

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Tuesday, 28th May 2019 at 11.15 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

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

Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan, DPI (Colleges), Punjab, and Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh could not attend the meeting.

Condolence

The Vice-Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the members about the sad demise of Shri Ashutosh Kapila husband of Professor Sunita Kapila, Chairperson, Department of Botany, on 11th May, 2019.

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

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the honourable members that Dr. Kewal Krishan, Associate Professor and Chairperson of the Department of Anthropology has been conferred the status of honorary member by the Board of Directors of the American Society of Forensic Podiatry (ASFP), Oregon, USA in recognition of his distinguished and outstanding contributions to the forensic podiatry (dealing with evidence related to human foot at the crime scene).:

The Vice Chancellor further said that he wanted to add two new things informally, to facilitate them (members) so that when they would feel free during the tea break or the lunch break, they could then discuss that or they could inform him at the end, so that they could execute those things. Firstly, he would like to say that they have been inching very fastly towards use of information technology in their day to day work. They have to bring lot of agenda papers for the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate besides various other meetings which is inconvenient too. The excessive use of paper also affects the environment. It has, therefore, been thought that all the Syndicate

members be provided with a Computer Tablet where a softcopy of the agenda papers would be uploaded. However, two hard copies of the agenda would be placed before the members of the Syndicate and one hard copy would remain with the Registrar/other officers which could be seen by them, if needed. Otherwise, the whole information would be provided in the Computer Tablet. The members would be required to bring the Tablet while coming to attend the meeting. He requested the members to think about this proposal and they would discuss this issue later on. Secondly, they have given a very good suggestion about the Affiliation Committee to facilitate the working of the colleges. They have given 5-6 names for constituting the Affiliation Committee, but later on 3-4 members again approached him and said that this is wrong, there name should also be included. However, he was also feeling that even six persons seem to be quite more to form the Affiliation Committee. So, they could also think over it as there is no hurry in it. They would talk about it after the agenda and do the same as would be suggested by them. He (Vice Chancellor) said he desires that there should be three members in the Affiliation Committee. The Vice Chancellor again requested the members to have a look in this matter and final decision would be taken in accordance with their suggestion as this is his suggestion only. They could identify three members for forming the Affiliation Committee, besides two members, it would be better, if the PUTA President is included in the Committee. This is his observation, however, final decision would be taken by them. Thereafter, the Vice Chancellor said, let they take up the agenda items now.

Shri Ashok Goyal, however, said that Action Taken Report, in fact, should always be the first item, so that if somebody has to point out that such and such thing is missing, he could do so and the members could think over it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he got the point, it is a very good suggestion.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the teachers under the Faculty Recharge Programme are getting a salary of Rs. 50,000/- p.m. only. This matter was also discussed in the last two Syndicate meetings.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would take action, but first they should complete the agenda items.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would like to talk about the issues mentioned in the Action Taken Report.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would discuss about it after the agenda item are completed. This is what Shri Ashok Goyal has said.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should first take up the agenda items and take up the issues of Action Taken Report later on.

RESOLVED: That –

- 1) felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to Dr. Kewal Krishan, Associate Professor and Chairperson of the Department of Anthropology on having been conferred the status of honorary member by the Board of Directors of the American Society of Forensic Podiatry (ASFP), Oregon, USA:
2. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 10.4.2019, **as per Appendix-I**, be noted.

2(i). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gargi Ghoshal be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **21.9.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Life Long Learning and Extension, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Prabha Vig be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Life Long Learning and Extension, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS)(2010), w.e.f **03.03.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Dazy Zarabi be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **01.01.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Dipti Sareen be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **14.11.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(v). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sarabjit Kaur be promoted from Associate Professor in Political Science (**Stage-4**) to Professor in Political Science (**Stage-5**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **07.08.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sujit Lahiry be promoted from Associate Professor in Political Science (**Stage-4**) to Professor in Political Science (**Stage-5**) at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010),

w.e.f. **14.8.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sasha be promoted from Assistant Professor in History (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor in History (**Stage-4**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **06.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to third amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Pushpinder Kaur Mann nee Gill be promoted from Assistant Professor of Law (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor of Law (**Stage-4**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **01.08.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-X**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Babita Devi be promoted from Assistant Professor of Law (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor of Law (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f **01.07.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(x). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ajay Ranga be promoted from Assistant Professor of Law (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor of Law (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **24.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Karan Jawanda be promoted from Assistant Professor of Law (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor of Law (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **1.8.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xii). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor/s (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor/s (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor/s of Law (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor/s of Law (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Law, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, from the date mentioned against each, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), , in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|------------------|
| 1. Dr. Aditi Sharma | : | 29.7.2014 |
| 2. Dr. Shiv K. Dogra | : | 27.7.2015 |

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xiii). Considered minutes dated 21.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XIV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Manju Gera be promoted from Assistant Professor in Education (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor in Education (**Stage-4**) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **07.09.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xiv). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Public Administration, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Navreet be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Public Administration, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **03.11.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xv). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XVI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vinod Kumar be promoted from Associate Professor in Economics (**Stage-4**) to Professor in Economics (**Stage-5**) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **27.02.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xvi). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XVII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gulshan Kumar be promoted from Associate Professor in Economics (**Stage-4**) to Professor in Economics (**Stage-5**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **01.01.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.

2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xvii). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kulwinder Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor in Economics (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor in Economics (**Stage-2**) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **10.6.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xviii). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XIX**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Purva Kansal be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) at at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **29.01.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xix). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XX**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Monica Bedi be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **01.07.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xx). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XXI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professors (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University, Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ashish Saijpal be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at University Business School, Panjab University, Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **17.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxi). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:-XXII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professors (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University, Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

RESOLVED: That Sh. Shashi Kapoor be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at University Business School, Panjab University, Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **1.05.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxii). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:XXIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Alka Bali be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) at at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **24.6.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to third amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxiii). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:XXIV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of English and Cultural Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. (Mrs.) Meenu Aggarwal nee Gupta be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of English and Cultural Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme(2010), w.e.f **03.11.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxiv). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:XXV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kalpna Dahiya be promoted from Assistant Professor of Mathematics (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor of Mathematics (**Stage-4**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **20.4.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxv). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That since the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee has not recommended the promotion of Dr. Saurabh Bhatia from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, owing to less score than required, his promotion be deferred.

2(xxvi). Considered minutes dated 22.02.2019 (**Appendix:XXVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Aarti Khurana be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **28.8.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxvii). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Suman Mor be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **30.8.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxviii). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Library and Information Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rupak Chakravarty be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) in the Department of Library and Information Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f **28.6.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxix). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Librarian (Sr. scale) (stage-2) to Deputy Librarian (Stage-3) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Neeraj Kumar Singh be promoted from Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale)(**Stage-2**) to Deputy Librarian (**Stage-3**) at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f **16.3.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxx). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXX**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **24.7.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxi). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXXI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professors (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor/s (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor/s (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, Panjab University, Chandigarh from the date mentioned against each under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------|
| 1. Dr. Arun Singh Thakur | : | 28.5.2018 |
| 2. Dr. Jaswinder Kumar | : | 03.06.2018 |

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxii). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXXII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Mukesh Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engineering (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor in Computer Science & Engineering (**Stage-4**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **07.10.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxiii). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Nirmal Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engineering (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Engineering (**Stage-2**) at University Institute Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **24.08.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxiv). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Ms. Rohini Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Computer Science & Applications, Panjab University, Chandigarh under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **15.09.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University The post

would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxv). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXXV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Mr. Deepak Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronic Engineering (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronic Engineering (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **31.1.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxvi). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Damanjeet Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronic Engineering (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronic Engineering (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **30.8.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxvii). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professors (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professors in Electronic and Communication Engineering (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professors in Electronic and Communication Engineering (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | |
|----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1. Dr. Preeti | : | 20.4.2018 |
| 2. Dr. Charu | : | 07.10.2018 |
| 3. Ms. Nidhi | : | 17.10.2018 |

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidates meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxviii). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Naresh Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor in Electronic and Communication Engineering (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Electronic and Communication Engineering (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **22.02.2015** in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxix). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Defense and National Security Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Jaskaran Singh Waraich be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Defense and National Security Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **04.01.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xl). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XL**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies and Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Shashi Chaudhary be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies and Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **20.9.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xli). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XLI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Botany, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Anand Narain Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Botany, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **23.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xlii). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XLII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh

RESOLVED: That Dr. Shankar Sehgal be promoted from Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor in mechanical Engineering (**Stage-4**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), w.e.f **07.11.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/- + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xliii). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XLIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Mr. Amandeep Singh Wadhwa be promoted from Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg. (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg. (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **04.09.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xliv). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XLIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Shri Jaswinder Singh Mehta be promoted from Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg. (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg. (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **04.09.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xlv). Considered minutes dated 23.02.2019 (**Appendix-XLV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Prashant Jindal be promoted from Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg. (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg. (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **22.9.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That letters of promotion to the persons promoted under Item **C-2(i) to C-2 (xxiv) and C-2 (xxvi) to C-2(xlv)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Arising out of the above, Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is one case of Dr. Saurav Bhatia, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, for promotion from Assistant Professor (Mathematics) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Mathematics) (Stage-3). His case was rejected during screening on the basis of his API score as he was not given the benefit of Invited Lectures attended by him in the Training Schools which are there in the engineering field. However, such a benefit was given to other teachers in the similar cases. She requested that this case be got reviewed from a Committee. The Committee could be formed under the Chairperson of Mathematics Department.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has been noted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should take a decision on this.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it should not be noted, but they should say that it has been decided.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should say that it has been noted for appropriate action and to constitute a Committee under the Chairpersonship of Chairperson, Department of Mathematics to which the Vice Chancellor said that there is need to change the wording.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is another case of Professor Narinder Kumar of Statistics Department with regard to date of promotion. He has given many representations. He is a very senior person and getting very desperate. She requested that a Committee be constituted to resolve his case.

The Vice Chancellor said he would look into this case also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this case is pending since many years. This is a very clear-cut case. If there is any ambiguity or problem, that should be got resolved immediately. If his services are required in this case, he is ready to help them.

The Vice Chancellor said, it is done.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she has talked about it day before yesterday. There is a bunch of cases, which, besides others, also includes the names of Dr. Ram Mehar, University School of Open Learning, Dr. Ashu Khosal, Dr. Parampreet, etc. The Registrar also knows about it. She has a representation from these people, which she would hand over to the Registrar. Their promotion cases for Associate Professors are lying pending for the last 2 years. She requested to evolve some mechanism to resolve these cases.

The Vice Chancellor said, let these cases first be seen and then the action would be taken accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that these cases may create a problem for them because some complaint could go to any Commission. Its implications could be serious.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that these cases could also be considered by a Committee constituted to consider the case of Professor Narinder Kumar.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members not to hotchpotch the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there may be some other problem in certain cases, but in some of the cases, at the department level, they used to create problems in one way or the other. He thinks that the departments have given only one responsibility of doing pre-screening. Thereafter, everything is done by the Office of the Vice Chancellor, generally it is done through the Secretary to Vice Chancellor. Besides these cases, if there are any other cases where there is some issue at the department

level, a Committee should be constituted at the University level which, besides others, should include the Dean of the concerned faculty, some ex-officio members or some intelligent person. He suggested that PUTA President must be included in the Committee to which the Vice Chancellor said that she must be there.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to repeat once again what he has said as some of the members did not listen it properly. He (Professor Navdeep Goyal) should explain the things from the beginning i.e. the work of the department is to do the pre-screening.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that, thereafter, the remaining work has to be done by the office of the Vice Chancellor. If there is any representation with regard to delay in pre-screening etc. at the department, an advance copy of the same should be submitted in the office of the Vice Chancellor to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is a good thing. Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there should be a Committee which should, beside other members, include the Dean of the concerned Faculty and President, PUTA, one representatives may be appointed by the Vice Chancellor from the department or a subject expert. The Constitution of the Committee would remain the same for all the departments.

The Vice Chancellor said, it meant that there should be one Committee at the University level.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Professor Navdeep Goyal has given a very good idea. He is talking about the pre-screening level. But, the cases, she is talking about, are such cases where the Selection Committee meeting has also been held.

The Vice Chancellor said that what Professor Navdeep Goyal is saying is different from what she is telling, so they should not mix up the things.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there is a case of Dr. Bhupinder Pali of University School of Open Learning, is pending since long. She requested to club the case of Dr. Bhupinder Pali along with the other cases. In his case the Selection Committee has also been held.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this case could also be given to the same Committee.

When several members started speaking together, the Vice Chancellor said that they are confusing the issue because both of them (Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill) are talking about two different issues.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee about which he has mentioned would also take up such cases also.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members stop for sometime so that the Registrar could provide some up date in the matter. They may speak, thereafter, and then they could reach on some conclusion.

The Registrar informed that there are two different issues. There are some issues which are of the pre-screening level and there are some issue which are even before the pre-screening level. For example, various departments ask the Establishment Branch to tell them the date of eligibility as in some of the cases the date of eligibility has been given notionally. So, one type of dispute is at the level of the Chairperson. The other is that, there are three things which have to be seen at the pre-screening level, one API score, second experience and publications the third, date of assessment period. After the pre-screening, screening is done and then selection. After the selection, there arises some issues as has been told by Professor Rajesh Gill. There are some such cases, where the issues are of two types, i.e. after the selection, there are objections from the R.A.O.

about the date of promotion. He suggested that for the issues raised at any other level before the case reaches the R.A.O., a Standing Committee should be constituted to resolve all such issues. The Committee to deal with the objections raised by the R.A.O. would be a separate one. To resolve the issues before the case reached the R.A.O., a Committee at the University level could be constituted, which, as suggested by Professor Navdeep Goyal, may include the PUTA President, Dean of the concerned Faculty and one subject expert. This Committee would regulate the things and resolve the issue. Now the other thing is that there are cases where R.A.O. has raised certain objections or there may be some problem at the office, to deal with such cases, as suggested, a Committee could be constituted under the Chairpersonship of Shri Ashok Goyal, , so that they could resolve the issues.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she would provide a list to the Registrar of all such cases where there is some problem.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that there is already a Committee which is looking into all such cases. Whenever, there is an objection from the R.A.O., there is a Committee at the University level to deal with such cases.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that Professor Rajat Sandhir is talking about the Committee which is dealing with the objections raised by the R.A.O., but there are many other different issues. The teachers have to take rounds of the Establishment Branch, R.A.O office, Accounts Branch etc. for getting their queries resolved. Teachers are required to spend their time in teaching and research. They have been begging, they are not supposed to beg like this. If they have to do it and if they are put in their shoes, then they would realise as to how painful it is.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as has been stated by Professor Rajat Sandhir if such a Committee is already there, what that Committee has done with regard to the cases which are pending owing to objections raised by the R.A.O.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that one case was referred to the Committee by the Establishment Branch, perhaps Professor Rajesh Gill is also a member of that Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, as told by Professor Rajesh Gill, she is not a member of that Committee. It meant that the cases are not being sent to that Committee. Therefore, let them not say that the Committee which has been constituted to meet the objections raised by the R.A.O. is not functional. So, starting from pre-screening to post selection, the concern is only about delay in giving their due, whether in the case of promotion or fixation of pay. He said that for any kind of delay, a Committee should be formed so that teachers should feel that there is somebody to take care of their problems. Besides this, they should keep on doing the work relating to API score or other academic issues. If the Committee feels that this issue should have gone to the API Committee, they could ask as to why it has not been sent to that Committee. That Committee may ask the Establishment Branch about the objection or they may talk to the R.A.O as well, so that there should be no delay. It is utmost necessary that PUTA President be made a member of that Committee to which the Vice Chancellor said, "sure". If they say that only one Committee would be constituted, how it is possible because there are several Deans of Faculties. If there are 11 Deans, how would they constitute one Committee or would they constitute 11 Committees? In this, what they could do is that there would be one Committee, but the subject expert of that subject could be invited. But it should be done at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor said he has noted it and he would constitute the Committee.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said, could anything be done at the level Registrar or at the level of the Establishment Branch that if a case of a teacher is received, a time bound reply to the concerned teacher is sent, say, within a week or so.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is what they are doing. Perhaps he (Principal Narinder Singh) has not listened to Shri Ashok Goyal attentively. Shri Goyal has also said the same thing that the unnecessary delay in solving the issues should be eliminated. The Vice Chancellor said that he would look into it.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that there have been so many CAS promotions and the issue of seniority is pending. He requested that this issue be got resolved at the earliest.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said the item regarding seniority is lying pending.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice Chancellor be authorised to constitute the following Committees to resolve various issues of the teachers relating to their promotions under Career Advancement Scheme:-

1. to resolve the case of promotion (under CAS) of Dr. Saurav Bhatia, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor under the Chairman of Department of Mathematics, P.U.
2. Professor Narinder Kumar, Department of Statistics; Dr. Ram Mehar, University School of Open Learning; Dr. Ashu Khosla, Department of Geology, Dr. Parampreet or any such similar cases, a Committee be constituted under Sh. Ashok Goyal to sought out the issues along with President, PUTA, and any other member(s) whom the Vice Chancellor would like to involve; and
3. Committee at the University level, comprising Dean of the Faculty concerned, President, PUTA and one subject expert, to look into the representation(s), if any, received from the teachers before or after pre-screening of their applications for promotion under the CAS.

3. Considered if –

- (i) Minutes dated 23.04.2019 of the Committee with regard to rate revision and other charges for the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Amrita Shergil Girls' Hostel, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, as per **Appendix-XLVI**, be approved, except the word 'laptop' mentioned at Sr. No. 10 in the list of electric appliances, which be deleted, and incorporated in the Hand Book of Hostel Rules, for the session 2019-20.
- (ii) Minutes dated 09.04.2019 of the Committee with regard to revision of rates and other charges for the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur for the session 2019-20, as per **Appendix-XLVI**, be approved.

When discussion on Item C-22 concluded, Shri Naresh Gaur pointed out that in the proceedings of the meeting of the Committee dated 23.04.2019 for revision of rates and other changes in the Handbook of Hostel Rules, it has *inter alia* been written that ".....Residents are not permitted to use/keep electric iron, electric kettles, desert coolers, **laptop**, and hair dryer/hair straightener without prior permission of Warden....", whereas nowadays laptop is absolutely necessary for the students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has wrongly been written.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that on the one hand, they are moving towards digital India, and on the other hand, they are not allowing the students to keep their laptops with them.

The members were of the unanimous opinion that the word "laptop" mentioned in recommendation 10 of the Committee (page 10), be treated as deleted.

RESOLVED: That -

- (i) Minutes dated 23.04.2019 of the Committee with regard to rate revision and other charges for the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Amrita Shergil Girls' Hostel, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, as per **Appendix-XLVI**, be approved, except the word 'laptop' mentioned at Sr. No. 10 in the list of electric appliances, which be deleted, and incorporated in the Hand Book of Hostel Rules, for the session 2019-20.
- (ii) Minutes dated 09.04.2019 of the Committee with regard to revision of rates and other charges for the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur for the session 2019-20, as per **Appendix_** be approved.

4. Considered recommendations dated 30.01.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to certain issues of the Guest House in respect of rent charges, rates of meals/washing charges, renovation in the Guest Houses, under Items 1, 2, 3 and other Item No.2, **as per Appendix-XLVII**, be approved.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor the minutes of which have been attached here for approval, two Fellows have been made members and the Chairperson is a non-Fellow. It has already been decided that where Fellows are included, would be chaired by a Fellow or a member of the Syndicate.

The Vice chancellor said, sure, perhaps this Committee was constituted before that decision. This was also endorsed by Dr. K.K. Sharma.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the rates of rent of Guest Houses and other charges should be same for Fellows and Ex-Fellows.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma while referring to Point (ii) Page 14-B of the Agenda papers, the X.E.N. has got sanctioned a sum of Rs.50 lacs for the renovation of Faculty House. He is giving a statement that with this amount, only wash rooms could be renovated. This is a very exorbitant expenditure. There is lot of seepage in the Golden Jubilee Guest House.

Professor Rajesh Gill requested the Vice Chancellor to divert the money sanction for putting stones around the trees to which the Vice Chancellor said that it has been done. She further said that the stones around the trees should be got removed immediately.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the amount of Rs.50 lacs is too much for renovation of Golden Jubilee Guest House. This amount needed to be reduced and a person should be deputed to oversee this work so that it could be done in a proper manner.

When the Vice Chancellor requested Shri Sandeep Singh to say something on this issue, he said that he had raised this issue in the last two Syndicate/Senate meetings, but nothing has been done. A sum of Rs.50 lacs has been spent on the renovation of Golden Jubilee, but nothing has been done against anybody so far.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it has been recommended that in order to renovate and refurbishment of the rooms in the Faculty House, amount be enhanced on the basis of Golden Jubilee Guest House.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar requested the Vice Chancellor to appoint 3-4 good persons to take care of this work. In fact, the expenditure which is shown is not actually spent.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said, as has been discussed in the Senate that the doctor on night duty should stay in Health Centre and not in Room No. 4 of the Faculty House to which the Vice Chancellor said that the said room has been allotted to the doctor at night duty. Dr. K.K. Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to get the decision of the Senate implemented.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua wanted to know about the budget of Rs.50 lacs for renovation mentioned at page 14-B of the agenda papers.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the X.E.N. is saying that though this amount of Rs.50 lacs was for the renovation of rooms, but now only the renovation of washrooms could be done with this amount.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would call the concerned persons and get the work on hold. He can understand the whole thing.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is great need to have a check on the working of the X.E.N. Office. Who is looking after the fact whether the allocation is less or more and at what level this amount is being sanctioned. It is a very big amount to spend on the renovation of washrooms. Before starting the work on the renovation of washrooms, they should be asked about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know whether it is for the consideration of the Syndicate. Suppose, if the Syndicate approves it, would the budget be placed before the

higher authorities. Are they approving this? The meeting of the Committee was held on 30th January, 2019. Four months have elapsed as it is 28th May today. This Committee has said that this Budget Estimate would be placed before the higher authorities for providing the requisite budget at the earliest to carry out the work. He would like to say that after four months, even the action should have come along with these recommendations. At point No. (ii) at page 14-B of the agenda it has been asked to provide a budget of Rs.50 lacs. It has been mentioned that the XEN has asked to enhance the budget. It means he has been given endless time to the work as and when he likes it. If they approve these minutes like this, what is the value of the Syndicate? Four months have elapsed as the meeting was held on 30th January, 2019. Even during the period of these four months, he does not think if any budget estimate has been received, but he is sure that it must have been received. It may be pending with the Finance & Development or in the office of the Registrar or the Vice Chancellor's Office.

The Vice Chancellor said it might not be in his office. It was received in his office on 16th. He would like to give one input. He would like to talk about two things. First, some of the officials are saying that they face problem in conducting the meeting as most of the members suggest their own timings for holding the meeting and request to shift the meeting for the date convenient to them. The second thing is regarding the preparation of minutes of the meetings. He has also said this thing in the meeting of the Chairpersons that the minutes should be got prepared and signed from the members within a week in all circumstances. He has been returning all such minutes which have not been prepared well in time. Referring to page 15 of the agenda papers, the Vice Chancellor said that they could see that the meeting was held on 30.1.2019 and the signatures were got done on 17.3.2019. They could see the efficiency. He would like to tell that the officials are facing a lot of problem in getting the signatures of the Committee members done on the minutes. Moreover no body puts the date under his/her signatures, so it is not known when they have signed the minutes.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if the members consist of the people belonging to the departments, then there should not be any delay, which means that there is some problem in the working of the office.

The Vice Chancellor said, no, it is very common. After observing all these things, he has told in the meeting of the Chairpersons that if the minutes are not prepared within a week, he would change the whole Committee. If they do not have time, why they become members of the Committees? When someone is a Convener of the meeting, it is his/her duty to call the meeting, prepare the minutes, get the signatures of the members and process it further. If it is not done, it means that he/she is inefficient Convener. This is not happening in one Committee; rather, it is happening, almost in all the Committees. They feel a lot of problem in preparation of minutes and getting signatures of the members. Therefore, he would like to request all of them to observe all these things. If they allow him, he would get it recorded that the minutes should be got prepared and signed within one week and placed before the competent authority, so that it could be processed further. No paper is kept pending even for a day at the level of their 3-4 offices. He could say that, as of today, there is no work pending. He has also been tracking the cases where action has to be taken. For instance, a meeting regarding Ph.D. was held in the department, but the Chairperson was not aware of it and the case is lying pending in his office for the last one month. When it would be received in the office, there is a bit problem at the level of the dealing official and keeps it pending for some time. But, he would like to tell them that as soon as the case is received in the office, after 1-2 days it is submitted to the office of the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as regards the preparation of minutes, these are prepared by the Convener of the Committee. Thereafter, the minutes would be mailed to the members. This would also establish as to when the minutes were prepared. There may be some cases where the signatures or consent of the member is not received within the stipulated time. In such a situation, after the expiry of the

stipulated time, the approval of the Chairperson of the Committee could be sought. If some member is from outside, he should be sent a mail to get his/her consent.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they used to send their approval on mail in for minutes of Grievances Cell Committee.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the minutes should be part of the meeting, why these are not prepared on the same day.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a bit difficult, they should think it from the practical angle.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said sometimes there is a very small meeting of half an hour. If someone is coming from Khanna, he should get the minutes prepared and signed on the same day.

The Vice Chancellor said, this option could be thought considered if the meeting is not so lengthy.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that if the meeting is in the morning, the outside members could be requested to wait till the evening so that the minutes could be prepared and got signed.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that those members who did not intend to stay, their consent could be sought through email.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is a very good option.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that normally most of the meetings are held in the Committee Room of the Vice Chancellor's Office. As has been said by Dr. K.K. Sharma, in some of the meetings, the minutes are very short. The members try to get the minutes prepared and signed then and there, but there is no provision to type the minutes if the Convener is the Establishment Branch or the Estate Branch. Sometimes, the minutes contained only 4-5 lines.

The Vice Chancellor said that a number of meetings, one after the other, are held in the VCCR.

Professor Rajesh Gill said this is not so all the times. Most of the times the VCCR remains vacant, but there is no provision to get the minutes typed.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a very good idea and he would look into it. One Computer and Printer would be installed there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that most of the meetings are held either in the VCCR or in the Syndicate Room.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there is provision for authentication of signatures on the laptop itself. When the minutes would be circulated, he thinks, with the help of that particular software, one could just sign and authenticate it. In order to make paperless office, they have to acquire such software. Every officer should have this particular facility so that their electronic signature could be obtained. He thinks there is no problem in it.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a good idea.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when a meeting of the Committee would be held and decisions taken, where it is necessary that if there are ten members, all of them are required to sign the minutes? For the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, the

minutes are prepared by the Registrar and approved by the Vice Chancellor. The minutes of the Syndicate or the Senate are not got signed by all the members of the Syndicate or Senate. So, earlier also, the Chairperson of the Committee used to sign the minutes. But from the last some years, some of the members had objected that the decision taken was something else and recorded something else. So, at the heat of the moment, it was decided that signatures of all the members should be got done. When the Convener prepared the minutes, suppose, these are sent to him and he might say that the file be left with him and he would sign after reading the minutes. He may return the file after ten days, another member may return it after four days and so on. So, the simple solution to this is that the minutes be prepared and those tentative minutes be circulated to the members through email and objections sought within a stipulated time. After the expiry of the stipulated time, if no objection is received, the minutes could be confirmed by the Chairperson of the Committee to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is a very good idea. Continuing, he said that it should, however, be ensured that the Convener should record only that which has been decided in the meeting. He would tell him (Vice Chancellor) as to how the minutes are changed later on. This was the background for getting the signatures of all the members on the minutes. Otherwise also, it gives a wrong message that 8-9 persons are signing on the minutes before these are signed by the Chairperson. It should be seen so that the participation of all the members is there and the delay is also avoided.

The Vice Chancellor said that as has been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor S.K. Sharma, with the use of technology, their work would get easy.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should send the minutes of other Committees to the members as they have been sending the tentative minutes of Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would like to say that this should process should be made time bound. It should also be determined who would get the minutes prepared and get the signatures done. They have now discussed that it is the responsibility of the Convener to prepare the minutes and get the signatures of the members done. The Chairperson of the Committee should approve the minutes immediately and, thereafter, the minutes be submitted in the office of the Vice Chancellor. The whole process must be completed within a week. Unless and until it is made time bound, the things would not improve.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the tentative could be prepared by the next day of the meeting as the minutes are not usually so long of routine meetings. As far as possible, a hardcopy of the tentative minutes should be sent to the members, but if it is not possible, the same be sent through mail. The members should be given at least a week's time and after 2-3 days, the minutes be sent to the office of the Vice Chancellor. This process would take 10 days.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should give only a week's time, otherwise, the whole exercise would again become useless.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this exercise would be undertaken only if the minutes are very long, otherwise these could be finished immediately after the meeting as has been said by Professor Rajesh Gill.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is the first option. They would provide Computer and printer to get the minutes done immediately after the meeting. But if the minutes are long, the whole process of preparation of minutes and getting the minutes signed, should be completed within a week.

RESOLVED: That recommendations dated 30.01.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to certain issues of the Guest House in

respect of rent charges, rates of meals/washing charges, renovation in the Guest Houses, under Items 1, 2, 3 and other Item No.2, as per **Appendix-XLVII**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (i) Former Fellows be charged the same room rent, etc. by treating them at par with the existing Fellows; and;
- (ii) Tentative minutes (if could not be prepared immediately) of various meetings be got approved through email from all the members within seven working days and the same be sent within 10 working days for approval by the competent authority.

5.

Considered if benefit of Basic pay + G.P. & D.A. be granted to the daily wage employees appointed on D.C. Rates after December, 2008 in view of the Legal opinion (**Appendix-XLVIII**), pursuant to recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 13.11.2018.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Finance dated 13.11.2018 (item 17) along with recommendations of the Committee dated 26.09.2018 is enclosed (**Appendix-XLVIII**).
 2. A copy of General discussion (9) of the Senate in its meeting dated 3.11.2018 enclosed (**Appendix-XLVIII**).
 3. A detailed office note containing the financial liability, etc. in this regard is enclosed (**Appendix-XLVIII**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should first see as to what they are doing, there should be clarity in it. If they see the legal opinion, available at page 48 of the agenda papers, it is very clearly written, “daily wage employees, ad hoc appointees, employees employed on casual basis, contractual employees and the like, discharging similar duties and responsibilities as regular employees, are entitled to draw wages at the minimum of the pay-scale drawn by regular employees, along with Dearness Allowance (as revised from time to time), but without any other allowances. If “Grade Pay” is considered to be a part of Basic Pay, then the aforesaid minimum of the pay-scale would include such Grade Pay as well, in my opinion.....”. The Committee had recommended that the daily wage employees be given DA/GP after 10 years. But if they see the legal opinion, it says that any such type of employee who has been employed, he/she is immediately eligible for DA/DP. The way this item has come here, the meaning is very clear, it says, all employees are eligible for DA/GP.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired whether the Security Guards who are ex-serviceman, are also covered under this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said all such employees are covered under this.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that all such employees are eligible for this benefit irrespective of the fact where one is employed.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Finance & Development would give some input in this regard.

It was informed that the legal opinion was sought on the basis of the decision of the Board of Finance. The original item which was placed before the Board of Finance was that all the employees, to the extent of available vacant slots, may be considered for this benefit, but in the Board of Finance meeting it was considered that this much of liability is not possible to be borne by the University at this stage because the annual liability would be around Rs.5 to Rs.7 crores. Then the Board of Finance considered the

matter and arrived at the considered view that it can be implemented in a phased manner. So, at the first instance, those employees who have already completed 10 years of service, they will be given this benefit, but with two caveat, one, that it may be examined legally, considering their existing contract, whether they could do it. So, specific legal opinion was sought that if they want to implement this decision for those who have completed 10 years of service, can they do it. On the basis of this a legal opinion has been given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be made clear as to what they are passing.

On being asked, it was clarified that employees working at different places in all the categories would be covered under this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the question which has been raised by Professor Navdeep Goyal has not been answered.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is ambiguity, it is a financial matter, so everything should be clear.

Shri Ashok Goyal said they sought legal opinion on the point that whether the employees who have completed 10 years of service could be given this benefit, because the Board of Finance has recommended this. He asked that when they sought legal opinion for those who have completed 10 years of service, what reply received? Have they received the reply that the employees who have completed 10 years of service should be given this benefit? This was endorsed by the Vice Chancellor and Dr. K.K. Sharma. Actually, the reply is that this benefit should be extended to those who have completed even 10 days of service. It was said that the Board of Finance has said that they cannot bear this much of liability, which they also know. So, today, they are taking a decision to grant this benefit to those who have completed 10 years of service, it should not be stopped. But in view of the legal opinion and in view of the latest Supreme Court judgement, as has been quoted by the Legal Retainer, the issue needs to be relooked by the Board of Finance. It should be told that the persons who have completed 10 years of service have been given this benefit, but they have also to extend this benefit to all others also. Now, there are two methods for this. They could say that till the time this benefit is extended to all, the benefit being given to those who have completed 10 years of service should also be stopped, but they have not to do that. But, as per rule, if they deny the benefit to someone which is due to him/her, then they should not hesitate to take it to the Board of Finance, especially in view of the fact that they have received the legal opinion and Supreme Court decision, which is now on record with them. If there is any way to ignore this, the F.D.O. could tell about it.

It was informed that there is principle of Equal pay, Equal work, there is one more factor i.e. mode of appointment. If the mode of appointment for two persons is different, then the concept of Equal pay, Equal work, cannot be applied. This is a flaw in it. If they would consider it legally, it may not happen that the benefit which they are giving on completion of 10 years, may get into a fix. The issue of mode of appointment whether it was similar or not, might create a problem in this matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there is any issue of mode of appointment, it has not asked while giving the legal opinion, whether the mode of appointment was similar or not.

It was clarified that in the legal opinion, they have just asked whether they could give the benefit or not to those who have completed 10 years of service and not about the mode of appointment. Had they questioned that these employees are demanding Equal Pay for Equal Work, then all the parameters from the very beginning i.e. qualifications, mode of appointment etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should grant the benefit to those who have completed 10 years of service, because they say that they wanted to give this benefit to them. It means, it is up to them only whether they would like to give this benefit or not. The ground on which they are extending the benefit to those employees who have completed 10 years of service, ignoring the fact whether they were appointed on similar grounds etc., on the same ground they could try to give this benefit to all. If it could be done, it is okay, otherwise leave it. On a question raised by the F.D.O., Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been decided that the persons who have completed 10 years of service would be given this benefit.

It was said that if they review this issue in another way, he (FDO) has apprehension that an issue may not arise in the Board of Finance that the decision for giving the benefit to those who have completed 10 years service may also not get into a trouble.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they approving it that those who have completed 10 years of service would be given this benefit.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that how the case is to be prepared on the basis of the distinction about which they are talking here, a Committee of the Syndicate members could be constituted so that the case could be placed before the Board of Finance. The members of the Board of Finance could also be included in the Committee.

It was said (by the F.D.O.) that his submission let they first implement that those who have completed 10 years of service, they should be given the benefit at the first instance and the issue of giving benefit to all should not be included in this discussion at the moment.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it is better if they take up this issue later on and at the moment it should be closed.

The members said that item under consideration is passed and the daily-wages employees, who have completed at least 10 years of service, be given this benefit

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have passed the item i.e. the recommendation of the Committee relating to completion of 10 years of service. If they look at the item, it seems that they are extending this benefit to the daily wage employees.

It was reiterated by the Registrar that they are approving the recommendations of the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the item it is written that in view of the legal opinion, pursuant to recommendations of the Board of Finance date 13.11.2018, it meant that the legal opinion has come in pursuant of the BOF, but they are passing the recommendations of the Committee and recommendations of Board of Finance.

The Registrar said, just to avoid complications, what had been happening in the past was that they appoint the persons with one day break because there had been objection from the audit. So, they should also approve that to count 10 years of service, the notional break of one day shall be ignored. Secondly, on completion of 10 years of service, enhance pay shall be applicable from the first day of the next month.

The Vice Chancellor said with this, there would be clarity; otherwise, if they grant this benefit from different dates, that would create problems.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that this provision should be on continuous basis i.e. as and when one completes 10 years of service, he would be given the benefit from the first day of the next month.

The Vice Chancellor said that being the Vice Chancellor, ultimately, he has see, execute and to face the things. Since crores of rupees needed to be spent for extending this benefit, he sought the cooperation of the members for getting funds for the purpose. They have to think from where the money would come. They have also got permission to make appointments, but the government would not provide the money because the University already told them that it would not demand additional funds to this some of the members requested the Vice Chancellor to rectify it. The Vice Chancellor requested the members belonging to the Colleges to cooperate in solving the issues related to the colleges. They should meet the Hon'ble Governor, Punjab Chief Secretary and other people, for which he would help them in having a liaison. The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Sandeep Singh if he had ever met the D.P.I., Colleges, Punjab.

Shri Sandeep Singh said he (Vice Chancellor) should tell to whom he is required to meet. He is ready to meet any person.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had to liaison with the D.P.I., but no one followed the case and the money could not be got released. If someone go to the D.P.I. office and impress upon them, the funds could be got released. What who will do it? They have a good number of colleges, so all of them should make efforts in this regard. He is ready to give his services wherever required. The things which are required to be got done at the Central Government level, that he would get done, but the issues concerning the colleges are to be dealt with at the level of D.P.I. Colleges, Punjab or the Punjab Government. They are not doing anything in it. Nobody is talking about the problems of non-teaching staff. Many a times he is pained, they do not talk about the academics.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that as there is PUTA in Panjab University, similarly for the Punjab & Chandigarh Colleges, there is Chandigarh and College Teachers' University which is making efforts in this regard and got grants in crores.

The Vice Chancellor, however, said that nobody is doing anything. He should not be compelled to speak as they were not able to get even two increments and also grant from RUSA. Let they should perform.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) in pursuance to the recommendation of the Board of Finance dated 13.11.2018, all daily wage employees (appointed on DC rates), who have completed at least 10 years of service, be given the benefit of Basic pay + G.P.(if any) & D.A.
- (ii) The above benefit be also extended to remaining daily wage employees (working on DC rates), as and when they complete 10 years' of service.
- (iii) the notional break in their service be ignored; and
- (iv) the benefit of enhanced pay will be given from the 1st of next month in which one completes 10 years of service.

- 6.** Considered if the term of appointment of the Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor, Centre for Stem Cell Tissue Engineering and Biomedical Excellence, purely on temporary basis, be extended up to 30.6.2019, on the same term and conditions, on which he was working earlier, with one day break on 01.05.2019, under Regulation 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. He will automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the semester/academic sessions. Information contained in office note **(Appendix-XLIX)** was also taken for consideration.

- NOTE:** 1. Dr. Anuj Gupta was appointed as Assistant Professor at Centre for Stem Cell Tissue Engineering and Biomedical Excellence, purely on temporary basis in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible for the academic session 2010-2011. He was re-appointed afresh for the further Academic session i.e. 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016, 2016--2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, under 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007
2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015, has decided that all the persons working as Guest faculty and/or temporary or Part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the regular appointment.
3. Request dated 26.4.2019 of the Chairperson, Centre for Stem Cell Tissue Engineering and Biomedical Excellence along with recommendations of the Administrative & Academic Committee dated 11.4.2019 is enclosed **(Appendix-XLIX)**.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they should authorise the Vice Chancellor, to extend the term of appointment, so that there could be no problem in giving approval even in case received even in the month of July.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a very good suggestion, which would help in smoothening the process.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that with regard to the temporary appointment, there is a very clear cut decision that they cannot replace them. Obviously, the extension has to be allowed. It may be there that the Syndicate meeting may be held after a gap of 1½ month, as such their salary would stop unnecessarily. Therefore, the Vice Chancellor should have the authorisation. The Vice Chancellor should approve the appointments in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate. The item could be placed as a ratification item. There is another issue which they have noted at one or two places. It is also in the knowledge of the Vice Chancellor that in order to remove a person, the teaching load is deliberately reduced. He would suggest that if there is such a case, that should be brought to the Syndicate, it would also strengthen the hands of the Vice Chancellor. Elaborating the point, he said that if the Vice Chancellor gets a report that the department is committing some injustice to anybody, it should be placed before the Syndicate.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that while extending the term of appointment it should be ensured that the department is having adequate workload. For example, if there is no work load at the PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, why they should give extension there? It would be unnecessary burden on the University exchequer. The Vice Chancellor has the authorisation to extend the term of appointment if the workload is adequate.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that when they would check the workload for the current session, it should be tallied with the previous year's time table. Sometimes, in order to increase the workload, the departments usually depute 2-3 persons for conduct of practical. So, this is what they need to check.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said they should check as to how they increased the work load in the last year and how they are increasing the workload in this year, both should be tallied, only then some decision should be taken.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that the workload of the last two years should be tallied.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Professor Rajat Sandhir has said, he has said this because where the Vice Chancellor feels that there is no hitch in granting the extension in appointment, he should do it in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, but if the department wants to remove some persons, such cases should be brought to the Syndicate. He is saying so because a department is asking for extension of a teacher, but in the next year, with same circumstances, same workload and for teaching same courses, it is saying that they do not need the services of a teacher. So, it should not be there that workload should not be reduced to remove someone or workload should be increased to adjust someone.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the extension cases must be approved. There is a decision of the Syndicate dated 31.5.2015 says that, it is decided that all the persons working as guest faculty or temporary or on part time basis, should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by regular appointment. The decision is with regard to both guest or temporary faculty. The temporary faculty is given salary for twelve months, but the guest faculty is also appointed in the University, they give them extension only if they have to favour someone. Can they not reduce this arbitrariness? If the department does not want to retain a person, they could do anything, such as reducing of workload, change of course and due to this many teachers have to suffer. If there is same course and same workload, the teacher who have taught in the previous year should be allowed to teach in the next semester.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members, suppose a person did not perform well, what would be done in such a case?

Professor Rajesh Gill said, that is a separate issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he talking about the quality education. Suppose a person is not performing well and creating problems in the department, but his case is being approved by the Vice Chancellor/Syndicate for the last 3-4 years. In such cases, people think that there is blanket permission and one would get approval from the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate. But, he would bring such cases to the Syndicate. There may be cases where the work is the same, course is the same, but the person is not performing well.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is right, but the case has to put up in black and white.

The Vice Chancellor said this is what he is saying, he would not grant blanket permission.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are also saying the same thing that where he (Vice Chancellor) is convinced, he could grant permission, but if there is some issue, such a case should be brought to the Syndicate.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that new guidelines have come for appointment of Guest Faculty, so they should appoint the teachers according to new guidelines and the honorarium should also be paid according to them according to the these guidelines. There is another core issue. They have approved the 7th Pay Commission in Senate/Syndicate and Board of Finance. They would take up the cases of guest faculty as per the new guidelines of Guest Faculty, but the Guest Faculty would not be able to get the arrears if they did not appoint them according to the new guidelines because the selection procedure is different in the new guidelines.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is right, but there is some technical problem in it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Professor Rajat Sandhir has given a very good suggestion. At present, the selection procedure for the appointment of Guest Faculty is different from the one which has been suggested by the UGC now. They should at least approve it henceforth. The selection procedure for appointment of guest faculty is different. The advantage of following new guidelines would be that, suppose, they are appointing the Guest Faculty today, then they would not have to repeat the procedure again and that could be implemented in time.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said if the permission for implementation of 7th Pay Commission recommendations are received after a year, would they deny the enhanced honorarium. This item was being brought in the Syndicate of January month, but the item was removed from the agenda owing to imposition of Code of Conduct.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the next session is going to start. So, at least the next appointments should be made as per the Selection Committee mentioned in the new guidelines.

The Vice Chancellor said that both the things are different. Professor Rajat Sandhir is talking about the money, here they are attached with the Punjab Government, so this is not so easy. As regards making appointments through the Selection Committee, they are working on this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, suppose, they make appointments through a different Committee than the mentioned in the new guidelines, when they have to implement the 7th Pay Commission, they have to get done all the selections again.

The Vice Chancellor said, suppose, they accept and implement what he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is saying, then the persons so appointed would ask remuneration as per the 7th Pay Commission.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is just talking that the Selection should be made as per the new guidelines for appointment of guest faculty for which the Syndicate would authorise the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should first examine it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they could tell the government that they have adopted the selection procedure as per the new guidelines.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is positive on this issues and he would see as to how it could be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are authorising him (Vice Chancellor) to make selection as per the new guidelines so that he could change the Selection Committee accordingly for appointments which would be made for the ensuing session.

The Registrar said that items from 6 to 9 are the same which relate to extension of appointment. Here the first extension is for one month only i.e. up to 30th June with one day's break. Secondly, for the new session, some departments did not send the approval cases, now applications from them are also pouring in. As has been said by Professor Navdeep Goyal that the item is approved as such, but along with it, the Vice Chancellor, on the recommendations of the departments, in the normal cases, is authorised to give extension to teachers on temporary basis on behalf of the Syndicate and henceforth such normal items would come to the Syndicate for ratification only. Secondly, the Vice Chancellor is authorised to frame policy regarding the guest faculty appointment.

The Vice Chancellor said that the policy is already there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said they should constitute the Selection Committee as per the new guidelines to which the Vice Chancellor said, 'yes' they should include the word 'selection Committee'.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should write that in view of the latest guidelines, this issue would be looked into.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in Note 2 to Item 9 at page 73 of the agenda, it has been written that "The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015, has decided that all the persons working as Guest Faculty", but it has been wrongly recorded as the same was not approved.

The Registrar said that this is what Professor Rajesh Gill has said that it has been passed in the year 2015.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it was not passed, it has been recorded wrongly. He would like to tell as to what is common in between these two i.e. Guest Faculty and the Temporary Faculty is that, they cannot be replaced. But the persons appointed on temporary basis are to be given extension and the Guest Faculty is to be retained only for the time, he/she has been appointed. When an appointment is to be made for the next session, he/she would be appointed. For the intervening period, they would not be paid salary. So, this not should be corrected that this is not applicable for the Guest Faculty in view of the decision of 2015. Secondly, with regard to approval of extension of appointment of temporary and Guest Faculty appointment, the Vice Chancellor has to monitor that nobody could exploit the process for favouring/opposing somebody. He (Vice Chancellor) may not wait for the Syndicate meeting for granting extension, because due to this, there would be a problem in paying salary to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has also observed that the things are taken as granted. Summer vacations are going to start, but most of the Chairpersons have not sent their recommendations for the appointment of Guest Faculty and Temporary Faculty. He has received very few cases of extension in appointment of Guest Faculty and Temporary Faculty.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have given authorisation to the Vice Chancellor for approval of such cases.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no question of authorisation. They have asked the Chairpersons to send their recommendations in this regard.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that a circular has to be sent to the departments asking them to send the cases of extension in appointment.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is talking about the sincerity. He would like to say that if one is the Chairperson of a department, is it not his concern to run the department? If he sends a note of displeasure, it would be taken in other way.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that a notice from the Registrar should go to all the department in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be recorded that the Chairpersons should send their recommendations regarding extension in the appointment of Guest Faculty/Temporary Faculty well in advance duly forwarded with all the justification and enclosures; otherwise, that would attract the disciplinary action.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recommendation in this regard should be sent at least two month before the start of the next session.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that names for extension in appointment should be got approved by the Administrative and Academic Committees of the department. Otherwise, it would become a prerogative of the Chairperson.

On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal as to what has been resolved about the Chairpersons who do not send the recommendations in time in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said they would be asked to send their recommendation well in advance.

On being asked by Shri Ashok Goyal whether a notice for sending their recommendations would be sent every year, the Vice Chancellor said when a decision is taken here, they have to send it, however it would circulate once. If they do not send recommendations, the cases would be placed before the Syndicate for taking action.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are cases where the Guest Faculty is appointed in the month of December or January and the case is placed before the Syndicate in the month of April and the semester is now going end.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that everybody knows here that everything is done here. So, let them take some very clear-cut action. There are 2-3 such cases, in which the recommendations have not been sent and he is going to send his displeasure. Somebody, who is Director, says that he was out of station, being Sunday. At least he/she should apply for station leave. It is very sad that a person, who has been appointed as Chairperson of a Department, does not know as to how he should go out of station.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that station leave is must for all. The Director or Chairperson has to inform the Dean University Instruction.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that there are instances where action has been taken against the persons who have not taken station leave.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would enforce this provision and requested Professor Rajesh Gill, PUTA President to cooperate him.

Professor Rajesh Gill suggested that a circular should be sent to all the departments in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would issue a circular in this regard, but he would take action against those who would not abide it.

Professor S.K. Sharma said it is necessary to inform the Chairpersons about it.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they cannot take action at once without informing the Chairpersons.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should issue a circular stating that it has come to his notice that those teachers who do not take station leave, action would be taken against them.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that it would be very unpleasant.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that without issuing a notice, he could not take action.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have a separate clause for taking disciplinary action.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not unpleasant. He is saying that it should be written that it has come to his notice that the people do not take station leave.

The Vice Chancellor said that an uncomfortable thing is not spoken again and again as all the Chairpersons and Professors are respectable members of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, when they would take action, would that be not unpleasant work?

Professor Rajesh Gill said that disciplinary action is also an unpleasant word.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already stated this in the meeting of the Chairpersons. It would not be nice to say this thing again and again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have no objection to it and also not passing this here. They are just giving a suggestion to him (Vice Chancellor). The sentiments which he (Vice Chancellor) has expressed, perhaps, he would not believe it that many of the teachers do not know that they cannot go out of station without station leave. Actually, this is the regular practice in all the organisations to remind and reiterate the instructions from time to time so that the new appointees should be made aware of it and the old ones may not forget it. As he (Vice Chancellor) must be aware that the Credit Card Companies run with overdue interest. In spite of this, they give a message that such and such amount is due to be paid. They should not have sent such messages because they would be losing interest. So, he would suggest that they should send a circular every year to the Chairpersons asking them to send their recommendations within a stipulated period and after that no request would be entertained. If such a circular is sent every year, at least they could not escape the responsibility that they were not aware of it. What he has gathered is that the purpose of the Vice Chancellor is not to harass anyone rather it is to streamline the system. He thinks that such steps should be taken at the administrative level by the Registrar/Dean University Instruction, but not as a decision of the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That the term of appointment of the Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor, Centre for Stem Cell Tissue Engineering and Biomedical Excellence, purely on temporary basis, be extended up to 30.6.2019, on the same term and conditions, on which he was working earlier, with one day break on 01.05.2019, under Regulation 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. He will automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the semester/academic session.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

- (i) the Vice Chancellor is authorised in future to approve the extension cases, (if any), of faculty working on temporary basis under regulation 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 in anticipation of approval of Syndicate; and
- (ii) the Registrar is directed to issue a circular to all the teaching department/centres/constituent colleges requesting them to forward the cases of extension of appointment of temporary faculty after following the proper procedure to the Vice Chancellor for approval well in advance.

7. Considered if the term appointment of the following persons as Assistant Professor, UIET, purely on temporary basis be extended up to 30.06.2019 on the same term and conditions, on which they were working earlier, with one day break on 01.05.2019, under Regulation 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. They will automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the semester/academic session. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-L**) was also taken for consideration.

Sr. No.	Name of persons	Branch
1.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
2.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Applied Management
3.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Applied Management
4.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh	IT
5.	Ms. Rajni Sobti	IT
6.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
7.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Applied Sciences
8.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Applied Sciences
9.	Ms. Geetu	Applied Sciences
10.	Dr. Jyoti Sood	Applied Sciences
11.	Ms. Renuka Rai	Applied Sciences
12.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Applied Sciences
13.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
14.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Biotech
15.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Biotech
16.	Dr. Ranjana Bhatia	Biotech
17.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Biotech
18.	Mr. Saravjit Singh	ECE
19.	Ms. Garima Joshi	ECE
20.	Ms. Daljit Kaur	ECE
21.	Ms. Pardeep Kaur	ECE
22.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
23.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
24.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
25.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
26.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	ECE (Micro Electronics)
27.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
28.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	ECE

- NOTE:**
- 1 The above persons were appointed as Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis, at UIET for the academic session 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.6000/- plus other allowances under 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Vol. I, 2007.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015, has decided that all the persons working as Guest faculty and/or temporary or Part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the regular appointment.
 3. Request dated 16.4.2019 of the Director, UIET alongwith recommendations of the Administrative & Academic Committee dated 22.3.2019 is enclosed (**Appendix-L**).

RESOLVED: That the term appointment of the following persons as Assistant Professor, UIET, purely on temporary basis be extended up to 30.06.2019 on the same term and conditions, on which they were working earlier, with one day break on 01.05.2019, under Regulation 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. They will automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the semester/academic session.

Sr. No.	Name of persons	Branch
1.	Ms. Dhriti	CSE
2.	Mr. Hitesh Kapoor	Applied Management
3.	Ms. Anu Jhamb	Applied Management

4.	Mr. Sukhvir Singh	IT
5.	Ms. Rajni Sobti	IT
6.	Mr. Rajneesh Singla	IT
7.	Ms. Jyoti Sharma	Applied Sciences
8.	Ms. Prabhjot Kaur	Applied Sciences
9.	Ms. Geetu	Applied Sciences
10.	Dr. Jyoti Sood	Applied Sciences
11.	Ms. Renuka Rai	Applied Sciences
12.	Ms. Mamta Sharma	Applied Sciences
13.	Mr. Amit Thakur	Mech.
14.	Dr. Anu Priya Minhas	Biotech
15.	Dr. Minakshi Garg	Biotech
16.	Dr. Ranjana Bhatia	Biotech
17.	Dr. Parminder Kaur	Biotech
18.	Mr. Saravjit Singh	ECE
19.	Ms. Garima Joshi	ECE
20.	Ms. Daljit Kaur	ECE
21.	Ms. Pardeep Kaur	ECE
22.	Ms. Anahat Dhindsa	ECE
23.	Mr. Jitender Singh	ECE
24.	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar	ECE
25.	Ms. Harvinder Kaur	ECE
26.	Mr. Vijay Kumar	ECE (Micro Electronics)
27.	Ms. Gurpreet Kaur	ECE
28.	Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bedi	ECE

8.

Considered if:

- (i) The term of appointment of Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor, Centre for Public Health IEAST, be extended till 30.06.2019 (with one day break i.e. on 01.05.2019) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- + two increments, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier; and
- (ii) Dr. Manoj Kumar, be re-appointed afresh as Assistant Professor, Centre for Public Health IEAST, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date of start of classes for the academic session 2019-20 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- + two increments, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier for the session 2018-19.

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

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.11.2018 (Para 17 (vii)) has re-appointed afresh Dr. Manoj Kumar as Assistant Professor, Centre for Public Health, IEAST, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date of start of classes for the academic session 2018-19 i.e. 09.07.2018, on the first opening day after the summer vacation or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- + two increments, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, on

the same terms and conditions on which he is working earlier, which was read out and noted by the Senate in its meeting dated 15.12.2018 (Para XVI I-3).

2. Request dated 29.04.2019 of the Coordinator, Centre for Public Health, IEAST, P.U. along with minutes dated 11.4.2019 of JAC is enclosed **(Appendix-LI)**.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) The term of appointment of Dr. Manoj Kumar, Assistant Professor, Centre for Public Health IEAST, be extended till 30.06.2019 (with one day break i.e. on 01.05.2019) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- + two increments, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier; and
- (ii) Dr. Manoj Kumar, be re-appointed afresh as Assistant Professor, Centre for Public Health IEAST, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date of start of classes for the academic session 2019-20 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- + two increments, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier for the session 2018-19.

- 9.** Considered if Mohd. Samshad Alam and Mohd. Taukir Alam, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis), Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, for the session 2019-2020 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier on the same term and conditions according to which they have worked previously during the session 2018-2019, under Regulation 5 at page 111, P.U. Cal. Vol., 2007. They automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the semester/academic session.

- NOTE:** 1. Mohd. Samshad Alam and Mohd. Taukir Alam as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis), Department of Community Education and Disability Studies were appointed as Assistant Professor for the academic session 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Rs.6000/- plus other allowances under 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007
2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015, has decided that all the persons working as Guest faculty and/or temporary or Part-time basis should be allowed to continue as such until they are replaced by the regular appointment.
3. Request dated 30.4.2019 of the Chairperson, Department of Community Education and Disability Studies along with recommendations of the Administrative & Academic Committee dated 26.4.2019 is enclosed (**Appendix-LII**).

RESOLVED: That Mohd. Samshad Alam and Mohd. Taukir Alam, be re-appointed as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis), Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, for the session 2019-2020 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier on the same term and conditions according to which they worked during the session 2018-2019, under Regulation 5 at page 111, P.U. Calendar, Volume 2007. They will automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the semester/academic session.

- 10.** Considered minutes dated 02.04.2019 (**Appendix-LIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding proposal for appointment of outside adjunct faculty (as per UGC Guidelines) at the University Teaching Departments.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.12.2018 (Para 4) (Appendix-VIII Pages 93-95) considered minutes dated 28.09.2016 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding proposal for appointment of outside adjunct faculty (as per UGC Guidelines) at the University Teaching Departments and it was resolved that for the time being, the consideration of the Item be deferred, and at the same time, the matter be referred to the same Committee to revisit the matter and make comprehensive recommendations. Professor Keshav Malhotra be also made a member of the afore-said Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would like to tell something for the information of the members. This item was also placed before the previous meeting of the Syndicate, but at that time the guidelines which were received from the UGC were not attached which have now been attached. Secondly, the Committee has made some changes in the guidelines, but those are not changes basically. For example, if the UGC has written, Head of the Institution or his nominee, since at their University, the Vice Chancellor is the Head of the Institution, so they replaced it with 'Vice Chancellor'. Similarly, they have said, 'Dean Academic Research' they have replaced it as Dean University Instruction'. The words 'one external expert nominated by the Head of the Institutions', has been replaced with 'one external expert nominated by the Vice Chancellor. Registrar/Vice Principal/Bursar or equivalent has been replaced with the Dean of the concerned Faculty which is appointed in the Selection Committee as a member. The words, 'competent authority' have been replaced with 'Syndicate'. In the UGC guidelines it is mentioned that the strength of the Adjunct Faculty should not exceed 25% of the sanctioned strength of the faculty. In addition to it they have added in it, 'not more than two Adjunct Faculty per department'. He is telling about the changes just to help the members to which the Vice Chancellor said that otherwise the item is passed. They have made one more change with regard to honorarium. They have said that as far as honorarium is concerned, the guidelines for Guest Faculty are there, the same should be applicable to the Adjunct Faculty because they do not want to put more burden on the University.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, while referring to Para 6 at page 94 of the agenda papers, said that there was a suggestion regarding the specialised courses. It says that specialized courses have to be introduced in the Affiliated Colleges under this scheme. He had been saying since the last six months that a Committee consisting of the College Principals and teachers' representatives be constituted to start new courses. He has said this in the Principals Conference also. The coming time is very difficult for the colleges and for that the constitution of this Committee is must. The Guru Nanak Dev University has introduced many such new courses and the other Universities are also following the suit. They should study those courses and after finding out their employability of the courses, they also need to introduce such courses.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council, to send a circular in this regard and a Committee would be constituted to look into the issue.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma further said that there should be some flexibility. Some traditional courses are already running. If the teachers are already there, then with the appointment of Adjunct Faculty, the workload of the teachers would end up or reduced. But they have to use the expertise of the Adjunct Faculty, so there is

need to have some flexibility. They have been mentioned that 25% of the sanctioned strength of teaching faculty, could be Adjunct Faculty. So, such a provision should be made for the colleges also that they could also appoint 25% Adjunct Faculty. The College Principal should inform the University as to in which field they have appointed the Adjunct Faculty.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that since the inception of the University, only traditional courses are running, but now the scenario has changed. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma has explained about it in detail. At present there is dire need of starting such courses. But here what is happening is that the UGC prepares the syllabus of a Course and sends it to the University to start in the colleges, but in Punjab or Chandigarh College, the students do not get much benefit out of it. As stated by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, it would be better if the University constitute its own Think Tank and design the syllabus of the courses. The University should send the list/syllabus of these courses to the Principals of the colleges for introducing the same. He thinks that it would be very beneficial.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the Dean College Development Council should get a list of courses along with the curriculum from the Universities in Punjab, Delhi or other Universities, even in South India where such courses are introduced. In South of India, people are much ahead of them. The Dean College Development Council should prepare a list so that the same could be provided to the Committee to be constituted. It would help the Committee to determine the employability and potential of a course.

Principal Inderjit Kaur suggested that the duration of a course should not be so long. The duration should be one year course like that of a diploma course.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma to suggest some of such courses.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it would be done in the Committee meeting.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that there is resistance to change in the public. They had started many B.Voc. degree programmes, such as Banking Insurance, Retail Management, Multimedia Graphic and English Speaking Software. People do join these courses initially, but after that the strength reduced only up to 10-15 students. Their bent of mind remains towards traditional courses. So, whatever grant the colleges have received from the UGC to start such courses, seems to be procured on an individual basis. So, as has been stated by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, it would be better if such courses are started simultaneously in all the colleges by the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the colleges are facing the problem of their survival. There is a very big gap posts at the level of the D.P.I. Colleges, Punjab and the University relating to 1925. In that notification it has been said that after 3-4 posts, one post should be converted to teach the Vocational Courses, which they did. But they have a problem as to where these teachers would be deputed after converting these posts to Vocational Courses. Rather, they have deputed the Vocational course teachers to teach the traditional Courses as they do not have such courses. This is a fact. Secondly, it has been said that the list/syllabus of courses be got prepared from the University, but he would like to say that there is a big gap between the University teachers and the teachers teaching in the rural areas. It cannot be viewed which course is running at the Panjab University and which course would be suitable for Suitab Muktsar Sahib, which course is required to be started at Ludhiana or at Hoshiarpur. A circular should be sent to all the Principals of affiliated colleges as to which course they would like to start as per the requirement of their area. For one college, Physical Education course could be better, but for the other it may not suit. Thirdly, when one such a Committee is constituted consisting of teachers from the University. Rural area teachers should be associated with the Committee. The other issue is that Community

Colleges, they admit students because they get grant for that, but there is no provision for appointing permanent faculty. The scam which occurred, due to which the amount to be given to the SC students is held up, he apprehended that after two years, this scam would occur. The provision for running a Community College is that they have to bring the students residing in slum area, they might belong to the weaker section, but in most of the colleges, just to get grant, a student is admitted at the undergraduate level and the same student is being taught the B.Voc. Course in the evening classes. So, the University should send a circular to the colleges that they would not promote this malpractice. Before, the Colleges send their papers to the UGC for grant, the University should take an affidavit from them that in the Community Colleges, only those students would be admitted who fulfil the conditions. In fact, it is happening that the benefit of this scheme of the Government is not reaching out to those students for which it was made. It is adhered to strictly, then they might bring students from the slums.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that some time ago he (Vice Chancellor) has said that they do not discuss academic issues meeting and now Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua has spoken on an academic issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that 90% discussion should be on academic issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, in fact, there is not even 5% discussion on academic issues and it should also not have done, because for academic issues, they have many Academic Bodies, i.e. starting from Academic Committee of the Department to Board of Studies, Faculties, Academic Council, but they do not system for other issues. It is the impression that Senate and Syndicate are the academic bodies, but it is not.

The Vice Chancellor said that Syndicate and Senate are the Bodies of a big institution, so, it is seen under a big umbrella as all are Professors and academicians here.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, the Syndicate and Senate consider all the aspects of the University, including the academic issues. He would like to say that the suggestions which have been given, are very good. Let they should confess that in Panjab University, they hesitate to change their syllabus as per the changing trends. He had also talked about this in the Faculty of Commerce & Business Management. He would be surprised to know that in BBA, there is a paper of Computer, but there is no practical. The students pass the paper, but they say that they do not know as to what is a computer. The student who does not know how to operate the Computer, he could not understand, what they see in the degree of BBA. It is very surprising that there is no computer training. When he enquired about it, he came to know that it is not in the syllabus. Though, it is there in the B.Com. Course, but practical is also not there. He is of the opinion that with the changing time, they should also change the syllabus, especially in view of the fact that the surrounding Universities are very quickly changing their syllabus. So, they could give a message to various bodies that they need to change the syllabus according to the changing time.

Professor Rajesh Gill while referring to page 83 of the agenda regarding engagement modalities, said that this is a very good scheme, but there could be many financial implications. There is lot of subjectivity. When they say that for skill based courses, one should be an accomplished professional, expert in his chosen field of discipline and may not necessarily possess qualifications prescribed under the UGC Regulations. So, there is much arbitrariness. Earlier also, they had appointed Honorary Professors or Visiting Professor in this way, so one should be a little more cautious. The maximum limit of remuneration to them is Rs. 80,000/- per month. So, selection should be very fair.

The Vice Chancellor said he would look into this.

RESOLVED: That the minutes dated 02.04.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding proposal for appointment of outside adjunct faculty

(as per UGC Guidelines) at the University Teaching Departments, **as per Appendix-LIII**, be approved.

- 11.** Considered minutes dated 22.04.2019 (**Appendix-LIV**) of the Committee, constituted in pursuance of the decision (Para 7) of the Syndicate dated 18.02.2019, that at point No.2 be referred back to the committee for re-examining the guidelines and *inter alia* decided the words “Students should not be involved in any Dharna & protest” be deleted.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2019 (Para 7) (**Appendix-LIV**) considered minutes dated 19.12.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to frame guidelines/rules for providing concession of full fee/tuition fee and examination fee to the transgender students and it was 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.
2. Point No.2 of the minutes of the Committee dated 19.12.2018 is re-produced below:-

“Student should not involve in criminal cases, ragging or any other misconduct/ violation of University Rules. Moreover, they should not be involved in any Dharnas & Protests”.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that there is an undertaken written at point No.2 of the minutes i.e. ‘student should not involve in criminal cases, ragging or any other misconduct/violation of University Rules. Moreover, they should not be involved in any Dharnas & Protests’. If this undertaking is for all the students, it is okay, otherwise it looks odd. It should be seen if the earlier clause i.e. ‘student should not involve in criminal cases, ragging or any other misconduct etc. is only for the transgenders, or for all. If it is for all, it is okay, otherwise it should be removed.

The Vice Chancellor that this could be examined.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that point 4 at page 103 of the agenda papers was discussed last time also. Do they need to have an affidavit from the transgender students, whether they live with their parents or not? They are giving them the benefit owing to their being transgender. If they do not take income certificate from them, what would be the problem in that?

The Vice Chancellor asked, then who would attest their application form?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is very simple they should give them the benefit on the same ground on which they are giving to the other categories.

The Vice Chancellor said, it is alright, why they should evolve a new method?

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) minutes dated 22.04.2019 of the Committee with regard to guidelines/rules for providing concession of full fee/tuition fee and examination fee to the transgender students and *inter alia* decided the words “Students should not be involved in any

Dharna & protest” be deleted, as per **Appendix-LIV**, be approved; and

- (ii) the term and conditions for claiming fee concession shall be the same as applicable to the other students.

12.

Considered reply (**Appendix-LV**) dated 08.04.2019, 04.04.2019 and 05.04.2019 of SDP College for Women, Ludhiana, D.D. Jain College, Ludhiana and Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana, respectively, in response to the letters issued vide Nos. A-8/2645, A-8/2647 & A-8/2646 dated 30.03.2019 **Appendix-LV**), pursuant to the decision (Para 27) (**Appendix-LV**) of the Syndicate dated 18.02.2019.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 11.05.2019 (Para 15) (**Appendix-LV**) considered the issue regarding undue interference, harassment and creation of problem by the University in day-to-day working of S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana and point-wise reply of the College Branch in response to the report of the Committee dated 14.09.2018 accepted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.02.2019 (Para 27) and resolved that –

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

2. An office note along with statement containing observation of the Enquiry Committee and the reply of the Colleges in this regard is enclosed (**Appendix-LV**)

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that under this item, there was a report of three colleges and the main college was SDP College for Women, Ludhiana. A reply from this college was also received, which was condemned by the Syndicate. Thereafter, they had asked for point-wise reply from these colleges.

Dr. K.K. Sharma intervened to say that there was another College of Chowarianwali which was also clubbed with these colleges.

Continuing, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said, it is yesterday's development that the SDP College for Women, Ludhiana has given three months termination notice to Ms. Preety Narula, Ms. Shaminder Kaur, Ms Gurpreet Kaur and Ms. Reena Matta on account of bad conduct, loss of credibility and confidence. He requested to take a serious view of this. As regards the para-wise reply of these three colleges is concerned, he could say that it is not satisfactory. In the para-wise reply given by the SDP College for Women, Ludhiana, they have tried to adopt delaying tactics by asking different types of information from the University, such as, they were not aware of the Inspection Committee Visit or there was no representative of the college, the Committee was biased etc.etc. By taking a serious note, they should impose Regulation 11.1 on the College. As regards the D.D. Jain College, Ludhiana, the College has itself confessed in their reply at some places that the deficiencies pointed out by the Committee are correct. The Committee has said that the college is paying 100% DA, whereas the DA is 132%. The college has said that they give more than 100% DA, which means they do not give full DA of 132. As regards Provident Fund, they said that they follow the Central Government rules, but they have to get implemented in toto the Panjab University Calendar rules according to which 10% P.F. of the basic +DA needed to be deducted. So, there are many such things which they have accepted themselves. The third College is Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana. This is purely an unaided self-financed college. They do not pay even full salary to the Principal. They do not approve the appointment of Director. The College itself confessed that the Director has countersigned on the time-table etc. All this is wrong. The College Management has, directly or indirectly, confessed that they have committed the mistakes. So, keeping in view the reply given by these colleges, the University needs to take action against these three colleges, especially on SDP College for Women, Ludhiana which has given notice for termination of services of four teachers. The Registrar should use his powers and these teachers should be reinstated and action should be taken against the college under Regulation 11.1.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for the SDP College for Women, they have already taken decision for imposing Regulation 11.1. There are two other colleges. He believes that if they talk in a proper way, the things could be enforced. As has been explained by Shri Jagdeep Kumar, all the colleges are not that of the same status. They have already made an Affiliation Committee and that Committee could be requested to see as to how the working of the Colleges could be improved. There are many people, such as Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu, in the Syndicate belonging to Ludhiana, they could be requested to monitor the working of these colleges as per the University Rules and Regulations. He suggested that keeping in view the replies of these colleges where the University is not satisfied, a Committee of five members could be constituted, under the Chairmanship of Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu. This Committee should see the deficiencies and suggest as to how these deficiencies could be removed.

It was informed (by the Dean College Development Council) that only yesterday, they have received a letter from SDP College for Women, Ludhiana. In fact, they have written a letter to the Hon'ble Vice President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University, stating that the Panjab University authorities should be stopped to take any action until they could meet the Hon'ble Vice President of India.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that this letter has come from the SDP College, when they were asked to explain as to why Regulation 11.1, be not imposed on them. So, they are again doing diversion. The SDP College for Women is the most notorious college which always tries to twist the things and does not talk on the main issue. He was of the opinion that if the reply to be received from the SDP College was not found to be satisfactory, Regulation 11.1 should be imposed on it. As has been already said, caveat be also filed. Though, the other two colleges i.e. D.D. Jain College, Ludhiana and Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana, are also notorious colleges, but they are less notorious than SDP College. so, an Observer, could be put on each of these two colleges so that the deficiencies could be removed.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that in the Syndicate meeting of May, 2019, it was decided that the College should be given only 10 days to reply, but it was not said that their reply should also come. A notice was given to the college that if they do not give any reply, why action be not taken against them. He wanted to ask the Dean College Development Council as to when that letter was sent and whether 10 days time has been elapsed or not? If 10 days have already elapsed, they would not now discuss the issue. Now, they should file a caveat after having it vetted from a good Legal Retainer.

The Dean College Development Council said that roughly 10 days have elapsed, but since the letter was written by the Registrar, he would be able to tell about it.

The Registrar said that as has been said by Shri Naresh Gaur, it is a very serious issue. The College has sent a letter to the Chancellor's office alleging that Panjab University is harassing them. So, it was utmost necessary to bring it to the knowledge of the members, because from Advocate point of view, they could impose 11.1 on the College, but there would be some repercussions. So, he wishes that there should be a Committee so that if there is any emergency, they could seek guidance from that Committee.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that this issue is related to the affiliation and there is already an Affiliation Committee, so why to appoint another Committee.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that a letter was sent to the Chancellor by the Colleges was forwarded to the University for information. He asked, has the Hon'ble Chancellor asked the University not to take any action till he asked the University to do so?

It was informed by the Registrar that people do write letters to the Hon'ble Chancellor. The procedure is that whenever any such letter is forwarded to the University by the Chancellor's Office, they ask for comments and *inter alia* say that suitable reply be sent to the concerned person with information to the their office. They never ask to take action because they say that everything has to be done as per rules.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the enquiry which was held in respect of these three colleges was marked by the Chancellor Office. The teachers of these colleges have written to the Hon'ble Chancellor, hence the enquiry was held.

The Registrar said that they have already taken a decision in respect of SDP College for Women and they are implementing it as such, but, if there arises any issue that could be dealt with if a Committee is formed.

Dr. Naresh Gaur said that basically this issue is also related to affiliation, so this could be dealt with by the Affiliation Committee.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that there should not be any implication as per rules. However, in case, there is any implication, it could be legal. The legal implication could occur only if they go to the Court. They follow the Panjab University Calendar, so they should see whether proper procedure is being followed. If this case goes to the Court, it could be taken care of at that time.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired as to what decision has been taken on this issue. As has been stated by Professor Navdeep Goyal, the situation of these three colleges is different, so if they have to do some in respect of other two colleges, they have to discuss their replies point-wise. As regards the DD Jain College and Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, many points are clear. Thus, Regulation 11.1 cannot be imposed on them.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar and Shri Sandeep Singh said that if Regulation 11.1 cannot be imposed, then Regulation 11.2 should be imposed.

Some of the members enquired as to what has been resolved?

It was informed by the Registrar that they have already taken a decision in respect of SDP College for Women and a show-cause notice would be served under regulation 11.1 and the legal aspect would also be seen. As regards DD Jain College and Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, as has been stated, their cases are different. There are certain deficiencies which they have met with but some of the deficiencies are yet to be completed. So, for that Regulation 11.2 could be imposed on these two colleges.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar urged the Vice Chancellor to take some decision in respect of the teachers of SDP College for Women, Ludhiana, who have been given termination notice.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one the one hand they are saying that the Legal Retainer has said so and so, they have written to the Chancellor, and on the other hand they are rushing through the agenda. The problem in it is that they say that they have already taken decision to impose Regulation 11.1 on SDP College for Women. If the decision has already been taken, then what for the item has been brought here. They should try to evaluate it from the point of view that it is going to be a legal issue. Tomorrow they would say that they have sent a letter on the asking of the UGC, therein they have given para-wise reply, which was taken to Syndicate also for consideration and there the Syndicate did not consider the reply at all and action has been taken. What would be the reply with them? Would they say that they have already taken the decision? If they have already taken the decision, then what for the item has been brought here to the Syndicate? Now, what he is saying is that the earlier decision which they have taken, was taken on the basis of the letter which was not liked by the Syndicate and the University owing to the kind of language used by them against the University. As far as this agenda is concerned, the decision is to be taken on the basis of that letter which had been written to them and the reply which they have sent. They only have to see the tone and tenor in which the reply has been given, which is very clear (last para 5, page 106) and says, "Certificate of the University that all other affiliated Colleges except those which were inspected by the Inspection Committee are working as per PU/UGC norms and there is no violation". They asked them to issue a certificate to enable them to reply to the letter of the University. In Para 1, they have asked for a copy of the complaint/s on the basis of which inspection/enquiry of the College was conducted by the Inspection Committee. The detailed proceedings of the Syndicate meeting held on 18.2.2019 have also been asked for. In Para 2, they have also sought the transcripts of the evidences recorded or documents collected from the complainants in support of the complain/s issues raised. In Para 4, they asked for the status report of all affiliated private colleges which have been inspected by the Inspection Committee. How do they respond to this is for consideration of the Syndicate? To say that they have already initiated/taken action as per Regulation 11.1 would not serve the purpose and instead they have to pass speaking orders after consider this report wherein they could record that it is not for the first time that the college has written such nasty letter rather than replying to the specific issues which have been raised by the Inspection Committee, they have tried to challenge the authority of the University which they are not entitled to. So, keeping in view the conduct of the college, what the University should record to decide that the earlier decision was taken by the University and , thereafter, the order has to be vetted from an Advocate and whosoever Advocate has said, the University does not have any powers, howsoever senior he maybe, they have every right to defend. If the Advocate has said it, then let they should resolve that all the colleges are autonomous and they have no control over them. Then what for they are considering these reports of the colleges. Let them do whatever they want to do. If it has come to their notice that the University does not have any authority, then why they are indulging in this useless activity. He thinks, perhaps the Advocate might have said that the University does not have power to take any action on this particular aspect. But to say that the University does not have any power, which

he thinks that the Advocate might not have said, is wrong. What is happening is that there is a college with whom they are in litigation in Punjab & Haryana Court. In that case, they did make mistakes as they treated the Inspection Report of that college in a casual way. Without going into the details, the loopholes which are there in the procedure they have adopted, they exploited it and taking benefit in the High Court. On the basis of the loopholes in their procedure, the Advocate might be of the opinion that in that particular case, their hands may not be strong. This statement that they cannot regulate the college, is, perhaps, not correct. Perhaps the Vice Chancellor has not read this letter. If he had read this letter, he would think, what type of University, he is a Vice Chancellor where a College is saying, who is he? It is the college which is not doing anything in the right way. Teachers are being removed without following any procedure. All these things are appearing in the newspapers. It has been told that the University wrote a letter to the said college, but instead of giving reply to them, they wrote a letter to the Hon'ble Chancellor, a copy of which sent to the University. The letter written to the Hon'ble Chancellor would be marked to the University. But their intention is, that they would not accept anything the University ask them to do. So, hoping against hope that the University would get this thing done or that thing done, is useless. So, the reply which they have sent and the reply which come, they should wait for ten days, on the basis of that let they should take a conscious decision with the help of Lawyer who has to defend the case in the Court. They should also file caveat in the Court. Since the action against the college for disaffiliation under Regulation 11.1 is made out, the same should be taken. As regards the other two colleges, they have also to take conscious decision against them separately taking into consideration the replies submitted by them. In case, if it is found that their replies are also at par with SDP College for Women, same action should be taken against them. These colleges should be considered on merit whether they have fulfilled the conditions fully or partly or are at par with the SDP College for Women, decision should be taken accordingly. He was of the opinion that in the case of SDP College for Women, decision should be taken as per the consensus of the House, but only with a view that they have to defend the case in the Court, which is clear from their letter that they would definitely go the Court against the decision of the University. Since the College has already given statement about the Hindus and Sikhs, now they would go to the Court under Article 14 of the Constitution of India i.e. discrimination being done to the college. But as regards the other two colleges, though he does not know whether they have considered their replies or not, on the basis of that, if they think that there is scope for improvement, they should take a decision accordingly because it has neither been the intention of the University to close any college nor to stop it from functioning. They have to help stand the college and if there is any problem, the same is to be removed. There is one proposal to appoint Observer(s) on the Management of the College under Regulation 11.2. They would, in fact, be the representatives of the University. Regulation 11.2 says, "If after enquiry it is found that an affiliated college under private management is not being properly administered the Syndicate may authorise the Vice Chancellor to appoint a representative or representatives of the University on the Managing body of the College for such period as may be prescribed by the Syndicate". The next provision is, "If a representative/s of the University appointed on the Managing Committee of an affiliated college is/are not invited to the meeting/s of the Managing Committee, the proceedings of the meeting/s shall be regarded as invalid. T.A. and D.A. of the University representative/s will be paid by the college concerned. So, the regulation is very clear. But, what the colleges do, they should know that also that they know if they do not invite the representatives to the meetings, the proceedings of the Managing Committee would be invalid. They may say that they would not hold the meeting of the Managing Committee and not invite the representative. What they would do in such a situation. It is a shortcoming on their part because they do have any record of their by-laws, they have the record as to when their meeting would be held or when it should be held, so that that the University could ensure whether they have invited the representatives. If the University would give a reference of this regulation to them, they may say, tell them, when they convened the meeting of the Managing Committee. This also has to be kept in mind. It has also to be kept in mind that the plight of colleges who are not able to bear the expenses of paying TA/DA to the representatives. So, they have to think about

it as to who should be put as representative on the Managing Committee by which they could get their work done and at the same the college may not have to pay for him. They could think of appointing local persons as representatives on the Managing Committee. The Syndicate has also to decide as to for what period the representative(s) is/are to be appointed i.e. for a year or for six months. The representative/s may inform the as to how much improvement has occurred or there is need to continue the arrangement. Though these things are known to everybody, but they have incorporate all these things by way of record so that it should look that whenever a decision is taken, it is taken after due application of mind. If they have to put representatives on the Managing Committees of both the Colleges, if they have considered the reply of the two colleges, he has seen the reply of these two colleges, he has seen the reply of SDP College only, for the two colleges, he suggested that the persons belonging to Ludhiana should be appointed as representatives. Two representatives on each of the Managing Committees of these colleges should be appointed.

The Vice Chancellor said that his first question is whether they would like to authorise him to appoint the representatives.

The members said that they would like authorise him.

The Vice Chancellor said that it meant that the persons belonging to Ludhiana could be appointed on the Managing Committee of these colleges and not of far off places.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that their and the purpose of the Vice Chancellor is that the colleges should not close. The persons to be appointed as representatives should be the Senators.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu remarked that if the Managing Committee did not bring those items in the agenda for which the representatives are appointed, what the representative would do in that case?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the first thing is that the University is giving them an opportunity to improve. Secondly, the representatives could suggest to put some specific item in the agenda. Thirdly, there is provision of any other item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there is any apprehension that the college is not in a mood to cooperate with the University, only then they could assume what Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu has remarked. If there is scope to improve, then why should they assume it?

Dr. K.K. Sharma said a letter from the University should go telling the colleges that their report has been received and the answer is a little bit satisfactory. When some members objected to it, Dr. Sharma said that it meant that there is a scope for improvement in future.

Dr. Naresh Gaur said that the University should rather say that their reply is not acceptable, however, they are being another chance and the points/deficiencies which have been raised in letter of the University, should be corrected and it should be reported within ten days or so. Suppose, the University did not reply to their letter and impose Regulation 11.2 immediately, then as stated by Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu, they might not bring that item in the agenda.

Dr. Harpreet Singh said that they may say that as their replies are not acceptable to the University, and in order to improve their functioning, the University is appointing two representatives each on their Management under Regulation 11.2. Earlier also, when they went for inspection, there was no quarrel at all. They should be told that they are appointing two representatives only to improve their functioning.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the replies of two colleges i.e. D.D. Jain College, Ludhiana and Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana are not completely satisfactory. They have accepted that they did commit mistakes which have been pointed out by the Committee. So, it is necessary to issue them a letter telling them about the discrepancies and to remove the same. The other point which has been raised is that they did not want to put financial burden on the colleges to be incurred on paying TA/DA to the representatives. He would like to say that these colleges are self-financed colleges and those who are making the appointment of Director has written that they pay salary to the Director from their own funds. The other college is financially sound, so the argument of being unable to bear the financial burden does not seem to be very healthy. He was of the opinion that they may appoint local representative or otherwise, but the main aim should be to smoothen the working of these colleges.

It was said (by the Registrar) that they would write a letter to D.D. Jain College, Ludhiana and Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana to the effect that since their replies have not been found satisfactory, the University has appointed two representatives on the Management of their colleges to smoothen their functioning under Regulation 11.2.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma intervened to say that they could not do so as these colleges have already fulfilled most of the conditions imposed on them by the Inspection Committees and the remaining conditions would be fulfilled shortly. In one of the colleges out of the 24 persons, 22 persons have participated in the refresher courses. So, how they could say that their reply is unsatisfactory. They could say that their replies are partially correct, some of the deficiencies pointed out by the Committee have been met with.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would neither say partially correct nor they would say unsatisfactory, they would simply say that after considering the enquiry report, and their letter dated so and so, the Syndicate has decided that for proper administration of their college, as per Regulation 11.2, the following two representative are being nominated on the Management of their College for one i.e. from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020. There is a reason to write this, they can neither say that their reply is not satisfactory nor they can say that their reply is positive, because it has been claimed by them that they have completed the deficiencies, but it is not known whether it has been done or not, it is subject to verification because the Committee has said something else and the college has said something else. Both the colleges have refuted the charges. So, they do not want to make any comments, but whosoever would be appointed as representatives, they should work with a positive approach to help the colleges and not to create problems for them.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that both these colleges are minority institutions to which Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said the minority status has not yet been granted to them.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the letter of 8th April of SDP College has been brought here by mistake because the same was placed in the Syndicate meeting held on 11th May and a decision was taken.

The Vice Chancellor said that due to this mistake, 20 minutes of the House has been wasted which is not fair.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was a very serious issue, it is a matter of congratulation to who all members that they could deliberate on the issue in such a short time.

The Vice Chancellor said that he congratulates all the members for this, but the letter which has been placed here is misleading unnecessary, he has reservation on that.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) reply of SDP College for Women, Ludhiana to the show cause notice issued to them by the University, be placed before the Syndicate for consideration under regulation 11.1 at page 160, Panjab University, Calendar Volume-1, 2007;
- (ii) that Dean College Development Council will write to the Principals of D.D. Jain College, Ludhiana and Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana, that their reply to the points raised in the enquiry report are not satisfactory; and
- (iii) the Vice Chancellor is authorised to appoint two representatives of the University w.e.f. July 15, 2019 to 30th June, 2020, each on the Managing Bodies of D.D. Jain College, Ludhiana and Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana, under regulation 11.2, page 161, Panjab University, Calendar Volume-1, 2007.

13.

Considered

- (i) the Enquiry Report (**Appendix-LVI**) submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Officer against Shri Ashok Kumar, Senior Assistant, College Branch (under suspension), Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted.
- (ii) If the above enquiry Report is accepted the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent official- Shri Ashok Kumar, Senior Assistant, College Branch (under suspension), so that he be asked to explain his position as to why the penalty proposed may not be inflicted upon him.

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

NOTE: 1. As per rule 1.1 (II) appearing at page 74 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the post of Assistant held by Shri Ashok Kumar is a Class 'B' post; and

As per Regulation 3.1 appearing at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Syndicate is the appointing authority of Class 'B' employees belonging to the category of Assistants.

2. Regulation 3.3 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 speaks that the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.

3. The minor and major penalties stand defined under rule 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

The Registrar while giving brief history of the case said Shri P.L. Ahuja had been appointed as Enquiry Officer to enquire into the case of Shri Ashok Kumar, Senior Assistant, College Branch (under suspension). The charges levelled against him are given at pages 145-146 of the agenda papers. The Enquiry Officer has concluded at page 164 that "after considering the various aspects of the matter and discussing whole of the evidence I have come to a definite conclusion that the charges at Sr. No.2 to 4 of charge sheet (page No. 22 of Inquiry files) are proved by concrete evidence against the delinquent. Charge at Sr. No. 1 is partly proved..." In case they decided to accept the report, they have to decide the punishment also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should first be told as to what are the major and minor penalties. However, at least they should accept the enquiry report.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the Charge 1 which has been levelled on Mr. Ashok Kumar.

The Registrar said that Charge 1 is mentioned at page 145.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one of the Charges is 'That on 10.4.2018 at about 2.30 p.m., he came back in the office shouting and using vulgar language in drunken state to almost all the staff members who were present. He was sent for medical examination and the medical legal report dated 10.04.2018 issued by Government Multi Speciality Hospital, Chandigarh (GMSH), confirmed that he had consumed alcohol'.

Shri Ashok Goyal went through the charges one by one and asked whether these charges have been proved.

The Registrar said that Charges at Sr. No. 2, 3 and 4 have been proved with evidence and Charge No.1 is partly proved. So far as penalties are concerned, the same have been mentioned under rule 3 at page 114 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume III, 2016.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma pointed that minor penalties are - (i) censure; (ii) withholding of increments or promotion; and (iii) recovery from pay of the whole or part of any pecuniary loss cause to the University by negligence or breach of orders.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that it might be first decided whether minor penalty is to be imposed or major.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that minor penalty i.e. withholding of increments or promotion should be imposed.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that there could not more serious charges than these, but if they still want to impose minor penalty, they could do so. He asked if they foresee any chance of improvement in his conduct.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Shri Ashok Kumar is addicted to alcohol and if they wish, they could send him to a rehabilitation centre at least for a period of six months.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that it is a nice proposal.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua apprehended that it may not become the liability of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that they could either impose the penalty of reduction to a lower post or time scale; or to a lower stage in a time scale or withhold his increments or promotion. They could impose any one of these penalties.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar enquired if the University has suffered any loss owing to his misconduct.

Certain members suggested that the penalty of reduction to a lower post or time scale should be imposed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the major penalties also, they could not go beyond first point i.e. reduction to a lower post or time scale because they did not have any

intention to award capital punishment. To his mind even this punishment seems to be too harsh in this case and in the minor punishments, except (ii) i.e. withholding of increments or promotion, they did not have any other option. He did not know as to why it has been written – withholding of increments or promotion, because the moment they withheld the increments, promotion would automatically withheld. In fact, he was expecting that the Vice Chancellor in consultation with the Registrar, would propose the punishment, but he (Vice Chancellor) is not proposing any punishment rather asking the same from the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that on the one hand they saying that there cannot be a charge more serious to this and on the other hand when they come to decide the punishment, they take it lightly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no denying the fact that he has said that there is no serious charge than this, but there are two things that if they have to award less than the capital punishment, they have penalties at Sr No. (ii) under the minor penalties and (iv) under major penalties. They do not have any other alternative to this. But if they say that such a person should not be there in service, then the Vice Chancellor should tell about the punishment.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is saying that there could not be more serious than this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that is his view and he hold it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the capital punishment in this case is not made out because he has not frauded the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, why he is saying so is, because it would not stand scrutiny of law because there it is said that the punishment should be in proportionate to the offence. In such cases, the Courts generally, he is not saying in any case, hold the capital punishment on the higher side. If he has to decide, he could say that a person who comes to the office in a drunkard position, what good they could expect from him. He desired that it would be better if the Vice Chancellor could propose the punishment.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the penalty mentioned at Sr. No. (ii) under Minor Penalties should be imposed which was also endorsed by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that before imposing minor penalty of stoppage of increments, it would be better if it be checked from his service book as to what basic pay he is getting because if he had already reached at the maximum of the scale, stoppage of three increments would not affect him.

After lunch, the service book was requisitioned and it was informed by the Registrar that he (Shri Ashok Kumar) has not reached the maximum of the scale; rather, he is at basic of Rs.16,600/-, whereas the maximum limit of the pay-scale is Rs.34,800/-.

The members suggested that three increments of Mr. Ashok Kumar, without cumulative affect should be stopped.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the Enquiry Report submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Officer against Shri Ashok Kumar, Senior Assistant, College Branch (under suspension), Panjab University, Chandigarh, be accepted.

- (ii) Shri Ashok Kumar, Senior Assistant, Colleges Branch (under suspension) be asked to explain as to why the minor penalty of stoppage of his three increments, without cumulative effect, be not imposed upon him.

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

- (i) University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University Chandigarh and Esteem Industries, Baddi, H.P., be executed, to facilitate the faculty and students at UIET to learn from Esteem, designing details of milling machines and utilize the infrastructure and facilities available on their premises for fabrication of such machine and its stage wise components.
- (ii) Panjab University, India and State University of New York at Stony Brook, United States of America, be executed, for developing bilateral relations and convinced that cooperation between institutes of higher learning contributes to cultural enrichment, scientific progress, and the consolidation of friendship between countries.
- (iii) Panjab University, Chandigarh and University of Wolverhampton, United Kingdom, be executed for i) staff or student exchange opportunities, ii) cooperate on the development of and articulation of, academic programming, iii) development of other mutually beneficial programs, iv) organising joint conferences, workshop, seminars, v) exchange of scholarly information particularly with regard to Punjabi and sikh studies and vi) undertaking Joint Research projects.
- (iv) University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University Chandigarh and Finamics Engineering, Rajpura, Punjab, be executed to facilitate through advisory consultancy, commercial production of multi-axis CNC and Special purpose machines by Finamics.

Note: The above MoUs have been legally vetted by the Senior Law Officer of P.U.

- (v) University of Tyumen, Russia and Panjab University, be executed, for initial focus and discussion shall be in relation to:
- Exchange of graduate and undergraduate students for study and research
 - Exchange of faculty members for research, lectures and discussions
 - Exchange of non-academic staff for exchange of experiences
 - Joint research activities
 - Co-organization and participation in lectures, seminars and conferences
 - Exchange of academic materials and academic publications and information
 - Cooperation in administrative issues
 - All other relevant activities of mutual interest
- (vi) Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi and Panjab University, Chandigarh, be executed, to enter into long-term collaboration for promotion of students' training and quality postgraduate research in cutting edge areas.

(vii) Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) and Panjab University, Chandigarh, be executed for implementation of Scheme Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya National Mission on Teachers and Teaching 2019-2020.

(viii) **A.** London School of Management Education and Panjab University & Chandigarh Region Innovation & Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), be executed, for initial focus and discussion shall be to:

Initiate and nurture the culture of Responsible Research and Innovations amongst participating institutions in CRIKC.

Work collaboratively with partnering institutions to identify and carry out joint research projects in the Chandigarh region.

Facilitate exchange programmes and initiate joint teaching within collaborating institutions.

Make research more responsive to the needs of Indian society, bringing together the resources of PU, CRIKC network, LSME, and Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU).

Facilitate network development or research partnerships with third party institutions of mutual interest for wider collaboration in UK and India.

Review other possible areas of cooperation in the near future.

Co-organization and participation in workshops, seminars and conferences.

All other relevant activities of mutual interest.

B. The University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, West Midlands B15 2TT, United Kingdom and Panjab University, India, of Sectors 14 and 25 of the city of Chandigarh, for initial focus shall be in relation to:

3.1 Research collaborations

3.2 Faculty exchange visits

3.3 Exchange visits by students

3.4 Organization of joint conferences, workshops and schools

3.5 Creation of a joint program to develop innovations and discoveries for large scale applications.

(ix) **A.** Punjab Remote Sensing Centre (PRSC), PAU Campus, Ludhiana and Panjab University Chandigarh, be executed, for research and academic collaboration for application of Remote Sensing and Geospatial Technology.

B. Commercialisation Licence Agreement between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Institute of Microbial Technology (IMTECH) under Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, be executed.

(x) Panjab University, Chandigarh and Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change and Chandigarh Pollution Control Committee, be executed, pursuant to the National Clean Air Programme (NCAP) for pan-India to tackle the air pollution problem across the country.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said there are two types of memorandums, some of them are called Memorandum of Understandings (MoUs) and the others are called Memorandum of Agreements (MOAs). For one of the Memorandum of Agreement, they have to talk as Memorandum of Understanding. There is one such MoU which has come to them after signatures of the parties. They could see the first MoU between University Institute of Engineering & Technology and Esteem Inc. Baddi, H.P, where the parties

have already signed. What they are approving here? Only the signatures of the Registrar have left. It has already been done. It should have been Memorandum of Agreement and not Memorandum of Understanding.

The Vice Chancellor said that this Memorandum is incomplete and it would become final only after the approval by the Syndicate.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that Memorandum of Understanding has no legal sanctity whereas Memorandum of Agreement has legal sanctity.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they should check what Professor Rajat Sandhir is saying.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that there are MoUs and MoAs also. How would the differentiate them? In the list which has been appended here, there are MoAs also. So, the MoU should come in the form of MoU and MoA should come in the form of MoA.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that earlier also he had demanded as to how many MoU have been signed with the outside agencies/institutes, how much work has been done and how much exchange of research, research students, etc has been done. The Vice Chancellor had assured to provide this information earlier also. He again requested the Vice Chancellor to provide this information to him before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in 1-2 Memorandums, there are certain clauses. For instance, at page 263 of the agenda, there is Clause 3(I): Study Abroad Conditions. In this clause it is written, 'In the event that there is an imbalance in the number of students wishing to exchange, the parties may agree to establish a Study Abroad programme additional to the above student exchange program for students from the home University to study at the host University'. She is unable to understand the language of this clause as to what does it means. Has it been got legally vetted? The clauses mentioned in the Memorandum are undesirable. She also referred to Clause 3(II) at page 263 which says, 'Students enrolled in such a Study Abroad program will be subject to all of the exchange conditions listed within this Appendix with the exception of tuition waivers'. Where is the appendix? She then referred to clause 4 at page 264, which reads as. Initial selection of students will take place at the home institution; however, the host institution reserves the right to deny admission to any student not meeting its general admission criteria. Students participating through SBU may be from other SUNY or U.S. institutions, registered through SBU.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said it is not known from which department, the memorandum is originating.

When Professor Rajesh Gill, referred to Sr. No. 3.4 and 5.6 of the MoU between University Institute of Engineering & Technology and Finamics Engineering, Rajpura, Punjab, at page 274-275 of the agenda, the Vice Chancellor said that she should thoroughly look into it so that there could be no mistake.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to bring it to the notice of Professor Rajat Sandhir that the first MoU start with "This agreement is made on___", whereas all the Memorandums are MoUs

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that they should prepare a model MoU and the pattern should be used for each and every MoU for which they should take assistance of legal people, so that they might not face such problems in future.

The Registrar narrated the decision "that they are approving the item with the condition that a small Committee comprising Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Rajat Sandhir would constituted to vet the language".

The Vice Chancellor said that they should also take into consideration the suggestion given by Professor S.K. Sharma to prepare model MoU.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should prepare model both for MoU and MoA because at certain places they have to sign MoU and at certain other place MoA.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she had earlier also pointed out the **TIGRIS** Project relating to Cambridge University where there 11 participants including Panjab University. She had sought certain information which has been provided to her by the Dean Research. According to the MoU, this project had been awarded to Panjab University, but she did not know how it has landed in the pocket of Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Former Vice Chancellor. She pleaded that an enquiry in the matter should be conducted as the project involved crores of rupees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, if what Professor Rajesh Gill is saying, is correct, it is a very very serious issue.

Professor Rajesh Gill reiterated that an enquiry must be conducted in this matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the preparation of a Model MoU is very important.

RESOLVED: That vetting of language of three MoUs/MoAs be got vetted by a small Committee consisting of Professor Rajesh Gill and Professor Rajat Sandhir and, thereafter, the Memorandums of Understanding (MoU)/Memorandum of Agreements (MoA), be executed between:

- (i) University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University Chandigarh and Esteem Industries, Baddi, H.P., be executed, to facilitate the faculty and students at UIET to learn from Esteem, designing details of milling machines and utilize the infrastructure and facilities available on their premises for fabrication of such machine and its stage wise components.
- (ii) Panjab University, India and State University of New York at Stony Brook, United States of America, be executed, for developing bilateral relations and convinced that cooperation between institutes of higher learning contributes to cultural enrichment, scientific progress, and the consolidation of friendship between countries.
- (iii) Panjab University, Chandigarh and University of Wolverhampton, United Kingdom, be executed for i) staff or student exchange opportunities, ii) cooperate on the development of and articulation of, academic programming, iii) development of other mutually beneficial programs, iv) organising joint conferences, workshop, seminars, v) exchange of scholarly information particularly with regard to Punjabi and sikh studies and vi) undertaking Joint Research projects.
- (iv) University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University Chandigarh and Finamics Engineering, Rajpura, Panjab, be executed to facilitate through advisory consultancy, commercial production of multi-axis CNC and Special purpose machines by Finamics.
- (v) University of Tyumen, Russia and Panjab University, be executed, for initial focus and discussion shall be in relation to:

- Exchange of graduate and undergraduate students for study and research
 - Exchange of faculty members for research, lectures and discussions
 - Exchange of non-academic staff for exchange of experiences
 - Joint research activities
 - Co-organization and participation in lectures, seminars and conferences
 - Exchange of academic materials and academic publications and information
 - Cooperation in administrative issues
 - All other relevant activities of mutual interest
- (vi) Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi and Knowledge Cluster (Panjab University, Chandigarh, be executed, to enter into long-term collaboration for promotion of students' training and quality postgraduate research in cutting edge areas.
- (vii) Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) and Panjab University, Chandigarh, be executed for implementation of Scheme Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya National Mission on Teachers and Teaching 2019-2020.
- (viii) **A.** London School of Management Education and Panjab University & Chandigarh Region Innovation & CRIKC), be executed, for initial focus and discussion shall be to:
- Initiate and nurture the culture of Responsible Research and Innovations amongst participating institutions in CRIKC.
Work collaboratively with partnering institutions to identify and carry out joint research projects in the Chandigarh region.
Facilitate exchange programmes and initiate joint teaching within collaborating institutions.
Make research more responsive to the needs of Indian society, bringing together the resources of PU, CRIKC network, LSME, and Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU).
Facilitate network development or research partnerships with third party institutions of mutual interest for wider collaboration in UK and India.
Review other possible areas of cooperation in the near future.
Co-organization and participation in workshops, seminars and conferences.
All other relevant activities of mutual interest.
- B.** The University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, West Midlands B15 2TT, United Kingdom and Panjab University, India, of Sectors 14 and 25 of the city of Chandigarh, for initial focus shall be in relation to:
- 3.1 Research collaborations
 - 3.2 Faculty exchange visits
 - 3.3 Exchange visits by students
 - 3.4 Organization of joint conferences, workshops and schools
 - 3.5 Creation of a joint program to develop innovations and discoveries for large scale applications.
- (ix) **A.** Punjab Remote Sensing Centre (PRSC), PAU Campus, Ludhiana and Panjab University Chandigarh, be executed, for research and academic

collaboration for application of Remote Sensing and Geospatial Technology.

B. Commercialisation Licence Agreement between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Institute of Microbial Technology (IMTECH) under Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, be executed.

- (x) Panjab University, Chandigarh and Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change and Chandigarh Pollution Control Committee, be executed, pursuant to the National Clean Air Programme (NCAP) for pan-India to tackle the air pollution problem across the country.

15. Considered minutes dated 08.05.2019 (**Appendix-LVIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for finalization of Examination fee and all other related charges for the session 2019-2020.

The Vice requested the members to give their opinion of Item No. 15.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that this fee structure is continuing since 2018-19 and though there is no revision, but in Point No. 4, at page 281 of the agenda papers, many examinations, such as B.P.Ed., B.Sc./B.Com./BBA/BCA, B.Ed. (General) etc., the normal fee is Rs. 2575/-.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma intervened to say that before taking up this item for discussion, they should first go for lunch and then discuss this item. This item requires a lot of discussion as they want to reduce the examination fee, so it should be discussed after lunch. He said, they may form a Committee to enhance the Examination fee, but here they have to decrease the examination fee.

The Vice Chancellor requested Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma to let Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu explain his point.

Shri Naresh Gaur also suggested that they should discuss this item after lunch.

When the meeting resumed after lunch, some discussion took place regarding **Item No. 13** which has been shifted from here and made a part of discussion of Item No. 13.

When the discussion again resumed on Item No.15, the Vice Chancellor asked the Finance & Development Officer to update the hon'ble members so that there might not be any confusion about the fees.

It was informed by the Finance & Development Officer that there is no recommendation for enhancement in the examination fee, whatever fee they were charging earlier, it is proposed that the same fee should be charged.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the examination fee should be reduced.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said it is very difficult as, at present, they have a liability of Rs.6.5 crores.

The Vice Chancellor said that the integrated liability, as of now, is to the tune of Rs.30 crores and today they are putting the liability of Rs.1 crore more today. They are, somehow, trying to meet this liability, but it is increasing this time. The Panjab Government has not given them Rs.2.5 crores only. They have taken a decision for Rs.1 crores due which the liability would enhance.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they should write to the Panjab Government that since the University is running their Constituent Colleges, so they should immediately release the grant.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that in the annual system, the examination fee was Rs.1250/-. Then they increased in to Rs.1500/-The former Vice Chancellor brought an agenda item. He held a press Conference. An affidavit was also given in the Court to the effect that the University is in financial crises and it would be closed some day. They were also given a feedback that if they do not enhance their income, the UGC/MHRD would also stop giving grant to the University. Owing to this they got scared that the University may not close down or something else might not happen. So, out of emotion, they agreed to increase the fee. The poor students who were giving Rs.1250/- examination fee, today they are giving Rs.5000/-. They introduced semester system but not with the intention to harm the students as for as the examination fee is concerned. But here only the students are the sufferers. Whatever examination fee is being taken by the colleges, 33% of it is going to the kitty of the University. But, the University expects them to pay 136% D.A. and many more thing. They have to maintain infrastructure and give salary to the staff, how it is possible. The students have to suffer double due to the semester system on account of examination fee. Thus, the fee has been enhanced quadruplicate as the examination has to be conducted twice. So, there is need to rationalise the fee. They should constitute a Committee to rationalise the fee. They should take into consideration the plight of the rural colleges because the students joining these colleges come from a very poor financial background The college get about Rs.10000/- to Rs.11000/- from a student as examination fee, but at the same time they also give them concessions, SAF, concession on tuition fee. In addition to it, now the University has also allowed concession to the wards of the University employees taking admission in affiliated colleges. The fee of SC students is also not being given by the government. The true picture is that the rural colleges are facing acute financial crises. He, therefore, suggested that the examination fee should be decreased.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this fee was increased 3 years back. As has been stated by Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, the University was in acute financial crises. If they see the financial position of the University even today, he did not see much difference. Even at that time, it was kept in mind that the University would not increase the fee of the poor students. In fact, if they see the table, the fee has been increased. It was decided that fee of Economically Weaker Section (EWS) students would not be increased. It was also decided that the fee of only those would be increased who could afford it. But if they decide today to take back the enhancement in fee, it would badly affect their budget and rather everything.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that he fully endorsed what Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma has stated. He requested that he should be told as to what document are to be taken from the students (EWS) from who less fee under the EWS quota is to be taken, as well as the criteria and slab of income. He said that it should be quite clear. Secondly, there is a category of SC students. He wanted to know whether normal or less fee is to be charged from the SC students, irrespective of the fact, whether the government releases the grant or not. There is no clarity for this category as all the SC students are EWS as the SC students who are getting scholarship come under the income slab of Rs.2.5 lacs. So, there is no clarity about it as they do not know which students is covered under the EWS category and what proof is to be taken from the students as also whether those proofs would be submitted to the University or the college would simply send their forms to the University.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the enhance fee of SC students should be reduced to half. He has talked to the Controller of Examination just now and told him that an SC student who visited the University to get his DMC, he was not only asked to deposit the fee, but a of Rs.2000/-. Even after depositing the fee as well as the fine, the student was not given DMC and was asked to come again after a few days. The students would have to come again after travelling 150-200 Kms and incurring an expenditure on fare to

get the DMC. He asked on what grounds they are imposing fine on those SC students whose fee has been remitted by the Government. He requested the Vice Chancellor to issue clear instructions to the Finance & Development Officer in this regard as the students, especially girls, come from far flung areas. The students come to the University after facing lot of problem including financial, and here what harassment they undergo, could not be felt by sitting in this air conditioned room.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they are giving a good message to the society that they are not increasing the fee, but the sentiments of the House is that it would be fair if the things are smoothened for the EWS students so that they can avail the concessions.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar requested the Vice Chancellor to form a Committee and, if possible, the examination fee should be reduced.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it should be made known to them as to what documents are required for giving fee concessions to the SC candidates. Is SC certificate enough to grant them the fee concession?

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that income certificate is required to claim this fee concession by the SC candidates.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that income certificate would be procured by every candidate.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma also enquired as to what documents are required to grant the fee concession to the Economically Weaker Section students.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they should have an declaration from the student to the effect that his/her father or mother is not a government employee. There would be clarity with the declaration of the student.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that suppose a student is studying as a regular student of a college, but due to one or the other reasons, he/she could not continue his/her studies, then the SC students or the girls students could appear as a private candidates, he wanted to know why the general category candidates are not allowed to appear privately. Why they penalise the general category candidates?

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said, to his mind, no candidate should be allowed to appear as a private candidate. This was also endorsed by Dr. K.K. Sharma.

Shri Naresh Gaur while referring to Point 2 at page 282 of the agenda papers, the normal fee has been mentioned as Rs.2575/-, but in the Column Fee for EWS Category, against M.Sc. System Biology and Bio-informatics (Two Year Course) (Without Practical), the fee has been mentioned as Rs.3850/- which he could not understand. The fee for EWS Category candidates should have been less, but here it has increased.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, while clarifying, said that when they did rationalization, it was not there that the fee for all the courses is to be increased. In fact, in certain cases the fee has also been reduced. Thereafter, a decision was taken that the Examination fee for EWS Category candidates is not to be changed. But it is also correct that lesser of the two fees should be taken and not charge more fee, which they were earlier charging, so what Shri Naresh Gaur has said is right.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the sentiments of the colleagues are that the fee should be reduced. It has also been expressed that if they decrease the fee at this juncture, it would also not suffice the purpose. So, it should be mentioned specifically as to what are the criteria for determining the fee. If there is some scope in the criteria, it should be thought if the income slab for EWS category students is increased, so that more students could be brought under the ambit of this fee concession. He suggested

suppose they have now fixed the income slab for EWS candidates as Rs.2.5 Lacs per annum, it could be enhanced to Rs.3.5 lacs so that more students could be covered. If they could not enhance the fee, they could give benefit to the students in this way.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that as stated by Shri Naresh Gaur, at page 282 of the agenda papers, somewhere the normal fee is Rs.2575/-, somewhere it is Rs.1210/-. Similarly, in the column, Fee for EWS Category, the fee is different. He, therefore, suggested that in order to bring uniformity in this fee structure, a small Committee should be constituted.

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

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that at page 282 of the agenda, at serial number 3, the normal fee is mentioned as Rs.3075/- and in the column of EWS Category, the fee has been mentioned as Rs.3850/-. What they are doing? He suggested that a small Committee should be constituted to look into the fee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that whenever the University needs money, it started looking towards the colleges, but when the colleges need money then neither the University nor the Punjab Government come for their help. If it was said to generate Rs.35 Crores, it does not mean that the whole amount is to be generated by enhancing the examination fee. As they know that they collect Rs.80-90 crores from the examination fee, but this has deteriorated the financial health of the colleges. They have been saying this since January that the examination fee should be enhanced genuinely. They have brought the proposal to increase the fee of the University by 10%, but they do not allow this for the colleges. On the other hand, when the University needs money, they increase the examination fee. He said that they should not continue with the present fee structure and requested that the examination fee should be reduced at all costs.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the printing quality of the fee structure table and other pages is so poor that it is not possible to read it properly.

The Vice Chancellor advised the Registrar that the paper could be of a bit low quality, but the printing should be fine.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu asked as to what has been resolved.

On being told by the Registrar that the issue would be examined, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should constitute a small Committee to look into the issue.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that representatives from the Colleges should also be included in the Committee. This was also endorsed by Dr. K.K. Sharma and some other members also.

RESOLVED: That, recommendations of the Committee dated 8.5.2019, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for finalization of Examination Fee and all other related charges for the session 2019-2020, be approved; and

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice Chancellor is authorised to constitute a Committee to rationalize the fee structure having members of colleges including Shri Jagdeep Kumar.

16. Item 16 on the agenda was read out, viz. -

16. To appoint the Dean Student Welfare, Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Associate Dean, Student Welfare w.e.f. 01.06.2019.

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

- NOTE:**
1. The term of present Deans, Man & Women viz. Professor Emanuel Nahar, Professor Neena Caplash and Associate Dean, Student Welfare Professor Ranjan Kumar is upto 31.05.2019.
 2. Regulation 1 and 2.2 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 reads as under:
 1. “The Senate may, on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare for such a period and on such terms and conditions as may be determined by them”.
 - 2.2. “The Senate may also, on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare (Women) for such period and on the same term and conditions as for the Dean of Student Welfare out of the Amalgamated Fund Account.....”.
 3. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 1/15/28 and 29 May 2016 has resolved as under:

“That a person belonging to the reserve categories be given the charge of Associate Dean of Student Welfare”.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said three persons are already working Deans, Man & Women and Associate Dean, Student Welfare and he was of the opinion that they could continue with them.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what are the rules and the decision would be taken in the light of those rules.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while explaining about the rules, said that they have to send the recommendation to the Senate and final decision would be taken by it. Their recommendation is that the persons who are already working on these posts should continue.

The Vice Chancellor asked what does, there recommendation means?

It was said that, it meant the recommendation of all the members of the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recommendations of the Syndicate are finalized in the meeting of the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it means that they (members of the Syndicate) are recommending for their continuation, but he (Vice Chancellor) is not recommending it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have been continuing for the last more than two years.

The Vice Chancellor said he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is right. He (Professor Emanuel Nahar) is par excellence academician and he (Vice Chancellor) would not like to talk about him. But the question is that he has to run the University and the Dean Student Welfare is a very-very important component of the University administration. The Vice Chancellor said that he has to execute the things daily, but they (members) meet him after a month and they could help him only then.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could help him even help him (Vice Chancellor) in daily activities.

The Vice Chancellor requested that they should see which is not possible.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked as to what is not possible.

The Vice Chancellor said that they wanted to continue the present status of Deans, but it is not possible.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they are recommending that all the three persons should continue for one year.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said most of the time of leave of Professor Ranjan Kumar has already passed.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Ranjan Kumar is on leave.

In fact, he wants that on the positions of Deans should be filled on full-fledged basis. The posts of Deans are very important and he seek their cooperation in this regard.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are cooperating the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said, though they are cooperating, but they are suggesting their own names for these posts.

Shri Narinder Singh Sidhu said that the members are doing a good job.

The Vice Chancellor said he is not here do analysis of anyone. But he does not recommend the persons who are already working as Deans.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the Vice Chancellor has to give his own opinion and the House has to give its own opinion.

The Vice Chancellor said, it would be forwarded to the Senate and ultimately, it is the Senate which has to take a decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is doing a lot of monitoring and putting lot of efforts, but he has no recommendations on these names.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that ultimately the recommendation of the Syndicate would go to the Senate. They (members) have already talked on this issue, so he (Vice Chancellor) either could take it as his opinion or opinion on behalf of the whole House. Their opinion is that these persons should be allowed to continue. A regulation is also there which says that it has to be finalized by the Senate. Obviously, they would continue now, but if the Senate make any change, it is a separate issue. One thing which the Vice Chancellor may not be knowing, but he would like to tell that last time their term was extended till September by the Syndicate, but the Senate changed it and extended their term for the full year and not till September. So, there is no doubt that ultimately it has to be take a final decision on this issue. It is the same Senate which has changed the decision of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Senate is a supreme body and it could change any decision.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that is why they would not like it if the decision of the Syndicate is later on changed by the Senate. The Syndicate may recommend to extend their term for one year, but if the Senate wants to change is, it is for the Senate to see to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that is what he is saying, let them continued and the matter be placed before the Senate. But at the moment he has no recommendation neither on these names nor anything relating to it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the recommendation of the Syndicate has to go to the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could get their recommendation recorded, but he has no recommendation in this regard. He would like that this issue should be resolved unanimously and he has already given his opinion on the issue. There is not anything in his mind to against anyone, but they should also understand his position as he has to come across many difficulties and to resolve the certain problems he has to get in touch with the UGC, MHRD, Mahila Commission etc., but he could not discuss all these things with them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are many experienced persons in this University. He has also worked as Dean Student Welfare. As and when they faced some problem, the problems would keep on coming, he himself along with Vice Chancellor and other, had resolved the problems.

The Vice Chancellor said that what they are saying is alright, but he has been looking all such things since the last ten years as he has also rendered 35 years of service at B.H.U., he has seen such things there also. They do resolve the things, but the first outlet has been the Vice Chancellor, however, the resolve would be done by all of them.

Professor Ashok Goyal said they could even help him in day to day activities.

The Vice Chancellor said, how they could help him in day to day work.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at least he could help him as he is from the campus.

The Vice Chancellor said that 10 months experience here.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that to say something on the performance of someone, there could be vested interest of the people to deny somebody. If he (Vice Chancellor) has some specific instances, he should share it with them to which the Vice Chancellor said that is not desirable. Secondly, if the Syndicate takes a decision, it means that the whole Syndicate is behind him (Vice Chancellor), whenever there is question of filling a position or extending the term. Every one of them has always stood by him, would always stand by him because they all are the part of the administration. It is not only the Vice Chancellor or the Registrar, the Governing Body is equally important because all the decision are taken by the Governing Body. So, if it is unanimous wish of the Syndicate to extend the term of the Deans, he should take it into consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is considering it, but he would neither agree to it nor recommend it.

Professor S.K. Sharma said as has been stated by Professor Navdeep Goyal that these people would continue till the Senate undo it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Senate is the Supreme Body.

The Vice Chancellor said that is what he is saying. Here he would neither give any recommendation nor he accepts it. If it is not being resolved here, let it continue as it is, ultimately it would be resolved in the Senate.

Professor S.K.Sharma said that at least they have to write as to what has been resolved.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that the meeting of the Senate would be held very late.

The Vice Chancellor said that they try to hold the meeting early.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate meeting might be held once in a month, but he (Vice Chancellor) has to hold the meeting of the Senate soon, though not to discuss this issue, to which the Vice Chancellor said that the Senate meeting would be held soon. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has to hold the meetings of the Senate also once or twice in a month.

The Vice Chancellor said it is for them to see as to when the meeting of Senate has to be held.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one representation for holding the special meeting of the Senate is already there, but another has also been received.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, what has been said, he could foresee that then there would be nothing with the Syndicate, except to fix the date. He could show him people saying that whatever these people were saying, was right. Is it possible to hold the meeting of Senate after every 15 days? But if they are interpreting the regulation in the way, it was interpreted on that day, then also the situation would not change.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to link it with that day, they would talk about that later. First the issue under reference should be resolved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has stated that it is not necessary to wait, the Senate meeting could be held soon. There is no doubt that it is his prerogative and as per the requirement, the meeting of the Senate has to be convened. But the question is that there is no recommendation of the Vice Chancellor. His recommendations is neither in 'yes' nor in 'no'. Earlier the item was for extension in their term, but he does not know, how and under what circumstances, revised item has come. Therein, it is to consider to appoint the Dean Student Welfare Dean, Student Welfare (Women) and Associate Dean, Student Welfare and there also there is no recommendation of the Vice Chancellor. Once the item is brought by the Vice Chancellor, he holds that whatever comes to the Syndicate, it is actually the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor, but he has not recommended any name and he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that he does not want to recommend it also. The Senate, a number of times, has overruled the recommendations of the Syndicate or they have not accepted the recommendations of the Syndicate. As has been explained that the recommendation of the Syndicate was up to 30th September, but the Senate, in its wisdom, extended it up to 31st May, meaning thereby that the recommendation of the smaller authority, can be accepted or may not be accepted by the higher authority. Now, with all due regards, and having all respect for what he (Vice Chancellor) has said, he thinks, he (Vice Chancellor) would appreciate this that whatever his recommendation is, as he has said, though it is not in black and white, he (Vice Chancellor) is not in favour of the present incumbents in spite of the fact there is nothing against them. He is recommending to the Syndicate that he be not continued, but he thinks that this concession has to be given to the Syndicate that they may or may not accept his recommendation, because this does not mean until and unless, the two recommendations are there, the appointment cannot be done. Earlier also the recommendation had come with the names, that to consider the recommendation of the

Vice Chancellor that such and such persons be appointed as Dean Student Welfare. At that time the Syndicate had not accepted that recommendation and the Syndicate had recommended somebody else to the Senate. Both the names were in front of the Senate i.e. the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor as also the recommendation of the Syndicate and never ever Senate has approved the recommendation made by the Vice Chancellor. They have always approved the recommendation of the Syndicate. He is saying this that let they try to read the situation in its right perspective and before he say something further, he would simply like to submit that under any circumstances, they did not want this impression to go as if the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate are on different path. Such impression should not go as it is not in the interest of the University. But still if he is so definite in his views, even if the University loses, he thinks that he (Vice Chancellor) must understand the sentiments of the Syndicate also, why it has not been done. The moment, the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor has not been accepted by the Syndicate and the Syndicate has recommended its own names or they have sent different recommendation to the Senate. Immediately, the person recommended by the Syndicate is appointed, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Senate because the functioning cannot be got standstill. To share with him and to be honest with him (Vice Chancellor), after all he is the head of the family, he must know, they have deliberated on this issue in a very detailed manner and different viewpoints were also considered and ultimately everybody reached the conclusion that the incumbent should be allowed to continue for another year and somebody pointed out, maybe he would be retiring, a month before even one year, so automatically it amounts to till superannuation or one year, whichever is earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a separate thing, that should not be linked with this, he is aware of the entire scenario, what he is doing, how much service he has to put in etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that obviously, he (Vice Chancellor) must be knowing about it as he (DSW) is working under him. So, in the light of that he has been able to understand during informal discussion and also formal discussion, the Syndicate is of the unanimous view, rather, the Syndicate recommends that the present incumbents, all the three incumbents, be given extension for one more year i.e. till 31st May, 2020 and since Senate is the final authority, till the Senate takes, this way or that way, all the three would continue as such and whatever would be the outcome of the Senate, that would be binding on all of them, whole of the University, all the incumbents as well as all the members of the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor. So, his suggestion in this regard is, as he (Vice Chancellor) has rightly not brought the recommendation in writing because he must have thought that he would share his sentiments in the Syndicate, let this recommendation go to the Senate and he could share his sentiments in the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is obvious that he would share his sentiments in the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is telling it very seriously. When the Vice Chancellor said that he is also serious, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) is not serious, perhaps he is thinking that the Syndicate is against him. He (Vice Chancellor) used the words that he has to run the University, but the word 'he' is not appropriate here as they all are saying that they are with him, but he (Vice Chancellor) does not accept it.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and some other members said that they are with him (Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said that he is also not saying that they are not with him, the work would not run without their help, but the day to day things have to be executed by him, they should also accept this fact.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has to execute the decisions taken by the Syndicate/Senate, so the Executive Government of the University is the

Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor is the Head of that Executive Body. Now to say that it is the only the Head who is to execute, it is not. Actually, the Syndicate is supposed to execute the decision taken by the Senate and the Vice Chancellor is execute the decisions taken by the Syndicate. Unfortunately, he (Vice Chancellor) probably is feeling as the Syndicate and Vice Chancellor are different, Vice Chancellor and Syndicate have different responsibility.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are raising the basic question and they are not ready to leave their names. For issues which crop up daily, he could not call the meeting of the Syndicate to resolve such issues.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is why the Syndicate has not decided anything here, but the Vice Chancellor has to take the decision, that power is given to the Vice Chancellor that he could take the decision on behalf of the Syndicate and report the same to the Syndicate in its next meeting. But, where the Syndicate has taken some decision, even if it is not liked by the Vice Chancellor, Registrar or the Dean University Instruction, that, of course, has to be executed in its true letter and spirit, of course, having all kinds of reservations. In some of the issues all of them has reservations while taking a decision, but they have to consider that decision as final because the competent body has taken the decision. So, in view of that, let they send the unanimous recommendation of the Syndicate to the Senate that these three person be allowed to continue for another one year i.e. upto 31st May, 2020.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members if someone would like to speak on this issue. Thereafter, he would give his input and then nobody would again start the discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if something comes out from his (Vice Chancellor) input which could not covered, then they have to speak.

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

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has said that he would not recommend the names and it is only in response to that. If he (Vice Chancellor) has to say something besides this, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) thought that then at least, he (Vice Chancellor) should give them concession to speak.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no question of giving concession as they are the honourable members of the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever has been said by the Vice Chancellor, he would still request the Vice Chancellor with folded hands that he should never say that the Syndicate is not with him.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that they (members) are much senior to him in terms of membership of Syndicate and Senate as they have been members of these bodies for several times. The University would function only with their cooperation.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they always highest regard and due respect for him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he (Vice Chancellor) feels that there is some problem, he thinks that in order to remove that difficulty, all the members are ready to share the responsibility with him.

The Vice Chancellor said, 'alright' but he would stick to his earlier stand and he does not agree with whatever decision they have taken and he does not recommend the names.

Shri Ashok Goyal, Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu and some other members requested the Vice Chancellor to tell them about the resolved part.

Dr. K.K. Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor as to what else he recommends.

The Vice Chancellor said that he does not recommend anything.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor, the Registrar said that the resolved part is that the Syndicate members unanimously recommended to continue all the three persons.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that the Syndicate unanimously recommends that all the three incumbents namely, Professor Emanuel Nahar, Professor Neena Caplash and Professor Ranjan Kumar, holding the positions of Dean Student Welfare, Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Associate Dean Student Welfare, respectively be given extension in their term for one more year i.e. upto 31st May, 2020, and till this recommendation of the Syndicate is considered, and decision on this is taken by the Senate, all the above said incumbents would continue to discharge their duties against the respective position they are holding.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not agree with the above recommendation, and hence the decision may be taken in the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked that they should be told as to what has been got recorded by the Vice Chancellor.

The Registrar, read out the opinion got recorded by the Vice Chancellor as "I do not agree to the above opinion of the Syndicate and at the same time, I do not agree to the recommendation as well to continue with the existing DSW, DSW (Women) and Associate Dean". The Registrar further explained that the term of DSWs is till 31st May, 2019, and the recommendation of the Syndicate is that after 31st May to the meeting of the Senate, the existing DSWs would continue, but the Vice Chancellor is of the opinion that he would not do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the term of these people would end on 31st May, 2019.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that he would not allow the present incumbents to continue beyond 31st May, 2019 irrespective of the fact as to when the meeting of the Senate would be held, to which the Vice Chancellor said, 'yes', he would not allow them continue. He felt that he (Vice Chancellor) is writing something else, but the meaning is something different. The Syndicate decision is that they (DSWs) will continue till the Senate decides, but the Vice Chancellor does not agree to it, that is what he has said, meaning thereby that being the Vice Chancellor, just one of the members of the Syndicate, is simply saying that he would not want to agree or he does not want to obey what the Syndicate decides.

The Vice Chancellor said there is no question to obey or not to obey and so, they should not talk on this.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said in plain language, he (Vice Chancellor) meant to say that he has dissent on the decision of the Syndicate, but still the decision of the Syndicate would prevail.

The Vice Chancellor said that his dissent and their recommendation are two different things.

Principal Narinder Singh said that his (Vice Chancellor) view would not be in the decision as his dissent would be got recorded. This was also endorsed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor has written that he has no recommendation as Vice Chancellor and he gives dissent to the decision of the Syndicate also. He (Vice Chancellor) also says that he does not agree to the decision of the Syndicate that these persons would continue till this of the Syndicate is not ratified by the Senate. That meant that there is a provision where it is written that it is the choice of the Vice Chancellor whether to accept the decision of the Syndicate or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that someone else could be appointed for the intervening period to get the work done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) could say that even though a decision has been taken, but he does not agree to it and that he has a proposal that instead of allowing these persons to continue after 31st of May, 2019, other persons be appointed as DSWs till a final decision is taken by the Senate, but the Syndicate is of the view that, 'no' these persons would continue till the decision of the Senate and if he (Vice Chancellor) says that it is not acceptable to him, it would be a big problem and the university would not be able to function. Tomorrow, if the Vice Chancellor and the Syndicate take two different decisions on an issue, then whose decision the Registrar would abide by and which decision would be implemented by the Registrar i.e. the decision of the Syndicate or the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor would expect that he is the head and to hell with the Syndicate and only that should be implemented which he (Vice Chancellor) says. Then there would be chaos. They knew that it has never happened in the Senate but he (Vice Chancellor) and they also know that whatever is being said by the Vice Chancellor, would be done by the Senate and the decision of the Syndicate would be changed. But the Vice Chancellor's saying to the extent that till then he (Vice Chancellor) would not allow them to continue and to say that he (Vice Chancellor) does not accept the decision of the Syndicate, does not seem to be proper. This meant that if tomorrow, the Senate takes a decision against the liking of the Vice Chancellor, would the Vice Chancellor say that he does not accept the decision of the Senate. Then the Syndicate and Senate would become irrelevant. He urged the Vice Chancellor to think over it with a cool mind and discuss it with the administration and legal experts. He felt that the University should not be taken to such a point that it becomes a matter of mockery at the national level. Even if it is done, it is okay, but to say that he does not accept the decision of the Syndicate is not proper. He enquired as to where it is written that the Vice Chancellor might not accept the decision of the Syndicate/Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is interpreting his recommendation in his own way. So far second option is concerned that what would happen in between, they could discuss about that as to what could be done. If they say that the incumbents should be allowed to continue till the decision of the Senate, that is also wrong.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Registrar is saying that the Vice Chancellor is saying that in spite of this resolution of the Syndicate, he would not allow them to continue.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is true as he does not like them to continue.

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

Professor Rajat Sandhir remarked that let they save the University from embarrassment.

At this stage, certain members requested the Vice Chancellor to adjourn the meeting for some time and discuss the issue with the administration and Dr. Devinder Kumar, Professor of Law.

When the Vice Chancellor said that they should take up the next item on the agenda, some of the members said that first this issue should be resolved.

The Vice Chancellor said that his stand is the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked has he (Vice Chancellor) got it legally examined, and if not, it should be got done.

The Vice Chancellor said that he still sticks to his stand and legal view would not help in this matter.

Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that the meeting should be adjourned for some time to think over the issue with a cool mind as they do not want the University to be put in any kind of embarrassment.

When the Vice Chancellor asked for Calendar to go through the relevant provisions, Shri Ashok Goyal urged the Vice Chancellor read Regulation 9 at page 36 which says, "The Syndicate shall have power to pass orders on various University matters in order to carry on the executive government of the University...". The other things would be discussed on these lines.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that, in fact, they did not want embarrassment for the University on this issue.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that, that was why, they are suggesting that the meeting should be adjourned for some time to think over the issue in a peaceful manner.

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor said that the meeting is adjourned for some time.

When the meeting resumed, the Registrar said that now, he would read out the resolved part, which reads "The Syndicate resolved that Dean Student Welfare (Men), Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Associate Dean Student Welfare, be given extension for one more year, i.e., up to 31st May 2020 and till this recommendation of the Syndicate is considered by the Senate, all the said incumbents would continue as such. The Vice Chancellor expressed his strong reservation to the above mentioned resolution since he has not recommended the names of Deans Student Welfare (Men), Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Associate Dean Student Welfare, for extension".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that urged the Vice Chancellor not to do so.

The Vice Chancellor said that though he had requested them with folded hands that he should be given one Officer of his choice and they have cooperated with him so much, which he would never forget. He had seen them even by requesting with folded hands and everybody cooperated with him and somewhere it seemed as if he get someone appointed from outside the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that even now they would cooperate with him.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they did not cooperate, then it (University) would function as it is and the University would take another direction. But they should keep one thing in mind that it is neither they are getting defeated nor he. However, whatever its loss or benefit in it would be, the same would be of the University. They should call a meeting of the Syndicate or the Senate, but in that the defeat or win or loss or benefit would be of the University. However, he would work in accordance with the opinion and it is not a big issue at all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that day before yesterday, there was a detailed discussion and he had told as to what is there in store and they would get entangled in this job.

The Vice Chancellor said that is unfortunate and when they are thinking on these lines, what one could do. He is only an Officer, whereas they are Hon'ble members and he, being the Executive Head, has just to execute the orders/directions/decisions taken by them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would do everything together.

The Vice Chancellor said that there should not be any confusion and they should move forward.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that, this is for the first time, when the whole Syndicate decided that they would cooperate with him (Vice Chancellor), but it is also his duty that if Syndicate ask something, he should agree to that because it is a two-way traffic.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever has been asked by them during the last 10 months, he had done that. Today and in future also, he would continue to do that because he has come here to perform and after performing, he would leave. He has demanded only one Officer and on that 10 persons are writing and when persons would write, what one could do. He has just to execute the orders/directions/decisions taken by the Syndicate and Senate, but they are not able to understand the financial position of the University.

Shri Naresh Guar intervened to say that, that is a separate topic and should not be linked with the Deans Student Welfare.

The Vice Chancellor said, "No, he is telling the entire scenario, foreseeing the things".

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu remarked that, in that, he (Vice Chancellor) did not have any role.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that, that is only action and reaction.

The Vice Chancellor said that the question is that he demanded only one Officer, but he/she is not given to him. Why he did not get him/her, it might be owing to his inefficiency. Now, they should take up Item 17 for consideration.

A couple of members said "Right Sir".

RESOLVED: That Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dean Student Welfare, Professor Neena Caplash, Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Professor Ranjan Kumar, Associate Dean, Student Welfare, be given extension in their term of appointment for one more year i.e. up to 31.5.2020 and till this recommendation of the Syndicate is considered by the Senate, all the said incumbents would continue as such.

The Vice Chancellor expressed his strong reservation to the above mentioned resolution since he has not recommended the names of Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dean Student Welfare, Professor Neena Caplash, Dean Student Welfare (Women) and Professor Ranjan Kumar, Associate Dean, Student Welfare, for extension in their aforesaid term of appointment i.e. 31.5.2020.

- 17.** Considered if, the contractual term of appointment of Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Programme Coordinator, NSS, be extended for further period of one year w.e.f. 01.07.2019 to 30.06.2020 on the same terms and conditions as mentioned in the appointment letter dated 16.06.2016 (**Appendix-LX**). Information contained in office note (**Appendix-LX**) was also taken for consideration.

- NOTE:** 1. Ms. Navdeep Sharma was appointed as Programme Co-ordinator (NSS) (on contract basis) for the period of three years & extendable for further one year), Panjab University, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + GP Rs.9000/- plus allowances admissible under University rules, and she be offered basic salary in Pay-Band-4 equal to whatever she was getting in her present position at A.S. College, Khanna as per the decision of the Syndicate dated 01.015.2016 (Para 2(i)) **(Appendix-LX).**

She joined the Panjab University on 01.07.2016 (F.N.) **(Appendix-LX).**

2. Request dated 22.01.2019 of Ms. Navdeep Kaur is enclosed **(Appendix-LX).**

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one year extension could be given to Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Programme Coordinator, NSS.

The Vice Chancellor said that then, after this no extension should be given to Ms. Navdeep Sharma. Hence, the extension should be given only for one year.

Shri Naresh Gaur pointed out that it is written that the contractual term of appointment of Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Programme Coordinator, NSS, be extended for further period of one year.

The Vice Chancellor said that the extension should be given only for one year and the word only should be inserted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the recommendation has come for one year extension.

The Vice Chancellor said that the extension should be given only for one year and thereafter not.

A few members said that such is not the recommendation.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that since the recommendation has come for one year, one year's extension would be given. When the extension would come again, the matter would be discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that meant, they are not in favour writing "thereafter no extension".

Some of the members, including Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu, said, "No, because such a recommendation is not there".

The Vice Chancellor said that then okay because it is also going on like this, this might also go as it is.

RESOLVED: That the contractual term of appointment of Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Programme Coordinator, NSS, be extended for one year w.e.f. 01.07.2019 to 30.06.2020 on the same terms and conditions as mentioned in the appointment letter dated 16.06.2016.

18. Considered if -

- (i) the term of Ms. Twinkle Bedi, Assistant Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology (purely on temporary basis), be extended upto

30.05.2019 (with one day break) i.e. on 01.05.2019, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which she was working for the session 2018-19; and

- (ii) Ms. Twinkle Bedi, be also re-appointed afresh as Assistant Professor at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology (purely on temporary basis) w.e.f. the date of start of classes for the academic session 2019-20 or till the regular posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which she was working for the session 2018-19.

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

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.08.2018 (Para 16 (vii)) has:

- (i) extended the term of appointment of Ms. Twinkle Bedi, Assistant Professor in Computer Engineering, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, purely on temporary basis (with one day break) upto 30.06.2018, 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 for the session 2017-18; and
- (ii) re-appointed (afresh) Ms. Twinkle Bedi as Assistant Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, purely on temporary basis, w.e.f. 09.07.2018, for the academic session 2018-19, or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2017-18, which was read out and noted by the Senate in its meeting dated 03.11.2018 (Para XXII (I-10)).
2. Request dated 10.05.2019 of Chairperson along with the minutes dated 06.05.2019 of the JAAC Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology is enclosed (**Appendix-LXI**).

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the term of Ms. Twinkle Bedi, Assistant Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology (purely on temporary basis), be extended upto 30.05.2019 (with one day break) i.e. on 01.05.2019, under

Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which she was working for the session 2018-19; and

- (ii) Ms. Twinkle Bedi, be also re-appointed afresh as Assistant Professor at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology (purely on temporary basis) w.e.f. the date of start of classes for the academic session 2019-20 or till the regular posts are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and conditions on which she was working for the session 2018-19.

19. Considered if, the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis), University Institute of Hotel Management and Tourism, be extended upto 30.06.2019, on the same term and conditions on which they worked previously, with one day break as usual:

1. Ms. Lipika Guliani
2. Mr. Gaurav Kashyap
3. Mr. Abhishek Ghai,
4. Mr. Manoj Semwal

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

- NOTE:**
1. The appointment of the incumbents enlisted at Sr. No. 1 to 3 were initially made for the session 2012-13 and re-appointed/ extended for the session 2013-14 onwards.
 2. The appointment of the person at Sr. No.4 is being made from 2015-16 onwards.
 3. A copy of minutes of joint meeting of Academic, Administrative and Technical Committee of UIHTM dated 01.04.2019 is enclosed (**Appendix-LXII**).
 4. A copy of request dated 11.04.2019 of Director, University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management, P.U. is enclosed (**Appendix-LXII**).

RESOLVED: That the term of appointment of the following Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis), University Institute of Hotel Management and Tourism, be extended upto 30.06.2019, on the same term and conditions on which they worked previously, with one day break as usual:

1. Ms. Lipika Guliani
2. Mr. Gaurav Kashyap
3. Mr. Abhishek Ghai,
4. Mr. Manoj Semwal

20. Considered minutes dated 22.05.2019 (Item 1, 4, 6, 8) (**Appendix-LXIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for framing and printing of Rules and Regulations of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree in accordance with the UGC minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that he believed that the Registrar has clearly written that Items 1, 4, 6, and 8 might be taken to the Syndicate, and the other items are not for the consideration of the Syndicate. The first recommendation of the Committee related to Special Admission Drive for students with disabilities in M.Phil./Ph.D. course under the Clause 5.4.1 of the University Grants Commission (Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degrees) Regulations, 2016. This recommendation is correct and needed to be approved. So far as recommendation 4 of the Committee is concerned, an issue had crept up that one of the faculty members had been insisting, even though it was not proper, that she be allowed to supervise her real brother for Ph.D. degree. According to him, it is not proper. She was asking that she should be shown the guidelines, norms, etc. Now, the Syndicate should clearly approve that it is a rule/guidelines that one could not supervise his/her real brother, sister, son, daughter, etc. for Ph.D. degree.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they had approved certain guidelines but certain remained. For GATE, they approved that the minimum GATE score, but it should not be minimum, it should be GATE qualified. As such, they are now approving GATE qualified. Since the admissions are approaching, it was absolutely necessary to approve this. He said that if one qualified the GATE, which is a national level test, there should not be any time limit for him/her. It is not that the GATE is valid only for a limited period or up to the time for which fellowship is given to him/her. Hence, the validity of GATE should be for an unlimited period, i.e., for all time to come.

Professor Rajat Sandhir, while referring to Clause (c) of recommendation 6, said that it is written that "While issuing certificate regarding plagiarism for Ph.D. thesis, the Supervisor of the student should manually subtract the similarity percentage from own papers of students.....". He is amused to this recommendation. How would the Supervisor manually do it, especially when the software does it on its own?

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that Clause (c) of recommendation 6 should be deleted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that so far as recommendation 8 is concerned, the case of the candidate was not processed. The student has been registered for Ph.D. under the old Ph.D. Guidelines, 2008. If extension is to be given to him for submission of Ph.D. thesis, the Syndicate could grant the same. They should give him extension.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, of course, the Committee might have seen it. Is the Entrance Test of the University, which is mentioned at page 5, has also been made valid forever/for life long? Though it is good, he should be made aware that earlier it was valid only for a period of two years. Even for two years, the Departments people were saying that they are facing a lot of problems as the candidates of before two years could not be enrolled/registered and new more are got added. How would they compare between old and new candidates? Now, if the validity is made for life time, would it be practically possible? First, they advertised the Ph.D. slots of each and every Department, and conduct the Entrance Test in accordance with the advertised slot. The new candidates, who qualified the Entrance Test, did not know that there are already candidates, who have qualified the Entrance Test but could not be enrolled/registered during the previous year(s) and those, who have already qualified and are eligible, are waiting for enrolment/registration.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that so far as slots are concerned, he would like to make it clear that it could not be linked with slots because otherwise also, as per the existing guidelines, they give preference to those, who have fellowship.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that, this also is not being followed in all the Departments. This meant, there is some ambiguity in it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it could be checked. Moreover, it did not mean that if there are two slots, they would qualify only two candidates. The Entrance Test is being conducted only to assess whether the candidate is fit to do Ph.D. or not. Possibility is there, that more number of candidates, who have qualified UGC NET, are applicants for Ph.D. than the number of slot, which had been advertised. As such, they could not much correlate the slots with it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that was why, he is saying that there are Departments, where even the JRFs are being ignored.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is wrong and it needed to be corrected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the validity of the Entrance Test is made life long, what would be the criteria for enrolling/registering the candidate for Ph.D.?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they conduct the interview for assessing the candidates.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant, all the candidates, i.e., who have qualified Entrance Test during all the previous years, would appear in the interview and complete among themselves. He suggested that it should be taken care of.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that it is wrong.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the old system, i.e., 5 years validity of the Entrance Test, should be allowed to be continued.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the validity of the Entrance Test should be two years. Earlier, the validity of the Entrance Test was two years, but in the year 2017, they raised this validity to five years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the validity of two years was increased because certain candidates did M.Phil., which is a two years programme. Hence, the old system should be allowed to be continued.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the Entrance Test, which was qualified five years ago, becomes redundant as nowadays several changes take place at the national and international levels.

The Vice Chancellor said that the validity of the Entrance Test should be fixed three years.

RESOLVED: That minutes dated 22.05.2019 (Item 1, 4, 6, 8) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for framing and printing of Rules and Regulations of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree in accordance with the UGC minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree, **as per Appendix-LXIII**, approved with the following changes:

- (i) That point (c) under item 6 (I) of the minutes dated 22.5.2019, be deleted; and
- (ii) That Item 6(II) of the minutes dated 22.5.2019, be read as under:

“The Committee further RESOLVED the GATE/GPAT or any other national level test meant for admission to Ph.D./M.Mhil. would be valid forever and the amendment be made in the Ph.D. Guidelines and be placed before the Syndicate for approval. However the validity of PU

University Entrance test for admission to Ph.D./M.Phil. courses would be 3 years.

- (iii) the request of Shri Kurshid Ansari dated 16.05.2019, Research Scholar, Department of Urdu, regarding allowing him to submit thesis up to 28.08.2019, be approved.

21.

Considered letter No.VPS-15/2/R/PU/2018 dated 08.05.2019 (**Appendix-LXIV**) received from Under Secretary, Vice-President's Secretariat, New Delhi, regarding complaint under Section 3(2) of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 against Professor Arun Grover, former Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, in response to P.U. No.ST/4097 dated 18.04.2019 (**Appendix-LXIV**).

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 22) (**Appendix-LXIV**) examined the report of PUCASH on complaint of sexual Harassment and resolved that the Ph.D. registration of the student be cancelled and a DDR be lodged against her for making a false complaint of sexual harassment.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2018 while discussing the Agenda Item No. 15 regarding representation dated 20.07.2018 of xxxxxxxxxxxx, #289, Milk Colony Dhanas, Sector-14 West, Chandigarh-160014 forwarded by Under Secretary, Vice-President's Secretariat vide No.VPS-15/2/R/PU/2018 dated 02.08.2018 regarding complaint against Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Ex-Vice-Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh for creating circumstances under section 3(2) the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act 2013 to favour the xxxxxx (xxxxxxxxx), has decided that a separate item may be brought to the next meeting of the Syndicate in regard of reviewing of the decision already taken by the Syndicate dated 28.05.2017 vide Para 22 regarding cancellation of the Ph.D. registration of xxxxxxxxxxxx.

Accordingly, the matter was discussed by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 14.10.2018 (Para 4) (**Appendix-LXIV**) and it was resolved that the Vice Chancellor be authorised to form a Committee with a clear and explicit term of reference to review the decision taken by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 22) regarding cancellation of her Ph.D. Registration.

3. The recommendations of the Committee dated 15.11.2018 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 14.10.2018 (Para 4) with regard to review the decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 22) were considered by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.12.2018 (Para 7) (**Appendix-LXIV**) and it was resolved that efforts be made to settle the issue in accordance with the discussions held in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 14.10.2018, and until then the matter be kept pending.
4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.03.2019 while considering the Vice-Chancellor's Statement has resolved that a complaint of sexual harassment dated 20.07.2018 of a woman research scholar against the former Vice Chancellor (Professor Arun Kumar Grover) to the Chancellor, was

referred by Chancellor's Office to the University. The complaint placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 23.9.2018, was discussed. It was now decided that the said complaint be sent to the Chancellor's Office as the Chancellor is the employer of the then Vice Chancellor for appropriate action at the end of His Excellency.

It was informed by the Registrar in this letter the Chancellor's office has said that since the Chancellor is no longer the employer of Professor Arun Kumar Grover, former Vice Chancellor, against whom the complaint has been made, the matter may be placed before the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that a very good letter had been written to the Chancellor on 18th April 2019. As per the decision of the Syndicate, only few important words escaped/missed to be mentioned. They had quoted everything in the above portion of the letter and written in the last paragraph that "In view of the decision of the Syndicate dated 16.03.2019, the complaint of the applicant, which was placed before the Syndicate is forwarded to the Office of the Chancellor for taking necessary action as deemed fit their end", **the later being the employer of the accused** and they did not mention these words. What their reply is?

It was informed by the Registrar that they have written that "In the light of the facts/observations shown above, the matter may be placed before the Senate, which has the entire management of, and superintendence over the affairs, concerns and property of the University, and as also the Chancellor is no longer the employer of Professor Arun Kumar Grover, the Ex-Vice Chancellor, Panjab University".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they are saying that since they are no longer the employer of Professor Arun Kumar Grover, former Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, the matter be placed before the Senate. What relation the Senate has with Professor Arun Kumar Grover at the moment. It should not be taken so lightly. The Internal Complaint Committee or in the instant case, the Chancellor being the employer could enquire into the allegations levelled by anybody against the employee. He was the then employee appointed by the Chancellor, he (Professor Grover) does not escape the responsibility that whatever he had done at Panjab University, let the same should be buried. When it comes to their own employees, they even take action against the pensioners, but in the instance case, they (Chancellor's Office) are saying that now they are not now his employer. If the complaint is against the employee, the Internal Complaint Committee, as per the Act, has to proceed. Since Professor Arun Kumar Grover is not their employee, what would the Senate do? It is not to be the complainant, who has to be having any relationship with the University and it is the accused in fact, who is supposed to be having relationship with the University. That was why, in this very case, the PUCASH had conducted the enquiry against somebody, who was not an employee of the University. As such, they had already committed a mistake in this matter. Hence, they could conduct inquiry only in his/her case, who is their employee. However, in this case, Professor Arun Kumar Grover was never the employee of the Senate nor he is nor ever would be. He was an employee appointed by the Chancellor and they are saying that they are no longer his (Professor Grover) employer and simultaneously in the same letter is writing that the matter be placed before the Senate. In the over superintendent and management, which has been referred to, nowhere the name of Professor Arun Kumar Grover has been mentioned. If tomorrow any complaint is received against a person of Rehri Market of Sector 15, Chandigarh, would they place the matter before the Senate even though he/she is not under them? As such, the opinion of the Syndicate should be mentioned that the letter was placed before the Syndicate and the Syndicate after considering/perusal the same has observed that the Senate was never the employer of Professor Arun Kumar Grover. However, the Chancellor was the employer of the then Vice Chancellor, Professor Arun Kumar Grover, so it is being resubmitted for reconsideration at your end.

RESOLVED: That letter No. VPS-15/2/R/PU/2018 dated 8th May, 2019 received from the Under Secretary, Office of the Vice President of India, New Delhi was placed before the Syndicate. The Syndicate after perusal of the letter has observed that the Senate was never the employer of the former Vice Chancellor Professor Arun Kumar Grover. However, the Chancellor was the employer of the then Vice Chancellor Professor Arun Kumar Grover. Therefore, the case be again submitted to the Hon'ble Chancellor for reconsideration.

22. Considered that the following recommendations dated 08.04.2019 (**Appendix-LXV**) of the Committee constituted by the Senate in its meeting dated 15.12.2018 (Para III) (**Appendix-LXV**), to look into the problems faced due to 24x7 opening of girls' hostels, be approved:

1. Identity Card of the Hostel is mandatory for the residents while entering details in the mobility register for late night exit/entry.
2. For movement outside the hostel after 10.00 p.m., the entry in the mobility register is must for all residents. If residents do not make entry in mobility register, written warnings will be issued by the concerned Warden. More than two defaults will lead to expulsion from hostels.
3. Attendance is must between 9.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m. If a residents does not come for attendance, then written warnings will be issued by the concerned Warden for two times, after which defaulter will be expelled from hostel.
4. Guest entry must be made before 10.00 p.m. No guest will be allowed to enter in the hostels after 10.00 p.m. Defaulters will have to pay fine as per rule.
5. Only two gates will be opened after 10.00 p.m. i.e. Main Gate near Girls Hostel No.6 will be opened for residents of Girls Hostel No.3, 4, & 6 and Gate of Girls Hostel No.7 for residents of Girls Hostel No. 5 & 7. Hostel Gate of Girls Hostel No.5 will be closed at night after 10.00 p.m. All the residents should exit and enter from these two gates only, due to shortage of security staff and for maintaining proper record.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after opening of girls' hostels 24x7, a problem arose that the girls totally stopped marking their attendance. Since the rules had been framed earlier, which had been mentioned in the booklet, they faced difficulties. Now, they have identified as to where the rules needed to be modified, so that the indiscipline, which has increased, could be curtailed.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired was the representative of the students there in the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the representatives of the students were there, but he/she did not come to the meeting, in spite of invitation. In fact, all the four representatives had been associated with the Committee; rather, he being the chairman of the Committee called them on phone to attend the meeting, but they did not come.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that this is a very serious problem and he apprehended that the University could get into a problem at any time. In fact, they should have a permanent solution and the permanent solution would be that they should have a biometric attendance at the time of going and coming with an SMS facility, so that when the student goes or comes back, an SMS goes to his/her parents. This is the only way, they could save themselves. He urged that it should be done as it would save them for all times to come.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that this is what, which is being done at Chitkara University. The moment, the student goes out, a message go to his/her parents.

The Vice Chancellor said that though the biometric is a very nice/good system, they are working in the Government System. Secondly, who would monitor? From where the so much money, including for maintenance would come?

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Professor S.K. Sharma said that machine (biometric machine) with the facility of face identification just cost about Rs.20,000/- to Rs.25,000/- each.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have more than 22 hostels. He reiterated from the funds for maintenance would come. Most importantly, how the monitoring would be done? At the moment, they are unable to do the monitoring of attendance. This is the difference between approval of policy and its execution.

Professor S.K. Sharma apprehended that if tomorrow any incident takes place, the buck would stop at him (Vice Chancellor) as all others, including the Dean Student Welfare would run away from the responsibility.

The Vice Chancellor said that the question is that they have to improve upon the system.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are no two opinions that they are required to improve upon the system and they would do that also.

RESOLVED: That the following recommendations dated 08.04.2019 of the Committee constituted by the Senate in its meeting dated 15.12.2018 (Para III) (**Appendix-LXV**), to look into the problems faced due to 24x7 opening of girls' hostels, **as per Appendix-LXV**, be approved:

1. Identity Card of the Hostel is mandatory for the residents while entering details in the mobility register for late night exit/entry.
2. For movement outside the hostel after 10.00 p.m., the entry in the mobility register is must for all residents. If residents do not make entry in mobility register, written warnings will be issued by the concerned Warden. More than two defaults will lead to expulsion from hostels.
3. Attendance is must between 9.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m. If a residents does not come for attendance, then written warnings will be issued by the concerned Warden for two times, after which defaulter will be expelled from hostel.
4. Guest entry must be made before 10.00 p.m. No guest will be allowed to enter in the hostels after 10.00 p.m. Defaulters will have to pay fine as per rule.
5. Only two gates will be opened after 10.00 p.m. i.e. Main Gate near Girls Hostel No.6 will be opened for residents of Girls Hostel No.3, 4, & 6 and Gate of Girls Hostel No.7 for residents of Girls Hostel No. 5 & 7. Hostel Gate of Girls Hostel No.5 will be closed at night after 10.00 p.m. All the residents should exit and enter from these two gates only, due to shortage of security staff and for maintaining proper record.

23. Considered the requisition letter dated 1.3.2019 (**Appendix-LXVI**) of 19 Fellows to convene special meeting of the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this issue was also discussed last time in the Syndicate and it was said that if any request for a special meeting of the Senate is received, could they convene a special meeting of the Senate every time without going into the merit(s) of the request. Were they not required to go to the merit(s) of the request? So far as Regulation is concerned, Shri Ashok Goyal had read out the Regulation on that day. At least he is not convinced even today. Could they convene a special meeting of the Senate on any issue? It has been clearly mentioned in the Regulation that they would discuss the cause for holding the special meeting of the Senate. Since couple of members were aware of the issue and were not in favour of deliberating on the issue, the other members gave their opinions. They had their own apprehension and the Vice Chancellor had also the apprehension, which was genuine also, that it would be difficult for the University to function like this. If they allowed someone's request to convene a special meeting of the Senate once, then they would not be able to deny similar requests received in future. However, if they have to convene a special meeting of the Senate, then they have to do that. Why not it be got legally examined that is it necessary for the Syndicate to fix the date for the special meeting of the Senate whenever any request is received or the Syndicate has second alternative, i.e., to discuss the merits of the request?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever happened in the Senate meeting day before yesterday was discussed in the Syndicate in detail and after getting convinced, they had taken the decision. Since Vice Chancellor chairing the meeting of the Senate had allowed the issue to be raised by some of the members, they thought that the Vice Chancellor would defend the decision of the Syndicate though the Vice Chancellor had told him later that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should have spoken at that time. Whereas they were of the opinion that everybody had given their views and apprehended that if they acceded to their request, then everyday a special meeting of the Senate would be held, which is not the purpose of the provision mentioned in the Calendar. As told by the Professor Navdeep Goyal, that was why, some of the members were requesting for fixing a date for the special meeting of the Senate. Perhaps, it was observed that the atmosphere was not congenial there to discuss the issue. They thought that the tempers have reach so high that it is not possible to understand each other. That was why, they stuck to the point that, if they feel proper, let the issue be referred back to the Syndicate, so that if the Syndicate felt that they have taken a wrong decision, they could reconsider the same with open mind. Whatever was their apprehension, he (Vice Chancellor) could not imagine as he also could not imagine, that they would receive such request for convening a special meeting of the Senate every day. Issue or no issue, whether there is any relevance, violation is there or not, 15 Fellows would sign a request and give the same to him (Vice Chancellor). If they thought that the Syndicate is only to fix the date for the special meeting of the Senate, then he did not think that the University would function. That was why, they are not against convening the special meeting of the Senate. But they should not take any decision in haste. One such requisition has been received by the University today also. As such, he is of the opinion that before fixing the date, this should be got legally and administratively examined because he has expressed his opinion and he thought that whatever has been said by him is correct. The other members have also expressed their opinion and are of the view that whatever has been said by them is correct. Hence, it should be got examined to have objective view, and not as to what is suitable to them, keeping in mind the practical functioning of the University and also keeping in mind the statutes of the University. He further said that the problem in it is that the regulation under which this requisition comes, the next to next Regulation 9 says that "At a special meeting of the Senate, only the business for which the meeting is convened shall be transacted". It could also not be done that six requisitions have come, one special meeting of the Senate should be convened. That could not be done, as they have to convene six special meetings of the Senate. Whether they would be able to do this? Once they started this practice, and thereafter the pandora's box, which would be opened, they would not be able to stop that and they would also not be able to say that now they should get it examined. The issue could also be discussed with the friends, who have given the requisition, as they

are not out of their fold. They would also talk to them and the Vice Chancellor could also do so. They could be persuaded to that if it is so much important issue, it could be discussed in the regular meeting of the Senate also. If a special meeting is convened like this, he has no doubt that in this University, more meetings of the Senate than the Syndicate would be held. Would they be able to do that, especially keeping in view the financial resources they have? Is it possible for the Vice Chancellor to convene a special meeting of the Senate every day? Hence it should be got examine.

The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Ashok Goyal as to what could be the resolved part.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that keeping in mind the deliberation of the Syndicate in its meeting held on 16.3.2019 about the requisition made under Regulation 7 at page 28 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 as also the discussion held in the meeting of the Senate dated 26.5.2019, it is resolved that it be got legally examined and also from the feasibility point of view as to whether the Syndicate is only to fix date for the Special meeting of the Senate or they have to consider the purpose also, which is mentioned in the requisition made by the Fellows before fixing the date for the Special meeting of the Senate.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma suggested that the matter should be got examined by the Senior Advocate.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that instead of Senior Advocate, the matter should be got examined from the Legal Retainer preferably Shri Anupam Gupta.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that instead of going to the Advocates/Legal Retainers, legal opinion should be sought from the legal experts, whose services are available in the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the Senate everybody was speaking emotionally. Had he been authorised or asked to respond, he would have suggested to get the matter legally examined as proposed by Shri Sandeep Singh. Whatever had happened in the meeting of the Senate, had happened only owing to the communication gap. In fact, he is saying from the very beginning that they should sit together and discuss the issues informally so that they are able to take decisions in the meetings quickly. He remarked that there is no need to enter into long discussion and get the same recorded; rather, they should take decisions here quickly and move forward. Everybody has to think about the University; otherwise, it is very difficult to hold the meetings of the Syndicate/Senate, which involved huge expenditure, and they are also aware as to how much the image of the University is tarnished. Still, the perception is that they (Panjab University) are going down. His only request to them is that they should encourage/enter into informal discussion. He was of the view that solution to every problem could be found by discussing the issue sitting round the table. He requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to talk to them (the Fellows, who have given requisition for convening the special meeting of the Senate) along with two-three members of the Syndicate and get the issue solved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should try to resolve the issue. He requested the Vice Chancellor to arrange a meeting where they could sit together and try to resolve the issue.

When Dr. K.K. Sharma enquired as to what has been resolved, Shri Ashok Goyal said that resolved part would be recorded that they would sit together to have an informal meeting with the Fellows, who have given requisition for the special meeting of the Senate, to get the issue resolved.

This was agreed to.

- 24.** Considered if Ms. Aishwarya Jagga (petitioner), be granted admission to LL.M. one year course (first semester), for the session 2019-20, pursuant to the orders dated 10.05.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in COCP No.1630 of 2019 (**Appendix-LXVII**), filed by her.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.03.2019 (Para 8) considered the recommendation dated 07.02.2019 of the Board of Control, ULS, that an additional seat already created for Ms. Aishwarya Jagga to take admission in LL.M. one year course, pursuant to the orders dated 20.12.2018 of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide CWP no. 27423 of 2018 filed by her, be treated for the session 2019-20 instead of 2018-19 and the fees paid by her for whole one year course of the session 2018-19, be also adjusted and it was resolved that the said recommendations of the BOC be not approved.
2. Letter dated 14.05.2019 of Director, University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U., containing the comments of the SLO is enclosed (**Appendix-LXVII**).

The members were requested to draw their attention to the orders of the Court (available at page 91 of the **Appendix-LXVII**).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had the Advocate of the University mentioned the decision of the Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 in the reply, perhaps, the contempt proceedings might not have been initiated against the University. In fact, the decision of the Syndicate should have made a part of the reply by the University Advocate.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That Ms. Aishwarya Jagga (petitioner), be granted admission to LL.M. One-Year course (first semester), for the session 2019-20, pursuant to the orders dated 10.05.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in COCP No.1630 of 2019 (**Appendix-LXVII**), filed by her.

- 25.** Considered and

RESOLVED: That Dr. Paramjit Singh, Fellow, Principal, Government College, Hoshiarpur, (**Appendix-LXVIII**) be assigned to the Faculties (opted by him), as mentioned below:

1. Languages
2. Arts
3. Education
4. Design & Fine Arts

- 26.** The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(ii)** on the agenda was read out, viz.,

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed the following amendments in General Financial Rules in P.U. Account Manual, pursuant to notification No.F.1/26/2018-PPD dated 02.04.2019 (**Appendix-LXIX**):

Rule	Existing	New Provision
------	----------	---------------

27.5	<p>Registration of Suppliers for inviting limited quotations:</p> <p>(i) With a view to establish reliable sources for procurement of goods commonly required for University use, the Department shall prepare and maintain item-wise lists of eligible and capable suppliers. Such suppliers will be known as “Registered Suppliers”. Such registered suppliers are prima facie eligible for consideration for procurement of goods through Limited Tender Enquiry. They are also ordinarily exempted from furnishing bid security along with their bids.</p> <p>(v) The list of registered form approved by one department for any item can be used by other departments also, if latter has no registered supplier for such items.</p>	<p>Registration of Suppliers for inviting limited quotations:</p> <p>(i) For goods and services not available on GeM, the concerned Department may register suppliers of goods and services which are specifically required by that Department or office,</p> <p>(ii) periodically. Registration of the supplier should be done following a fair, transparent and reasonable procedure and after giving due publicity. Such registered supplier should be boarded on GeM as and when the item or service gets listed on GeM.</p> <p>Note: There is no change in clauses (ii), (iii) and (iv).</p> <p>(v) The list of registered suppliers for the subject matter of procurement be exhibited on websites of the Procuring Entity/e-Procurement portals.</p>
27.8.1:	<p>Government e-Market place (GeM) :</p> <p>DGS & D or any other agency authorized by the Government will host an online Government e-Marketplace (GeM) for common use Goods and Services, DGS&D will ensure adequate publicity including periodic advertisement of the items to be procured through GeM for the prospective suppliers. The credentials of suppliers on GeM shall be certified by DGS&D. The procuring authorities will certify the reasonability of rates. The GeM portal shall be utilized by the University buyers for direct on-line purchases as under:</p> <p>i) Upto Rs. 50,000/- through any of the available suppliers on the GeM, meeting the requisite quality, specification and delivery period;</p> <p>ii) Above Rs. 50,000/- and Up to Rs. 30,00,000/- through the GeM Seller having lowest price</p>	<p>Government e-Marketplace (GeM):</p> <p>Government of India has established the Government e-Marketplace (GeM) for common use Goods and Services. GeM SPV will ensure adequate publicity including periodic advertisement of the items to be procured through GeM for the prospective suppliers. The Procurement of Goods and Services by Ministries or Departments will be mandatory for Goods or Services available on GeM. The credentials of suppliers on GeM shall be certified by GeM SPV. The procuring authorities will certify the reasonability of rates. The GeM portal shall be utilized by the Government buyers for direct on-line purchases as under:</p> <p>(i) UP to Rs.25,000 through any of the available suppliers on the GeM, meeting the requisite quality, specification and delivery period.</p> <p>(ii) Above Rs.25,000/- and up to Rs.5,00,000/- through the GeM Seller having lowest price amongst</p>

	<p>amongst the available sellers, of at least three different manufactures, on GeM, meeting the requisite quality, specification and delivery period. The tools for online bidding and online reverse auction available on GeM can be used by the Buyer if decided by the competent authority.</p> <p>iii) Above Rs. 30,00,000/- through the supplier having lowest price meeting the requisite quality, specification and delivery period after mandatorily obtaining bids, using online bidding or reverse auction tool provided on GeM.</p>	<p>the available sellers (excluding Automobiles where current limit of 30 lakh will continue), of at least three different manufacturers, on GeM, meeting the requisite quality, specification and delivery period. The tools for online bidding and online reverse auction available on GeM can be used by the Buyers even for procurements less than Rs.5,00,000/-.</p> <p>(iii) Above Rs.5,00,000/- through the supplier having lowest price meeting the requisite quality, specification and delivery period after mandatorily obtaining bids, using online bidding or reverse auction tool provided on GeM (excluding Automobiles where current limit of 30 lakh will continue).</p> <p>Note: There is no change in clauses (iv), (v), (vi), & (vii).</p> <p><u>New Clause</u></p> <p>(viii) In case intended goods/services are not available on GeM or the desired quantity/quality of intended goods/services are not offered on GeM, then the concerned Department may procure such goods/services after following the procedure of inviting bids as contained in Rule 27.9 to 27.12 as the case may be after recording the following certificate to be signed by Departmental Purchase Committee. "This is to certify that the intended goods/services are not available on GeM." or "This is to certify that the intended goods/services of desired quantity/quality are not available on GeM."</p>
27.7	<p>Purchase of goods by Spot Purchase Committee:- In case of special circumstances or urgency to be recorded in writing purchase of goods costing above Rs. 15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand) may be made by a duly constituted Local Purchase Committee consisting</p>	<p>Purchase of goods by Spot Purchase Committee:- In case a certain item is not available on the GeM portal, Purchase of goods costing above Rs.25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand only) and upto Rs.2,50,000/- (Rupees two lakh and fifty thousand only) on each occasion</p>

<p>of three members of an appropriate level as decided by the Vice-Chancellor. The committee will survey and collect spot quotations from the market to ascertain the reasonableness of rate, quality and specifications and identify the appropriate supplier. Before placement of the purchase order, the members of the committee will jointly record a certificate as under.</p> <p>"Certified _____ that we _____, members of the purchase committee are jointly and individually satisfied that the goods recommended for purchase are of the requisite specification, quality, lowest market rate and the supplier is reliable and competent to supply the goods in question".</p>	<p>may be made on the recommendations of a duly constituted Local Purchase Committee consisting of three members of an appropriate level as decided by the Head of the Department. The committee will survey the market to ascertain the reasonableness of rate, quality and specifications and identify the appropriate supplier. Before recommending placement of the purchase order, the members of the committee will jointly record a certificate as under:</p> <p>"Certified that we, members of the purchase committee are jointly and individually satisfied that the goods recommended for purchase are of the requisite specification and quality, priced at the prevailing market rate and the supplier recommended is reliable and competent to supply the goods in question, and it is not debarred by Department of Commerce or Ministry/ Department concerned".</p>
---	--

NOTE: A copy of the circular No.2697-2896/FDO dated 03.06.2017 is enclosed (**Appendix-LXIX**).

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed the following Lab. Instructors (temporary basis) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), in the pay scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules and their salary be charged/paid against the vacant posts as mentioned against each:-

- (i) W.e.f. 04.06.2019 to 07.07.2019 after giving one day break on 03.06.2019 (being Sunday on 02.06.2019) or till the vacancies are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier; and
- (ii) For the next academic session 2019-2020 w.e.f. 08.07.2019 to 30.05.2020 i.e. upto end of Semester Examinations or till the vacancies are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

Sr. No.	Name	Post against which salary to be charged
1.	Mr. Nand Kishore, (I.T.)	Technical Officer
2.	Mr. Sandeep Trehan, (M.E.)	Technical Officer
3.	Ms. Seema, (Biotechnology)	Workshop Instructor
4.	Mr. Lokesh, (C.S.E.)	Senior Workshop Superintendent
5.	Ms. Sunaina Gulati, (C.S.E.)	Deputy Librarian

NOTE: 1. The above Lab. Instructors were re-appointed by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017

(Para 40 (v)) w.e.f. 11.07.2017 to 01.06.2018 i.e. upto end of the Semester examinations (after one day break on 10.07.2017, 08.07.2017 & 09.07.2017 being Saturday & Sunday) or till the vacancies are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier.

2. The term of appointment of above persons has been extended w.e.f. 05.06.2018 to 31.07.2018 after giving one day break on 04.06.2018 vide letter No.8275-77/Estt. dated 27.06.2018 (**Appendix-LXX**).
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.11.2018 (Para 17 (R-iv)) (**Appendix-LXX**) had extended the term of appointment of above Lab. Instructors w.e.f. 01.08.2018 to 01.06.2019, purely on temporary basis, in the pay scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP of Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under University rules and their salary be charged/paid against the vacant post.
4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-LXX**).

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Item 26 - R-(i) to R-(ii)** on the agenda, be ratified.

Referring to **Sub-Item R-(i)**, Professor Rajat Sandhir pointed out that they, especially the Principal Investigators, are facing a lot of problem for purchasing articles/items/instruments through Gem Portal. Moreover, certain items on Gem Portal are expensive than the market. Hence, they have to show some openness. They have also decreased the limit of Rs.50,000/- to Rs.25,000/- and at certain other item the limit has been reduced to Rs.2,500/-. He, therefore, requested that they should review it and make it simpler, for which a Committee should be constituted.

It was clarified that they have to follow the Gem Portal.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they do have to follow the Gem Portal, but there must be some flexibility because several items are cheaper in the market and the same are expensive in the market.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired could they go beyond Gem Portal.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he is only saying that when the things are available in the market cheaper, why should they purchase the same on higher rates from the Gem Portal?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier, they used to purchased items on the rates approved by the DGS&D though there also the rates of certain items were high than the market. Still people preferred to purchase those items on the rates approved by the DGS&S because they knew that objection(s) would not be raised by the Audit.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that in certain cases, the difference is more than Rs.2 lacs.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that in certain cases, the difference was more than Rs.20 lacs.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he would like to bring to their kind notice that PGIMER is not still following the Gem Portal. Why are they rushing through Gem? When PGIMER is not facing any difficulty, how could they? He, therefore, suggested that they should look at it again.

It was informed that the Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD), Government of India, while releasing the grant has imposed a categorical/unequivocal condition that the University shall follow GFR.

Professor Rajat Sandhir intervened to say that they have already implemented it, but they could review it and make it simpler.

It was informed that in view of the condition imposed by the MHRD, they have no other option but to follow the Gem Portal. Still they took up the matter with the Gem Authorities of Union Territory because they have a permanent office in Union Territory of Chandigarh. This issue was taken up with them and they told that the vendor, who says that he would give them the items on cheaper rates, let that vendor be registered on Gem.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they are not in favour of unfair practices, but they should give some flexibility. Hence, they should review, and they are not saying that it should be withdrawn. They could form a Committee to improve upon it.

The Vice Chancellor said that FDO would examine the system prevailing in the PGIMER and, then look into the matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that PGIMER is not getting grant from MHRD. They did not know whether PGIMER has sought permission from the funding agency or the funding agency has imposed any condition on them or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that all such things would be seen.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Item 26 - R-(i) to R-(ii)** on the agenda, be ratified.

27. The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(ii)** on the agenda was read out, viz.,

(i) To note minutes dated 18.04.2019 (**Appendix-LXXI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.12.2018 (Para 13) (**Appendix-LXXI**) to release the pending grants from Government of Punjab, under Post Matric Scholarship Scheme for SC and ST students.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.12.2018 (Para 13) (Appendix) while approving the recommendations dated 29.11.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the representation received from Ambedkar Students Association (ASA), Panjab University, Chandigarh, with regard to Syndicate decision to charge Examination fee and implementation of Post Matric Scholarship in Self Finance Courses in the Teaching Departments of Panjab University & its Regional Centres, has also resolved that the Punjab Government be requested to release the pending grant; otherwise, it would be difficult for the University to continue with the Scheme. At the same time, Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Finance and Development Officer would talk to both the Punjab and Central Governments Officers.

2. A copy of the latest communication sent to the Govt. of Punjab vide letter dated 18.04.2019 is enclosed (**Appendix-LXXI**).

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the terminal benefit of Encashment of Earned Leave in respect of Late Ms. Lovely Sharma, Senior Assistant, USOL (who expired on 14.04.2017, while in service) as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, in equal share/proportion i.e. 50% to each Shri Anil Kumar Sharma (Brother) and Ms. Anita Sharma (Sister), who are the nominees of the deceased employee as per nomination made by her.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2019 (Para 31 (vi)) has sanctioned the two terminal benefits i.e. Gratuity and Ex-gratia Grant in respect of Late Ms. Lovely Sharma. However, the sanction of Earned Leave Encashment was kept pending for want of Service Book from the department as the same was burnt during the fire incident in Accounts Branch.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Item 27 - I-(i) to I-(ii)** on the agenda, be noted.

General Discussion

- (1) The Vice Chancellor said that they are contemplating to give them (the members of the Syndicate) Tablets and would like to have their observation(s) on that. They would prepare a couple of hardcopies of the agenda – (i) one of the hardcopies would be kept for the assistance of Vice Chancellor and Registrar and another for the assistance of the members of the Syndicate.

Professor S.K. Sharma and Shri Naresh Gaur suggested that at least two hardcopies of the agenda should be kept for the assistance of the members, i.e., one this side and another on the other side.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it would create problem for them as they makes notes on the copy of the agenda. He suggested that option should be sought from the members as to whether they wanted agenda in the form of hardcopy or softcopy and the same be provided to them in accordance with their option.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could not be done. They have to follow only one system and not two sets of system for different members because they are already incurring a lot of expenses on the preparation of agenda papers, including papers, printing, manpower, etc. Since they all are literate and tech-savvy, they could easily shift to technology. Yes, they could provide them two hardcopies of the agenda instead of one.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua reiterated that option should be sought from the members whether they would like to have hardcopy of the agenda or softcopy.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Except this, there could not be any other option”. He further said that they have already taken decision on this issue.

When the members said that they have not taken any decision in this regard, it was informed that a proposal had come that they would provide notepad to the members. To start with, the notepads would be given to the members of the Syndicate. When Shri Naresh Gaur said that notepad is very small and the same would not be useful, it was informed that, in fact, Ipads

would be provided to the members. In the beginning, these would be provided to the members of the Syndicate. If the proposal proves to be successful, the ipads would be given to the members of the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be seen carefully as the ipads would be much expensive.

On asking, it was informed that each ipad would cost between Rs.30,000/- and Rs.35,000/-.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that, in fact, the ipad would cost between Rs.45,000/- and Rs.50,000/- because he himself has purchased an Apple ipad recently.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when they say ipad, it meant Apple ipad. He would like to tell them approval has neither been given by the Syndicate nor by the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that if it is so, let the existing practice continue.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that option should be sought from the members and those who wanted softcopy of the agenda, they should be provided the agenda in the form of softcopy. At least, he is interested in the softcopy.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the annexures could be provided in the form of softcopy, but the main agenda should be provided in the form of hardcopy.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Naresh Gaur said that, earlier, they used to provide them hardcopy of agenda along with softcopy of the same in the pen drive. The cost of pen drive is Rs.300/-, whereas the cost of ipad is Rs.45,000/-. Shri Naresh Gaur requested the Vice Chancellor to reintroduce the system of pen drive. When the people would be used to be, they would automatically adopt this. At the moment, they are not used to this system.

Professor S.K. Sharma again suggested that option should be sought from the members as to in which form (hardcopy or softcopy), they would like to have the agenda.

It was said that they should seek option from the members as to in which form (hardcopy or softcopy), they would like to have the agenda, and thereafter, would act accordingly.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to what did they mean by the softcopy?

It was said that softcopy meant pen drive.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, this meant, hardcopy would be provided to only those, who would seek the same. So far as softcopy is concerned, it could be supplied to everyone as the same could also be provided through e-mail.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that on the one hand, they are saying that they are facing a financial crunch, and on the other hand, they are provided ipads, which cost about Rs.35,000/- each.

It was informed that they wanted to save papers, which is also very expensive.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to think on this matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that hardcopy of only the main agenda should be provided, but the annexures and other related documents should be provided to them in the form of softcopy.

The Vice Chancellor said that, to reduce the burden, could they not share the agenda papers. If they provide them 2-3 hardcopies of the agenda, would it suffice?

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that sometimes, they have to read the agenda papers on the spot.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would provide them the softcopy and requested the members to come to the meeting after reading the same.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that even if Laptop is provided to him, he would be comfortable.

The Vice Chancellor requested to think over the matter, discuss the same with themselves and come with a proposal/ solution.

- (2) The Vice Chancellor said that now, he would like to discuss with them the issue relating to appointment of Affiliation Committee, which was constituted by the Syndicate in its previous meeting. He requested the members to suggest names of any three members for the Affiliation Committee as the Affiliation Committee constituted by the Syndicate earlier is very lengthy. However, he was thinking that since President, PUTA, is a woman, if she is appointed a member of the Affiliation Committee, it would be better, but the total members of the Affiliation Committee should be three in all.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that sometimes, certain members did not come to attend the meeting of the Affiliation Committee. Whosoever have been appointment members of the Affiliation Committee, they should be allowed to continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are facing a lot of problems on this.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor to tell as to what problems are being faced.

The Vice Chancellor said that certain persons are coming to him. Moreover, a Committee of six persons did not seem appropriate to him. Or they should all come and consider the cases relating to grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation to the Colleges. They could discuss the affiliation cases informally and make recommendations.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that, earlier, the power for affiliation was given to the Syndicate.

When a reference was made to quorum, Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the quorum for the meeting of the Syndicate is only five.

It was informed that they had decided to appoint Affiliation Committee comprising six members, but now the same has become 9-member Committee.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that this should not be allowed to be done. The practice of his/her Colleges is to be stopped. One Inspection Committee imposed conditions, including appointment of 4 teachers, and in similar other College,

another Inspection Committee imposed condition for appointment of only 1 teacher. They practice of nepotism is to be stopped.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was why, he was suggesting that 3-Member Affiliation Committee should be constituted.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that sometimes the Affiliation Committee has to do a lot of work.

It was suggested that then all the members of the Syndicate should informally consider the affiliation/extension of affiliation cases and make recommendations.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that whatever Affiliation Committee had been constituted by the Syndicate in its previous meeting, the same is right.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever Affiliation Committee had been constituted by the Syndicate, the same should be allowed to function. Secondly, he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that all should sit together.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that 3-4 more names could be added in the Affiliation Committee as every type of persons came to him, which is a problem for him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that some of the six members, who have been appointed members of the Affiliation Committee, could be excluded.

The Vice Chancellor said that this option also seemed to be proper.

Certain members, including Shri Jagdeep Kumar and Professor Rajat Sandhir said that exclusion of members did not seem proper.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what the Syndicate has observed is that the Vice Chancellor is saying that certain persons are coming to him.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that other would come only from the Syndicate and not from outside.

It was said that they are also saying that the persons from the Syndicate itself are coming to them.

To this, certain members, including Shri Ashok Goyal, said that the Affiliation Committee has been constituted from the Syndicate itself.

The Vice Chancellor said that if someone from the Syndicate itself came to him and say that it has been done wrong and his/her name should also be inserted in the Affiliation Committee, what should he do?

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu suggested that all the six members of the Affiliation Committee should scrutinize all the cases of affiliation/extension of affiliation and make recommendations. Thereafter, all the members of the Syndicate should be called to consider those recommendations, the problem would automatically be solved. Then none would have any objection.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that it would be a Sub-Committee.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu remarked that in this way, everybody would be happy.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar remarked that it is not the question of making anybody happy.

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that somebody might have any objection to the recommendation(s) of the Affiliation Committee.

To this, Shri Jagdeep Kumar said, what it was not done when the Affiliation Committee was constituted. In fact, objection should have been raised when the Affiliation Committee was formed. What is the need of going to the Vice Chancellor later on?

Principal Narinder Singh Sidhu said that then it should be disclosed as to who had gone to the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that, that is what he is saying. Whosoever has gone, is wrong.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whosoever has gone to the Vice Chancellor after the decision of the Syndicate, should not be entertained. When it was said that the name of those six members, who had been appointed on the Affiliation Committee, should be told, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) said that since they had the recording of the proceedings of the meeting, they could verify it from there. They should only keep those six names and no other name(s) should be included.

On asking, it was informed that names of the Syndics, who had been appointing members of the Affiliation Committee, are Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor S.K. Sharma, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, Dr. K.K. Sharma, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the name of Shri Jagdeep Kumar was also suggested.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are talking about the six persons, who were appointed on the Affiliation Committee.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Shri Jagdeep Kumar jointly said that the name of seventh person was added here itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it could six or seven persons. What should they do is that they should see the recording and after verification whatever decision is found to be taken, the same should be followed and implemented.

It was informed that, in fact, six names were suggested. Thereafter, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma had said that Shri Jagdeep Kumar should be included in the Affiliation Committee. Then Principal Rajesh Kumar Mahajan suggested that his name should also be included.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should check the recording.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should check the recording. If other name(s) found, the same should be included.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Affiliation Committee should be made time bound because the session is going to start soon.

It was informed what happened is that Affiliation Committee is formed. Thereafter, cross allegations are levelled that this is his/her College and so on and so forth, which resulted into blocking of affiliation process. What needed to be done is that an Affiliation Committee of those members of the Syndicate

should be formed, who do not have any connection with the affiliated Colleges. However, if the decision of the Affiliation Committee is found to be objectionable, the same should be placed before the Syndicate. Hence, let there be an Affiliation Committee of the members, who do not have any relation with the affiliated Colleges.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma remarked that from where this new idea has come.

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

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that whatever had been decided in the previous meeting of the Syndicate should be followed and implemented. Whatever has happened has happened. He is astonished that people start thinking after the incident/decision taken by the Syndicate.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that whenever there is smoke, fire is always there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma is right that whatever decision had been taken by the Syndicate, on 11.5.2019 the same should be followed/implemented.

This was agreed to.

- (3) Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one of the candidates for CET (PG) could not upload certain information because of the technical failure. He believed that the candidate concerned should be allowed to get the requisite information uploaded. Request from the candidate in this regard has also been received, and the same was handed over to the Registrar on the floor of the House.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that several such requests have been received and all should be accepted to. He also requested that the date should also be extended a little bit.

- (4) Shri Naresh Gaur said that his request is that the bill which is credited by the University to their bank accounts, is in fact the reimbursement and not a payment. Usually, it is written that Rs.1960/- be credited to such and such account. Since one could not maintain multiple accounts, the amount whichever is reimbursed to him is deposited in his salary account. In the account, nowhere it is mentioned as to for what the amount has been reimbursed and for which meeting it belonged to. Date of meeting and the reason for which the amount is reimbursed should also be mentioned, so that the C.A., who is supposed to file his return, know and file the return accordingly.

It was assured by the Finance and Development Officer that while crediting the amount, the date of the meeting and reason for the reimbursement would be mentioned.

- (5) Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when they came for the meeting in the morning, several cars were parked on the road leading from University School of Open Learning to Gate No.1. When they asked the Security personnel to let them park their vehicle inside, they did not allow and plead that only the vehicles of only three persons are allowed to be parked here. The Fellows could park their vehicle on the other side, i.e., near the Lawn Tennis Court. They only come for attending the meetings of the Committees, Syndicate, Senate or any other University body; otherwise, they did not come for months together.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that could they make valet parking type arrangement here.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that sometimes the security personnel misbehaved while performing their duties.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that earlier, an incident had taken place with Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that before it becomes a big incident, they should check it here only, i.e., nip the evil in the bud. What is happening is that they suppose that the orders have been issued that only three vehicles would be parked there, but according to those orders, the vehicle of even the Vice Chancellor could not be parked there. Could any security personnel have the courage to stop the vehicle of the Vice Chancellor or the Dean of University Instruction or Secretary to the Vice Chancellor? In that case, the orders are not being implemented in their case, but they have closed the gates for the members of the Syndicate and Senate. He should be told as to whom the porch has been made. Though one could not park his vehicle there, but could be allowed to reach the porch and the driver could be asked to park the vehicle at the parking place meant for the purpose. The security personnel, in the name of obeying the orders, sometimes misbehaved. It has happened to him and the matter has been brought to the notice of the Registrar.

- (6) Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that a golden chance has been given on the 550th Birth Year of Guru Nanak Dev Ji to the candidates, who have reappears/compartments, to complete their degrees. However, neither information about this has been uploaded on the University Website nor advertisement has been given in the newspapers. He pleaded that the last date to apply under this chance be extended at least by 4-5 days. He suggested that a Press Conference in this regard should be held so that it is given a wide publicity and they need not to pass this information again and again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, this chance has been given to those to complete their degrees, who have exhausted their all permissible chances, but under the garb of that the candidates, who have even permissible chances left, are also applying under this chance and asking for preponing of their chance to complete the degree, which was not the purpose because with that their regulations would be violated.

- (7) Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that a case regarding award of D.Litt. degree had come to the Syndicate in its meeting held in the month of February 2019. The case pertained to a person belonging to Chandigarh College of Architecture. Four months have already elapsed, but nothing has been done so far.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee has already been constituted to look into the matter.

It was clarified by the Controller of Examinations that in this case it had been resolved that as to why delay had occurred as an office note was appended with the item stating as to who had done the evaluation of the thesis and an enquiry be conducted into the matter. For the conduct of enquiry, the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor is constituting a Committee and the file is with the office of the Vice Chancellor. At this stage, nothing is with them.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua again said that four months have elapsed after the decision taken by the Syndicate. Would the enquiry be conducted by the next year?

- (8) Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there was a case relating to National College for Girls, Chowarianwali, Fazilka, and the College has removed all the teachers from the service. Last time, they had suggested that the case of the College should be brought to the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired have they received any reply of the explanation, which they had sought from the College.

The reply was given by the Dean, College Development Council in affirmative.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then why the reply has not been brought to the Syndicate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they should not take the issues relating to the Colleges lightly.

The Vice Chancellor said that since it is the responsibility of the Dean, College Development Council, he would explain the position to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though the reply has been received in the office of the University, the same has not been placed before the Syndicate. In any case, the reply must be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that after the sad demise of Shri Raghbir Dyal, it was decided that railing would be fixed in the balcony of the first floor of the Guest House, but no action has been taken on that so far. Would it be fixed shortly, or are they waiting for some more mis-happening? He pleaded that this should be taken up on urgent basis.

- (9) Shri Sandeep Singh said that the fine, which they were proposing to impose on the SC/ST students, should not be imposed.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Sandeep Singh to take up the matter with the D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab.

(Karamjeet Singh)
Registrar

Confirmed

(RAJ KUMAR)
VICE-CHANCELLOR