019(**Appendix-IV**), and

RESOLVED: That Rule (vi) at page 267 of Handbook of Information 2018, be amended as under.

Existing Rule	Proposed rule
However no carry forward/ adjustment of fee shall be allowed in the subsequent session/ class/year if the duration of the course is more than one year. No. refund of fee shall be allowed after the expiry of the said 15 days period.	Carry forward/adjustment of excess fee in the subsequent session/class/year shall be allowed only if the duration of the course is more than one year.

- 10.** Considered minutes dated 27.11.2018 (Item No. 1) of the Joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committee with regard to Eligibility criteria, Scheme of tests, Merit criteria for Entrance test for admission to M.A. Economics in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, for the session 2019-20.

NOTE: A copy of letter No. Eco/18/2097 dated 16.10.2018 of Chairperson and Co-ordinator UGC-SAP is enclosed .

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the minutes of the joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committee held on 27.11.2018, at page 29 of the agenda papers, in the Scheme of Test, Point No. (i), it has been written that “the duration of the Entrance Test will be one hour and thirty minutes and it will consist of 75 multi-choice questions of one mark each. The syllabus will be based on the course content as provided in B.A. Honours in Economics/B.A. Hons (under CBCS Scheme)/ Economics (Elective) in B.A. of Panjab University, Chandigarh”. This is very-very confusing. How could it be oblique as B.A. Pass Course is different from B.A. Hons. The baseline has to be B.A. Pass course (Elective); otherwise, the students would be at loss.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that it should B.A. Pass Course.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the students who have passed B.A. (Hons.) can be given weightage. On being asked by Professor S.K. Sharma, she said that the weightage for B.A. (Hons.) students is 15% which is at the time of admission.

It was informed that at point No. (ii) under the scheme of Test, it has been written, under the heading Pattern of paper, it has been mentioned as to how many questions would be set from different subjects. At point No. (iii), it has been written “Separate Paper Setters be appointed according to their specialization as per the above said scheme”. According to this, they have to appoint eight paper setters. It may be referred back to the Committee with observation of the members to revisit and approve it again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the observation regarding B.A. Pass Course must be included which should be the baseline.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the syllabus should first go to the Faculty of Arts. This was also endorsed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor S.K. Sharma also said that this should come through the Faculty of Arts.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it cannot go to the Faculty after it is approved by the Syndicate

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the Syndicate has no power to change the decision of the Faculty. It should be referred back to them as it has to come through the Faculty.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the procedure has to be followed.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 27.11.2018 (Item No. 1) of the joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committee with regard to Eligibility criteria, Scheme of tests, Merit criteria for Entrance test for admission to M.A. Economics in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, for the session 2019-20, referred back to the Department with the direction that

- (i) the minutes be routed through the Faculty of Arts;
- (ii) under the heading 'Scheme of Test' the syllabus for Entrance Test for admission to M.A. (Economics), will be B.A. Pass with Economics;
- (iii) the pattern of question paper and paper setter, be reviewed.

11. Considered minutes dated 04.12.2018 (**Appendix-V**) of the Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what they have to approve in this item.

It was explained that in the Proceedings of the P.U. Youth Welfare Committee held on 14.12.2018, at point No. 4, a Sub-Committee was constituted to review the Score System of Overall Trophy in Youth Festivals. The item has been brought to the Syndicate as per routine, but it is not mentioned in the Calendar that the minutes of Youth Welfare Committee and Sports Council are to be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they used to pass the Youth Welfare Committee in a very casual way. He would like to ask that this item has come to the Syndicate for consideration. What they have to consider?

It was said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is right as there is nothing to take any decision. Rather, it should come as an Information Item.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the item is okay.

Principal Inderjit Kaur said that the issue regarding North Zone Cultural Festival has not been discussed.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 04.12.2018 of the Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee, be approved

- 12.** Considered minutes dated 31.10.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Committee of the College Development Council.

Principal R.K. Mahajan read out point No. (iii) at page 43 of the agenda papers which says, "Financial Subsidy @ Rs.40,000/- be sanctioned and dispensed to the Eligible Colleges for organising the Seminar/Symposium/Workshop". He said, first of all, he would like to thank the Vice Chancellor as he has been taking much interest in promoting research culture in Colleges. Continuing, he said it is very difficult to arrange Seminar with Rs.40,000/-. He, therefore, requested that it should be doubled.

Some of the members said that it could be earmarked as per the available budget.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that it needed to be enhanced at least to some extent.

Shri Ashok Goyal said though Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan has requested to enhance it to Rs.80,000/-, but to his mind, it is difficult even to arrange a seminar with one lac. It should be enhanced to 1 lac or 1.5 lacs. It is not that, that they cannot do it in the Syndicate, but let them do it keeping in view the budget provision. It should be passed as it is, but for the future, it should be taken into consideration.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that there is another item related to it for attending Seminars/Symposium/Workshop/Conferences within or outside India. For Seminars etc. within India a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- has been earmarked and for outside India Rs.4,00,000/-. One proposal has been received for within India and four for outside India. A sum of Rs.15,000/- has been sanctioned for within India and Rs.2,00,000/- for outside India i.e. @ Rs.50,000/- per person. It is not possible to go abroad for attending the seminar with Rs.50,000/-. He requested that this amount needed to be enhanced in case to they want to promote research.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this suggestion should be sent to the Dean College Development Council and it would be decided again.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they should not see it in isolation. They should also see as to what are the rules in other Universities.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this is the college money and they have sufficient amount in that fund for this purpose.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that they could check that about 70% income of the University is from the colleges.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma reiterated that the colleges are having sufficient funds for this purpose.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that if the funds are available, it should be given to the colleges.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the amount which has been allocated is Rs.15 lacs and proposal which has been passed is to the tune of Rs.7.20 lacs. With rest of the amount, it has been written that the Dean, College Development Council, would hold four types of seminars, etc.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that since the amount was less, the proposals were not sent. The total budget was to the tune of Rs.15 lacs, but a total of

Rs.7.20 lacs were used and Rs.7.80 lacs is the unspent amount. He, therefore, requested to enhance the allocation for attending seminars in India and abroad.

It was suggested that this item should be passed and for the next time, they would take care of it.

Dr. K.K. Sharma suggested that instead of enhancing the allocation from Rs.40,000/- to Rs.80,000/-, it would be better if this amount is given to two colleges i.e. Rs.40,000/- to each college. This was also supported by Professor S.K. Sharma and some other members. A policy is made that the college which has been given this grant last year, it would not be given the grant for the current year. But they do not want this policy. They have to be more inclusive. He informed that they charge some amount from the participants. He requested to enhance the purview instead of enhancing the budget.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that they should allocate the grant to all the college who apply for it.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that it is the duty of the Dean College Development Council to ensure that the benefits of the scheme go to many colleges. The big colleges have a system and they immediately apply for that. It is the duty of the Dean College Development Council to see that small Colleges are also given the benefit of this scheme. It is their duty to push them up.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that most of the colleges do not apply, whichever colleges have applied, they were given the grant. What Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan is said is right and they should enhance the grant to some extent. The condition, i.e. the colleges which have taken this grant in the previous year would not be eligible to apply in the next year, should be lifted.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that preference should be given to those who have not been given this grant in the previous year.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said if they receive 10 applications from those colleges which have already been given this grant, then what would be their criteria. In that case they have resort to draw of lots.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that preference would be given to those colleges which have applied for the first time.

Shri Narinder Singh Sidhu said there should be quality of work also.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar whosoever would send the proposal, according to him, that is the best proposal.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan again requested that the grant needed to be increased as Rs.40,000/- are not sufficient.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that simultaneously the Dean College Development Council should ensure that more and more college are given this grant so that their teachers could know more about the ongoing research.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should pay more attention to the welfare of the colleges. The MHRD is going to give grant of Rs.2 crore to each college. They have to promote all these things and also what else could be done.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that when they form the College Development Council, they should include more teachers from the Colleges. This time also, there were more teachers from the University.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar also suggested to enhance, in equal number, the representation of College teachers and Principals in the College Development Council.

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 31.10.2018 of the Committee of the College Development Council, be approved.

13. Considered –

- (A) minutes dated 27.11.2018 (Item No.6) (**Appendix-VII**) of the Executive Committee, PUSC.
- (B) minutes dated 24.12.2018 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Executive Committee, PUSC.

It was informed that in the Panjab University Calendar there is provision regarding functions and powers of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee of PUSC approves the budget. The approval of their budget has no link with the budget of Panjab University. So, their items also come here for approval. This time, two items have come for approval i.e. (i) Local conveyance be enhanced from Rs.100/- (both ways) per day to Rs.100/- per day in tricity i.e. Chandigarh, Mohali and Panchkula and (ii) For outstations duty Rs.100/- one way to official who perform duty for the Directorate of Sports including coaching camps meetings, purchase etc. This item was not required to bring to the Syndicate.

Professor S.K. Sharma told as to why this has happened. One of the biggest scandal in sports happened in this University. The bills which were submitted for purchase of Samosas, when enquired it was found that there was a hardware store in Sector-15 at that address. They might not be aware of it, but he was there at that time. About Rs.2 lacs were spent because the Director has the powers. That was why, it was thought that the expenditure incurred should taken care of. So, these things should be kept in mind.

It was said that since it is there in the rules, so they need to make change in the rules, because the rules provide that the whole power is vested with the Sports Executive Committee and with the main body, i.e., P.U.S.C. It should come as an Information Item and not as Consideration Item.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked that if this power is with the Executive Committee of PUSC, then why it is put up to the Vice Chancellor for approval.

It was informed that they have made it a practice.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should pay heed what Professor Sharma has said because the biggest ever scandal of the University took place in Sports Department. At that time in some Syndicate meeting, it was decided all the recommendations of the Executive Committee of PUSC should be placed before the Syndicate. But that decision has not incorporated in the Calendar. He informed that there could be at least 300 decisions of the Syndicate which have not been incorporated in Calendar Volume-III. These decisions have not been incorporated even in Calendar Volume-III which was printed in 2016 again. It is right that they do not raise any objection, but it should remains in their mind that it would be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it should be brought for information of the Syndicate.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that it should be sent to the Regulation Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not talking about the Regulation Committee. He is talking about those rules, which have been passed by the Syndicate, but not have been incorporated in Volume-III. Regulations are incorporated in Volume-I or Volume-II.

It was said that, in future, the recommendations of Executive Committee of PUSC would be brought as Information Item.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the minutes dated 27.11.2018 (Item No. 6) and minutes dated 24.12.2018 of the Executive Committee, PUSC, be approved; and
- (ii) in future, the minutes of the Executive Committee of PUSC be placed before the Syndicate as an information item.

14. Considered minutes dated 05.12.2018 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to sort out the practical difficulties arising, while implementing the Child Care Leave.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2018 (Para 7) (**Appendix-VIII**) considered minutes dated 17.07.2018 with regard to look into the recommendation of the Sub-Committee dated 10.07.2018 to issue clear cut guidelines with regard to Child Care Leave to the University Employees and resolved that the rules for grant of Child Care Leave framed by Punjab Government be followed in letter and spirit for the University Employees. It was further resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a Committee to sort out the practical difficulties arising while implementing the above rules so that there is no ambiguity.

It was informed that Item 14 related to Child Care Leave.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that now new Child Care Leave Rules have come, but the rules which are already there are okay.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that now single father will also be entitled for Child Care Leave, however, when these rules would come from the Central Government, the Punjab Government would adopt it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the minutes dated 5.12.2018, at point No 1, it has been written, "Person who is likely to proceed on leave, should give prior intimation in writing at least 45 days prior on the prescribed format".

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in the earlier rules, the teachers were supposed to submit evidence also. For instance, he was required to submit date sheet 45 days

prior to the date of leave. In fact, it was not possible in many of the cases because the date sheet usually published late. Due to this, the audit has put objections and many cases were lying pending. The employees were facing a lot of problem on this account. In order to solve that problem, it was desired that the employees who wanted to take this leave would inform 45 days prior to the Chairperson/head of the office by an application so that information is there with the office, but he would give evidence 10 days prior to proceeding on leave regarding date sheet or medical ground.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked, how one could give evidence 10 days prior if he has to avail Child Care Leave on account of medical ground? How one could know 10 days prior about his child's illness.

Professor Rajesh Gill said in such cases could be dealt with differently.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the office would go by whatever would be written in the rules. At point No. 2, it has been written, "Documentary proof of medical grounds examination exigencies with dates be submitted at least 10 days before proceedings on leave". As regards evidence, he again asked, how one could submit the medical certificate 10 days prior to the start of Child Care Leave. Secondly, how could one know about the exigency 10 days prior to the leave? The evidence could be given only about the examination date, that is possible only, if it is released well in time. Nowadays, even the date is released only one week prior to the examination.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, however, said that the date sheet is released 10 days prior to the examination, so it is right to give evidence 10 days prior regarding Child Care Leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that for medical ground or other unforeseen exigencies, the leave would be considered even at the last moment.

It was said that point No.3 could be written as, "Documentary proof of examination with dates be submitted at least 10 days before proceedings on leave. However, leave on medical ground or other unforeseen exigencies, could be considered at the last moment.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that in the government offices, Child Care Leave on medical ground is given on medical certificate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for his (Professor Rajat Sandhir) information, no leave could be claimed as a matter of right. The Earned Leave, Casual Leave or any other kind of leave could be taken with prior permission. If they accept the condition of prior information, how one could know that he would fell ill next week. So, the purpose of it is that even if one is granted leave or availed leave, first priority is that of one's employer and he could be called and the leave could be rejected.

The Vice Chancellor felt that if these types of sentences have been used, they should also see to it also as they are pro employees so, they have to do it. It would be better to use the words, like exigencies or seriousness here. Hence, they should revisit this clause so that they might not face any problem in future.

Professor Rajesh Gill urged the Vice Chancellor to do immediately whatever changes are required to be done as teachers are waiting for it since long.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that sixth point should be added that "Notwithstanding anything contained above, in case of medical problem/ any other unforeseen exigency, the request for leave will be considered on merit".

The Vice Chancellor asked the members not to decide the issue in haste. He is in favour of approving the item, but it is better to revisit the item

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Colleges had also received a letter from the Punjab Government. The Government had specified all the rules in their communication. He enquired, Could they change the rules of Punjab Government?

It was said that, it means that the decision is that, item is approved as such, but Professor Rajat Sandhir would reframe the language of the recommendations in the light of Punjab Government Rules.

Professor Rajaesh Gill said that, in fact, earlier they made recommendations in toto as per Punjab Government rules, but they faced some operational problems. They is why they have to revisit these rules, the other things are as per the government rules.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 05.12.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to sort out the practical difficulties arising, while implementing the Child Care Leave, be approved in principle and Professor S.K. Sharma & Professor Rajat Sandhir be requested to reframe the language of Child Care leave in consonance with the discussion that took place in the Syndicate meeting and viz-a-viz the rules of Punjab Government

- 15.** Considered minutes dated 18.12.2018, 09.01.2019 and 17.01.2019 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to evaluate the applications of the students **as per Annexure A, B & C**, from Law Courses for attending classes/transfer from one institution to the other within the Panjab University System of Institution.

NOTE: The classes have been started w.e.f. 7.1.2019 and the students have been allowed to attend the classes provisionally

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this is a very-very important issue. This is basically a back-door entry of the students with low merit to come to this campus. In this particular process, what they are trying to do is that they are undermining their own Regional Centres, they are weakening them. Any student who comes from Regional Centres to these departments, the load of teachers got reduced there. These students could not get admission here at the P.U. Campus with that merit. Under the guise of this system, they get the admission here and the University charge some amount from them. Secondly, the transfer is being sought on medical ground. If the person was not medically fit, why the hell at the first instance, he has been given admission in that particular institute. Now they say that they have to get treatment at the PGI. Why did they were given admission at Hoshiarpur. They say that these facilities are available only at PGI. There are top institutions in Ludhiana, including two Medical Colleges. They are having all the medical facilities at Ludhiana and the students are trying to have admission at the Campus. In this way, they are weakening their Regional Centres. They are trying to bring low merit students to the Campus. The fee structure for the students of their Regional Centres is Rs.24,000/- and but for others, it is Rs.1 lac. Basically, they first get admission in a College and then, by paying a little money, they come here to the Campus. The students get the medical certificate from any doctor and submitted for the purpose. In order to set it right, the Panjab University should constitute its own Medical Board and only that Medical Board should certify the treatment facility for some disease is available only at Chandigarh. In order to discourage this practice, the fee for Constituent Colleges and other colleges should be the same, i.e., Rs.1 lac. He was of the opinion that if they did not restrain this practice, they would be reducing the academic value. He further suggested that they should be asked to appear from the same institution where they had taken admission. Now what they do is that they shift to the Law Department and say that

they have passed from the Law Department of Panjab University. In this process, they get dual benefit and the University is being undermined.

While endorsing the view point of Professor S.K. Sharma, Professor Rajat Sandhir said that some of the Regional Centres do not have law students as they all get migration from there. The teachers would have less teaching load, this brings a bad name to the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is right what Professor S.K. Sharma has said. Discussion with regard to Medical Board was discussed earlier also. As regards fee, he said that this is not migration, it is only the permission to attend classes for one semester. It was there that if some students is coming from their Regional Centre to the University Campus, he has already paid fee to the University, but if someone is coming from an affiliated College, he has not paid fee to the University. So, if someone is coming from an affiliated College, he would have to give more fee.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the college is also affiliated with the Panjab University.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is only to discourage the students who come to the University Campus from the affiliated colleges. That is why they have kept the fee for those students at Rs.1 lac.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are 84 cases and out them in 74 cases the students want to come to Chandigarh. This is a vicious cycle that when the teachers would not having students, they get lazy. If there are only 2 or 4 students, then it cannot be considered as a proper class. So, this problem is there and she wanted to know as to what they could do in this matter.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the students who are coming from the Regional Centres to the University, the reason for that, perhaps could be that the quality of education at the University campus is better. If they are considering this issue, then why should they also not think about the Faculty Mobility Programme of the UGC? The teachers working here at the University Campus should be posted in the Regional Centres for two years and vice versa as is being done in the army in America. They also take some trouble, only then the Regional Centres would run properly. The quality education at P.U. Campus is comparatively much better than the Regional Centres. In order to improve the situation, the teachers at the P.U. Campus have to come out of the comfort zone.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the students who get them migrated here, they are also not of less merit, so they cannot say that in the University campus, very highly qualified students are studying. He could tell the data of the last four years. The topper in the subject of Political Science has been a girl of his College. There are students who get even up to six positions. Then how could they say that the college students are having less qualified. So, they cannot make the comparison like this. He said that more students from DAV Colleges seek migration on medical grounds. He is a witness to it or they could ask the Controller of Examinations about it.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan wanted to know from the Controller of Examinations if the examination forms of the DAV colleges are submitted late, do they not pay the late fee?

Shri Sandeep Singh again said that they could see how many students of DAV College have appeared in the papers on medical grounds.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the medical certificate could be obtained from anywhere.

Shri Sandeep Singh said this is the point. On the one hand they say, it is right and they should approve it, but on the other hand they say that it should be done after making a medical board. So, there cannot be two parameters.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it seems that these students are already attending the classes here. It would not be fair to do something in between the semester.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar wanted to know as to how they could get admission without permission.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they should approve it now, but for future, it needed to be relooked.

Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should do it now but for future it should be looked into as it is not a good practice.

The Vice Chancellor said that this time they are relaxing the condition and approving it. For future, a Committee, comprising Professor Navdeep Goyal, Shri Sandeep Singh and another member from the affiliated Colleges, i.e., Dr. K.K. Sharma, would be constituted to look into the whole issue, especially in view of the fact that they are planning to make admission through lateral entry.

Shri Ashok Goyal said though they had almost arrived at the decision, he would like to point out a very important issue. Clarifying, he said that there are two types of students i.e. those who are already studying at the Campus and others whose requests have already been considered by the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that he is hundred percent in agreement that this problem is not new, but is being faced for the last many years. How far this issue has reached is known to everyone as it had appeared in the newspapers. Let them accept the fact that they are more social animals than the members of the Syndicate and Senate. They know that they are doing something wrong, but at that time they also say that they would not do it again. However, someone could say that it should be extended upto this or that date. As has been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal that some students have already taken the benefit and attending the classes as per the existing rules and some others who are similarly placed are entitled for that. They should also be given this benefit. However, for future, a Committee should be constituted to relook the matter in its totality.

This was agreed to.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are planning to make admission through the lateral entry also, but the number of students in their Regional Centres is reducing. In addition to this he has felt that staff working in the Regional Centres get internal selection at Panjab University campus, thus, leaving the posts vacant at the Regional Centres. At the same time, they are not allowed by the government to fill these posts. He requested the House to devise a time bound promotion policy so that the persons working in the Regional Centres are not tempted to come to the Panjab University Campus.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the Medical Board must be constituted and the students should get a medical certificate from this Board.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what is the definition of Medical Board.

Shri Sandeep Singh said it would be difficult to come to the Medical Board for those students who are studying at far off places. He/she would rather prefer not to study than to come to Chandigarh for getting medical certificate from the Medical Board.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not know how the Medical Board would work here, but in the B.H.U., the student might obtain medical certificate even from P.G.I., they did not even accept that. There is a Medical Board consisting of doctors of Medical College. They accept the recommendation of the Medical Board of that College only.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that here, there are three Medical Boards. One is in General Hospital, Sector-16, the other is at GMCH, Sector 32 and the third one is at PGIMER, Sector 12, Chandigarh. After getting a medical certificate from them, the C.M.O. of Panjab University countersigned that medical certificate. So, the University cannot make its own Medical Board and the Medical Board is constituted by the government only.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that most of the Universities are nominating their own Medical Boards.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is a vigorous activity. On a query by the Vice Chancellor, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have not made these Medical Boards, rather these have been constituted by the government.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to which Board they would like to make.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that one has to go to that Board under jurisdiction the institute is falling. If their area fell under the jurisdiction of Sector-16 hospital, how could they go to PGI?

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired whether the proceedings of the Committee related to Law or Management.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that the opinion of Principal, Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, should be taken and also of the Chief Medical Officer of P.U. Health Centre.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua wanted to know this facility which is available for the students of Law, would it be available to the students of Management of Regional Centres, Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur.

Shri Naresh Gaur asked, why this facility is available only to the students of law?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that instead of extending it, they should curtail it.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it needed to be seen in two different ways. If the seats are not available at Chandigarh and the student has to take admission at Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur. But as they know that Hoshiarpur Centre is not developed properly and the students did not like to go there and they prefer to come to P.U. Campus. If they would try to curtail this practice, it would mean that they are teaching the students, how to make a fake medical certificate. So, they should develop such a policy where a student could get the benefit of P.U. Campus departments or the Colleges situated at Chandigarh. They should see whether they should curtail the policy of migration of students to the campus or to stop it. He suggested that it should not be just on medical grounds.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that usually it happens that the students could not get admission here in the Campus due to high merit. They first take admission at a Regional Centre and they request to come to the Panjab University Campus.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the difference of merit is not much. It is just in points.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is indeed a back door entry.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to where this money i.e. Rs.1 lac or twenty thousand goes which is taken from the students.

It was informed that this money goes to the University account.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said, no, this money is used by the department itself as per its will. He requested that the different fee should not be charged from the Regional Centre students or the College students, it should be the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that this would also be looked into by the Committee.

As regards the lateral entry, Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that some of the work has been done in this regard.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the Committee should also see if this facility could be extended to others also, why to law students only.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) minutes dated 18.12.2018, 09.01.2019 and 17.01.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to evaluate the applications of the students from Law Courses for attending classes/transfer from one institution to the other within the Panjab University System of Institution, be approved; and
- (ii) the following Committee is constituted to re-look the issue for future:
 - (a) Professor Navdeep Goyal
 - (b) Shri Sandeep Singh
 - (c) Dr. K.K. Sharma.

16. Considered minutes dated 24.12.2018 (**Appendix-X**) of the Academic and Administrative Committee for enrolment of Ph.D. Student in the Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology (IFSC), P.U.

NOTE: A copy of letter dated 11.01.2019 of the Chairperson, Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology is enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

It was informed at page 123 of the Appendix, it has been mentioned that the question paper will comprise of total 75 marks, whereas the total marks are 70. This correction should be noted. It had happened owing to misprint. A query was made and clarification has been received from the department in this regard.

Professor S.K. Sharma wanted to know about the criteria for admission to Ph.D. in other departments. For other departments, the University conducts Pre-Ph.D. test, but for Forensic Science, why there is interview.

It was clarified that the word Ph.D. has been mentioned inadvertently; rather, it should have been P.G.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that it could create a problem.

It was informed that in item No.2 has been written correctly.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the item No.1.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the item be placed before the Syndicate after getting it corrected.

It was informed that the test would get delayed, however, it would be got corrected.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 24.12.2018 of the Academic and Administrative Committee (Item No.2) along with the clarification given vide letter No. 413/IFSC dated 29.1.2019 for M.Sc. Forensic Science and Criminology, in the Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology (IFSC), P.U., be approved

- 17.** Considered minutes dated 20.12.2018 (Item No. II to IV) (**Appendix-XI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18), to look into the leave cases of teaching staff.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Dr. Komal Marwaha, Assistant Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, went on study leave for two years with pay, then extended by one year without pay. Now, she wants extraordinary leave in continuity. The study leave expired on 28th July, 2018. She requested if she can be allowed to join.

The Vice Chancellor asked her to tell about the rules in this regard.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she could come and join and then go on leave.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one issue would remain there. They have delayed in taking a decision. Now they could give her a notice to join.

It was informed that a notice has already been issued to her and her resignation has also been received.

The Vice Chancellor said that being PUTA President, Professor Rajesh Gill should know about her resignation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is wrong, when the item has been placed before the Syndicate, all documents should also be placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is the problem of his (Vice Chancellor) office. They should be asked about it.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 20.12.2018 (Items II to IV), be approved

- 18.** Considered minutes dated 26.12.2018 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Revising Committee to consider and approve the lists of Paper-setters and Examiners/Evaluators recommended by the various Boards of Studies, against the

vacancies occurred on account of completion of prescribed term of paper-setters/Examiners or due to any other valid reason/s i.e. cancellation of appointment, debarring a person, death of a person going abroad etc. in various subjects/faculties for the examinations 2018-2019.

It was informed that Item 18 related to the list of paper setters.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that some departments have allowed all the teachers to mark the papers. There are many teachers in Government College, Hoshiarpur or Tanda Urmar, who are protected by the High Court or the Supreme Court. They have been working on full salary since the last 15 years. Earlier they were allowed to mark the papers. Perhaps, they are not NET qualified. Some of them are having M.Phil qualification, but they were marking papers. Perhaps the English Department has not allowed them to mark the papers whereas other departments have allowed them. He requested that it should be on uniform basis. Either all of them should be denied or all should be allowed. Perhaps, the Controller of Examinations is aware that due to this, some problem was experienced for the marking of papers of English subject.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that a meeting was held in this regard and the problem was solved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that clear directions in this regard should be issued. He himself, as Chairperson of Physics Department, has prevented some teachers to mark the papers who were not NET qualified. They could categories in various ways. The regular teachers are allowed. There was a confusion with regard to the retired teachers, but it was got cleared and finally they would be allowed. The third category is of those teachers who have been working since long. Whether such teachers would be allowed or not? On being asked by the Vice Chancellor, what he would mean, from long time, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, since long means, the teachers who had been working for the last 10 or 12 years. He requested that some clear direction should be issued in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that some clear direction should be there.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that their Board of Studies in Commerce in University Business School had decided the regular and retired teachers are allowed to mark the papers. Secondly, those who are working on *ad hoc* basis but who are eligible, they have been allowed if they have three years of teaching experience. Finally, those teachers who are not eligible, but teaching the classes for the last five years, they have also been allowed. This should be applied uniformly.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the Constituent Colleges, teachers have been working for the last 5-6 years and getting full salary for all the twelve months and are eligible. Such teachers should also be allowed to mark the papers.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, what Dr. K.K. Sharma has said, if that is done, all teachers would be covered.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should make a uniform policy.

Dr. K.K. Sharma requested the Vice to get the policy implemented uniformly decided by the University Business School as it has been devised after a thorough discussion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as Syndicate members, they say that the policy framed by the UBS is quite okay.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there are some teachers in the Colleges who are working on adhoc basis, but they are not NET qualified.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to ask whether he (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) agreed to the policy framed by the University Business School.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the policy framed by the UBS, there is a problem as there are permanent as well as *ad hoc* teachers also.

Dr. K.K. Sharma reiterated what he has said earlier. The teachers who were permanent teachers and now retired, they are allowed. Secondly, those who are working on *ad hoc*/Guest Faculty but are eligible and having 3 years experience, they are also allowed. Thirdly, those teachers who are not eligible, but working for the last 5 years, they are also eligible. This has covered all the teachers.

Shri Jagdish Kumar said that in some subjects, the teachers are not available for marking due to which the results are not declared well in time. He suggested that those teachers who are working on adhoc basis, for them the condition of 3 years teaching experience should be reduced to one year. Further, the teacher who is on probation, this criterion should not be made applicable to him and he should be allowed to mark the papers. He is saying this because a problem is being faced at some places such as in the subject of Mathematics.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the teachers who are working on contract basis, they are required to have three years of experience. This was objected to by Shri Jagdish Kumar, Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu and some others.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it would be better if all these things which have been said by the members are made available to them in written form so that they could suggest the required changes. It is necessary because the examinations will be held shortly.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he would like to talk about an issue related to it. Every year they see that the papers are set out of syllabus. When such things are published in the newspapers, these bring a very bad name to the University. Secondly, the evaluation of papers is also not done properly. A candidate who is awarded zero marks is declared pass on re-evaluation. What is this? The Coordinator never checks it whether the evaluation is being done properly or not, though he is paid for that. Earlier, up to 3 bundles of answer sheets were sent to the residences of the evaluators. He got this system stopped. They could know how the papers would be checked if these are sent at their residences.

Professor Rajesh Gill said it might not be known as to who has checked the papers.

Shri Naresh Gaur requested the Vice Chancellor that an Observer, maybe a Syndicate or Senate member, be appointed at the Evaluation Centre and see whether the evaluation is being done properly. Such things are bring a bad name to the University as a student getting 20 marks has been getting 45 marks after re-evaluation. It is a very serious matter.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Observers are not being appointed for the last 5-6 years.

It was pointed out that at page 134 of the appendix, it has been suggested that all the guest faculty/part-time/contractual teachers may be considered by the all the Under/Postgraduate Board of Studies for evaluation/examiner-ship, who have NET

qualified and minimum regular experience of three years for undergraduate courses and five years for postgraduate courses. It has observed that only selected/regular teachers have been approved for paper-setting as large chunk of regular teachers are retired and it is actually required to extend the assignment of paper-setting to the guest faculty/part-time/contractual teachers as various Board of Studies allowed/approved their names for evaluating the answerbooks of various courses. This suggestion was immediately sent to different Board of Studies. This message was also sent to the Evaluation Centres. From next year, whatever the observations are being made today, the same would be made applicable. The retired teachers up to the age of 65 years would be allowed for evaluation except paper-setting. However, the Board of Studies should decide the matter uniformly. The data in respect of the College teachers is ready. However, the data relating to the University teachers is not complete as majority of the teachers are not getting themselves registered for the purpose. A request in this regard was made to President, PUTA, to use her good offices to persuade the teachers. If the University teachers also come forward and get themselves enrolled, it would really be a great help to the University as they would easily know to whom the answerbooks are to be sent. In this way, they would try their best to declare the results in time. It would also address the concern shown by Shri Naresh Gaur and others, they would be able to improve the quality of evaluation as well. As pointed out by Shri Naresh Gaur, certain students are getting failed only for want of 1 mark. The credit goes to the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor, who had allowed to declare the result of such students as "Pass", as a special case. The Vice Chancellor had constituted the Committee on the same day, which met on the same day and made recommendation(s). The result was also declared on the same day. Now, they are conducting the examination of the students again. Moreover, today the result of re-evaluation of those students has also been received, and they would be astonished to know that out of 33, 24 students have got qualified. Now, the Vice Chancellor has ordered that even the practical examinations would be held under the supervision of Observer(s).

Dr. K.K. Sharma pointed out that the re-evaluation is got done from the local teachers at Chandigarh and not from the teachers belonging to Punjab. Perhaps, they are declaring the students fail just by giving 1 mark less. In fact, they are the beneficiary as they get papers for re-evaluation.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that it has been decided by the concerned Board of Studies that the papers in the subject of Computer would be evaluated only at Chandigarh or Ludhiana as the teachers are not available at other places. He did not know why this decision was taken by the Board of Studies. He had talked to the Head of the Computer Department as also the Deputy Registrar (Secrecy) and informed them the computer teachers are also Hoshiarpur and Dasuya where 10 regular teachers are available at each place. Besides this, some other *ad hoc* teachers, who are eligible, are also available, but they are not assigned this job.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that as stated by Shri Naresh Gaur about the checking of papers in Evaluation Centres, in Government College, Hoshiarpur, the Principal had decided to give one bundle to a teacher from 9.00 a.m. to 12.00 noon and the other bundle from 1.00 p.m. to 4.00 p.m. They would be surprised to know that phones calls from Chandigarh starting pouring in advising him not to do so and the Principal has to withdraw his orders. They used to make rules, but do not stick to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that in order remove their grievances, they could send a mail to him on which he take necessary action at his own level. It is unfortunate that they would forget all this once they leave the House. He suggested that the recommendations made by the University Business School, as pointed out by Dr. K.K. Sharma, should be approved.

This was agreed to.

The Vice Chancellor further said that majority of them are in various Committees and might be in certain Board of Studies. He would like to bring to their notice that sometime they make certain recommendation, which could not be expected in the University like Panjab University, i.e. in certain cases, the Board of Studies have recommended grace marks to the tune of 20 to 25 marks which is not desirable. Though it has been ignored this time, but such a thing would not be accepted in future. They should not spoil the academics in this manner. If he did not accept their recommendations, it would hurt them.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Shri Sandeep Singh said that there might be some reason for recommending 20-25 grace marks.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar pointed out that the 30-40 marks question paper in the subject of Political Science was out of syllabus.

The Vice Chancellor said that there might be some reason, but only they have to think to solve the problem. It is also his responsibility to see all such things. There should be some maximum limit for grace marks. This is the first University where he has seen that even up to 20 marks grace marks are given, it is not fair. The University should not be destroyed in this way.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it is better if re-examination in such cases is conducted.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not take the rules of the University lightly and they should work responsibly. He has felt that whosoever had been made the Chairperson or members of the Committee, they say that such things used to happen. Does it mean that he (Vice Chancellor) should also do that? Secondly, they appoint Coordinators which is a very important issue. The persons who do not visit the Centres, a list of such persons be given to him, such persons would not be appointed this time. As regards Observers, he would definitely appoint Observers. He could tell them that these things were not in his mind. Here they just think about their own authority, how they should think only about the authority of the University. They should allow the University to function, otherwise the image of the University would be maligned. He had himself visited all the Centres. They need to make arrangement for electricity and water. He saw that the examination is being conducted, but there is no arrangement for drinking water. What is this? This is also their responsibility. He has come from such a system where the Vice Chancellor watches everything and he believes in such type of system. He requested that they should not take the things lightly like this and further desired their help in this regard. They should do everything for the development and dignity of the University. His whole focus is on 2021. If they lag behind, it would lead them to a very bad situation.

Shri Jagdish Kumar said that all the other conditions for marking papers are alright, but for the teachers who are working on ad hoc basis but otherwise qualified, the condition of 3 years teaching experience should be reduced to one year.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that those teachers who are appointed on regular basis, there should not be any condition of teaching experience.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the three years teaching experience condition cannot be lifted.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that if it is not done, they would face problem in the subject of Mathematics, then people would come to him (Professor Navdeep Goyal). He again urged that a qualified teacher, though he is on *ad hoc*, should be allowed to mark the papers after attaining one year's experience.

It was informed that on this item the decision taken is that this item be approved and the Controller of Examinations will ensure uniformity across the Faculties in recommending the paper setters/examiners. This would include each and everything, including the UBS model suggested by Dr. K.K. Sharma. Further, the Observers would be appointed in each Evaluation Centre.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Observer could not monitor the answer sheet every day.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be left to him as to how what the Observer would do.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had raised the issue of marking, but the Vice Chancellor is not allowed him even to put forth his viewpoints.

The Vice Chancellor said that only he could not be allowed to speak again and again.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said on the one side, he (Vice Chancellor) is binding up the issue and on the other side, he (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) is not being allowed to speak despite his raising the hand.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has spoken many times and this is not the way to raise a point.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is also not his habit to raise his hand up for 10 minutes.

The Vice Chancellor said that to give time to a member to speak is his prerogative.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is not a question of allowing. Even if the Observer is appointed, what he/she would do.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Observer would submit a comprehensive report.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the problem is that the University sends the answer books in bulk (50 thousand) and the same are stocked in a store, which might be far away from the office of the Principal. Suppose they have appointed 20 examiners for evaluation of answer sheets and there is a rider to complete the marking within 10 days. The correct procedure is that the examiners should be supplied the answer sheets at 9.00 O'clock and these be taken back from them, say at 12.00 Noon, and the same practice should be followed in the evening session. With this, the problem of mass checking/wrong checking etc. would be solved. Could the Observer check as to how many number of bundles has been distributed? These are some of the practical problems faced at the Evaluation Centre. With the appointment of Observers, the financial burden on the University Exchequer would increase. In addition to Coordinator, there are two more Co-Coordinators i.e. one for the morning session and the other for evening. What needed to be done is that, that the Coordinators should be asked to supply the bundle to the Evaluators in accordance with the list provided to them. If they do this, there would not any need of Observer.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into. However, if the need of Observer is felt, the Observer would be appointed. There are Syndicate/Senate

members and teachers who would be willing to perform the duty as Observer without any remuneration.

Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out that there are teachers who return the answer book after keeping it with them for months together. This is a very serious issue which needed to be looked into. He suggested that a list of such persons should be prepared and they be debarred from the examination work.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma remarked that some of the teachers are even ready for this.

Shri Sandeep Singh said in case they are ready, they do have dearth of teachers who are willing to evaluate the answer books.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he wanted to know as to how many University teachers are performing the evaluation duty. As per his information, major part of the evaluation work is being done by the College teachers.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that in case one refuses to perform the evaluation duty or wrongly evaluate the answer books, suitable action should be taken against him/her. Such remarks should be placed in his/her personal file so that the same could be taken into consideration at the time of promotion.

Professor S.K. Sharma said the University has been conducting nth number of examinations. It would be better if they prepare a data bank of more than 100 questions keeping in view the latest syllabus. The question should be selected randomly by the computer itself through a software for the question papers. This would help in reducing the expenditure. This could also be done for the CET Examination. When he was Dean of University Instruction, he had started the practice setting two question papers along with answer keys. By adopting these measures, they would be able to save a lot of money.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the recommendations of the Revising Committee dated 26.12.2018, as per appendix, be approved;
- (ii) Observers be appointed in each Evaluation Centre; and
- (iii) Controller of Examinations will ensure uniformity across the Faculties while recommending the paper setters/examiners and will also develop mechanism to streamline the system.

19. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 20.12.2018 that the following articles of more than the value of Rs.1,00,000/- in the Department of Zoology, be written off from the record, as these articles are beyond economical repair or unserviceable on account of non-availability of spare parts:

Sr. No.	Item	Price	Qty	Date of Purchase
1	Hp 7380 Desktop Computer with accessories	110336.50	3 nos.	31.03.2008
2.	Pentium TV Computer with accessories	132500.00	5 nos.	15.12.2003
3.	BOD Incubator Cap. 10Cu Ft and 4 Cu	136812.37	2	29.03.1998

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

	Ft		nos.	
4.	Cold Room Equipment PC-600 A PUF Insulated Panels Refrigeration equipment with Stabilizers	160246.50	1 nos.	31.12.1988
5.	Multiparameter Water Proof Water Analysis Kit	174080.00	1 no.	23.02.2004
6.	80 Column Dot Matrix Printer for AAS 4139-1 No. Oil free air compressor-1 No. Regulator for acetylene gas cylinder-1	178276.00	1 no.	30.08.1997
7.	Tata Sumo Jeep Chasis No. 403303, Engine No. 806869	375698.00	1 no.	09.02.1998
8.	Computer controlled double beam Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer with PC 58 & Colour monitor, Background correction	657489.00	1 no.	30.08.1997
9.	Latroscan TH-10, TLC/FID Analyser with accessories	3787675.00 Japanese Yen = Rs.194897.90	1 no.	29.05.1985
10.	Double Beam Spectrophotometer with lamp, printer code, PC with colour Monitor, Quartz Cuvette	2,72,845.00	1 no.	31.12.2002
11.	Uvkon 860-UV Visible Spectrophotometer with accessories	4,37,698.10	1 no.	05.09.1986

NOTE: 1. As per P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 appearing at page 450-51, the competent authority to write off losses is as under:

1.	Vice-Chancellor	Up to Rs.1 lac per item
2.	Syndicate	Up to Rs. 5 Lac per item
3.	Senate	Without any limit for any item

2. Copy of letter dated 24.12.2018 of the Chairperson, Department of Zoology, is enclosed.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this is a very-very important issue. The University writes of instruments worth hundreds of crores. In some of the instruments only a fuse is needed, otherwise those instruments are working. However, they constitute a Committee of four Professors and get it recommended that the instrument is not working and it is recommended for writing off. They have a Department in the University SAIF where the people are available who could repair these instruments. They have CSIO also. What they should do is that if any department wants to write off an instrument, they should get clearance from the CIL because those are the people who are trained in repairing such instruments. He informed that as Principal Investigator, he had an instrument worth Rs.10 Crores. When he retired, nobody was there having knowledge as to how to operate those instruments. After five years a notice was issued and they said that these instruments are not working and as such of no use. For instance, there is no TGN in northern India. He could have given it to SAIF as they could repair it. He suggested that they could write to the manufacturer to certify if the instrument is not repair worthy. They should also tell him that if they are not able to repair it, next time their company would not be allowed to send quotation as

they did not have the capacity to repair it. He suggested that if they are able to repair these instruments they could give these instruments to their Colleges also for research, which are running Ph.D. programme such as UV Spectrometer. But, they are just writing off for nothing. He said that they should send a notice to all the departments that they should prepare a log book of each and every instrument which is working along with its operational manual and technical manual. In case somebody has to repair that instrument, he would ask for the technical manual. In order to save the instruments in future, he requested the Vice Chancellor to ensure that a letter is sent to the departments asking them to prepare a log book. If the log book shows after a year that the instruments have not been used, but it is a new instrument, shift it to SAIF. The testing should be free for the Principal Investigator who has purchased it, but the SAIF could charge money for others.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a very good idea.

Continuing, Professor S.K. Sharma said that they should make a Committee. The CSIO is conducting international training programmes. He suggested that they should strengthen the CIL team for the repairs of such instruments.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he remembers that Professor S.K. Sharma had been raising this issue and it was resolved in earlier two Syndicate meetings, but nothing was done. He requested the Vice Chancellor that now it should be implemented.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that if some instrument is to be written off, it should be through CIL so that they could at least know whether it is repairable or not.

Professor S.K. Sharma said there could be a problem of only a fuse.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that as stated by Professor S.K. Sharma, these instruments could be given to the Colleges also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is a very good suggestion. There are many types of instruments and sometimes there does not remain a user. In such a case, instead of condemning it, it should be given to someone. This is must to be kept in mind. Now the question is as to who could test any instrument. He could not agree that every instrument be sent to the CIL for repair or getting a certificate regarding its workability. The CIL could only test the electronic instruments. For other instruments, the experts could be available in UIET.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the CIL is running instrumentation Course. The CIL should say that repair of instruments is one of the topics of their study. They should use it in their practicals.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said as far as instruments part is concerned, it could be done by the CIL. However, for repair of electrical equipments, it could be sent to the UIET and for refrigeration the experts are available in Dr. SSB UICET.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the companies which sell their products, their servicing is outsourced. In the same way, the servicing and upkeep of the instruments in the University could also be outsourced. They could check these instruments from time to time and make the entry in the log book of each department. By doing so, the instrument would remain in good condition instead of asking the teachers to take care of it. Secondly, as has been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal, they should have rationalization of the instruments i.e. if some instrument is not required by any department, it could be shifted to some other department where it could be put to use.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Professor S.K. Sharma said that circular economy is in vogue in these days. The Panjab University has already passed the legislation that on every equipment, it would be written that as to what percentage of it is going to be re-cycled. So, when they purchase an instrument, they must ensure, what is the life of the instrument and what particular guarantee the company give for the repair of the instrument.

The Vice Chancellor said that it meant that they should withdraw this item and a comprehensive Committee should be constituted consisting of Dean University Instruction, experts from the CIL, Dr. H.S.J. Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital. There could be two types of instruments, one which could be repairable and the others which would be totally obsolete.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that for the instruments which have become obsolete, they could ask the company that if the new model has come, can they take the old instrument back at some less cost. If he refuses to do so, then tell him that he would be black-listed. He did it once in CIL for ultraset tablet. It was costing about two crores and he got it repaired in eighty thousand rupees.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that instead of giving it to scavenger, they should put it online where the buyers are available who used to purchase old instruments also.

The Vice Chancellor while asking for any other input from the members said that they are going to withdraw the item and would make a Committee.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the item be withdrawn; and
- (ii) the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Comprehensive Committee to make recommendations for writing off various articles under the Chairmanship of Dean University Instructions comprising expert members from CIL, UIET, Dr. SSB UICET, Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, etc.

20.

Considered observation dated 05.11.2018 submitted by Chief Vigilance Officer, Vigilance Cell, P.U., for constituting a Committee of technically expert persons for physical verification of the purchase of furniture for Boys and Girls Hostel (2009-2013).

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2018 (Para 17) considered the suggestion of CVO on the issue of constituting a Committee for making physical verification of all the purchases made by the Office of P.U. Construction and resolved that –

- (i) the item relating to Er. S.K. Sharma, S.D.E. P.U. Construction office, already referred to the Senate, by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 30.3.2018, be withdrawn from the agenda of the Senate;
- (ii) the supplier, namely, M/s Dwivedi Furniture who had supplied the items in question be blacklisted with immediate effect and it be circulated to all the departments and offices of the University for their information and necessary action; and ;

- (iii) the Chief Vigilance Officer be requested to undertake the physical verification of all the items purchased by the P.U. Construction Office (2009-2013) (Sr. No.1-11 and 13) (Pages 160-170) and after the verification, the matter be placed before the Syndicate in one of its next meetings.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the C.V.O. has investigated the issue of purchase of furniture of Hostel No.9. The CVO has made a Committee, why the same Committee could not look into the other things also. In one case, they have held someone a culprit, but the same thing has happened at various other places. But, what they suspect is that to whom they have said culprit, perhaps that persons is not at much fault. That was why the Syndicate as a Body had wanted that it should be checked at other places also. They have a Committee already constituted. Now they wanted to form a Committee for a particular hostel.

It was informed that they wanted to have a Committee of technically expert persons.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what should be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be referred to the same Committee as they have to check the specifications only.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if they have to get the specifications checked, they should include persons in the Committee from University Institute of Engineering & Technology or Dr.SSB University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that persons from University Institute of Engineering & Technology (Mechanical Branch) were already there in the Committee. He does not know why they are asking for constituting a Committee of technical experts.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members if the investigation be given to the same Committee constituted earlier. However, the CVO has been asking to form a Committee of Technical Experts. If they are not doing it, it meant that there might be something.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the Vice Chancellor should be authorised.

RESOLVED: That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee of technically expert persons to consider the observation dated 5.11.2018 submitted by Chief Vigilance Cell, P.U., for physical verification of the purchase of furniture items made by the P.U. Construction Office for Boys and Girls Hostel (2009-2013).

- 21.** Considered if the following list of successful candidates (merit-wise) of competitive test of Stenography (English), be approved, for filling up 50% posts/vacancies of Stenographers, presently lying vacant/ likely to fall vacant in future, as per rule ibid:

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name	Number of mistake	Marks out of 500, i.e., 500 minus number of mistake
1.	16	Shri Manish Kumar	07	493
2.	15	Ms. Nidhi Rani	17	483

- NOTE:** 1. The Rule 4 class B posts (ii) (a) (b) for the post of Stenographers are as under:
- (a) Stenographers: 50% posts of Stenographers shall be filled in by promotion from amongst the Steno-typists and the person having completed 15 years' service as a Steno-typist shall be eligible for promotion against this quota.
 - (b) The remaining 50% posts of Stenographers shall be filled by promotion of Steno-typists through competitive tests in Shorthand and typing to be held after every 5-6 months preferably in January and July each year. In case no person from in-service employees qualifies the test, the post may be advertised and selection made by a selection Committee to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, through competition which may be made open to outsiders as also in-service Steno-typists/Clerks.
2. The Stenography test was held on 02.12.2018 and two candidates (out of the 16) at Sr. No. 16 & 15 have qualified.
3. An office note is enclosed.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that there was an observation. Some of the applicants have given a complaint that the pronunciation of the person was so poor that they could not comprehend. He does not know why that complaint has not been put across. They have given in writing that the pronunciation was not understandable. Out of 17 people, only 2 have qualified. It could be due problem in pronunciation or something else.

It was said that the issue could be understood, but since it was a test, what could be done now. However, another test could be conducted after few months. On a point made by a member, it was said that in case they decided to scrap the test, the persons who have qualified would raise the objection.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they have given the complaint before the declaration of the result that the pronunciation was not clear. Since the complaint was received before the declaration of the result, it meant that there was some problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was very serious and asked that when the complaint was received before the declaration of result, why it has not been taken in to consideration.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that though the pronunciation was poor, but the two persons have been able to understand it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that since two persons have qualified, this item should be approved. However, for others the test could be held again.

It was informed that 50% posts are filled through test and the reaming 50% through promotion and 4% mistakes are allowed.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in case some post(s) still remain vacant, the test could be held for them again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the complaint made by other Stenos should have been attached to it. Why it has not been attached, whether it has been disposed off, whether they should take cognizance of the complaint, it is not known as the complaint has not been attached. Now the question is that those who have qualified, because of the grievance of others, if they do not approve the item, the persons who have qualified would be at loss. So, they should approve this item. In case they do not take any decision, even then they have vacant posts with them, hence they have to conduct the test again.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have already made a mistake by not addressing to the grievances, and now they are asking them to wait as they are going to conduct the test again for them.

On a point raised by Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu, Shri Ashok Goyal said that now since they have declared the result and two persons have qualified, what answer they would give to them if the item is not approved.

Professor Rajat Sandhir pointed out that in case the item is approved and it would affect the seniority of those persons who have not been able to qualify the test, even if the test for them is conducted again.

It was informed that a total of 16 persons had appeared for the test out of which 2 have qualified. The other persons had come to him and they were told that they are still having some posts vacant and they would conduct the test again.

On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal, it was informed that they were satisfied with the reply.

The Vice Chancellor said that his only concern is that injustice should not be done to anyone.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that to his mind the person, who has dictated the passage, might not be a senior person. A Steno has to take dictation from a senior person such as Chairperson of a Department.

It was informed that the dictation for this test is given by a senior person in the Secretarial Cadre.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the remaining persons should be given a chance to appear for the test against the vacancies lying vacant. If they were satisfied with the reply given to them, it is very good. It is understood that nobody is against them. Now, they are talking against those, who have the grievance. He asked as to what could be the solution to their grievance.

It was not informed that only re-test could be held.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it right that re-test could be held, but what precautions they have to take while conducting re-test, so that they might not have to file such a complaint. Some senior person should be deputed to dictate the passage.

It was informed that the senior person was deputed to dictate the passage.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the pronunciation of the person, who has dictated the passage, is not clear, he should not be deputed again.

RESOLVED: That the names of the following two successful candidates (merit-wise) of competitive test of Stenography (English), be approved, for filling up 50% posts/vacancies of Stenographers, presently lying vacant/likely to fall vacant in future, as per rule:

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name
1.	16	Shri Manish Kumar
2.	15	Ms. Nidhi Rani

22.

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

NOTE: 1. Regulation 14.5 at page 129 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

“14.5. The Syndicate may, at their discretion, allow a permanent employee to continue to be a depositor in the Fund even during the period of his absence on leave without pay, or any other programme approved by the Vice-Chancellor for this purpose, but he shall not be entitled to University contribution during this period”.

2. Request of Dr. Rajesh K. Chander is enclosed (**Appendix-XIII**).

Professor Rajesh Gill said that this is a case for depositing the Provident Fund contribution by Dr. Rajesh Chander as he had gone to Jawaharlal Nehru University from September 14, 2016 to March 27, 2017. The Finance and Development Officer might be knowing about this case.

On being asked by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma if there is any provision for the same, it was informed that the provision is there.

Some members said that in case the provision is there, then it should be allowed.

The Vice Chancellor said that at page 176 of the agenda, it has been mentioned that the Syndicate is empowered. They should see to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have being doing this always as they would lose nothing.

The Vice Chancellor it is alright if the practice is there.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rajesh Chander, Assistant Professor, Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies, be allowed to deposit permissible Provident Fund contribution into his Provident Fund account in Panjab University for the period of his EOL without pay, i.e., 14.09.2016 to 27.3.2017 (for which he had worked as Associate

Professor at Centre for the Study of Discrimination and Exclusion, School of Social Sciences, J.N.U., New Delhi), under Regulation 14.5 at page 129 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

23. Considered –

- (i) An apology dated 31.10.2018 (**Appendix-XIV**) submitted by Dr. B.B. Goyal pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 29.4/26.5.2018 (Para 24) (**Appendix-XIV**).
- (ii) the representation **Appendix-XIV** of Dr. B.B. Goyal of University Business School, requesting to amend the orders of the Senate dated 11.6.2009 (Para LII, in the light of judgment of the Civil court dated 28.3.2014 in Civil Suit No. 1043 of 2.4.2010.
- (iii) Promotion order of Dr. B.B. Goyal from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) w.e.f the due date of his eligibility i.e. 1.1.2009, under UGC Regulation 2010, already issued vide office orders dated 14.2.2013 (**Appendix-XIV**)

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

While briefing about the items it was said that Item related to Dr. B.B. Goyal who had levelled a charge that there is corruption prevailing in the University.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she had read the whole case. In last meeting of the Syndicate, Shri Ashok Goyal had said that Dr. B.B. Goyal would submit his apology and then this item should not be brought again to the Syndicate. Accordingly, it should not have been brought to the Syndicate.

It was informed that earlier he had submitted the apology with certain conditions, and when he again submitted the apology the stipulated time period over. That is why this item was placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor that it is not good to shift the stand again and again. In this case also, the same thing has happened.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that since he has tendered his apology, the same should be accepted.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay".

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

24 Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following Assistant Registrars (except Sr. No. 5), be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Branch/Deptt.	Date of promotion	Date of confirmation
1.	Shri Kesar Singh, Offg. D.R. Exams	07.05.2015	16.06.2017

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

2.	Shri Kewal Kumar, Conduct (Retd. on 31.08.2017)	26.06.2015	17.06.2017
3.	Mrs. Tripta Devi, General (Retired on 31.07.2017)	01.12.2015	18.06.2017
4.	Shri Ramesh Kumar, Office of D.U.I. (Retd. on 31.01.2018)	08.12.2015	19.06.2017
5.	Shri Surinder Kumar Thind VVBIS & IS Hoshiarpur (Retired on 31.08.2018)	17.03.2016	20.06.2017
6.	Mrs. Veena Re-evaluation	17.03.2016	21.06.2017
7.	Shri Madan Gopal Singh Exams. (Retd. on 28.02.2018)	22.04.2016	21.06.2017
8.	Mrs. Santosh Kumari UIET (Retd. on 30.09.2018)	17.05.2016	01.06.2017
9.	Shri Dhara Dutt, Accounts (Retd. on 31.08.2018)	01.07.2016	01.11.2017
10.	Shri Omesh Verma Conduct	22.09.2016	01.01.2018
11.	Shri Mohinder Singh, Exams (Retd. on 31.03.2018)	18.10.2016	02.01.2018
12.	Mrs. Pawan Kumari Aneja Accounts	22.11.2016	01.05.2018
13.	Mrs. Prem Lata, UIAMS	20.01.2017	01.07.2018
14.	Mrs. Nisha, DUI's Office	24.01.2012	01.09.2018

- NOTE:**
1. The date of confirmation of these Assistant Registrars is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.
 2. The persons listed from Sr. No. 2 to 5, 7 to 9 and 11 have retired from the service, but their confirmation falls prior to the date of their retirement. Similar such cases have already been got approved by the Syndicate/Senate, earlier.
 3. The work and conduct of these persons in service has been found satisfactory and they have been found eligible for confirmation as A.R. in view of their service record.
 4. The confirmation at Sr. No. 5 (Shri Surinder Kumar Thind), was retired from the University services on 31.08.2018, but he had not been sanctioned any retirement benefits as some enquiry/fraud cases/court cases are pending against him. Therefore, his case of confirmation as A.R. cannot be taken for approval and the same is to be kept pending till such time his all the pending cases are finalized. However, a vacant slot has been kept reserved for his confirmation.
 5. An office note is enclosed.

It was informed that this item related to the confirmation of Assistant Registrars.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to why the person at Sr. No. 5 has not been confirmed. If he has retired, would they not confirm him?

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

It was informed that there is some fraud case against the person at Sr. No.5, so his confirmation is to be kept pending until the decision of the Court.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following Assistant Registrars (except Sr. No.5), be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

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

25. Considered if, Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund, Assistant Registrar, DSW, be confirmed w.e.f. 01.06.2016 instead of 01.04.2017. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate at its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 14) recommended the confirmation of certain Assistant Registrars along with the confirmation of Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund, Assistant Registrar, DSW, to the Senate and the same was approved by the Senate at its meeting dated 10/24.09.2017 (Para XXXI) (**Appendix-XV**). The date of confirmation of Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund was proposed w.e.f. 01.04.2017.

2. The Chairman of Panjab University Stenographers' Association vide letter dated 27.11.2017 (**Appendix-XV**) has written that Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund was confirmed as

Assistant Registrar (Secretarial cadre) w.e.f. 01.04.2017 on the retirement of Sh. J.R. Dhiman on 31.03.2017. However, the confirmation of Shri J.R. Dhiman as Deputy Registrar has been recommended by the Syndicate w.e.f. 01.06.2016 meaning thereby that the post of Assistant Registrar from the secretarial cadre fell vacant on 01.06.2016. The necessary steps be taken to prepone the date of confirmation of Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund, Assistant Registrar to 01.06.2016 instead of 01.04.2017.

3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 32) (**Appendix-XV**) has recommended the confirmation of Shri J.R. Dhiman, Deputy Registrar, Secrecy Branch w.e.f. 01.06.2016, to the Senate and the same has been approved by the Senate at its meeting dated 03.11.2018 (Para XXVII) (**Appendix-XV**).
4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).

Briefing about the case, it was informed that there was one Deputy Registrar namely Mr. J.R. Dhiman from the P.A. Cadre, whose promotion was preponed with the concurrence of the Syndicate. Subsequently, the promotion of next person in line needed to be preponed.

On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal whether the promotion of other person/s in the line would also be preponed, it was informed that Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund is the next person in line and she has not yet retired. When she would vacate the post, the next persons would be promoted accordingly.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund, Assistant Registrar, DSW, be confirmed w.e.f. 01.06.2016 instead of 01.04.2017.

- 26.** Considered minutes dated 28.11.2018 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to revisit the qualification and experience for the post of Manager (Production and Sales), Publication Bureau, P.U., Chandigarh. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XVI**) was also taken into consideration.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this whole case has been prepared keeping in view that this is a technical post, so there should be technical qualifications for this post. Accordingly, they have given the technical qualifications. In desirable qualifications, it has been mentioned: Master's degree of Management or Mass Communication. It meant that anybody who might not have the earlier qualifications and had only the Master's degree of Management or Mass Communication, he/she could get into that post. Then, all that what they have done for the technical qualifications, is just an eye-wash. So, he thought that they could say that added advantage might be given to the persons who have these qualifications. This appears to be a backdoor entry of somebody who is not having technical qualifications for this post.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know the rationale behind it. Why they are revising the existing qualifications?

Professor S.K. Sharma said they have mentioned about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, where it is written.

Professor S.K. Sharma said they have written that earlier it was post-graduation only.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that at page 280 of the agenda, the existing qualifications are: Master's Degree in Management. In the proposed qualifications, they have added Master's Degree in Management or Mass Communication.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said earlier the qualification was post-graduate in all subjects. Now it has been particularised as M.Tech. (Printing Technology) only.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that now they have added the desirable qualification which overrides the earlier one. It meant that if the earlier qualifications are not there, one with the desirable qualifications could get the post.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the earlier qualification was post-graduation in any field. Now, why it has been particularized as Printing Technology?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that earlier five years experience was required, but now it has been reduced to one year and the qualification has been enhanced. There is no logic and also no consistency.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that to his mind, the existing qualifications are good enough, so there is no need of any change.

The Vice Chancellor said they could also see the proposed qualifications.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, there is no need to see as there is no logic in it. On being asked by a member as to what is the urgency in it, Shri Ashok Goyal said that unless and until these qualifications are got approved, they cannot advertise the post.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if they should keep the old qualifications, the desirable qualification should be the additional qualification and preference should be given to the person having desirable qualifications also.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the existing qualifications are alright.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that in the existing qualifications, the desirable qualifications are also there.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the desirable qualification did not override the existing qualifications.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that desirable qualification is not an essential qualification.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the persons having desirable qualifications should be given added advantage.

The Vice Chancellor said that since they have changed the qualifications, so he was of the opinion that these qualifications should be got revisited.

Professor Rajesh Gill reiterated that the existing qualifications are alright.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not want that they should distrust on someone that everything is spoiled, he did not know as to what is the factual position.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would tell why the other members are saying and why the qualifications should not be revisited. The reason for this is that all the members have guessed that there is interest of someone. If the Vice Chancellor deputed him (Shri Ashok Goyal) to revisit the qualifications, someone would influence him also. The Registrar was also in the Committee, so he should tell them what was the rationale behind it? He suggested that it is better to advertise the post with the same qualifications.

The Vice Chancellor said that the qualifications should remain as these have been earlier.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is his suggestion that if such a revision would come in future, the Committee should give the rationale as to why it has revised the existing qualifications to the present qualifications, so that the Syndicate is able to understand.

RESOLVED: That minutes not approved and it was decided that no change in the existing qualification for the post of Manager (Production and Sales), Publication Bureau, P.U., Chandigarh, be made.

27. Considered deferred Item No.14 of the Syndicate meeting dated 08.12.2018 (Para 14) with regard to the reports dated 14.09.2018, 20.09.2018 and 13.10.2018 (**Appendix-XVII**) submitted by the Committee in respect of the following Colleges:

1. S.D.P. College, Ludhiana
2. Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana
3. Atam Valabh Jain College, Ludhiana

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that reports with regard to three Colleges have been placed before the Syndicate. The Hon'ble members had visited these Colleges, one of whom is present here in the meeting. The findings given by these members in their report are the same, which they had discussed in the Senate, such as non-grant of leave, salary, taking back the salary, did not deduct proper provident fund etc. etc. They have noted down all the discrepancies. To his mind, the Syndicate should accept the reports given by the members and stringent action should be taken against all the three Colleges. This action should send a message to the other Colleges that in case they resort to such malpractices, the University would not spare them. They should not take the University as granted. He reiterated that such a clear message should go from the Syndicate so that their teachers should also feel it that the University has taken some action. In some cases, the College Managements have tried to give a communal colour to various issues, one was a local teacher or a Sikh teacher and the institution was a Hindu Institution, etc. etc. He was of the opinion, that they should not indulge in such things and rise above all this and they should give a clear message to the Colleges. He urged that action be taken against these three Colleges. In S.D.P. College, a complaint was received in the Grievances Cell and with the efforts of the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor and Registrar, those teachers are still unharmed.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they were having information about these Colleges. Now the Committee members have proved it that the information they (members) were having is right. The situation in these Colleges is very bad. S.D.P. College had removed two Lecturers. He had asked on what grounds they remove their Lecturers. Had their workload decreased or something wrong been done by them? There should be certain parameters. They said that the last person would go first. They removed two Lecturers from service by giving them three months' notice. Another Lecturer was removed from the service owing to less teaching load. The practice is prevalent in the Colleges on a large scale. In fact, the managements removed them from the service only because otherwise they would have to be confirmed and paid full pay, grade pay, etc. They do

all this to set aside all these things. Those teachers did come to him, but at that time he thought that they are from the Kamla Lohtia College. These teachers have fulfilled the criteria required for the job and they have crossed the age limit for a job. He also rang up to the College and asked them where those lady Lecturers would go now. He had also requested the Dean, College Development Council, that action should be taken against these Colleges. Earlier also, he had pointed out the case of one of such College. In the case of Mai Bhago College, Ramgarh, the University had decided that admission to Commerce Stream should not be made until they take back those Lecturers, who have been removed from the service. He requested that same action should be taken against S.D.P. College, Ludhiana. Secondly, they have tried to give it a communal colour which is very bad. The University and this House should condemn their action. If a Sikh member of the Committee goes to a Hindu Institute or a Hindu member goes to a Sikh Institution and if an objection is raised on this, then how the University would function. He urged the whole House to condemn this action of theirs' and stern action be taken against them.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that there is one thing which is important that these Colleges come under grant-in-scheme of the Government. It has been written that the grant from the D.P.I. (Colleges) was received from 1.1.2006, but the salary has not been disbursed to the teachers by the Principal, which could attract serious action from D.P.I. (Colleges).

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is no regular Principal in the College for the last 8 years.

Continuing, Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that his College deduct Provident Fund since 1.4.2008 as per the University Calendar by adding basic and DA., but certain Colleges deduct 10% Provident Fund on the basic only. Thus, the teachers are at loss on this account also. He again pointed out that from the teachers, who have been appointed on a pay of Rs.21600/- p.m., some amount is taken back from them. No salary or increment is being given to the non-teaching staff for the last 2-3 years. Another important issue is that the teachers on grant-in-aid post are getting AGP of Rs.6000/-, as they are not allowed to attend any refresher course/orientation course. Some of the teachers are at the verge of retirement, but they are still at AGP of Rs.6000/- because they are not fulfilling the eligibility criteria.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that all these things have been mentioned in the report. The question is as to what action should be taken. He suggested that the University should write to these Colleges to take corrective measure with regard to the problems/deficiencies pointed out by the Committee. Secondly, one Observer should be appointed in each College by the University. Corrective measures should be taken and the things in the Colleges should set right in a year and the Observer should give a report regularly.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they had given affiliation to S.D.P. College, Ludhiana for B.P.Ed. 4-Year Integrated Course. As per his information, this is the only College in Ludhiana City, which has been given this Course. He has raised this issue in the Senate also that affiliation of such a profitable course should be withdrawn from such a College. If the College continued to treat the teachers in such a manner, they have to think for the withdrawal of affiliation.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they have to think as to what action should be taken and the reports should be sent to the Colleges concerned for compliance and reply. This is the natural justice. In this meeting, they could not take any action. They should seek explanation on the basis of the report. The best course of action is that they should try to mend these Colleges and try to help the teachers as much as possible. In case they think to close down the Colleges, it would rather be

detrimental to the interest of the teachers. They have to take the corrective measure and ensure that the provisions of the University Calendar are followed. This should be their spirit. If they ask for the compliance reports from the colleges, they would, perhaps, comply with many of the deficiencies out of fear.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that first of all, before initiating any action, the Colleges should be sent the report of the Committee and point-wise reply should be sought.

Dr. K.K. Sharma, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, said that D.D. Jain College had sanctioned 3 months maternity leave to a teacher, and after receiving the panel, they granted leave for 6 months. Whenever some check is applied, it has shown positive results.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that has been told by Shri Naresh Gaur that two teachers of Ramgarh College were removed from service and the University did not allow them to hold admissions for B.Com. After this action, he was given to understand that the teachers have been taken back in service.

Dr. K.K. Sharma endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that sometimes they feel that they are helpless and they could not do anything, except to take corrective measures, because if the Colleges are disaffiliated, the teachers and students would be at loss. He thinks, let they take a decision, in principle, that they have not to take any action and only corrective measures would be taken. If that is not so, then they have no alternative, except to move in terms of what is mentioned in the Calendar. He agreed with Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma that this report, actually, should have been sent, immediately after its receipt in the office to the respective Colleges for their para-wise comments and then should be considered here. Anyway, it has been brought to the Syndicate, lot of period has already passed. Now another 15-20 days, whatever time they would give the Colleges, for responding to each query/finding, they have to wait for them. As far as corrective measures are concerned, to be at the mercy of these Colleges, hoping against hopes that they would take the corrective measures, then they would enhance maternity leave from 3 to 6 months and that they have started now improving, that is not going to be sufficient. When they have in-built mechanism, as per Regulation 11.2 that after enquiry if they find that the College is not being administered properly, then they could put two representatives of the Syndicate of the University on the Managements of these Colleges and Committee meeting of the Management could not be called without inviting those two representatives. If at all, any Committee meeting takes place without inviting two members, the proceedings of those meetings of the Committee should be declared null and void. The basic purpose is, where they feel that the Colleges did not have the will to improve and the University did not want to close the College also, at the same time wanted to ensure that all the rules and regulations are implemented, this is the mechanism which has been given. Hopefully, they would succeed in getting the desired results. However, still if they are not able to get the desired results, they did not have any option but to issue them a notice under Regulation 11.1 telling them that they did not deserve affiliation, thus the University could not continue with that. But, it is not the question of these 2-3 colleges. He was of the opinion that these three colleges might be much better than various other colleges. Since the complaint was filed in the office of the Chancellor against these three colleges, so a Committee was constituted by the Vice Chancellor to enquire into it. It is very unfortunate that some people tried to give it a communal colour. Not going by what they say, their conscious should be clear that they did not want either to harm anybody or favour anybody. Let they not give them more than 15 days time to respond to whatever has been reported by the Committee. Whatever reply is received from them, even if it is three or two days before the next meeting of the Syndicate, it should

be placed before the Syndicate to enable it to take the decision as to what further course of action is required to be taken. Why he is saying, as to what course of action to be decided, he has told two alternatives, but it is just possible that on the basis of their response, they might have to proceed in accordance with Regulation 11.1 only, because sometime they may say that they could not do this or that. Probability has been there that they would try to counter everything, which has been reported by the Enquiry Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Enquiry Report could be accepted on these lines and point-wise reply would be sought from the Colleges concerned.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the representation dated 25.1.2019 of S.D.P. College, which they have received, has been made by Director, S.D.P.College for Women, Ludhiana, whereas no such posts existed in any of the affiliated colleges. From this, the intention of the college could be gauged. It seems that the Managements have nexus in the University. They should have countered this letter instead of circulating the same amongst the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could not stop anybody from writing. As per the provisions of the University Calendar, the only Nodal agency between the University and the College is the Principal, but anybody other than him/her, whether he/she is the President of the Management or Director of the college, they have not to entertain any communication from them. But it is really unfortunate that a letter written by so called Director, of which no such nomenclature existed in the University Calendar, has been circulated as an official document by the University. Such a practice, should immediately be stopped and they should only entertain the communication written by the Principal or the Officiating Principal. The letter written dated 25.1.2019 written by the Director, which has been circulated to them, should be treated as withdrawn.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is need of a support system. A lot of complaints have been made in the Police and Vigilance by the teachers as well as from the non-teaching staff. They should ensure that teachers are paid full salary.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could send a team to the College later on when this whole activity would end up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have a mechanism for that also. One option, as he has already told, is appointing two representatives of the University on the Management of the College. Another option is periodical inspection, but he did not know why they are not implementing it. But to send a team, where a team had already been visited, would, probably, send a message that many more such Committees would visit. So, that should not be the spirit. But they should also introspect as to why the Colleges have gone to the extent of disobeying the University. The basic idea is why the University is not asking the financial statement of the colleges every year which is mandatory as per the Calendar. That financial condition is improving from the income from hostels. The balance sheet in all respects has to be submitted to the University. Every time, the Colleges are not able to pay the salaries. On being asked, he said that earlier, before his (Vice Chancellor) joining the University, it was done.

However, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said, no, it was not done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was done earlier, it was a regular practice, in a phased manner, it stopped, they started ignoring for which they are responsible and he is not denying the fact. The Calendar is the same today.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be seen.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the Dean College Development Council should take action on this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the College Managements themselves are saying that they do not have funds to pay salary, so they would stand exposed.

The Vice Chancellor said that financial statements in respect of all these three colleges would be sought.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when they would ask the comments from the Colleges, along with it, all the mandatory information in the chapter of affiliated colleges should also be sought.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the S.D.P. College, there is four types of staff. The staff under grant-in-aid was paid salary till they keep getting the grant. The staff from whom the money is to be taken back, they were given salary till June, 2018. The non-teaching staff which is working there was paid salary upto October, 2018. They were told that if they would return the money, only then they would be paid the salary.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that all these things are there in the report.

When Shri Harpreet Singh Dua was told that there are many more items to discuss, he said this is a very important item. The items relating to the Colleges normally not discussed properly. He informed that the Superintendent of S.D.P. Jain College has been working there since the last 25-30 years and he is being paid a salary of Rs.2500/- p.m.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said, let the colleges reply first.

The Vice Chancellor said that in case they have to really put the colleges on the right track, they should give the points, which are in their minds related to the college; otherwise, these would run as they are running. Because of them, he has got some courage. If they would not visit the Colleges, he could also not visit. Why he would put his hands in the beehive.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he must compliment that the Syndicate is hundred percent with the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor they should think about it that the College is just giving a salary of Rs.2500/- p.m. to the Superintendent. Is it a joke? It is a black spot on them.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the reports dated 14.09.2018, 20.09.2018 and 13.10.2018 submitted by the Committee in respect of (i) S.D.P. College, Ludhiana, (ii) Devki Devi Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana, and (iii) Atam Valabh Jain College, Ludhiana, be accepted and action be taken by the Colleges Branch;
- (ii) the College Branch be instructed to entertain only those letters which are written by Principal. Accordingly, letter No. SDPC/19/4677 dated 25.1.2019 written by Director, S.D.P. College for Women, Daresi Road, Ludhiana, be not entertained;

- (iii) Financial statement and other mandatory information of all colleges, as stipulated in the regulations of Panjab University Calendar, be asked from all the affiliated Colleges.

28.

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 was enclosed.
- B.** 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.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is one of those Colleges which are the biggest defaulters.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what has to be done.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that on the teachers' issue, strict action should be taken against the college. As regards the Co-education status, this issue should be taken up separately.

Dr. K.K. Sharma, however, said that they should see by merging both the issues at A and B.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they were admitting upto 1500 students. They were allowed co-education status for one year.

On being asked by Shri Jagdeep Kumar that action on the issues of teachers should be taken, Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should take action on all the issues.

The Vice Chancellor said that the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Professor Navdeep Goyal also endorsed the viewpoint of the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know that if this item is to be deferred, when it would be taken up again to which the Vice Chancellor said that it would be taken up in the next meeting. He further said that they should see the urgency as some of the teachers have been removed from service.

The Vice Chancellor said that this item could be put at the beginning of the agenda items.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the same procedure should be followed for this College also as has been stated by Shri Ashok Goyal for the other three Colleges mentioned in the earlier item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that their issue was different.

RESOLVED: That consideration of Item 28 on the agenda, be deferred.

29. Considered if the proposal dated 12.11.2018 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of Honorary Director, Publication Bureau, with regard to provision of increasing the discount on the sale-price of Text Books/General Books to increase the income of the Publication Bureau, be approved as per (**Annexure**).

Professor Rajesh Gill said instead of giving discount, they should improve their functioning. The quality of books should be good so that there is demand for these books. Discount is no solution. She reiterated that there is need to improve the functioning of their Publication Bureau. It is not good to sell the books just by giving discount.

Shri Rajat Sandhir said that the Panjab University earns a lot of money out of the sale of books.

It was informed that the Committee has recommended discount for student to enhance the sale of books.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the discount has been recommended for Fellows and other employees. Then the Finance & Development Officer put a query as to how much would be the profit. The file was again put to the F.D.O. by mentioning the profit

etc. The file was okayed by the F.D.O. in view of the explanation given by the office. But she is unable to understand it, because it is a very short term solution. They should strengthen such institutions.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a very good suggestion. They could let this lot through and after that it could be reviewed.

Professor Rajesh Gill said the Vice Chancellor could do as he deemed fit, but it is very unfortunate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that 8 or 15 percent discount is a margin of the seller. The non-registered or the registered re-sellers have to incur so many other expenses. As such, nobody would be ready to work on the discount of 8 or 15%.

Professor Rajesh Gill said they should also see that the discount to Fellows etc. is to the tune of upto 50% which is much more.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they might not approve the discount to Fellows etc.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they could neither save anything earlier nor they would be able to save anything even now.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the fact is that they are in a very pathetic state. They have to evolve some system.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members as to what should be done in this matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that basically let them improve the quality. Otherwise, it is like clearance a sale, but this is also good as the idea is to earn revenue. Let them see and accept these recommendations. But, are they sure that the sale would increase? So, what should have been recommended is that with these projected discounts, they are able to earn this much of amount? Suppose, they decide to enhance these discounts and if still the position remains the same, that would, probably, embarrass them. It seems that there is no projected figure that if they do it, this much respective buyers would be there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, as teacher they are allowed to buy books from the re-sellers and the University expects that the teachers would buy the books on 10 or 15% discount. Naturally, the discount to the re-seller should be more, the discount to them is already less.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he would like to say is that even if the discount is given to the tune of 50%, are they sure that the books could be sold?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if someone gets a good book, it is okay. In fact he is planning this for future.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item is for discount on the existing books.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there should be some model.

Principal Gurdip Kumar said that the Publication Bureau of Punjabi University, Patiala is very successful as they print quality books. However, he did not know why the books of Panjab University Publication Bureau are not selling. They should get the

model of Punjabi University studied to find out the reason as to why they are so successful.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they should evolve some long term system.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be considered as a business model to sustain for a long time.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members as to what they should do now.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that at the Punjabi University, they have printed about six thousand title books. They have printed books in all subjects such as Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, including the encyclopaedia etc. The books at the Publication Bureau of Panjab University are so old that there is no idea of their being sold. Nobody has interest in these old books. For example, Mohan Singh Diwana Book was printed by Panjab University, but that is not available. If that book is printed again, he thinks that the same could be sold even without giving any discount. The Publication Bureau had printed very good books, such as History of Punjabi Literature, it has also published some good dictionaries.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what should they do now?

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that six months ago, all the Senators were given a book free of cost. He was surprised to see all this. He did not know under what process that book was printed and what was its marketing and who was the person behind it. But to his mind, about Rs.5-7 lacs would have been spent on its printing. Before printing, they must see as to what is the use of that book?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the whole issue should be got reviewed by constituting a Committee.

Professor S.K. Sharma said they should also include person(s) from the P.U Library.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Dr. Harjodh Singh, who is Head of the Department of Punjabi in Punjabi University, Patiala, should be entrusted to bring the model adopted by Punjabi University, Patiala.

Shri Ashok Goyal said now they have received the input and also the observations of the office. He suggested a three-member Committee should be formed which should have interaction with Publication Bureau and also see the feasibility of selling the books on discount and the amount of discount.. He suggested the names of Professor Rajesh Gill, Professor S.K. Sharma, Dr. Harjodh Singh and Professor Rajat Sandhir.

However, Professor S.K. Sharma requested to recues him from the Committee as it would be difficult for him to attend as he would have to travel for 30 Km from his residence. However, he requested to include the name of Professor Navdeep Goyal in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Professor Rajesh Gill has already a lot of work as she is member of many other Committees. In some of the Committees, the quorum remains incomplete.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested to include the name of Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu in the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when a Committee of 16-17 persons is constituted, it is difficult to complete the quorum, that is why he has suggested a three member Committee only.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that one member from the P.U Library must be included as they used to purchase books.

On being requested by some members to include the name of Professor Rajat Sandhir, the Vice Chancellor said the Professor Rajat Sandhir is already over-burdened. Everybody should be given the chance.

Shri Ashok Goyal reiterated that the Committee should comprise Professor Rajesh Gill, Professor S.K. Sharma, Dr. Harjodh Singh and Professor Rajat Sandhir.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that Professor Rajesh Gill, one Professor from humanities i.e. Professor Gurpal Singh should be made the Chairperson of the Committee. However, some members suggested that Professor Rajesh Gill should be made the Chairperson of the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Chairperson of the Committee should not be Professor Gurpal Singh.

Professor S.K. Sharma reiterated to include some person(s) from the P.U. Library.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to who is the head of Publication Bureau in these days. It was told that Professor Gurpal Singh is the Head of Publication Bureau.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the books which could not be sold, the other way to dispose off such is books is that when there is some prize distribution function, some books could be given to the students.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the affiliated colleges should be requested to purchase these books.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that a list of books should be put on the University website as most of the people do not have the knowledge about these books.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. Murtunjay Kumar may also be included in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor S.K. Sharma has given a very good suggestion the affiliated Colleges should also purchase these books.

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

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the colleges could purchase only those books which are required, however, it should not be compulsory for them.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it should be left to Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, let the Committee find the via-media as to how these books could be sold.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the proposal dated 12.11.2018 of Honorary Director, Publication Bureau, with regard to provision of increasing the discount on the sale-price of Text Books/General Books to increase the income of the Publication Bureau, be approved;
- (ii) that a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to visit Punjabi University, Patiala to study the system for the sale of books; and
- (iii) the following Committee be constituted to explore the possibility of enhancing the sale of books:-
 - (a) Professor Rajesh Gill
 - (b) Professor Rajat Sandhir
 - (c) Professor Navdeep Goyal
 - (d) Professor Gurpal Singh
 - (e) Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, P.U. Library

30.

Considered if Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma K. Sharma, Principal (retired on 31.12.2018) G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector 32-C, Chandigarh, be re-appointed, being peculiar situation as such on contract basis for the period till the new Principal is appointed after holding the interview. Information contained in office note **(Appendix-XIX)** was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: A copy of legal opinion obtained from Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Legal Retainer, P.U., was enclosed **(Appendix-XIX)**.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that his first query is that this item should not have come to the Syndicate. It has reason, either this item has been brought intentionally or it has come here by mistake. The Syndicate in 2014 decided that those Principals who have completed the age of 60 years, though it was a wrong decision and they have been objecting to that decision till today, had decided that the interview for the new Principal in place of the retiring Principal would be held before his retirement. Further, if the Selection Committee says that none was found suitable, extension may be granted. But in this case, either it was unfortunate for Principal Bhushan that he missed the train or there might be some other reason. Due to one or the other reasons, the interview which was fixed for 14th December, could not be held before 31st of December. Now he has retired on 31st December, 2018. The Management of the College passed a resolution that they have re-employed Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma, due to peculiar circumstances and requested the University to consider it. Thereafter, legal opinion was sought from Shri Anmol Rattan Sidhu. He has failed to understand, what was the necessity to have the legal opinion? Why the legal opinion was taken and under whose pressure it was taken. Thereafter, the item was put in the Syndicate agenda. The earlier decision of the Syndicate, which they had opposed, is being in vogue even today. In the case of Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma, even if they have to implement the earlier decision, it should have been done that the interview which was postponed, that should got conducted. In that interview either someone would be selected. However, if no one is selected, the senior-most teacher should officiate as Principal. But Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma is not eligible for re-employment and he has been re-employed under that wrong resolution.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma is like his elder brother and he has all respects for him. He is also from the Commerce stream and he prayed for him all success in his life and he should rise beyond the post of Principal. But, India is a democratic country and democracy is the rule of law. There are three regulatory authorities which indicate the retirement policy i.e. first, Punjab

Government, which says that no one could be reappointed after the age of 60 years, second, the Panjab University Calendar which says that no extension could be given beyond 60 years and the third are the UGC Regulations, which say that re-employment could be done in the case of Assistant Professor, Association Professor and Professor. Further, the UGC has said that the post of Principal is a term post. He failed to understand where from the word re-employment of Principal has come. In the Year 2014, the Syndicate in its wisdom had decided that if a person with 400 API score is not available, temporary arrangement could be made. But now it has been becoming a permanent feature and it is encroachment upon the rights of the teachers. The zeal amongst the teachers is going to cease. In case, zeal ceases in some society, it comes to an end. The number of students is already decreasing. There is always a desire in the mind of a teacher to become Principal, that is also going to cease. What has been done in this case, is a colourful exercise to accommodate some person. He would like to have the comments of PUTA President on the issue as he himself is the Executive Member of Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers Union. So, her comments are must on the issue where the teachers are feeling suffocated.

Professor Rajesh Gill, however, said that he (Dr. K.K. Sharma) could not force her.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Syndicate in 2014 had resolved that the Principals were not available as the UGC has made some new rules. If they see even today, there are about 190 Colleges and Principals are available only in 100 Colleges. About 10 Principals are working on re-employment under this process and about 80 positions are still vacant. The Syndicate at that time had passed that rule, as per the situation prevailing at that time. As has been said by Shri Jagdeep Kumar that the advertisement should have been done, interview should have been conducted, but if in the interview, none found suitable, the Management, if wishes, could re-employ the Principal. Earlier, it was for one year, but later on it was extended to two years. Thereafter, the same process needed to be repeated and extension in re-employment could be done for another two years. Lastly, it could be done for another one year. Thus, the total period of re-employment could be extended upto a maximum of five years. The situation in respect of GGSDS.College, Sector 32 is more peculiar. The College advertised the position of Principal in time and thereafter, also fixed the date of interview. But, in the meantime, by giving the reference of a UGC letter, the UT Administration said that this interview could not be held on the scheduled date and they would not send their representative for the Selection Committee meeting. Thus, the University has to take a decision to stop the interview fixed for 14th. Now, as has been said by Shri Jagdeep Kumar, he also would like to say the same thing that there is no fault of Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma. At the present time, they could say that GGSDS College, Sector-32, Chandigarh is the best college affiliated to Panjab University. If the Management feels that the leadership should be the best, keeping this in mind, allowed Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma to work as Principal, till the interview is held and they find a suitable person, he does not think anything wrong in it and he (Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma) has just got natural justice.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that on 5th of January, the College sent 18 CAS cases to the Director Higher Education, but all those cases were rejected. They accepted those cases only after those were sent under the signatures of Officiating Principal.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that Professor Navdeep Goyal has talked about the decision of 2014. At that time, he was also a member of the Syndicate. When this issue came up for consideration, many good decisions were taken. The situation before 2014 was different because the persons with 400 API score were not available. Thereafter, a decision was also taken that now many persons have become eligible, the University should put the names of such persons on the P.U. website. Simultaneously, the University would also put the names of those colleges on the website where the

vacancies of Principals are available. But this has not been implemented so far. Though, they are not against Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma or anyone else, but he requested that keeping in view the present situation, whether any decision taken at that time due to peculiar circumstances, should be relooked. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor as to what should be done in this case, he said that it is a peculiar situation.

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Naresh Gaur whether he is in favour of it or he is against it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he is not in favour of permanent re-employment, only temporary arrangement could be done.

The Vice Chancellor while clarifying the point raised by Shri Naresh Gaur said that he (Shri Naresh Gaur) would like to say that the decision taken in 2014 should be revisited to which Shri Naresh Gaur said, 'yes'. The second issue is, as to what decision they have to take in this case.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should not allow re-employment for a long time. If the Management says that they are not able to find a suitable person, it does not mean that they could re-employ a person for 5 or 10 years. So, they should put some restriction on it and hold the interview.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this institute is the diamond in the crown of Panjab University. In the States of Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir and maybe Rajasthan, this is the only institute with A⁺ grade. Even the Panjab University is not A⁺ grade. Further, this institute has 80th position in all India ranking.

The Vice Chancellor asked, what is to be done now.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma is not at fault in this matter. The Management had asked to conduct the interview, but they could not do it. Now, the institute could not be left like this and put under some person who cannot keep its sanctity. It would be an injustice to that institute as well as to the University. So, till the new arrangement is made, Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma should be allowed to work as Principal, otherwise, the institutes would think 10 times before seeking affiliation to this University.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said, it meant that a person is above the institution, which is totally wrong and he objected to it.

Dr. K.K. Sharma informed that the CGPA of A.S. College, Khanna is 3.51 which is more than the CGPA of GGSD College, Sector-32. A person could not be so important that in his absence, the sun could not rise. It has always been the situation. They used to say, who after Nehru and who after Indira Gandhi.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that different persons come, but the institutions keep on going. It might be his (Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma) bad luck that the interview could not be held before the date of his retirement.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Shri Naresh Gaur and Professor Navdeep Goyal has stated that about 60-70 Colleges are without Principals. They are not advertising the posts. The number of re-employed Principals is about 7-8. First of all, they should ask the Colleges as to why they are not appointing the Principals. The teachers are just waiting for their turn, but the colleges do not advertise the post even.

He requested that vacant positions should be got advertised and the interviews conducted within a month or two, but these interviews should be held at the earliest.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the interviews for the posts of Principals should be got conducted in a time-bound manner, which looks like a best solution.

The Vice Chancellor asked, time-bound means, what?

The members said, at the earliest, as soon as possible.

Dr. Harjodh Singh said that Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma may be given re-employment and the interview should be conducted in a time-bound manner.

Shri Sandeep Singh also said that Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma should be given re-employed and the interview be held in a time-bound manner.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that on this part particularly, they had decided in the meeting of the Senate held in the month of December that a Committee would be formed to formulate a policy regarding re-appointment of Principals. The Vice Chancellor had himself approved it. In fact, they had felt happy when the Vice Chancellor had given his consent for constitution of 3-4 members Committee to examine and see whether the Principals are to be re-employed or not. However, no Committee has been constituted so far. It had also been told that the procedure for appointment of Principals in the Colleges of Education is entirely different from the Degree Colleges. For them also, a Committee is needed to be constituted. Had the Committee be formed and issue sorted out whether re-employment is to be given or not, the item would not have been before the Syndicate? The teachers, who are seeing all this, are getting demotivated. He remarked that some Principals are being re-employed and some are not. Had the policy been there, such a problem could not arise?

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Harpreet Singh Dua) meant to say that they needed to appoint a Committee for the formulation of policy on the issue. He; however, asked Shri Dua to tell as to what is to be done in the case under consideration.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that no extension/re-employment should be given to the Principals beyond the age of 60 years and up to 65 years, and this is their stand from the very beginning.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to take up the matter in its totality. He (Vice Chancellor) has narrowed it down that what is to be done in this case. Actually, there are two issues – (i) decision which was taken in 2014, which is being called illegal decision by certain people, wrong by certain others and not tenable by certain others. In fact, that decision is of the Syndicate, and the same is in vogue even in 2019. Now, it is not within the purview of the Syndicate or for that matter in anybody's purview to go out of that rule because it is still in existence. He agreed with Shri Jagdeep Kumar that why this item has come to the Syndicate, when the University had told the College not to go ahead with the interview, though it is true that the College had requested. They had postponed the interview, but till interview is held, it is resolved that the present incumbent would continue. The Vice Chancellor, keeping in view the circumstances, which were beyond the rationale given in 2014, has placed the matter before the Syndicate. In 2014, it was that only after inviting the applications through advertisement and holding the interview, if nobody suitable or eligible is found, the incumbent would be allowed to continue. However, here the situation is, which was not envisaged by the then Syndicate that interview would not be conducted, which has happened in the case under consideration. However, the office, maybe, at the instance of the Vice Chancellor or otherwise, did take a very safe passage by seeking legal

opinion. After taking the legal opinion, the item has come to the Syndicate that whether to allow him to continue till the interview is held. This is the only issue. Everybody is saying that the interview be conducted in a time bound manner. They wanted to hold the interview before 31st December 2018, but the University told them not to hold the interview. Once they had said not to hold the interview, and now they are saying that the interview be conducted in a time bound manner. Obviously, when the path would be cleared for the University, the interview would be held. Without casting any aspersions on the senior-most teacher there or other eligible teachers, maybe they are much better than the present incumbent, he is not taking anybody's name, in view of the Management which is to run the College, if it is in their view, the institution could be safeguarded only with a permanent Principal to be appointed or as an alternative they wanted to continue with the present incumbent, the University must support such Managements in continuing the excellence of such Colleges. Dr. K.K. Sharma has told that A.S. College, Khanna has got grade of 3.51 from the NAAC. He would like to tell them that there are many Colleges, which have secured more than 3.51 grade. They have no alternative but to accede to the request of the Management. Though everybody is saying that they have regard for Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma and has nothing against him, he wondered when the rule is there, could they go against it? When they are not against the rule, it is nothing but to oppose Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma and they are saying that they have nothing against Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma. So far as the matter of policy is concerned, any decision which has been taken by the University, if needed to be revisited, it could be revisited, but until that rule is revisited and revised, in view of the existing rule, they have no alternative but to accede to the request of the College.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that actually, it is the position they take. It depended how one viewed the position. She agreed with these two gentlemen (Dr. K.K. Sharma and Shri Jagdeep Kumar), who are taking into consideration the view of the teachers as the teachers also needed promotions. The Managements position is that they view the situation in a different manner. However, she is of the opinion and is always of the opinion that they should go by the Regulations and Rules. As is being said by others, interview should be held and Principal is to be appointed on regular basis. Until it is done, he (Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma) could continue, but they must go by the Regulations and Rules.

Dr. K.K. Sharma stated that he is talking only about the Regulations and Rules. The scheme for re-employment, which was approved by the Syndicate in the year 2014, has not been notified by the Government of India. Shri Ashok Goyal has said that P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, is like a Bible. Until Volume-I is amended, there is no relevance of the Syndicate decisions. If they got nod from the Government of India, they have no objection in the implementation of the decision as also for formulation of a comprehensive policy. Even if the age of superannuation of teachers is to be made 55 years, and 65 years of the Principals, that could be done, but after the decision of the Syndicate, the same should be got approved from the Government of India, and then implement it prospectively and not retrospectively.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that, in fact, he meant to say that not only P.U. Calendar, Volume-I is like a Bible, but the other Calendars, i.e., Volume-II and III are also like Bible.

Dr. Inderjit Kaur said that she is of the view that the Institution should not be put to a loss. To run the Institution, there is a role of the Management, Principal and the teachers. They have to function keeping in view all this as also what the Regulations and Rules say. So far as re-employment to Principals is concerned, keeping in view the fact that when they had already given re-employment to certain persons, they should not take a strict stand suddenly.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu stated that from the discussion two points have emerged, when in the year 2014, it was decided that re-employment be given to the Principals, the background was that the eligible Principals were not available and the situation has not improved till date. There are certain good people, who wished to go only to the good Colleges. However, there are several Colleges, where nobody wished to go, but the situation of this College (GDSD College, Sector 32, Chandigarh) could not be such where nobody is willing to go. Since it is a good College, everyone wanted to go there and here the situation is quite different from the other Institutions irrespective of whether it is the situation of 2014 or 2019. Shri Ashok Goyal has told them in detail, but he believed that they could not hold the interview owing to a technical hitch. However, it was not a fault of the Management. In fact, the Management wanted to hold the interview to appoint a good person, but owing to the technical hitch they could not hold the interview. However, they did not want to lose a good person. As soon as the hitch is removed, they be asked to hold the interview and appoint a Principal on regular basis.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu to conclude.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they waited for the meeting for many days. He requested the Vice Chancellor to listen to him (Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu).

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to meet him, but with concrete agenda so that they could reach at some decision within 10-11 minutes.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that whosoever had come to attend the meeting of the Syndicate, has come with open mind and has no personal agenda. He requested the Vice Chancellor to listen to the views of the members.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that if the technical issue, owing to which the interview could not be held, is solved, they should ask the College to hold the interview and until then the present incumbent should be allowed to continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that the decision, which had been taken in the year 2014, should be revisited.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma jointly said that, that is not a part of the agenda.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is saying so because certain members have talked about that. Hence, it is not that they could not revisit the decision, which is not on the agenda.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar stated that first of all, they should not take any decision on the issue just on the basis of majority view, but on the basis of logic. Secondly, Shri Ashok Goyal has said that they have no alternative, but to allow the present incumbent to continue. Why have they no alternative? Citing an example, if there is a glass half filled with water, it depended on one's perspective and one could say it half filled and another half empty. He is saying again and again that it has not happened by chance or coincidentally that Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma could not take advantage even of the wrong decision. It is either his (Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma) fault or of the circumstances. Now, the issue is simple, if they wanted to hold the interview in a time bound manner, they could do that, but one thing should be crystal clear that he (Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma) should not continue under any circumstances. The interview should be held, and if one is selected, it is okay and even if one is not found suitable, in that situation also the senior-most teacher of the College should officiate as Principal. He is reiterating that Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma has missed the opportunity by chance or coincidentally, and thus he would remain out. If they allowed him to

continue, it would be a wrong decision and with that they would always feel guilty. He urged that they should take the decision by listening to their conscience.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they must take into account the view of the Management also.

To this, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that why should they take into consideration the Management view? He is not at all in agreement with the viewpoint expressed by Professor S.K. Sharma.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the viewpoint(s) of each and every member should be sought.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that in all the three Colleges, Managements are there, but where it is suitable to them, the person concerned is a crown and at others places it is not. It is totally wrong. In fact, they are unnecessarily giving importance to the Managements, to which they are totally against.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that until Principal on regular basis is appointed, Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma should be allowed to continue.

To this, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said, "No, No". When one of the members suggested that the conduct of interview for the post of Principal should be made time bound, Shri Jagdeep Kumar and Dr. K.K. Sharma said that whether it is made time bound or not, it did not matter, but he should not be allowed to continue under any circumstances.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that they have to take the majority view to clinch the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should take into consideration as to what the majority view is there. Though the issue has been resolved, Shri Jagdeep Kumar has certain serious issues.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that nothing has been resolved so far; otherwise, he would disclose certain things, which would not be in the interest of anyone. He is keeping quiet, but if they allow Dr. Bhushan to continue, he would disclose as to why they are in favour of re-employment, which is known to them as well as to him. It is so simple that everybody has own vested interest.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to think on the issue seriously. If someone says so many things leisurely, it is not good. Everybody could say anything. This is the view of one section, but at the same time there is a strong and extreme view of other section. If they did not agree, they have every right to say that they did not agree. However, to say that if they did this, he would do this and that, that probably would not be in a good taste.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that as has been said by Professor S.K. Sharma that it is necessary to approve this, they would approve this item with the condition that the policy of re-employment of Principals would be reviewed.

To this, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this issue is not on the agenda.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that what is the benefit of their being teachers.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that then they should go by the logic.

Dr. K.K. Sharma asked that then where are the rules/regulations for re-employment of Principals. The rules/regulations are there for re-employment of teachers, which they are not allowing, whereas the post of Principal is a tenure post, where they are giving the re-employment. He urged the members to take into consideration their (teachers) interests also.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that for all intents and purposes, the Principal is a teacher first, which could be verified from the Calendar.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that he had already seen the Calendar and did not find it anywhere. He had found that a teacher, including Principal, could not go beyond the age of 60 years. As per UGC, if one could go beyond the age of 60 years, it is only the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, who could go beyond 60 years of age.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that re-employment policy also existed in the University.

To this, Dr. K.K. Sharma said that University is a separate issue as Principals did not exist in the University system.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if they wished so, the re-employment policy of the University should also be reviewed.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the re-employment policy is for the teachers and not for the Principals and the Vice Chancellors.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma reiterated that for all intents and purposes, the Principal is first a teacher.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the UGC has made the provision for re-employment designation-wise specifically for Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor and not for the Principal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is nowhere written that the re-employment is not for Principals.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired as to where the Principal has been barred from re-employment.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the post of Principal is a tenure/term post.

Professor Rajat Sandhir asked as to why they did not hold the interviews in time.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that even the Principals also take 2-3 periods a day. As such, first he/she is the teacher and then Principal.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is with him (Shri Jagdeep Kumar), but he was on camera when he cast personal aspersions that they have vested interests.

Many of the members suggested that interview for the post of Principal at GGSDS College, Chandigarh, should be got conducted in a time bound manner.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar urged the Vice Chancellor to go with his advice that they should take a decision on the basis of logic. Since the approval is to be given by the Vice Chancellor, he should reconstitute the panel as it is the prerogative of the Vice Chancellor and not the Syndicate. He urged the Vice Chancellor to use his power and see that justice is given to the teachers. To say that individual is higher than the Institution, is wrong.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he had an objection to this. Already people had cast aspersions relating to this case on the Vice Chancellor, Registrar, Controller of Examinations and the Dean, College Development Council, which is a shame. What is this? This meant, everybody in the University is corrupt.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that he did not call them corrupt to all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that he (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) has not said that the Principals are corrupt; rather, he has said it about the Colleges.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar reiterated that individual is not above the Institution.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that since it is first meeting, they should not behave like this.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar suggested that either they should take a rational decision or authorize the Vice Chancellor to take a rational decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not accept the authorization.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar suggested that the interview should be got conducted at the earliest in the time bound manner, where someone either would be selected and if not, the senior-most teacher should be allowed to officiate as Principal. Since he (Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma) has by chance missed the train, he could not take it now.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the management would act in accordance with the rules.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the rule is that the interview is to be conducted before the retirement of the present incumbent, but technically, it could not be held.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if one is selected in the interview, it is okay and if not, hereinafter the din prevailed again.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that if the Management or the President of the Management wishes, they could appoint him either Vice-President or something else. His only concern is that Dr. Bhushan Kumar Sharma should not continue under any circumstances as he has already missed the train.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that it is his (Shri Jagdeep Kumar) view and the Vice Chancellor is already aware about the views of other members, and he should now clinch the issue.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that Shri Jagdeep Kumar had said that everybody has vested interests.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that what he meant to say was that certain persons have vested interests.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that in the year 2014, the Syndicate took a decision with regard to re-employment of Principals, whether the same has been approved by the Government of India and notified. If it has not been notified, could that be enforced?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it could be enforced because the policy of re-employment irrespective of University teachers and Principals of affiliated Colleges, the same has been entertained by the Government.

It was said that as the majority of the members are in favour of this item, the item be approved.

However, Dr. K.K. Sharma suggested that it should be further resolved that the policy of re-employment of Principals be reviewed.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that in case the decision is to be taken on the basis of majority, they would come prepared that since the decision is to be taken on the basis of majority, they would not speak.

It was informed that interview would be conducted at the earliest.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that then it should be made clear that if the interview is held and none is found suitable, would the present incumbent continue? There would also be ambiguity in the resolved part.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said, "Yes". However, the post of Principal would be re-advertised.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that, that is the problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they would act as per rules.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that there is a problem in the rules, and the amendment is to be made in the rules that since the retirement date is already over, the matter should be placed before the Syndicate. If it remained so, the people would interpret it wrongly. If they do not want to listen to his request, their dissent should be recorded.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that his dissent should also be recorded.

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

Dr. K.K. Sharma and Shri Jagdeep Kumar got their dissent recorded.

31.

Considered request dated 30.10.2018 of Principal, CGM College Mohlan, Sri Muktsar Sahib, with regard to creation of Examination Centre (CGM College Mohlan) for conduct of semester system examination, December 2018. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Earlier, the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 24) considered the report dated 12.08.2017 of the Inspection Committee constituted by the affiliation Committee in respect of surprise visit at CGM College, Mohlan, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib, with regard to

infrastructure and grant of temporary extension of affiliation in the various courses/subject and it was resolved that:

- (i) the matter related to C.G.M. College, Mohlan be referred to the Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University, along with the relevant papers;
- (ii) the College be asked to submit status report in respect of teachers, staff and students since its opening;
- (iii) examination centre from the College be shifted to a suitable place;
- (iv) no new course be allotted to the College till a final decision in the matter;
- (v) proper guidelines of the requirements for grant of affiliation be framed and provided to the Affiliation Committees.

The above recommendations of the Syndicate were noted and approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 16.12.2017 (Para XXXIII I-134).

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para 42) considered the request dated 15.01.2018 of the Principal, CGM College, Mohlan, Sri Muktsar Sahib with regard to not shifting the Examination Centre (CGM College Mohlan) for the session May, 2018 and it was resolved that the consideration of the be deferred.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that a three members Committee had made a surprise visit of the College. Though the College had admitted 500 students, the Committee found only 30 students in the College. The Committee also saw the record of students admitted during the last year and found that they had admitted 1600 students, and the major allegation against the College was that they only admitted the students, but the students never attended the classes. This College is situated in the rural area. The situation has reached at such a saturated points that after the admission, when the students are to appear in the examinations, the flying squads are misguided by the local persons, who are deployed on the Highways by the College Administration. At that time, they were of the opinion that the College is a fit case for disaffiliation. However, keeping in mind the services of teachers and the career of the students, it was decided that at least the examination centre of boys should be disbanded from the College. Moreover, once the examination centre is disbanded by the Syndicate, the same should not be recreated without the permission of the Syndicate. Even if the examination centre is to be created, the prescribed procedure is to be followed, which has not been followed in this case.

A couple of members suggested that the case be placed before the Syndicate again after following the proper procedure for re-creation of examination centre, and until then the consideration of the item should be deferred.

It was informed that everything has been made clear in the office note. In view of the office note if (i) regarding creation of examination centre at CGM College, Mohlan is approved, a Committee would be got constituted for inspection of the College for re-creation of examination centre.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should be informed the circumstances which had necessitated for re-creation of examination centre at the College again.

To this, it was informed that the College has given an undertaking that they have streamlined the whole system and the admissions have also been reduced, which would be verified, if allowed by the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the request dated 30.10.2018 of Principal CGM College Mohlan, Sri Muktsar Sahib, with regard to creation of Examination Centre (CGM College Mohlan) for conduct of semester system examination, December 2018, be kept pending and they be asked to follow the procedure.

32. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the name of following examiners, be approved to evaluate the published work submitted by Dr. S.S. Bhatti for award of Degree of Doctor of Literature, in term of Regulation 4 at page 197 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007:

1. Professor P.S.N. Rao
Director
School of Planning & Architecture, Delhi
2. Professor P.S. Channi
Head of Department
Department of Architecture and Planning
Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkee
3. Professor Alok Ranjan
Professor of Architecture
MNIT, Jaipur-30217
Residential Address:
Flat No. 202
Emeralad Akkshita

NOTE: A detailed office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).

It was informed that Dr. Bhatti belonged to the discipline of architecture, but he has applied for the D.Litt. degree. The item has been placed before the Syndicate for appointment of examiners for which three names have been given.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired as to who has given these names. Since the degree of D.Litt. is to be awarded, the examiners should be from the IITs, etc.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested that they should be given the background of the case.

It was informed that this item is pending since June 2018. The only procedure which has not been followed is that the examiners have not been got approved from the Syndicate, though the examiners had been ticked by the former Vice Chancellor. When the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor noticed this, he asked to give the report which is available at pages 362-364. There were 9-10 names. Earlier, the thesis was sent for evaluation, but the office had some reservations, which have also been mentioned in the office note. The names of the examiners have been ticked from a list which contained 10 names. Out of these 10 examiners, the previous examiners had nothing to do with Architecture and Planning disciplines as one was former Vice Chancellor and another was also a former Vice Chancellor, and ultimately the process was halted by the present

Vice Chancellor. It was urged that the request should be reviewed and placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired as to who had suggested the names.

It was informed that the office did not know as to who had given the names. There were only 10 names. Those who have now been recommended belonged to Architecture discipline. If the Syndicate wished to add more names, they could do so.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the reply to the question, which is being posed by Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, has been mentioned as to who had given the names.

It was informed that the 10 names were appended at that time.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired were the names given by the candidate himself?

It was informed that the names were not given by the candidate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it has been written here that the candidate had given the names.

It was informed that the names had come to them and the thesis was sent for evaluation, but the same was not in accordance with the procedure. In fact, the procedure is that it has to be routed through the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Regulation 4 has been mentioned in the Appendix, which says that "The work submitted shall be referred to three examiners nominated by the Syndicate on the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor. The degree shall only be awarded if all three examiners recommend award of the degree".

It was clarified that till now, the thesis has not been sent for evaluation.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Controller of Examinations had come to him with the file. This was already a delay case. There was a list of 10 examiners and out of them three were ticked, but the examiners, which were ticked, were not qualified. Though he did not remember, he might have been told that since it is a delayed case, the other examiners might be ticked. It seemed that he might have ticked the names of these three examiners. According to him, the office should not have processed the case. How the Secretary to the Vice Chancellor could do this? It should have been dealt with by the concerned Department. He did not know why it has been got done from him.

It was clarified that neither the office nor the Vice Chancellor could do anything in this case. They have just to forward/recommend names to the Syndicate, and this process was earlier missed by them. Owing to this, the item has been placed before the Syndicate. Since these names are not final, more names could be added.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that one of the examiners must be from abroad.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since it is a very-very serious issue, they have to look into the matter in totality. Let they not take it only a case of appointment of examiners. They could themselves see as to what has happen as on page 361 of the appendix, it has been written that "on the above said letter dated 14.5.2018 (not diarized in the office of the Vice Chancellor), the Vice Chancellor on 31.5.2018 passed the following orders (C-23 bottom refers):

“Permitted to proceed with processing and evaluation for D.Lit. Degree”.

The said paper was not marked to any University Officer for further processing of the case according to the existing Regulations of the University and office procedures being followed in all such cases.” The letter was not diarized in the Vice Chancellor’s office. The Vice Chancellor passed the orders, but the same were not conveyed to any University Officer. Moreover, “However, Dr. Bhatti on 1.6.18, without having been formally conveyed by the University concerned office (in this case the R&S Branch who deals with the cases of scholars for determining their eligibility for Ph.D. enrolment and D.Lit. cases) that he has been permitted by the Vice Chancellor to submit his learned published research after fulfilment of the subjective requirements of spirit of Regulations 1, 2.1 and 2.2 specified above, deposited a prescribed fee of Rs.12,000/- in the relevant account (C/24 refers) and sequel to this, vide No.994.SVC/DS dated 1.6.2018, a list of Examiners, out of which three have been ticked by the Vice Chancellor and the said paper marked to “D.R. (Secrecy): **“Please get it processed without delay”** was sent in a closed envelope containing the D.Lit. case for evaluation of published work entitled **“ARCHITECTURE: Theory, Practice, Research and Pedagogy”** to the Secrecy Branch” along with the list. The candidate is writing himself. No processing, the candidate is himself giving the list of examiners. And as per page 366 of the appendix, the thesis has also been sent for evaluation. One of the examiners, Dr. S.S. Johl has given reply vide e-mail dated 25.7.18 (C/31 refers), “the thesis is already with me, I will send my evaluation report as desired”; and hence, a question arises that when the Secrecy Branch (Thesis Section) had not sent the published work to Dr. S.S. Johl till date, then who sent the published work for evaluation to this examiner and the case is submitted to the Vice Chancellor to look into the matter and decide the case accordingly so that further course of action may be undertaken”. If they took this case so lightly, that it is case of only appointment of examiners, that probably would not be proper. In para 2, it has been written that “With reference to this office note, it may remain a mystery that how the office of the Vice Chancellor sent three copies of the published work submitted by the candidate to the Secrecy Branch when the applicant had submitted four copies there, and who and how a copy was sent to the Examiner without intimating the same to the Secrecy Branch, and that too, in violation of Regulation 4 cited above as these examiners had to be marked to the Syndicate first for consideration and the case should have been dealt with strictly as per the stipulated Regulations”. In this case, they could not simply appoint the examiners.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that it is a very serious issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a very-very serious issue. An enquiry be ordered as to how this has been done. So far as the issue of evaluation of published work is concerned, the same would be decided later on.

Professor Rajat Sandhir observed that though the person is from Architecture discipline, the case is being processed for D.Lit., whereas it should be for D.Sc.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that one expert is of Biotechnology and another of Agriculture.

The Vice Chancellor said that let they conduct the enquiry first. The report of the enquiry would be placed before the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That Inquiry be ordered into the lapses pointed out by Deputy Registrar (Secrecy) in office note dated 11.9.2018 regarding submission of published work for consideration of award of degree of D.Litt. to Dr. S.S. Bhatti.

- 33.** Considered if, the request dated 18.01.2019 (**Appendix-XXI**) of Aditya Kumar, Student of M.A.-I, Semester-I, Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies and Development, duly recommended and forwarded by Chairperson of the said Department and Dr. Ameer Sultana, Fellow, P.U., for condonation of shortage of lecture in M.A.-I, Semester-I for the session 2018-19, as per Annexure-A, be approved.

NOTE: A copy of the minutes of the Board of Control dated 06.12.2018 was enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**).

RESOLVED: That the request dated 18.01.2019 of Aditya Kumar, Student of M.A.-I, Semester-I, Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies and Development, for condonation of shortage of lecture in M.A.I, Semester-I for the session 2018-19, be approved.

- 34.** Considered request of Ms. Japtesh Kaur, BE (CSE) 1st Year, PU Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, for her migration to UIET, Panjab University, Chandigarh, as a special case, for this year only and not to be quoted as precedence in future.

NOTE: 1. A copy of the minutes of Academic and Administrative Committee of Computer Science & Engineering dated 10.1.2019 was enclosed.

2. The Director, Directorate Physical Education & Sports, had examined the case and recommended her case for transfer to UIET, Chandigarh, keeping in view the facts that she is an outstanding Gymnast.

Initiating discussion, Professor Rajesh Gill said that the request of the student could not be acceded to as the Committee has said that it could not be done because there is no rule/regulation.

Professor S.K. Sharma enquired as to how they had done this? Has the student got any medal in sports?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Department has not recommended the case of the student. Normally, they did not allow without the recommendation(s) of the Department. So far as sport is concerned, no paper has been appended.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that they must maintain the sanctity of the Departmental Committees. The Departmental Committee has categorically said that it could not be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the only difference is that there the question was that of D.Lit. degree and here it is the migration. The letter has been written to the Vice Chancellor directly, and that too, has not come through proper channel from Hoshiarpur. The student has just put in her signatures. Neither the address nor the particulars have been mentioned. The letter came to the University and it has been written "Please examine and put up, Director, UIET". The student belonged to P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, but the case is put up to the Director, University Institute of Engineering & Technology. The Director, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, referred the case to the Committee, which denied. Thereafter, the office of the Vice Chancellor (through Dean of University Instruction) referred it to the Department of Sports, the job of which is to tell to certify that she is an extraordinary sportsperson, etc., is saying that, as one-time exception, not to be quoted as precedence, this case be allowed this year, as a special case. He

urged the Vice Chancellor to ensure that even rejection should also be done in accordance with the procedure, besides approval.

RESOLVED: That request of Ms. Japtesh Kaur, BE (CSE) 1st Year, PU Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, for her migration to UIET, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be **not** accepted.

35. Considered the request of Director, UILS, P.U. dated 17.01.2019 (**Appendix-XXII**) that Mr. Jashanpreet Singh and Mr. Abhishek Chaudhary, be migrated to 4th Semester of B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) to UILS, P.U. Chandigarh.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of minutes dated 16.01.2019 of the Board of Control of UILS was enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).
 2. A copy of Migration Rules for B.A./B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) 5-Year Integrated course was enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

RESOLVED: That the request of Director, UILS, P.U. dated 17.01.2019 for migration of Mr. Jashanpreet Singh and Mr. Abhishek Chaudhary from Rayat College of Law, Ropar, to University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the 4th Semester of B.Com. LL.B (Hons.), be accepted.

Item Nos. C-36 and C-37 were taken up together.

36. Considered recommendation dated 23.01.2019 of the Academic and Administrative Committee (in circulation) that Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh, be recognised as Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the subject of Botany, under the Faculty of Sciences, under the broader CRIKC Initiative.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.11.2018 (Para 26) (Appendix-) while discussing the above matter, one of the members had pointed out that the item has already been approved and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.
 2. Dean Research, vide letter No.DRES/19/129 dated 23.01.2019 had written that DIHAR has already been approved as Panjab University recognised Research Centre in the subjects of Pharmaceutical Sciences/Zoology and Chemistry.

37. Considered if, Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh, be recognised as Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh in the subject of Microbiology, under the Faculty of Sciences, under the broader CRIKC Initiative as requested by Chairperson, Department of Microbiology vide letter dated 15.11.2018.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of the recommendations dated 03.08.2018 of the Committee visited DIHAR for inspecting the Research Facilities and interacting with the Scientists involved in the Microbiological research to grant approval of DIHAR lab as a

Research Centre affiliated with Department of Microbiology, P.U. was enclosed.

2. A copy of the minutes dated 18.06.2018 of Joint meeting of Academic & Administrative Committee of the Department of Microbiology was enclosed.
3. A copy of letter dated 10.01.2019 was enclosed.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the case pertaining to Item 37, which related to recognition of Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh, as Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh in the subject of Microbiology, is properly put up. The application had come from DIHAR and marked to the Department concerned. The Departmental Committee recommended that a Committee should be formed to visit the Institution and the same was formed. The Committee visited the Institute, evaluated it and submitted a positive report. However, for the subject of Botany (Item 36), nothing like this has happened. She, therefore, suggested that Item 36 should also be processed in the similar manner.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the amount of fee, which they charged for recognition of Research Centre (especially for this Central Government Lab.), is Rs.5,000/-. Nowadays, this is just peanut, whereas they would be spending a lot of money in terms of viva, payment of airfare, etc. All the Universities in the country are charging annual fees and Professor Karamjeet Singh is aware of this. He thought that they needed to discuss the issue regarding formulating guidelines for such Institutions. In fact, they are charging minimum of Rs.1 lac for recognition of Research Centre from the Central Labs. Hence, they should look into this aspect.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that this should be revisited.

Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that they should revisit it and look into these MoUs in totality. Why should they have 5 MoUs with DIHAR and all in isolation?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the facilities needed to be checked department-wise.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that before this, all the cases where the recognitions have been granted to various Institutions by the Research Promotion Cell, had not been routed through the Departments concerned.

The Vice Chancellor said that all such cases needed to be looked into.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that such cases should be properly evaluated.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that Item 37, which related to grant of recognition to DIHAR as Research Centre in the subject of Microbiology, should be approved.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that how could they approve even Item 37 as only one teacher is there?

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not do like this. The issue should be examined in totality for which a Committee could be formed.

RESOLVED: That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee to look into the issue of recognition in totality of Defence Institute of High Altitude

Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh as Research Centre of Panjab University.

Item 38 on the agenda had been taken up along with Item 3.

- 39.** Considered if, Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXIII**) 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.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting held on 24.2.2018 (Para 22) (**Appendix-XXIII**) had resolved that Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) executed between Nottingham Trent University and Panjab University, Chandigarh, to explore future collaboration between Nottingham Business School of Nottingham Trent University and University Business School of Panjab University, be ratified.

Initiating discussion, Professor Rajesh Gill stated that this MoU is also on same pattern, i.e., personal. At page 50 of the Appendix, it has been mentioned that the fields/disciplines to be covered are “Human Rights, Law, Social Sciences, Fashion Technology, Business Management, Biomedical Sciences. She enquired whether this information was disseminated amongst the Social Sciences Departments that this is the MoU and they could avail this benefit. Was it meant only for few persons? At page 51 of the appendix, it has been mentioned that the Coordinator is Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal and the subject coordinators are Professor Swaranjit Kaur, Dr. Prabhdeep Brar and Professor Suveera Gill. This MoU remained limited to these persons. After going through the MoU today, she has come to know that this type of MoU has been executed for the Social Sciences Departments. She suggested that the members of the Committees, etc., should be made in ex-officio capacity and not in their personal capacity. In this manner, a wrong trend has commenced. She further suggested that this information should be disseminated to all the participating Departments. In future, the suggestions should be applied; otherwise, none of the Departments would be benefitted.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that extension of MoU should be done under the signatures of Dean Research and to be circulated to all the Chairpersons of the Departments.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that numerous MoUs have been executed by the University during the last few years. He suggested that at least a report should be presented to them as to how many, for what purposes, what benefits have been obtained, etc., from the MoUs executed so far. This report should be presented to the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that a list had been appended with this MoU as to who and where one had visited the foreign countries. She enquired from where the payment has been made to the visitors? This information should be provided to her.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that yearly review of all the MoUs should be got done on regular basis to assess the research carried out, faculty members who visited where and what purposes, achievements, advantages of the MoUs, etc.

RESOLVED: That –

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

40.

Considered minutes dated 12.10.2018 and 07.01.2019 (**Appendix-XXIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for finalizing the charges to be collected from the Teaching Department as well as Panjab University Campus students Council on account of cleaning/electricity/generator charges of University Auditorium.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that at page 75 of the appendix (minutes of the Committee) under recommendation (b), it has been recommended that, for cultural/academic activities of Panjab University Departments duly recommended by the concerned Chairperson and thereafter it has been written that “and signed by at least two office bearers of PUCSC for cultural/academic”. Thus, the recommendations of the Chairperson are supposed to be signed by the office bearers of PUCSC, which is totally wrong. He suggested that the words “and signed by at least two office bearers of PUCSC for cultural/academic” should be deleted.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that remuneration to Cleaner on duty after 5.00 p.m. on working day and on holiday is recommended as Rs.250/- and Rs.500/- respectively. Similar remuneration has been recommended to Multipurpose Supervisor, which is not commensurate to his position. She, therefore, suggested that the remuneration of Multipurpose Supervisor should be enhanced appropriately.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that the remuneration of Multipurpose Supervisor should be enhanced from Rs.250/- and Rs.500/- to Rs.300/- and Rs.600/- respectively.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should not be enhanced as the money is to be paid by the students.

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

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

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Vice Chancellor did not have time. The meeting of the Syndicate, which was scheduled for 27th January 2019, has to be postponed owing to unavoidable circumstances. However, none had expected that thereafter the meeting of the Syndicate would be held on 18th February 2019. In fact, that meeting should have been held within a week's time. At this point of time, they should have convened the second meeting of the Syndicate, i.e., for the month February. The Registrar should have brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor that the Committees, which have been formed today, should have been formed in the month of January in accordance with the provisions of the University Calendar.

- 41.** Considered minutes dated 22.11.2017 (Item No. 4, 9 and 13) (**Appendix-XXV**) of the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) (constituted for the year 2017), for Ministerial, Secretariat, Laboratory & Technical staff and Class 'C' staff of the University. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXV**) was also taken into consideration.

It was informed that the item related to promotion policy of Beldars and Helpers, JEs/AEs and 50% concession in payment of tuition fee to the wards of the University employees studying in the affiliated Colleges. In accordance with the recommendation, in the case of Beldars and Helpers, the condition of 10 years experience has been recommended to be reduced to 5 years. For JEs/AEs, instead of 100% promotion to the post of SDE on the basis of seniority, the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) has recommended promotion in the ratio of 50:50, i.e., 50% through promotion and 50% through selection.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired are these recommendations of JCM meeting held in the year 2017, and if so, why these are coming so late?

It was clarified that, last year, no meeting of the JCM had taken place.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his (Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma) question actually is, as to why the recommendations of the JCM meeting dated 22nd November 2017, had come to the Syndicate so late.

It was clarified that in one of the meetings held in the month of December 2018, the representatives of these persons had enquired as to why their promotions are not being made.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 22.11.2017 (Item No. 4, 9 and 13) of the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) (constituted for the year 2017), for Ministerial, Secretariat, Laboratory & Technical staff and Class 'C' staff of the University, be approved.

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

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

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Consideration of following Items (43, 44, 45, 46, 47 and 48) on the agenda was deferred:

- 43.** To consider 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 1104 of 2014.
 3. An office note was enclosed.

- 44.** To consider if, the period of absence from duty of Shri Amandeep Singh, Programmer (Senior 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 the detailed office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Senate in its meeting dated 03.11.2018 (Para X) accepted the resignation of Shri Amandeep Singh, Programmer, UIET, w.e.f. 02.04.2018 (instead of 14.03.2016).

- 45.** To consider 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 had 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 had 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) respectively approved the notional date of joining as 29.06.2010 of Dr. Naura.
4. Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura had 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) 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 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.
8. Shri Girish Agnihotri, Senior Advocate vide legal opinion dated 07.09.2018 had 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 had been done in the case of Dr. Puja Ahuja.
9. The Senate in its meeting dated 03.11.2018 (Para XII) 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 was enclosed.
11. A detailed office note containing the comparative brief history of the case of Dr. Amarjit Singh Naura and Dr. Puja Ahuja was enclosed.

46.

To consider 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 was enclosed.
5. An office note was enclosed.

47. To consider 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.

48. To consider 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.

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 30.3.2018/21.4/29.4.2018 (Para 32) which was approved by the Senate in its meeting held on 27.05.2018 (Para X).

49. Considered if, the material relating to the election of Board of Studies for the term 01.04.2019 to 31.03.2021, be sent to the Principals of the affiliated Colleges, Head/Chairperson of the teaching Departments and previous members of the Faculties through e-mode instead of hard copy. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXVII**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:** 1. Regulation 2.8 and 2.9 appearing at page 55 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, for electing the various Board of Studies, reads as under:

2.8. “the election of teachers from the affiliated Colleges of Under-graduate and Post-graduate Boards of Studies by the Faculties concerned shall be held by March 31 every alternate year by Single Transferable Vote System.

The Syndicate shall fix a date or dates on which meetings of the various Faculties shall be held for the purpose of electing Board of Studies.

The procedure for election shall be laid down in the Regulations relating to Election of Ordinary Fellows (Cal. Vol. I)

2.9. The Registrar (or a Deputy Registrar, if so appointed by the Syndicate) shall be the Returning Officer.

2. Generally, the Registrar acts as a Returning officer for the purpose and as per practice the material relating to election is sent by post to the concerned quarters, which involves huge paper work as well as expenditure. In case the material is supplied through e-mode it will save the time, paper work and financial expenditure.

It was informed that the item related to election of Board of Studies for which they send forms (in the form of hard copies) to the Principals of affiliated Colleges, and for this purpose, they have to incur a sum of Rs.36/- as postal expenditure plus expenditure on paper (copies for forms, etc.). Now, if the House permitted, they would like to send the above-said material in the form of soft copy and the Principals could down the same and print as much number of copies as they wish.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the proposal is good, but the Principals of many of the Colleges did not/do not provide the copies to the persons concerned.

It was informed that the entire material is available on the University website.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma remarked that it is should be thought of that they might not face a problem in the process of saving money.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the material relating to the election of Board of Studies for the term 01.04.2019 to 31.03.2021, be sent to the Principals of the affiliated Colleges, Head/Chairperson of the teaching Departments and previous members of the Faculties through e-mode instead of hard copy.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the entire material related to the above-said election of Board of Studies be uploaded on the Web Page of the University.

50. Information contained in **Items R-(i) to R-(x)** was read out, viz. –

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

NOTE: Ms. Shaffy Girdhar Assistant Professor in Computer Science was re-appointed (purely on contract basis), P.U. Constituent College Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. the date she will start/started work for the odd semester of session 2018-19, against the vacant post or till the post is filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier at a fixed salary of Rs. 30400/- on the same term and conditions on which she was working earlier for the session 2017-18 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.08.2018 (Para 16 R-xxiii).

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

NOTE: An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

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

NOTE: 1. Academically active report should be submitted by her after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 132 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 will be applicable.

2. The Senate decision dated 29.03.2015, item-8 (C-20) circulated vide No. 3947-4027/Esst.I dated 11.05.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.
3. Rule 3.1 appearing at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 reads as under:

“The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.

Accordingly, she has been requested to vacate the University accommodation (if any) at the earliest possible but not later than 28.02.2019.

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed that the admission of the Ms. Shreya d/o Pushpinder, B.A. 3rd semester at G.G.D.S.D. College, for the session 2017-18 be confirmed as a special case, on the basis of having compartment cleared in (B.A. 2nd semester) November, 2018 from Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, under Regulation 15 at page 19 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007.

NOTE: 1. The admission of Ms. Sherya d/o Pushpinder has been confirmed vide endst. No. 93-45/R&S dated 3.12.2018 (**Appendix-XXIX**).

2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXIX**).

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of certain teaching Department/s, for the session 2018-19:

Sr. No.	Name of the Student/ class	Department
1.	1. Ms. Snehdeep Kaur, B.Sc. (Hons.) 3 rd year, 5 th Sem. (Dec.2018) 2. Ms. Vaishali, B.Sc. (Hons.) 3 rd year, 5 th Sem. (Dec. 2018) 3. Ms. Asmita, M.Sc. (Hons.) 1 st year, 1 st Sem.(Dec. 2018)	Department of Chemistry & Centre of Advanced Studies in Chemistry

2.	1. Ms. Prodipta Sarkar, Masters in Geography- 1 st Sem. (July & Dec. 2018) 2. Ms. Nisha Nehra, Masters in Geography- 3 rd Sem. (July & Dec. 2018)	Department of Geography
3.	1. Ms. Sara Sharma, MBA (HR) 3 rd Sem. (NOV. 2018) 2. Mr. Girish Verma, MBA (IB) 3 rd Sem. (NOV. 2018) 3. Mr. Gaurvpreet, MBA 3 rd Sem. (NOV. 2018) 4. Mr. Avneesh Kumar, MBA 3 rd Sem. (NOV. 2018)	University Business School
4.	Mr. Daljit Singh M.A. II, Sem.-III (Women Studies) Session 2018-19	Department-cum-Centre for Women's Studies and Development
5.	Mr. Varinderpreet Singh MSW 1 st year 1 st semester Session 2017-18 (July-Dec. 2018)	Centre for Social Work University Institute of Emerging Area in Social Sciences

(vi) Pursuant to the orders dated 20.12.2018 (**Appendix-XXX**) of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide CWP No.27423 of 2018, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has created an additional seat to Ms. Aishwaraya Jagga for taking provisional admission in LL.M. One-Year Course.

- NOTE:** 1. Minutes dated 07.01.2019 of the Board of control is enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).
2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Committee dated 26.11.2018 (Sr. No.1) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted extension to Centre for Research and Industrial Staff Performance (CRISP), Shyamla Hills, Bhopal (M.P.) for conducting Online Cloud Based Admissions, for one year i.e. for the session 2019-20.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.04.2017 Para (40 R-Xliv) had ratified the letter No.1847/DUI/DS dated 19.04.2017 of Dean of University Instruction along with minutes dated 01.03.2017 with regard to Tender Committee for the opening of Technical and Financial bid for the implementation of "Cloud-Based Online Admission Management Services [Software as

a Service-Managed Services] for admission to Teaching Departments at Panjab University (PU), Chandigarh for the academic session 2017-18.

2. A copy of work order assigned to Centre for Research and Industrial Staff Performance (CRISP), Shyamla Hills, Bhopal, for conducting Online Cloud Based Admissions for the session 2017-18 and 2018-19 was enclosed.

3. An office note was enclosed.

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has given the officiating/additional charge of post of 'Librarian' (with administrative & financial powers) to Ms. Navjeet Kaur, Deputy Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U. (who is continuing as such after 31.03.2017 i.e. date on which she attained the age of 60 years till the final outcome of CWP filed by her) in place of Dr. Rashmi Yadav, Officiating Librarian, w.e.f. 01.02.2019 till her attaining the age of 62 year i.e. upto 31.03.2019, subject to the final outcome of her Court case.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed (**Appendix-XXXI**).

(ix) In partial modification of Office orders No. 13826-30/Estt. dated 05.11.2018 (**Appendix-XXXII**), the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has ordered that the date of implementation of pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+G.P. Rs.9000/- (at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University) already mentioned in the office orders No. 13826-30/Estt. dated 05.11.2018 regarding grant of revision of Sr. Scale/Selection Grade to Mrs. Arun Prabha, Deputy Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., be treated as 01.01.2006 instead of 01.01.2004, in accordance with the Rules/Guidelines of the UGC, 2010.

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted No Objection Certificate to Shaheed Udham Singh Panjab University Constituent College, Guru Harsahai, for installation of a Solar Power Plant fully sponsored by the Government of Punjab, on the recommendation of Mr. Gurmeet Singh Rana Sodhi, Hon'ble Minister of Sports, Punjab Government.

NOTE: An e-mail dated 31.01.2019 of Dr. N.R. Sharma, Principal, Shaheed Udham Singh Panjab University Constituent College, Guru Harsahai is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

Referring **Sub-Item R-(iii)**, Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that Dr. (Ms.) Reeta Grewal, Professor, Department of History, has been re-employed on contract basis with one day's break, whereas according to her she should have been re-employed without any break.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

Referring **Sub-Item R-(v)**, Professor Rajesh Gill said that this item also related to condonation of shortage of lectures of a student of Centre for Social Work, University Institute of Emerging Area in Social Sciences. She said that the case, which comes from the Department/Centre, should at least be recommended by the Department/Centre concerned. She pointed out that the case under consideration has just been forwarded. The name of the candidate is Mr. Varinderpreet Singh, and in the certificates, which have been appended, it has been written that “participated in Aghaz from October 20, 2018 to November 15, 2018” and medical from 12th to 24th November 2018. Both the periods are overlapping with each other. The Centre is seeking condonation of shortage of lectures of this candidate on the basis of participation in Aghaz and medical, and both the periods are overlapping with each other, which is a serious matter. The Centre/Department could not be so casual. She suggested that the case should be referred back to the Centre concerned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how the Department of Youth Welfare has given the certificate to the student for participating the ‘Aghaz’. How could it be possible that the student was ill and at the same time had also participated in the ‘Aghaz’.

Referring **Sub-Item R-(vii)**, Professor Rajesh Gill stated that extension has been granted to Centre for Research and Industrial Staff Performance (CRISP), Shyamla Hills, Bhopal (M.P.) for conducting Online Cloud Based Admissions, for one year, i.e., for the session 2019-20. She has gone through the papers and found that a Committee has been constituted to discuss online admission process to be followed. However, the observations of this are very serious – whether they have to make changes in it or not. As per minutes of the Committee dated 26.11.2018 (page 2) the mandate was to discuss online admission process to be followed by Panjab University for the academic session 2019-2020. At page 4 of the minutes, it has been recommended (recommendation 8) “that free education may be given to the grandchildren of riot victims”. Thereafter, in recommendations 10 & 11, a late fee of Rs.10,000/- and Rs.1,00,000/- have been recommended for failing to attend the first counselling and to submit online admission form for PG classes within the specified period, respectively. She enquired under which authority the above said late fees have been recommended. She further enquired that are these late fees part of the Hand Book of Information? She pointed out that the recommendations of the Committee are not in accordance with the mandate of the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, “What does this mean”? They are getting different things approved in piecemeal. Further, it has been written in the minutes of the Committee that for two years, they have been conducting the online admissions successfully. Is it a correct statement? So far as he remembered, they had faced a lot of problems during the first year.

Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Navdeep Goyal also said that the University had faced a lot of problems in making the admissions during the first year. Continuing Professor Rajesh Gill said that the job of making admissions online for the year 2017-18 was assigned to Bhopal Company and the Departments were told that they would be provided everything in online mode and they do not have to do anything regarding the admissions. However, later on everything was crashed and at the last moment, the Departments had to do everything manually. Moreover, if the Company is to be paid this much of amount, what would the staff of the Departments do? Would the staff of the Departments sit idle?

It was suggested that the Item under consideration could be withdrawn.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they had spent a sum of Rs.1 crore on this. They have Department of Computer Centre and University Institute of Engineering & Technology. Why could they not utilize the expertise of these Departments?

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the Company is using the data base created by the University.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the information contained in **Item R-(i) to R-(ii), R-(iv), R-(vi) and R-(viii) to R-(x)** on the agenda, be ratified.
- (ii) So far as **Sub-Item R-(iii)** is concerned, the same be examined by the Vice Chancellor;
- (iii) the information contained in **Item R-(v)**, be ratified with the stipulation that the case of condonation of shortage of lectures of Mr. Varinderpreet Singh, a student of Centre for Social Work, University Institute of Emerging Area in Social Sciences, be referred back to the Centre for specific recommendation/s; and
- (iv) So far as **Sub-Item R-(vii)** is concerned, the same be treated as withdrawn.

51.

Information contained in **Items I-(i) to I-(xxi)** was read out, viz. –

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, has re-appointed Mr. Pawan Kumar, as Assistant Professor in the subject of Computer Science, on contract basis, at Shaheed Udham Singh, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur, w.e.f. the date he will start work for even semester of the session 2018-19, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, at a fixed salary of Rs.30,400/-, on the same terms and conditions on which he was working earlier for the odd semester of the session 2018-19.

NOTE: An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed that B.A. (Hons.) Music (Indian Classical Dance), be introduced/started, at Post Graduate College for Girls, Sector-42, for the session 2018-19 at Undergraduate level.

NOTE: An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXV**).

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the circular issued by the Govt. of Punjab, Department of Finance vide No.4/118/09-1FPPC/575043/1 dated 28.08.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVI**), be adopted and implemented with regard to recovery of excess payment made by the employer in view of judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case of State of Punjab V/s Rafiq Masih (white washer) and others.

NOTE: An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor has accepted the resignation of Ms. Tanvi Sharma, Assistant Professor in Information Technology (purely on temporary basis), P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Una Road, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, w.e.f. 14.01.2019, under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

NOTE: 1. Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

2. Request of Ms. Tanvi Sharma enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVII)**.
3. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVII)**.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has accepted the resignation of Shri Neeraj Rohilla, Programmer (on contract), Computer Unit, P.U. w.e.f. 17.11.2017 (A.N.) duly recommended and forwarded by the Controller of Examinations.

NOTE: 1. A copy of Office order No.18442-46/Estt. dated 14.12.2018 enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVIII)**.

2. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXXVIII)**.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed that Professor Karamjeet Singh, University Business School, be paid an honorarium @ 10% of his substantive pay as per Rule 35(iii) at page 94 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-III, 2016 on account of holding additional charge of the post of Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Devinder Singh, Department of Laws will look after the work of Secretary to Vice-Chancellor, in addition to his own duties with immediate effect, during the leave period of Dr. Muneeshwar Joshi.

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to the approval of the Syndicate/ Senate has confirmed the admission of Ms. Jainab Akhtar, B.Sc. Agriculture, 1st Semester for the session 2017-18.

NOTE: 1. Request of Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Principal, GGSDS College, Haryana, Hoshiarpur, in response to letter No. 8277/R&S dated 02.11.2018 to re-consider the eligibility for admission to B.Sc. (Agriculture) 1st semester, session 2017-18 is enclosed **(Appendix-XXXIX)**.

2. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXXIX)**.

- (ix) The following candidates have been disqualified by the Standing Committee dealing with the Unfair Means Cases (UMC), from appearing in any University examination for the period noted against each, for being found impersonated, under Regulation 20 at page 13 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate/ Impersonator	Period of disqualification
1.	Vikas Kumar (Impersonated) S/o Shri Milakh Raj Roll No. 10413000981 B.A.II, Year, August, 2018 Jaswant Singh (Impersonator)	Disqualified for five years i.e. August, 2018 to April/May, 2023 (ten Exams.)
2.	Chhinderpal (Impersonated) S/o Shri Lakhwinder Singh Roll No.19713000223 B.A.II, Year, August, 2018 Des Raj (Impersonator)	Disqualified for five years i.e. August, 2018 to April/May, 2023 (ten Exams.)
3.	Avtar Singh (Impersonated) S/o Shri Deep Singh Roll No. 11804000209 B.A.-II, Year, August, 2018 Kulwinder Singh (Impersonator)	Disqualified for five years i.e. August, 2018 to April/May, 2023 (ten Exams.)

NOTE: Regulation 20, at page 13 of P.U. Calendar Volume II, 2007, reads as under:

“Any person who impersonates a candidate shall be disqualified from appearing in any University Examination for a period of five years, if that person is a student on the rolls of a recognized school or College. But if that person is not on the rolls of a recognized school or College he shall be declared as not a fit and proper person to be admitted to any examination of the University for a period of five years and the case, if necessary, may be reported to the police. The candidate who is impersonated shall also be disqualified for a period of five years. All cases of impersonation shall be reported by the Controller of Examinations to the Syndicate.

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed the students of M.Com. I and M.A. I (Punjabi) of Gopichand Arya Mahila College, Abohar, to appear in the Examination held in December 2018, subject to the approval of the affiliation case for the said courses for the session 2018-2019.

NOTE: 1. The College was informed vide No. Misc. 89583-89783 dated 06.09.2017 (**Appendix-XL**) to submit the application for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for course/s/ subject/s for the next academic

session i.e. 2018-2019, but the College had not applied for the same within the stipulated period. The College is required to submit the requisite affiliation fee of Rs.4000/- alongwith late fee of Rs.1 lac and any other charges/fee (if any).

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XL**).

(xi) In pursuance of orders dated 22.11.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.29638 of 2018 (Dr. Neera Garg and Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) in the same terms as CWP No. 26006 of 2017 and CWP No. 26730 of 2018, wherein in pursuance to the orders passed in LPA No. 1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioners have been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 13.12.2018, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

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

(xii) In pursuance of orders dated 22.11.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 29638 of 2018 (Dr. Neera Garg and Anr. Vs Panjab University & Ors.) tagged with LPA No.1505 of 2016, wherein the petitioner has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is pending, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) Dr. Pankaj Malviya, Professor, Department of Russian, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.01.2019 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No. 29638 of 2018 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA

(HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him shall be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per *pro forma*.

- (ii) he be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing, as in respect of all those the teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation).

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following retirement benefits to Dr. Rashmi Yadav, Officiating Librarian, A.C. Joshi Library, P.U., up to the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 31.01.2017, as she is continuing upto attaining the age of 62 years as per interim orders of the Hon'ble Court dated 22.08.2016 and will be completing 62 years on 31.01.2019:-

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Furlough for six months as admissible under Regulation 12.2 (B) iii at page 125 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough; and
3. Encashment of Earned Leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days, as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) sanctioned the following terminal benefits in respect of Late Shri Ashok Kumar, Senior Assistant, Legal Cell, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 25.09.2018, 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. Cal., Volume-III, 2016.
- (ii) further ordered that the aforesaid terminal benefits be paid in share/proportions to the following nominees of Late Sh. Ashok Kumar, Senior Assistant, Legal Cell as under:

Sr. No.	Name	Relation	Share/ Proposition
1.	Mrs. Anchal nee Anju Devi	Wife	10%

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

2.	Mr. Abhishek	Son	70%
3.	Ms. Anusha	Daughter	10%
4.	Mr. Ayush	Nephew	10%

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Asha Rani W/o Late Shri Darshan Singh, Mason, Construction Office, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 21.09.2018, 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. Cal., Volume-III, 2016.

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mrs. Daya Devi W/o Late Shri Moti Ram, Senior Assistant, Examination Branch-I, P.U., Chandigarh, who expired on 20.10.2018, 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. Cal., Volume-III, 2016.

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

Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
Dr. Nishtha Jaswal Professor Department of Laws P.U.	30.12.1988	31.01.2019	i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 & 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Cal., Vol.-I, 2007.
			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

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

			Government of India.
--	--	--	----------------------

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

(xviii) 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 Kesar Singh Deputy Registrar Examination Branch	29.01.1980	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.	Ms. Neelam Kumari Deputy Registrar College Branch	25.10.1976	31.03.2019	
3.	Shri Jagdish Chand Puri Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Anthropology	19.04.1976	31.01.2019	
4.	Mrs. Latesh Kumari Superintendent (PR) VVBIS & IS Hoshiarpur	11.08.1981	31.12.2018	
5.	Shri Ranvir Prashar Library Restorer Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, P.U.	07.08.1979	31.12.2018	
6.	Ms. Kailash Rani Assistant Registrar University Business School	10.11.1982	28.02.2019	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
7.	Shri Mahesh Kumar Superintendent CET Cell	15.06.2018	31.01.2019	
8.	Ms. Rajni Pathania Superintendent Construction Office, P.U.	25.11.1982	31.01.2019	
9.	Mrs. Santosh Verma nee Santosh Sethi Semi Professional Assistant Department of Psychology	20.10.1976	30.09.2018	
10.	Smt. Tripta Devi Peon Dr. S.S.B.U.I.C.E.T.	09.04.1984	31.01.2019	

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

- (xix)** The Vice-Chancellor has allowed quarterly rate of interest on Contributory Provident Fund and General Provident Fund paid/to be paid, to the employees w.e.f. 01.04.2017 to 31.03.2019, as per rate of interest declared by Government of India Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Budget Division) vide notifications **(Appendix-XLI)** issued from time to time.

NOTE: An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XLI)**.

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

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

NOTE: An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XLII)**.

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

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 28) **(Appendix-XLIII)** had accepted the donation of Rs.1,00,000/- donated by Shri Radha Krishan Sethi S/o Shri Kanshi Ram, H.No. 362, Sector-9, Panchkula.

2. The said amount has been deposited in Students Aid Fund Account vide receipt No.2506 dated 23.01.2019 and credit of the

same has been received in the account No. 10444984461 on 28.01.2019.

3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XLIII**).

Referring to **Sub-Item I-(iii)**, Professor Rajesh Gill said, "How could they recovered this amount"?

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the recovery has also been effected in the case of teachers, technical staff as well as the Pensioners. There is an order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that no recovery of excess payment could be made in the case of teachers, including retired teachers, technical staff and pensioners could be made, whereas the University had already deducted money from the Pensioners. Even in the legal opinion all these three categories have been mentioned. Later on the Pensioners approached the Court, the Court accepted their petition. He pleaded that the recovered money should be returned to the concerned persons and their salaries be got re-fixed, and the legal opinion also stated this.

It was clarified that this case is with respect to non-teaching staff wherein the establishment branch had issued wrong promotions orders, which were late on corrected. They had done this in two parts – (i) rectified the pay fixation; and (ii) a representation was received stating that in accordance with the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India recovery could not be made in this case. In fact, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India had framed certain guidelines, which have also been adopted by the Punjab Government. For non-teaching employees, they follow the service rules of Punjab Government, and this proposal is to adopt the circular of Punjab Government relating to the issue. After adoption, they have to deal with the cases on case to case basis, i.e., whether recovery is to be made or not and also do the re-fixation of pay. Though recovery is not to be made, correct pay is to be given.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they have to return the money to the concerned persons, which they have recovered from them because it is the same letter regarding pay fixation of retired teachers.

It was clarified that no recovery has been made and only pay fixation has been corrected.

To this, Professor S.K. Sharma said, "No, they have deducted the money". They had in fact deducted the money for 2-3 months.

It was informed that they had deducted the money only for about 2 months.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they deducted the money, that is why the persons went to the court. It is covered both under the guidelines of the Supreme Court and Punjab Government. Why they are extending this benefit only to the staff and not to the teachers?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the orders of the Supreme Court saved the employees. Has the Supreme Court said anywhere that it is only for the non-teaching employees?

It was clarified that this case had been initiated with respect to the non-teaching employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "That is by the Punjab Government". Panjab University rules are meant only for the non-teaching employees.

To this, Professor S.K. Sharma said, “No, No, the rules of Punjab Government are for all”.

It was clarified that it is not being said that the circular is applicable on non-teaching employees only. Only it is being said that this circular has been adopted on the request of non-teaching employees. On the circular is adopted, whosoever is covered under the circular irrespective of teaching or non-teaching, including technical, would be given the benefit.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that though there are three points, they are talking only about their own staff.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the circular under reference even the teachers are also covered. In the cases where the recovery has already been made, the recovered amount should be refunded to the concerned persons.

Inviting attention of the House to page 15 of Volume II & III, it was informed that it is not a one line order. The orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India are available on this page, and they have to apply the parameters mentioned there. Where the recovery could not be made, has been mentioned there. Wherever recovery could not be made, they would not effect the recovery.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what would happen in those cases, where the recovery has already been made.

It was clarified that wherever the recovery has been made, refund could not be given because wherever the pay fixation is to be corrected, the same has to be done. Wherever the recovery has been made, the same would not be refunded as they are implementing it prospectively.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that where they have made the recovery pending litigation in the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and they had done something wrong, they are not giving refund under the garb that they had already done this. If there is/are similarly places person(s), whose recovery could not be made owing to one reason or the other, they would not make the recovery.

It was clarified that there were several cases in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India itself before this case, and in one of the cases the decision of the Supreme Court was.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that there were several decisions, but the same have been changed by the Supreme Court itself.

It was clarified that earlier there was a decision that if there is no misrepresentation, the recovery could not be made. Thereafter, the Supreme Court said, “No, since it is Government money, recovery is to be made whether there is a misrepresentation or not”. There are several cases where the recoveries have been made.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that in one of the latest cases, the person concerned had obtained stay from the High Court, and thereafter orders have been passed after two months that if the employee has not misrepresented, they could not make the recovery, though re-fixation could be done from the back date.

It was clarified that the said decision has now been overruled on the plea that misrepresentation has no cause, and that decision has again been overruled. Now, this is the latest decision and is applicable and the decision is available at page 15 and 16.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Professor S.K. Sharma requested the members to go through the legal opinion, which is available at page 22.

On a query made by Shri Naresh Gaur, it was informed that this decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India is of the year 2014, to which Shri Naresh Gaur said that thereafter several new decisions have come.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the papers related to the issue, which are available with the Hon'ble members, should be obtained. If the members also wish to give more paper related to the issue, they should give the same. Thereafter, they would get the issue examined.

It was informed that the papers have been appended with the item and on the basis of those papers, they have to take the decision of adoption.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the adoption should be done, and if the teachers are covered under this, they should also be covered. In the cases where the recoveries have already been made, if feasible, the refund should be given, and in the cases where refund is not feasible, should be reported to the Syndicate.

Referring to **Sub-Item I-(vi)**, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he would like to congratulate to Professor Karamjeet Singh, Registrar, for getting an honorarium @ 10% of his substantive pay. He suggested that Professor Sanjay Kaushik, who has been given the additional charge of the post of Dean, College Development Council, and former Dean, College Development Council (Professor Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations) should also be paid an honorarium @ 10% of their substantive pay.

One of the members suggested that Professor Devinder Singh, Dept. of Laws, who has been asked look after the work of Secretary to Vice Chancellor, should also be paid an honorarium @ 10% of his substantive pay.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that the money is collected by him, but congratulations are being shared by them amongst themselves.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that leaving aside joke, he would like to suggest that since they are paying an honorarium of Rs.5,000/- per month to Dean of University Instruction, Dean Student Welfare, etc., Professor Karamjeet Singh, who has been given the additional charge of Registrar, given an honorarium of Rs.5,000/- per month instead of @ 10% of his substantive pay.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should not start the practice of giving an honorarium @ 10% of the substantive pay to the persons who have been assigned the additional charge of certain posts. However, he is pained to point out as to why the payment of honorarium has come now and why not earlier when Professor Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations, was given the additional charge of the post of Dean, College Development Council. Similarly, Professor Sanjay Kaushik has also been given the additional charge of the post of Dean, College Development Council, why an honorarium is not being given to him. According to him, payment of Rs.5,000/- per month as honorarium could be made to every person, who has been given the additional charge of certain posts.

The Vice Chancellor again said the matter would be looked into.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that it would be in the best interest to withdraw the honorarium @ 10% of the substantive pay, which had been granted by the

Vice Chancellor, and he would tell the reason for the same to the Vice Chancellor when he would meet him in private, so that they should not enter into a controversy.

Agreeing to the suggestion made by Shri Ashok Goyal, the Vice Chancellor said that he is in favour of giving uniform honorarium to all the persons, who are holding the additional charge of the certain posts.

Again, the Vice Chancellor told that I will look into.

Referring to **Sub-Item I-(x)**, Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that a fine of Rs.1 lac has been imposed on Gopichand Arya Mahila College, Abohar, for applying late for affiliation. Since the fine has been imposed wrongly, it should be waived off. He enquired which competent authority has imposed the fine.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that the competent authority, which has imposed the fine on the College, should be punished. There must be a mistake on the part of the College for which a fine of Rs.1 lac has been imposed. When Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the fine has been imposed for applying late for affiliation, Shri Ashok Goyal informed that they had recently imposed a fine even on the Government College for applying late for affiliation. Why should they waive off the fine imposed on a private College?

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is no provision for imposing the fine on the Colleges, which apply late for affiliation. He added that it is a case of only one student.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not get the fine waived off in such a manner.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that added that it is a case of only one student.

The Vice Chancellor said that the fine would not be waived off.

Shri Sandeep Singh enquired for what such a huge fine had been imposed on the College.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it is not a case of only one student; rather two classes are there, i.e., M.Com.-I and M.A.-I (Punjabi) and the College had applied late for affiliation for these two courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal added that the fine has even been imposed on Government College, Sector 46, Chandigarh. When Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired whether the fine has been recovered, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the fine would be realized.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if the fine is realized from Government College, Sector 46, Chandigarh, only then the fine should be recovered from Gopichand Arya Mahila College, Abohar. However, if the fine could not be recovered from Government College, the fine imposed on Gopichand Arya Mahila College, Abohar, should be waived off.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what does this mean. In fact, the fine on Government College has only been imposed recently, whereas the fine on Gopichand Arya Mahila College, Abohar, had been imposed much earlier. In accordance with the suggestion of Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma, they have to first wait for the recovery of fine from Government College, and only then they would collect the fine from Gopichand Arya Mahila College, Abohar, on which the fine had been imposed much before. Continuing, he said that whatever fine has/had been imposed on the Colleges, is to be realized.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

The Vice Chancellor requested the Hon'ble members not to give such an advice, i.e., to withdraw the fine imposed on the affiliated Colleges. He remarked that since they are the Hon'ble members, he is listening to them patiently.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that instead of realizing such a huge fine, some reasonable fine should be recovered from the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is reasonable fine as the College had admitted students to two courses, for the affiliation of which it had applied late.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that a fine of Rs.10/- served the purpose as it is a stigma on the College.

Dr. K.K. Sharma clarified that since there was a changeover of Principal in the College at that time, they forget to apply for affiliation, and they applied late. They were not even allowing the students to appear in the examinations, but the Vice Chancellor had allowed them to appear in the examinations, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that similar was the case of Government College, Sector 46, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) information contained in **Item 51, Sub-Items I-(i) to I-(v) and I-(vii) to I-(xxi)** on the agenda, be noted; and
- (2) the issue relating to **(Sub-Item I-(vi))** payment of uniform honorarium to the persons, who have been given additional charge of different positions, be examined in its entirety by the Vice Chancellor.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That in the cases where the recoveries have already been made **(Sub-Item I-(iii))**, if feasible, the refund be given; however, in the cases where refund is not feasible, be reported to the Syndicate.

General Discussion

1. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Fellows, irrespective of the constituency they come from, especially from the teaching or graduate constituency, are not be allowed by the Principals of their respective Colleges whenever they have to come to the University for some University work or to attend meetings, conferences, etc. He asked whether they have to take permission from the Principal or just inform him. He requested that it should be clarified and a letter be sent to the Colleges in this regard. He added that he had given a representation also in this regard, but so far no response has been received.
2. Shri Jagdeep Kumar further said that the election to the Board of Studies has to be held. Last year, in some of the Colleges, some problems were experienced as the signatures of the Principal are required on the form. In some of the Colleges, the Principal had refused to sign. So, whatever solution to this problem would be found by the University, the same should be informed to them.

3. Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu requested to inform well in time, whatever decision is taken by the Fee Structure Committee for the next session, so that there could not be any problem to the students and Colleges.
4. Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu further said that many of the Colleges might have applied for new courses, but the Inspection Committees have not been sent by the University so far. He requested that it should be done at the earliest.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that the Inspection Committees would be sent to the Colleges.

5. Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that there is 2-3 years old issue of Shahi Sports College regarding D.P.Ed. about which the Controller of Examinations might be knowing. Perhaps, the affiliation letter was sent late to the College, therefore fine for late examination fee was imposed on the College. If the letter was sent late, the fine should not be imposed on the College and if it is sent in time, then it is okay.
6. Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu further said that he had come to know that the affiliation granted to Mai Bhago College for Women, Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana, was declared null and void and teachers were removed from the service. But now it has been given to understand that those teachers have now been taken back and the Court case too. He requested that appropriate action be taken to revive the affiliation.
7. Principal Inderjit Kaur said that there is a rule in the Calendar that those students who pass B.A.-I, II and III as regular students from affiliated Colleges. However, when they go abroad, their mode of study is mentioned as 'regular student'. But if a student gets compartment in B.A. III examination, his mode of study is changed from regular to private. This put the students at a loss. She requested that this should be taken care of.
8. Shri Ashok Goyal wondered that the Inspection Committees have not visited the Colleges for affiliation so far. He asked when the Inspection Committees would be sent to the Colleges as the month of February is going to end. They had decided to adhere to the deadline given in the Calendar, vide which they have to complete the process of granting the affiliation by 31st March. He apprehended that the process of sending the Inspection Committees for grant of affiliation might not finish even up to December, if the things go on like this. It be at least told as to why these Committees have not visited the Colleges so far. Since the inception of the University, it had never happened that the Inspection Committees have not even started visiting the Colleges till the month of February. To his mind, it would create a problem.

It was informed that they would be sending the Inspection Committees within two weeks and he hoped that this process would be completed by 30th April and the Colleges might complete all the formalities till the month of May.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has serious objection to it that the Dean, College Development Council, did not know as to what are the guidelines. The Dean, College Development Council, says that they would complete the process by May or June as the Colleges would start in July. It has been discussed here many times in the Syndicate that they should follow the Calendar, whereas the Dean, College Development Council is saying that they would complete the process of Inspection by April. Perhaps, the office has not guided him properly that more than half of the inspections should have been completed till today.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not been told about it. They should complete the process as per the deadline given in the Calendar, but now he has got the point and appreciated the information given by him. He would have a look on it on daily basis. The Vice Chancellor further said that the incurable disease of non-sending of DMCs to the students has been solved and now no DMC is pending. He has to put in lot of efforts for this. He said that he would get it done.

Professor S.K. Sharma said the major lacuna in the visits of Inspection Committees is that they are not provided the reports of the previous Inspection Committees and thus they start the inspection from the beginning. They should specially mention what has been done, and what remains to be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that along with the report of the previous Committee, the Committee should also be provided the compliance report on the observations of the previous Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a very good idea and asked the Dean College Development Council to note it.

9. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua informed that four days back a letter has been received from the Punjab Government vide which they have informed that they are going to implement the recommendations of 6th Pay Commission wherein they have asked to prepare the extra burden on the exchequer on account of salary. He suggested that there is need to change the fee structure of the last 3-4 years. Whatever fee hike is required, that needed to be mentioned. There is need to restructuring the funds.

The Vice Chancellor informed that the work is going on, on this issue and he would bring it in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

10. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua further requested the Vice Chancellor that the Syndicate should be informed 1-2 months in advance about the update on the introduction of Choice Based System as there is need to deliberate upon the issue. Last year, seminars were also held in some Colleges on the issue.
11. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua also raised the issue regarding 1925 posts of Assistant Professor. He said the persons who are appointed on these posts, do not get their salary until their approval is not received from the University or the D.P.I. If the approval process takes six months' time, the teacher would not get salary till that time. If a teacher is appointed by a duly constituted Committee and his/her certificates have been verified, there is nothing to do with the approval. He said that a circular should be sent to the Colleges in this regard.
12. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua also raised the issue of retiral benefits to the College teachers. This issue has been discussed many times earlier also. A letter had been issued to the Colleges to deduct Provident Fund @ 10% on the total salary, and if they do not do so they would not get affiliation in future. He suggested that a reminder should be sent. It be ensured that this benefit is given to the teachers; otherwise, such Colleges might not be given further affiliation. He informed that the Colleges are charging more than Rs.2,000/- from each student for paying retiral benefits, but they do not disburse it to the teachers.

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Ashok Goyal if they could send such a letter to the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it is not only the question of sending the letter, rather it is obligatory on their part and it is a part of the Calendar. He further said that he would like to bring to the notice of the Vice Chancellor that in the affiliated Colleges, including the Government Colleges, amalgamated fund is misused very badly and the University is responsible for that. There are 39 heads where the money lying in amalgamated funds could be used. But the amalgamated fund is also being used for paying salary to the teachers and the Colleges say that it is for the welfare of the students. When the Vice Chancellor would ask for the financial statement from them, everything would be clear from the statement.

13. Shri Naresh Gaur raised the issue of periodical inspections of the Colleges. As the University does not hold any periodical inspections, the Colleges do not pay any heed to the instructions given by the University. If they hold regular periodical inspections of the Colleges, it would build pressure on them. He has been raising this since 2012-13. A Committee had been formed, but its meeting has not been held so far, due to which the problems are escalating.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are the very senior members and should tell him about this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had talked about it twice in the Syndicate and he has also told about the Committee which has been formed under his (Shri Ashok Goyal) Chairmanship, but not even a single meeting of that Committee was held.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if it is done, half of the problems would automatically be solved.

The Vice Chancellor said Periodical Inspection is a very good system.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is the part of the University system and they are under obligation to do that.

As regards the retirement benefits, Shri Naresh Gaur said that he had been pursuing this issue since 2012, but still that benefit is not being given to the teachers. Earlier also, he had said that a separate account should be opened and those Colleges which do not implement it, should not be given any right to charge this amount from the students. The Colleges are charging the money from the students to pay retirement benefits to the teachers, but it is not given to them. He requested that a strong worded letter should be sent to the Colleges stating that the Colleges charging the amount from the students, must pay the retirement benefits to the teachers; otherwise, strict action would be taken against them.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that a letter should be sent to the colleges in this regard within a day or two.

14. Shri Sandeep Singh said that there is a Post-Matric scholarship scheme of Punjab Government. The Examination Branch has withheld the DMCs of those students who come under this scheme. The Vice Chancellor has just now said that the DMCs of all the students have been sent, but the DMCs of all SC students studying in various colleges have not been sent so far.

It was informed that in the case of SC students, it has been decided by the Punjab Government that until the fee is settled, the DMC may not be issued to them. On being asked by the Vice Chancellor whether the students would

not be issued DMCs, the Controller of Examinations said that virtually, they should not have allowed the students to appear in the examination. There is a Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Anil Kumar where it has been decided that all the accounts has to be settled before the declaration of result.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said there is a letter from the Punjab Government that the DMCs of the SC students be not withheld. When the amount would be sent to the Colleges, the same could be taken from them.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that not only the DMCs of SC students have been withheld, but the DMCs of other students have also been withheld. It is because of the effort of the Controller of Examinations that the DMCs were sent to the students. The Examination Branch takes the plea that the Colleges are defaulters. On the one hand, the Government says that the DMCs of the students be not withheld and on the other hand, the University says that the University would issue DMCs to the candidates only when the fee is paid to the University. In fact, the students who have paid the fee, they are also suffering. He suggested that there is an alternative. They could withhold the degree of a candidate, but they should issue them the DMCs.

15. Shri Sandeep Singh raised another issue relating to roster about which he had talked to the Registrar also. He requested that whatever is permissible under the law, should be done as he is neither in favour nor against anybody.

The Vice Chancellor said that the roster is ready.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the roster might be ready, but no meeting for the same has been held so far. He requested to hold the meeting at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would hold the meeting soon.

16. Shri Sandeep Singh said that the students have the option to pay fee either through SBI or through the Post office. Last year, due to some problem at the Post Office, at least five hundred students could not get roll numbers due to which they have to miss one or two papers. He said that the world at large has reached on the moon, but they are still not able to implement the online fee deposit system. This could be done very easily as everybody is having ATM.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are improving this system. The SBI is under the impression that the University would not be in a position to leave the SBI. But this would not go on for much time.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they could have a tie-up with some other private bank. Such a bank would give them many more benefits.

17. Dr. Harjodh Singh said that he would like to talk about the teachers, who are working on temporary or *ad hoc* basis. Nowadays, due to various shortages, the farmers are committing suicides. He apprehended that the next such a step would be that of the teachers. The situations in which they are passing through, is terrible. He requested the Vice Chancellor that on the 550 Birth Anniversary of Sri Guru Nanak Dev Ji, he (Vice Chancellor) should do something for them. He said that to pay them less salary is a separate thing. If they are not able to produce good teachers, the situation would be the same as that of the farmers in the State of Punjab. He explained the small effort which they did for the teachers at Punjabi University. In the Punjabi University, the teachers who were working at far off places, they were transferred to the places

near to their residences. He informed that some of the teachers who belonged to Mohali or Chandigarh were working in the Ferozepur Centre. Such teachers were transferred to the Constituent Colleges of Punjabi University situated nearer to their place of residence. Secondly, the teachers who were being paid Rs.21600/- p.m., the Punjabi University started paying them Rs.30000/- p.m. It might not happen that the teacher community is finished. He, therefore, requested to think about such teachers

18. Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that in order to become eco-friendly, they should use the glass bottles in place of plastic. In the CET examination where about ten thousand students appear, they give one plastic bottle to each student. In this way, they help in generating a lot of plastic. It is better if the students are asked to bring their own non-plastic bottles. They need to be environmentally conscious.

19. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the appointment of Director in DAV Management Institutes has to be held for which Professor Rajat Sandhir is Vice Chancellor's nominee, who went there once. The meeting was fixed twice, but no expert went there. He requested that if the experts are not willing to go, new experts, who are willing to go, should be appointed in their places.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to why nobody is ready to go.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that it could only be checked by the Vice Chancellor.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to get the process completed when they want to appoint a Director.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though he did not know much about it, some managements are habitual of fixing the date arbitrarily, whereas they were sent instructions that the date be fixed in consultation with the Vice Chancellor's Nominee and other subject experts. When one knows that he would not be at home on that specific date, even then they do not listen to him/her and fix the date, though he did not know whether this is applicable in this case or not.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked Shri Ashok Goyal if it is a point of discussion. He is just telling the Vice Chancellor about it. Is it zero hour or to hold discussion on an issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor wanted to know as to why the Vice Chancellor's nominee and the subject experts are not going there.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Vice Chancellor would check it as to why they are not going, to which the Vice Chancellor said that he got it. He again requested the Vice Chancellor to get the date fixed.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would get the meeting of the Selection Committee fixed at Chandigarh, to which it was informed that the meeting is held at Delhi. The Vice Chancellor asked, why at Delhi?

Shri Ashok Goyal said if anybody could reply to this question, he would agree to do everything. They would not hold the Selection Committee meeting at Chandigarh.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he proposes to hold the meeting of the Selection Committee at Chandigarh.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that every selection should be held at Chandigarh.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to it.

20. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that for the women teachers, the Supreme Court has ordered for grant of 20 leaves, meaning thereby that if others are given 10 leaves, they (women teachers) would be given 20 leaves. The women teachers working in the Colleges against the aided posts, they have granted them leaves as per the P.U. Calendar. In the Constituent Colleges of P.U., not all, but there are some women teachers, who are full time teachers and getting full salary, but those women teachers are being deprived of these leaves. If the University is granting 20 leaves to women teachers working in other colleges, the same should be granted to the women teachers working in the Constituent Colleges; otherwise, it is violation of Supreme Court order, to which the Vice Chancellor said 'sure'.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it is written in the Panjab University Calendar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that an enquiry should be got conducted as to under what circumstances, these leaves are not being given to the women teachers.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to send a letter to the Constituent Colleges in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be done tomorrow.

21. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that traditional courses which they are running have become obsolete as the students did not want to take up those courses. He has raised this issue in the Principals' Conference. Punjabi University has gone a step further from them. They should also start some new courses, and for the purpose, they should constitute a Committee consisting of members from Panjab University and affiliated Colleges to look into the issue threadbare keeping in view the employability aspect. It is utmost necessary that they should have a list ready with them wherefrom they could choose the courses with syllabus; otherwise, the Panjab University would be left behind. The services of some good experts could be taken in this regard. He requested to do it at the earliest so that new courses could be started in the Colleges.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that he would like to add something in this regard. He has also raised this issue in the Senate that in these days the job oriented, skill oriented, short term, six months', one year or two years courses are much preferred. The courses could be done along with graduation like add-on-courses or separately. He suggested that a Think-Tank of the University should sit together and discuss about such courses. Such courses might be running somewhere or they could plan some new courses. They should supply such a list of Colleges so that the Colleges could choose the courses relevant to that area. It is difficult just to run the Colleges with the courses like B.A. etc. as they are finding it difficult to get students.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the Courses should not only be job oriented, but also business oriented.

22. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan raised the issue of admission of students of B.P.Ed. courses. He would like to inform the Vice Chancellor that in

his first meeting of the Syndicate, they have requested him about the admission of B.P.Ed. Courses and the Vice Chancellor had agreed to it. Consequently, they received a letter from Dr. Parvinder Singh, the then Dean, College Development Council, to hold the admissions, which they did. Thereafter, in the last days of month of November, they got a letter from the University that they are withdrawing their letter. However, by that time, the papers had started. He, therefore, requested that this issue be got resolved as they had already made the admissions and the students also appeared in the examination.

23. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan further said that there is another issue related to it. Perhaps, Dr. Parvinder Singh, the then Dean College Development Council, might remember that he had given permission for lateral entry in the B.P.Ed. but the University is not permitting the students under lateral entry. He informed that there are students of Guru Kashi University, Tanwandi Sabo, who have taken admission under lateral entry during the session 2018-19, but the University is not approving their admission. The case has been sent to the University for approval, but the University has returned the same raising an objection.

The Vice Chancellor said that the College issue would be looked and see as to what could be done.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan further said that there is another important issue of Colleges relating to NSS. From the last 10 years, no grant is being received from the University. They were giving subscription in respect of NSS students enrolled with them at the rate of Rs.10/- each student. Whether the University would give any grant this year or not, this is a secondary issue. Now they have received a letter whereby they have been asked that the subscription be sent @ Rs.10/- of the total number of students admitted in the College. He requested the Vice Chancellor to clarify.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is wrong.

Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that whatever was the practice earlier, the same should continue as the grant has not been given to them for the last 10 years.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor about the issue, it was clarified that NSS is running on self-sustaining basis, but some members did not agree to it.

The Vice Chancellor requested them to first listen and then say, whatever they want to say.

Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that they did not get any grant from the Punjab Government for the last many years. Recently, they were given some grant and their NSS account was running negative. For running the NSS programme, staff is appointed. For running some activities, the U.T. Government gives grants, but wherefrom the salary would be paid the staff, Programme Coordinators, etc. who are working there. If they get grant from the Punjab Government, then there is no need to take fee from the Colleges. But in case, they do not get any grant from the Punjab Government, it would not be possible to put more burden on the students and they would send only that much subscription which they had been sending earlier.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that in his College, the Programme Officer is also not being paid for a long time.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it is totally unethical and the same thing is happening with NCC also. He is also NCC Officer. The NCC Battalion has also sent a letter to them that they should pay at the rate of Rs.10/- each student, meaning thereby that if there are 5000 students in the College, then they are required to pay Rs.50,000/- to them. Rather, they should ask for the subscription only from the students who are enrolled in NCC. Suppose, there are 100 students, then they should charge only Rs.1000/-.

Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that they were paying at the rate of Rs.10/- for the students enrolled in NSS, but now they have received another reminder from the University.

It was said, then how could they run this programme?

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that if they are not able to pay even the Programme Coordinator, they should stop this.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he did not know whether they have pursued it with the Punjab Government or not. The Punjab Government was giving regular grant, so they need to pursue it.

It was clarified that they do not want to take money from the students, but they have to decide as to how they could run this programme. How to sustain it, if they are not getting regular grant from the Punjab Government? The University has to take a decision on this. Now, after a long time of 5-6 years and that too after holding meetings with the Programme Coordinators, they have been able to get the grant. But they have to pay the salaries to staff every month and also for the other programmes. So, they have to think about it as to how it has to be done.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked if Programme Coordinator is a sanctioned post to which it was clarified that it is not part of the Budget.

Dr. K.K. Sharma suggested that in order to minimize the expenditure, additional charge could be given to someone as is being done in some other cases.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that he wanted to know whether they would pay to the Colleges from the grant they have now received from the Punjab Government for the programmes which were conducted by the Colleges, to which it was replied in the negative.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they would not give any money to the University, whether the NSS programmes would run or not and they would do it at their own level as per their wish.

Dr. K.K. Sharma again reiterated that additional charge should be given to someone.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know if there is any model for it.

It was replied that it was on a self-sustaining model.

Shri Ashok Goyal said self-sustaining does not mean that they should charge the money from the Colleges.

It was again replied that it is not part of the Budget.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that self-sustaining also meant that if some Programme is impossible to run, then close it. Where it is written that it is necessary to run the Programme?

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that now the grant from Punjab Government has been received by the University. He wanted to know whether the Colleges would get the money from the University or the Punjab Government to which some of the members said that it would be paid by the University and they would submit the account after deducting their expenditure. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that after conducting the camps they would submit the bills to the University.

24. Principal R.K. Mahajan said that first of all he would like to congratulate the Vice Chancellor and Dr. Parvinder Singh for introducing online system, which is paperless and the system is very good. However, with this a lot of pressure is there on the affiliated Colleges. They submit the examinations returns online, and thereafter, they are being asked to submit the hardcopy also through a person. They are also asked to come to the University and get their RTGS verified. What is this fun? What is this online system? In fact, it is exerting more pressure on them. Why should they use their printer? He requested to discontinue this system.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that they send the printout also.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said either they should stop online system or stop asking for hardcopy.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that online system should be discontinued as sometime there is a problem in network.

The Vice Chancellor said that the online system is running everywhere. They should not take any such decision in haste.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should at least stop asking for the hard copy, if they do not want to stop the online system.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to it. They should consider it seriously and see as to what are the bottlenecks.

It was clarified that the University would give them a designated Email ID and the Colleges would have to give them UTR number and date to which the members agreed.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that R&S Branch send reminders to them again and again for submitting the hard copy.

Shri Ashok Goyal informed that two years back a software was submitted to the University without charging any money, for which the University was ready to spend lacs and lacs of rupees. This is also in the knowledge of Dr. Parvinder Singh, Controller of Examinations, and he thinks it might be in the knowledge of Professor Sanjay Kaushik, Dean, College Development Council, as well.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is in his knowledge also.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said, why that is not being put to use as all the things are there in it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are serious about it and after consulting the senior scientists, he would do whatever would be the best.

Shri Ashok Goyal said there is no need to take it to the scientists, everything is right in that.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have very competent faculty and he would not do any such thing which might not be good for the University. It has come to his knowledge now, and he would see as to how it could be made applicable and what is there in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they can arrange to show the demo of that software in the Syndicate meeting. This was also endorsed by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to it.

It was informed that first they should validate the data.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to ensure the secrecy of the data and where the server would be put. All these points have to be seen very carefully. That is why he does not take such a decision in haste as Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan has said that the online system should be stopped.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan intervened to say that he has not said this.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that they are changing their own decision after two minutes. He, therefore, requested the members not to do anything in haste.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan again clarified that he has requested only for stopping the submission of hardcopy.

The Vice Chancellor said that they need not worry as he would do only, which would be in the interest of the University.

25. Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that, perhaps, the last date to apply for affiliation is in the month of September or October, after which the fine is imposed. All the Colleges submit affiliation fee at the rate of Rs.2,000/- per course. Then they got a letter in January stating that there are some changes in the affiliation. He requested that it is not possible at this stage to make the changes as stated in the letter. He, therefore, requested that for this year the existing guidelines should continue. In case, any changes are to be made, those should be placed before the Syndicate and implemented from the next year.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has taken note of it and he would see to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan) is telling a new thing and he was not aware of it.

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan said that he is talking about the fact.

26. Professor Rajesh Gill said that one of their colleagues, Dr. Gaurav Verma from Dr. SSB University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology, who has taken Fellowship in the year 2014-15, was not being paid salary. She requested that his salary be released at the earliest. This was also endorsed by Professor S.K. Sharma.

27. Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to when the next meeting of the Syndicate would be held.

The Vice Chancellor said he would see to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have to fix the meeting as they have to make their other programme accordingly.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they have also to arrange their programmes accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) just takes into account his own convenience, to which the Vice Chancellor said that he would see his schedule and tell them within two days. Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would give him (Vice Chancellor) three dates.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they could think over the items properly; otherwise, the many agenda items get an accumulated.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should not do like this. He added that it be recorded that the Vice Chancellor did not agree to fix the meeting. In fact, it is the prerogative of the Syndicate to fix the meeting.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have also to plan their programme.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would get the next date of the Syndicate by day after tomorrow.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that, let the meeting of Syndicate be held on second Saturday of every month.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they did want to explain that the meeting of 27th January was postponed and today it is 18th of February, which is a working day. Many members might be having urgent works, but they abounded all those programmes so that the today's meeting might not be postponed. He requested that the meeting of the Syndicate could be fixed on any of the three days, i.e., either on 17th March or 23rd March or 24th March.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not worry about it, almost it would be done. He requested the members not to go at the extreme.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) also goes at the extreme by saying that he could not do this. He (Vice Chancellor) should at least talk to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should get the date for holding the meeting within a day or two.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th February 2019

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they were just asking for the date.

Thereafter, the National Anthem was sung, and the Vice Chancellor thanked the members for attending the meeting.

(Karamjeet Singh)
Registrar

Confirmed

(RAJ KUMAR)
VICE-CHANCELLOR