

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 18th January 2020** at **03.00 p.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor Raj Kumar ... (in the Chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Ms. Anu Chatrath
3. Shri Ashok Goyal
4. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa alias Dayal Partap Singh
5. Professor Emanuel Nahar
6. Smt. Indu Malhotra, Director, Higher Education, Punjab
7. Principal (Dr.) Iqbal Singh Sandhu
8. Shri Jarnail Singh
9. Professor Keshav Malhotra
10. Professor Navdeep Goyal
11. Principal (Dr.) R.S. Jhanji
12. Professor Rajinder Bhandari
13. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma alias Rabinder Nath
14. Principal (Dr.) Sarabjit Kaur
15. Dr. Satish Kumar
16. Ms. Surinder Kaur
17. Professor Karamjeet Singh ... (Secretary)
Registrar

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, could not attend the meeting.

At the very outset, the Vice Chancellor wished good afternoon and 'Happy New Year' to the esteemed members of the august house. He said that he look forward to their guidance for the smooth conduct of business during this year.

Condolence Resolution

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

- (i) Professor B.L. Abbi, father of Professor Kumool Abbi, former Chairperson, Department of Sociology, on 18.12.2019;
- (ii) Professor (Miss) Jatinder Bhullar, Former Professor & Chairperson, Department of Physical Education, on 18.12.2019;
- (iii) Shri S.S. Sethi, father of Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow, on 21.12.2019;
- (iv) Professor Sanjay Wadwalkar, former Chairperson, School of Mass Communication, on 25.12.2019;
- (v) Professor Shashi K. Sharma, former Chairperson, Department of Laws, on 31.12.2019;
- (vi) Professor Darshan Singh, former Fellow & Professor Emeritus, on 04.01.2020;
- (vii) Smt. Naseeb Kaur, mother of Professor Paramjit Kaur, UBS on 12.01.2020;

- (viii) Dr. Surjit Hans, former Head, Department of History, Guru Nanak Dev University, on 17.01.2020.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor B.L. Abbi, Professor (Miss) Jatinder Bhullar, Shri S.S. Sethi, Professor Sanjay Wadwalkar, Professor Shashi K.Sharma, Professor Darshan Singh, Smt. Naseeb Kaur and Dr. Surjit Hans and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- (i) Professor Archana R Singh, School of Communication Studies acted as Jury Member for the Central 66th National Film Award 2018 in which the legendary Shri Amitabh Bachchan was conferred Dadasaheb Phalke award for 2018.
- (ii) Government of India has sanctioned a SEED fund of Rs.1 crore of Biotech Industry Research Association Council (BIRAC) to BioNEST of Panjab University.
- (iii) Professor S.K. Sharma, Professor Emeritus & Fellow, has been nominated as Chairperson of the Environmental Management Committee of Bureau of Indian Standards, Government of India for 3 years.
- (iv) Dr. Nirmal Jaura, Director, Youth Welfare, Panjab University, has been awarded for Saudagar Natak by the Bhasha Vibhag.
- (v) Shri Arun Sood, former Mayor, Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh and alumnus of Panjab University, has been selected as President of Bhartiya Janta Party, Chandigarh Unit."

RESOLVED: That -

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to -
 - (i) Professor Archana R Singh, School of Communication Studies for acting as Jury Member for the Central 66th National Film Award 2018 in which the legendary Sh. Amitabh Bachchan was conferred Dadasaheb Phalke award for 2018;
 - (ii) Professor S.K. Sharma, Professor Emeritus & Fellow on having been nominated as Chairperson of the Environmental Management Committee of Bureau of Indian Standards, Government of India for 3 years;
 - (iii) Nirmal Jaura, Director, Youth Welfare, Panjab University, on having been awarded for Saudagar Natak by the Bhasha Vibhag; and
 - (iv) Shri Arun Sood, former Mayor, Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh and alumnus of Panjab University, on having

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th January 2020

been selected as President of Bhartiya Janta Party, Chandigarh Unit.

2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. (1-(ii)), be noted and approved.

The Vice Chancellor stated that, actually, this particular Syndicate is very-very important, although every Syndicate is important. This Syndicate is important in the sense because they are entering into a new decade, and at the same time, this year itself there would be formation of another Senate. In the light of that, this Syndicate is very-very important, and he is very proud to put on record that varieties of people from different domains are the members of the Syndicate this time. He is very hopeful that his team would contribute a lot and would be able to sort out the things which are hanging fire in the University and the entire contribution would certainly go for further upgradation of the University because time and again he used to say that the years starting from 2020 to 2022 would be crucial for the University. As they are going for the NAAC rating, each and every contribution would be very-very useful for securing good score as well as good ranking for the University. In fact, everything would be linked with the NAAC ranking, which they would be getting in the coming year(s). Last but not the least, they have decided that at the end of this meeting, they would have one photo session followed by High Tea.

2. Considered the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 07.01.2020 (Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 13).

ITEM 1

It be noted that the minutes of the meeting of Board of Finance dated 27.08.2019 were got confirmed through circulation vide email dated 3.9.2019. After confirmation, the same had been vide No. 5174-85/FDO dated 12.9.2019.

ITEM 2

That the Action taken report on the items considered and approved in the meeting of Board of Finance held on 27.08.2019 be noted:

Action taken report w.r.t. the meeting of Board of Finance dated 27.08.2019		
Agenda Item No	Decision	Action Taken Report
2	Action taken report on items considered and approved in the meeting of Board of Finance dated 13.11.2018 was noted by members.	
	Status on other issues discussed with the agenda	
	(i) Implementation of 7th CPC	Compliance made vide letter No. 6260-61/FDO dated 29.11.19 (Appendix-I) (Page 1-2)
3	Revised Estimates 2019-2020 and Budget Estimates 2020-21.	Approved provisions notified to all departments and offices.
	(Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	
	Status on other issues discussed with the agenda	

	(i) Examination of Decline in hostels income	Compliance made as the Vice Chancellor has constituted a Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Navdeep Goyal to examine the reason for such decline.
	(ii) Re-visit of functioning of Rural Centre at Kauni	Compliance made as a Committee has been constituted by the Vice Chancellor. The minutes of 1 st meeting are enclosed at (Appendix-II) (Page 3-5)
	(iii) Manpower auditing and re-structuring of various departments	Necessary action is being taken by Establishment Section.
4	Allocation of need based funds for developmental activities of UIET up to an amount equivalent to 8% of the revenue of UIET out of Development Fund of University as per the following condition of "UIET TEQIP-III" grant sanctioned to UIET (Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	Compliance made vide No.10333-35/A dated 13.11.19.
5	Pay protection of Dr. Bharat, Assistant Professor, UILS in terms of pay protection rules approved by the BOF/ Syndicate/ Senate and notified vide Establishment order No. 23588-738/Estt dated 14.12.15	The item was not approved
6	Adoption of Notification No.4/118/09-IFPPC/575043/I dated 28.8.2015 of Government of Punjab, Department of Finance regarding recovery of wrongly paid benefits to employees (Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	Compliance made vide No.10331-32/A dated 13.11.2019.
7	Pay protection of Dr. Akashdeep, Assistant Professor in University Institute of Engineering & Technology in terms of pay protection rules already approved by the BOF/Syndicate/Senate and notified vide Establishment order No. 23588-738/Estt dated 14.12.2015	The item was not approved.
8	Recommendations of the Committee regarding Library assistants.	The item was not approved.
9	Issue of payment of secretariat pay to certain categories of employees of Panjab University	As per the decision, a meeting was held on 30.10.2019 in which the nominees of Govt. of Punjab as well as U.T. Chandigarh had participated. The recommendation of the

		Committee were forwarded to the Government of Punjab for final decision vide letter No.6139/FDO/F-136 dated 13.11.2019 (Appendix-III) (Page 6-7) followed by another
		reminder No. 6417/FDO/F-136 dated 24.12.2019 (Appendix-IV) (Page 8-9) The final reply is awaited.
10	Pay step-up in cases where the pay of senior employees have got fixed at a lower stage in comparison to their juniors while implementation of Assured Financial Upgradation Scheme of Panjab University.	As per the decision of the BOF, the Vice Chancellor has constituted a Committee by including nominees of Government of Punjab and UT Chandigarh for taking necessary action.
11	Audited financial statement of F.Y. 2018-19 for approval (Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	Since it was a matter of reporting, hence no action was required.
12 (I)	Status of paras of Local Audit Department, Chandigarh Administration and Inspection Report of Principal Director Audit (Central) (Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	Since it was a matter of reporting; hence, no action was required.
12 (II)	Overtime to contract/ temporary employees working on DC rates be allowed @ Rs.30/- i.e. the rate applicable to the lowest slab of pay. (Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	Compliance made vide No. 10388-89/A dated 14.11.19.
12 (III)	Re-appropriation from one budget head to another exceeding Rs.1.00 lac during the year 2018-19 (Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	Since it was a matter of reporting, hence no action was required.
13	Revision of pay scale for the post of Physiotherapist held by Shri Rakesh Kumar, Directorate of Sports, be revised from Rs.10300-34800+GP 5000 to that of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400 (Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	Compliance made vide No. 8123/A dated 20.9.19.
14	Sanction of LTC to the employees who had taken prior approval of before the issuance of circular for suspension of LTC in terms of Govt. of India notification No. 7(1)/E. Coord/2014 dated 29.10.2014 and	Compliance made vide No. 10347-48/A dated 13.11.19.

	Punjab Government Notification 8/1/2014-15 Fin/326017/1 dated 16.10.2014 (Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	
15	Change in the existing nomenclature of Budget from “One Book Drop Facility for South Campus, Sector-25” to “Up gradation in RFID System” out of Development Fund (Approved in meeting of Senate dated 14.12.2019)	Compliance made vide No.10349-50/A dated 13.11.19.

Action Taken Report in respect of Sr. No.9 above of BOF 27.08.2019 regarding payment of Secretariat pay was noted and it was recommended that the directive of Govt. of Punjab dated 27.12.2019 be implemented at the first instance and thereafter the matter be referred back to Govt. of Punjab for reconsideration by giving full facts of the case.

ITEM 3

That the following recommendations of the Committee dated 29.8.2019 be approved:

- (i) The air travel through Air India shall be compulsory in only those cases where the reimbursement of travel expenditure is to be made out of Central Government funds. In other cases, the travel by private airlines (Economy class) shall be permitted. However, the condition regarding booking of Ari tickets either through the website/ booking counter of concerned Airline or by the Government approved agencies i.e. M/s Balmer & Lawrie, Ashoka Tour & Travels and IRTC shall continue to be applicable. No reimbursement of Air ticket shall be allowed if ticket is booked through any private agency/ unauthorized travel agent.
- (ii) In case of LTC, the air travel through private airline (Cheapest economy class) shall be permitted subject to the condition that the reimbursement of air fare shall be limited upto an amount equivalent to Air India economy (S/T Air fare) classes.

NOTE: 1) It was discussed that The TA/DA rules of Panjab University are based on Punjab Government Rules with certain modifications keeping in view the special requirements of Panjab University. However, with respect to travel by Air, the University was following the instructions of Government of India, according to which it is compulsory to travel through Air India only.

2) Members also discussed that the Air port of U.T., Chandigarh is not well connected with the Air-India traffic. Due to said limited connectivity with Air India flights, the external experts/ visiting faculty etc. have

been facing hardship in travelling to the PU Campus.

- 3) In many cases the concerned visiting faculty/ external expert etc. have to make compulsory halt at Delhi, which actually is discouraging such members to visit PU Campus
- 4) In this regard, the University had sought a clarification from MHRD in response to which a communication received by University vide letter dated 20.2.2019 (Appendix - VI) was received.
- 5) On the basis of above clarification of MHRD a committee was constituted by the Vice Chancellor and gave the above recommendations.

ITEM 5

That –

- (i) a communication to the Punjab Govt. be made to carry out either of the following proposals of repair/renovation work of building at PURC Kauni, Muktsar, on urgent basis, keeping in view the safety concern of students and other staff members.

Proposal-1

To dismantle the existing slab & beam of top floor & recast the same as recommended by the NITTR-(Estimated cost – Rs.85.79 lacs)

Or

Proposal-2

To dismantle the existing 2nd floor of building completely i.e. slab, beams, walls, columns & flooring and provide tile terracing on roof slab of 1st floor - (Estimated cost of Rs.17.59 lacs)

- (ii) in case there is delay on part of Punjab Govt. in execution of either of the above project, then the Vice Chancellor is authorized to sanction an amount of Rs.17,59,400/- to carry out the work of dismantling of second floor of the building completely and provide tile terracing on the roof slab of 1st floor out of development fund.

NOTE: 1) Executive Engineer –II visited PURC, Kauni and inspected the top floor of the existing building and found that the RCC slabs and beams of top floor of existing building (wherein the Rural

Centre is running presently) are in dilapidated condition.

- 2) The matter was considered by a Committee constituted by Vice Chancellor and Committee in its meeting dated 7.2.2019 (**Appendix-X**) (**Page 20**) decided that structural strength of slab & beam of top floor of existing building in PURC, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, be evaluated by NITTR. The NITTR submitted its test report on 01.07.19 and the test report concluded as under:

“.....The main cause of deterioration is corrosion in RCC members. As the structure is constructed of load bearing brick walls and brick columns so the extent of deterioration is low as compared to the RCC components. The building was not found to have deflection beyond permissible limits. However, the repair of the existing building requires specialized experienced agency as there is excessive corrosion of bar. The corroded reinforcement needs to be replaced completely at most of the locations in beams and slabs. Any trace of corrosion in bars will lead to more corrosion afterwards. As per present condition of RCC slab and beams the cost of repair will be very high, it is recommended to demolish the existing slabs and beams of the building and construct new one. In other parts of the building any deteriorated and damaged portion should be repaired. In future all the RCC members should be protected against the moisture ingress.”

- 3) On the basis of above test report, the Executive submitted the following two proposals:

Either

- (i) To dismantle the existing slab & beam of top floor & recast the

same as recommended by the
NITTTTR - (Estimated cost -
Rs.85.79 lacs)

Or

- (ii) To dismantle the existing 2nd floor of building completely i.e. slab, beams, walls, columns & flooring and provide tile terracing on roof slab of 1st floor - (Estimated cost of Rs.17.59 lacs).
- 4) The Committee in its meeting dated 15.7.19 (Appendix-IX) considered the above two proposals and was of opinion that the proposal to dismantle the existing 2nd floor of building completely i.e. slab, beams, walls, columns & flooring and provide tile terracing on roof slab of 1st floor is more viable proposal.

ITEM 6

That sanction of following works and provisions out of Development Fund, be granted:

Sr. No.	Nomenclature	Amount (in Rs.)
1.	Construction of washroom for staff room and language lab of department of English and Culture Studies and in the office of Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies in PU Campus, Sec.14, Chandigarh. (Civil Work -> Rs. 8,05,600/-) Electrical Work Rs. 34,600/-	8,40,200/-
2.	Provisions of toilets with wards of Department of Oral Surgery (Ground floor) of Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital in PU South Campus, Sector-25, Chandigarh.	7,78,400/-
3.	Providing 13 passenger lift (Gearless with machine room), UIET Block II in PU Campus, Sector-25, Chandigarh.	23,53,000/-
4.	Setting up of Library reading hall at UIAMS.	10,90,000/-
5.	Extension of Pantry/Toilets/ Projection for main guest House (G.F.) in PU Campus, Sector-14, Chandigarh. (Rs.13,22,400/-) Extension of Bath/WC/Driver Room for main Guest House (GF) in P.U. Campus Sector-14, Chandigarh (Rs.7,61,000/-)	20,83,000/-

NOTE: The detailed justification and estimates provided by XEN are placed at **(Appendix-XI) (Page 21-59)**.

ITEM 7

That –

- (i) designation and pay scale of following employees be changed as under:-

Sr. No.	Name of employee	Existing designation	Existing pay scale	Proposed designation	Proposed pay scale
1.	Sh. Vikas Bali	Programming Assistant	Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3800	Senior Technician (Grade-II) (Programming)	Rs.10300-34800 + GP 4400
2.	Sh. Satish Verma	Programming Assistant	Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3800	Senior Technician (Grade-II) (Programming)	Rs.10300-34800 + GP 4400
3.	Sh. Lovenessh Kumar Saini	Programming Assistant	Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3800	Senior Technician (Grade-II) (Programming)	Rs.10300-34800 + GP 4400

- (ii) if there are any other positions on technical side which could not be grouped in the relevant technical cadre, then the Vice Chancellor be authorized to approve such regrouping on case to case basis after due justification by the concerned Department and Establishment Section.

NOTE: 1) The Board of Finance in its meeting dated 4.7.2007 vide agenda item No.11 has approved the change of nomenclature of the post of Programming Assistant to that of Senior Technician (Grade-II) (Programming) with following conditions:

- (i) The present incumbents shall have the option to retain their present designation or opt for the change in nomenclature of the designation.
- (ii) There shall be no financial liability on part of University as a result of change in nomenclature of the previous designation.
- (iii) On opting for the new nomenclature of the designation, the incumbent shall give an undertaking that he shall not put any case for incremental/ financial benefits, whatsoever, and will continue to perform the same duties which were being

done by him/ her in the previous post/designation.

(iv) The Committee further recommended that this be implemented from 1.4.2006.

- 2)** In view of the above decision of the BOF which was duly approved by Syndicate and Senate, options were called from the existing incumbent on these posts vide circular No. 11633-39/Estt. dated 20.6.2008 followed by various reminders on 12.9.2008 and on 28.11.2008.
- 3)** At that time, following 3 incumbents were working as Programming Assistant but they did not opt for the change in nomenclature:
 - (i) Sh. Arun Kumar, UIET
 - (ii) Sh. Gurdial Singh, SSGPURC
 - (iii) Sh. Imam Bodhin, UIET
- 4)** In the pay revision of 2006, the pay scale of Programming Assistant was revised from Rs.5800-9200 to Rs.10300-34800+GP 3800. This revised pay scale of Programming Assistant was equivalent to that of Sr. Technician (Grade II) (Programming) as on 1.1.2006.
- 5)** From 1.11.2012, the pay scale of Sr. Technician (Grade II) were re-revised in view of the pattern of re-revision approved by Government of Punjab for certain categories of posts. However, the pay scale of Programming Assistant remained the same.
- 6)** On 29.10.2013, following 3 new Programming Assistants were issued appointment letters and they joined in the pay scale of 10300-34800 + GP 3800 plus allowances, though at that time the posts of Programming Assistants ought not to have been advertised as such posts were already merged with Sr. Technician (Grade II):
 - (i) Sh. Vikas Bali, UIET
 - (ii) Sh. Satish Verma, UIET
 - (iii) Sh. Loveneesh Kumar Saini, PUSSGRC, HSP.

- 7) Now, the above incumbents on the post of Programming Assistants are representing to merge them in the cadre of Sr. Technician (Grade-II) (Programming) in the re-revised scale of 10300-34800 + GP 4400.
- 8) On the recommendation of the Establishment section, the Vice-Chancellor has allowed to put up these cases before the Board of Finance for consideration in its meeting dated 13.11.2018.
- 9) The BOF in its meeting dated 13.11.18 resolved that the above proposal may be forwarded to UGC for examination and approval.
- 10) In pursuance of above, a clarification was sought from UGC vide No. 10153-54/Estt. dated 06.06.2019. The reply of UGC was received vide No. F.NO.1-5/2018(SU-I) dated 10.10.2019 **(Appendix - XII) (Page 60)**.The relevant part of the reply received from UGC is reproduced as under:

“With reference to your letter dated 4.2.19 & 6.6.19 referring certain administrative issues, I am directed to say that Panjab University receives fixed grants from Government of India through UGC. For their day to day administrative activities, they rely either on Government of Punjab orders or their own provisions/policies as per their Act. UGC’s role is to provide fixed annual maintenance grant to the University as decided by Government of India from time to time. UGC cannot comment on their administrative issues as well as their financial matters as they follow different sets of orders/ rules which are not comparable with Government of India or/ and UGC orders..... .

Financial Liability :Rs.5,36,030/- p.a.

ITEM 9

That the Budget estimates for the new course i.e. MBA (Capital Markets) at UIAMS, from session 2020-2021 as per Appendix - XIII (Page 62-63-C), be approved.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 13.12.2019 (Para-22) has resolved to recommend that the proposal to start a new course of MBA (Capital Markets) at UIAMS, from the session 2020-21, be approved in principle.

ITEM 10

That pay step up be allowed in cases where the pay of senior employees have been fixed at a lower stage in comparison to their junior while implementation of Assured Financial Up gradation Scheme of Panjab University subject to fulfilment of the principles of pay anomaly as laid down in Punjab Govt. notification dated 12.8.2010 regarding removal of pay anomaly.

- NOTE:**
1. The above matter was placed in the meeting of BOF held on 27.08.2019 vide Agenda Item No.10 **(Appendix-XIV) (Page 64-65)** wherein after detailed deliberation, the members authorized the Vice-Chancellor to constitute a committee (by including nominees of Govt. of Punjab and U.T. Chandigarh) and take a decision on the basis of recommendation of the Committee.
 2. In pursuance of the above decision of the BOF, the Vice-Chancellor constituted a Committee comprising the members of Punjab Govt. and U.T. Administration (Finance). The meeting of the Committee was held on 25.11.2019 **(Appendix-XV) (Page 66)** wherein the representative of the Govt. of Punjab and U.T. Chandigarh were of the view that they cannot give any opinion on this specific case because this scheme has specifically been devised for the employees of Panjab University, Chandigarh which is not prevalent in Govt. of Punjab or U.T. Chandigarh. They were of the view that the University may take a decision on this through its Governing Bodies i.e. BOF/ Syndicate/Senate.

Brief Facts of the case are as under:

- (1) The Board of Finance in its meetings dated 21.02.2012, vide Agenda Item No.11 and Syndicate/Senate dated 29.02.2012/ 31.03.2012 respectively approved the Assured Financial Upgradation Scheme to the P.U. Non-teaching employees on completion of 10, 20, and 30 years of service in a cadre w.e.f. 29.02.2012. Further, amendments/ clarification were approved in the meetings of the Board of Finance dated 19.7.2013 & 5.9.2014 and Syndicate/Senate dated 24.8.2013/

29.9.2013, 13.09.2014/ 14.12.2014 respectively
(Appendix - XVI) (Page 67-72).

(2) As on 29.02.2012 the following employees as well as Sh. Gopal Verma were in the same cadre, working on the identical posts as Senior Assistant and drawing the same pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP 4400.

1. Sh. Ashok Kumar Verma, Sr. Assistant
2. Sh. Rajinder Kumar Dua, Sr. Assistant
3. Sh. Rajesh Mittal, Sr. Assistant
4. Sh. Milap Chander, Sr. Assistant
5. Sh. Harmesh Chand, Sr. Assistant
6. Sh. Naresh Kumar, Sr. Assistant
7. Sh. Sat Paul, Sr. Assistant
8. Sh. Amarjeet Kaur, Sr. Assistant

(3) As per approved policy, the benefit of Assured Financial Upgradation Scheme was granted to the above employees vide No.1682-1704/Estt. dated 3.2.2017. While granting the financial benefit of 2nd Up gradation of AFUS on completion of 20 years, the Senior employees (mentioned above) as on 29.02.2012 placed in lower pay-scale i.e. 10300-34800+GP 4400 as Senior Assistant whereas Junior employee Shri Gopal Verma, placed in the higher pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400 as Superintendent due to the following reason.

In case of senior employees (i.e. Shri Ashok Kumar Verma and others) their placement as Sr. Clerk in the pay-scale of Rs.1200-2100 (prior to revision of pay-scale of 1.1.1996) was adjusted towards their first financial upgradation (i.e. on completion of 10 years service). Whereas Sh. Gopal Verma (Junior to the representing employees) was not placed as Sr. Clerk in the pay-scale of Rs.1200-2100, as such designation of Sr. Clerk was discontinued with the revision of pay-scale of 01.01.1996.

Because of reckoning the placement as Senior Clerk as a financial upgradation, the senior employees (Sh. Ashok Kumar Verma and others) on completion of 20 years service were granted 2nd Upgradation as Senior Assistant in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP 4400 whereas the junior employee i.e. Sh. Gopal Verma was granted 2nd Upgradation as Superintendent in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400. This resulted is an anomaly.

4. The aforesaid proposal is in consonance with the principle laid down in Punjab Government Notification No.6/138/98-1FP-II/6763 dated 21.06.2000, No.6/138/98-1FP2/124 dated 10.01.2006, No.6/46/ 2010-1FP2/387 dated 12.08.2010 regarding removal of pay anomaly
(Appendix – XVII) (Page 73-78).

ITEM 11

That the nomenclature of Chowkidar existing under the following budget head be changed to that of Security Guard as under:

Existing	Proposed
Department of Laws, Ludhiana Outsource of Services of Security, Sanitation/Cleanliness & Horticulture etc. (Peons-2, Chowkidars - 2, Cleaner -1)	Department of Laws, Ludhiana Outsource of Services of Security, Sanitation/Cleanliness & Horticulture etc. (Peons-2, Security Guards - 2, Cleaner -1)
PUSSGRC Bajwara, Hoshiarpur Outsource of Services of Security, Sanitation/Cleanliness & Horticulture etc. (Peons- 8, Chowkidars - 16, Mali-4, Cleaners -13)	PUSSGRC Bajwara, Hoshiarpur Outsource of Services of Security, Sanitation/Cleanliness & Horticulture etc. (Peons- 8, Security Guards - 16, Mali-4, Cleaners -13)

NOTE: The Board of Finance in its meeting held on 01.09.2019, vide Agenda Item No.1 duly approved by the Syndicate dated 06.09.2009, Paragraph 2, that the nomenclature of the posts of Chowkidars in the pay-scale of Rs.2520-4140 (with a start of Rs.2620/-) in the University be changed to that of Security Guards in the same pay-scale. All other service & conduct conditions will remain the same.

ITEM 13

That the decision and action for opening of a separate Bank Account for collection of Service Tax, which later on replaced by GST and for making payment to the Government Account via online mode, be ratified.

- NOTE:**
1. There are many services being rendered by the University (such as renting of immovable property, testing services, consultancy services, technical knowhow, etc.) which have been covered under the Service Tax Act/GST Act.
 2. In order to ensure proper classification of amount collected on account of Service Tax/GST as well as to keep such statutory amount separate from the University funds, it was decided to open a separate Bank Account in State Bank of India, Sector-14 Branch.
 3. In the year 2014, the Government has made it mandatory to make the payment of Service Tax/GST through e-payment Gateway of Central Board of Indirect Taxes.
 4. Since such statutory collection has to be deposited in the Govt. Account (via e-payment gateway) within prescribed deadline and also such payment is not a charge against any budget head or source of P.U., therefore all such statutory payments were made against the collections without pre-auditing, though

all such payments including supporting returns are subject to post audit.

5. Now, the ACLA has observed that the payment of GST may be made after getting the same pre-audited. The office has already started the practice of getting all such payments pre-audited. The previous record regarding the payment of Service Tax/GST along with statutory returns shall also be got post-audited from the office of ACLA.

Referring to Sub Item 2, especially payment of the Secretarial pay to the University employees, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to bring to the notice of the Syndicate as to what transpired in the Board of Finance meeting so far as the Secretarial Pay to the non teaching staff of the University concerned. He had expressed his apprehension in the Board of Finance on that day also that there is going to be a lot of unrest and agitation in the minds of those who had getting this benefit for last more than 4-5 decades and now if overnight they stop it, it is going to create a lot of problem. Somehow, it did not find favour with the representatives of the Punjab Government and they were adamant that first they (University) should give an undertaking that they had stopped the payment of Secretariat Pay to the University employees with immediate effect, only then they would release the grant. Somehow, they are facing the same situation now. At that time also, it was suggested that alright let they take up the matter with the Government of Punjab and in the meantime, they should continue at least for a month and if the things did not materialise positively, they would take the appropriate decision. Of course, this was also not acceptable to them (representatives of Punjab Government) and they said that this is the mandate to them that it has to be stopped with immediate effect. Finally, it was resolved that first they stop and then pursue the matter with the Government of Punjab to reconsider their own decision. He did not know whether it has been recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Finance or not, but it should be resolved and made a part of the Syndicate proceedings that the Vice Chancellor and the University as a whole should follow up with the Government of Punjab explaining and convincing them that this is not something undue, which they had been paying to their employees, so that they are able to convey the message amongst the employees that it is not the University, which is against them, but sometimes there are constrains from the funding agencies.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, referring to the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal, said that if the benefit, which was being given to the employees for the so many years, is withdrawn overnight, it is against the principle of natural justice. Moreover, the employees are pleading that they had given up their higher pay-scale and got this Secretariat Pay in lieu of that. It is also a human instinct that if something, which someone is getting since long, is withdrawn, he/she felt very bad. He urged the Vice Chancellor to withhold this decision and in the meantime pursue with the Government of Punjab to reconsider it, and only then a matter should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that he along with other members of the Board of Finance would pursue it with the Government of Punjab.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that this decision should be implemented after getting it reconsidered by the Government of Punjab.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was the condition of the Government of Punjab that if the University did not stop the payment of Secretariat Pay to the University employees, they would not release the grant to the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Government says that, first of all, the payment of Secretariat Pay to the University employees should be stopped immediately, thereafter, they take it up with the Government of Punjab for reconsideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would also like to inform them that besides release of grant, certain amount of arrear was also pending with the Government of Punjab. When he joined this University, the Finance and Development Officer apprised him with this entire position. He talked to the representatives of Government of Punjab, who were present in the meeting of the Board of Finance and told them if they did not release the grant as well as arrear, the University is bound to follow their direction. This time, they specially told that they had brought the letter relating to release of grant to the University with them.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari suggested that the Vice Chancellor should have a meeting with the representatives of the non-teaching staff because they have certain issues, which are relating to it, so that they would be well versed with their concerns and would also have a lot of input on this issue.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that the viewpoints of the effected parties should also be taken into consideration.

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that another decision has been taken in the meeting of the Board of Finance. Earlier, there used to be the post of Programming Assistant at the University Institute of Legal Studies and the advertisement was made in the year 2005. She believed that a decision was taken in the year 2007 to change the nomenclature of the post to Senior Technician Programming. At that time, the people were not aware about the consequences. They had submitted a representation, which is pending since 2012 saying that earlier the options were sought from them, but they were not aware that neither they would be getting pay revision nor promotion in their entire service career. She reiterated that they had submitted the representation, which is pending since 2012, that they should be allowed to give option now. Half the problem had been sorted out by the Board of Finance and the people, who are in service after 2007, but those, who had been appointed before 2007, their request needed to be considered positively because they would not be getting any promotion during their entire service career.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into and directed the Finance and Development Officer to put the case.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that along with the representation of the employees, for implementation of 7th Pay Commission and seeking of more grants, at least the issue should be taken up with the Governments. He suggested that a Committee should be formed, which could take up the matter with the Government.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a good suggestion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that a Committee had already been constituted for following up with the Government.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Emanuel Nahar should also be associated with the Committee referred to by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma enquired as to what they have thought about the item relating to employees, for which they are agitating and among other things, they would also approach the Court. As such, they must look into this issue very carefully.

The Vice Chancellor said that 2-3 persons are already on the job.

Referring to Sub-Item 7, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that there are two Programming Assistants, namely Shri Arun Kumar and another and he handed over the representation of these persons to the Registrar on the floor of the House.

The Vice Chancellor said that if there is another such case, the same should be given so that the same could be placed before the Committee, which has been constituted for the purpose. He also requested Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa to provide more input, if he had.

Another representation was handed over to the Registrar by Ms. Anu Chatrath.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that Committees had been constituted 3-4 times. In fact, he is talking about Hoshiarpur. He urged that the Registrar should be asked to provide at least MTS should be provided to Director, P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, as neither they have Security Guards nor Medical Assistant, Peon, Cleaner, etc., and the condition is the Centre is very bad. If any untoward incident occurred there, who would be responsible? He would like to point out that the problems had occurred there two-three times.

The Vice Chancellor said that, on his direction, the Registrar had visited P.U. Regional Centre, two-three times and there is a serious concern about this issue. The girls stayed there, but with the grace of God everything is going on smoothly; however, they have to address all these things. He has assigned this task to Professor J.K. Goswamy. In between, he faced some health problem.

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, is also located at far away from the city. That was also one of the reasons for the problems. Arrangement must be made there.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that was why, he had appointed a Committee of Syndics. Moreover, he had sent him (Registrar) at least 3-4 times to P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur. If possible, he would again send him (Registrar) once again.

Shri Jarnail Singh enquired as to what action they would take on the issue of payment of Secretariat Pay, which was being given to the employees.

The Vice Chancellor said that the payment of Secretariat Pay to the University employees has been withdrawn. If they go back again and again, they would not reach anywhere.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that the follow up for getting the decision reconsidered by the Government of Punjab should be done speedily.

The Vice Chancellor said that, perhaps, Shri Ashok Goyal has not been able to explain the whole issue properly.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the final decision on the issue of payment of Secretariat Pay to the University employees would be taken by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the decision of the Board of Finance is with them. Now, it is up to the Syndicate whether to endorse it or not. However, in the meeting of the Board of Finance it had been resolved to stop it (payment of Secretariat Pay) with immediate effect. Perhaps, the letter to this effect might also have been sent to the Government of Punjab because they said unless and until they get the letter regarding stopping of payment of Secretariat Pay to the employees from the University, they are not going to release the grant to the University. And when the Vice Chancellor had said that they (Government of Punjab) did not release the grant to the University in time,

they said that they (University) give the letter and get the letter relating to release of grant just now.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are in an embarrassing situation because they had already written a letter to the Government of Punjab.

Principal R.S. Jhanji enquired has the letter been sent to the Government of Punjab.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that, that meant, now the situation is that they had withdrawn it by threatening. Even if the Minister was present in the meeting of the Board of Finance, it did not mean that they are not supposed to follow the rules of law. If certain employees are getting extra pay or pay-scale for the last so many years, they could not withdraw the said benefit without giving them opportunity of hearing.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that he did not know whether the letter has been sent to the Government or not.

It was clarified that the letter would be issued after the approval of recommendations of Board of Finance.

Ms. Anu Chatrath enquired as to how could they stop the payment of Secretariat Pay to the employees without giving them opportunity of hearing. They are supposed to follow the principle of natural justice.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that they had left it deliberately.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she understood it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that then his dissent should be recorded.

Shri Jarnail Singh apprehended that tomorrow the Government of Punjab might ask the University to withdraw or stop certain other allowances. Then what would they do?

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that they could not withdraw the benefit by using the threat. This meant, they (Government) could do anything by using the threat.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that the Government was writing to the University for the last about five years and they (University) was stopping them again and again as also getting it reconsidered. In the end, the Government issued a threatening letter.

The Vice Chancellor said that this issue had come to his notice also at least for two times. The Government had said again and again that the University is violating and the University must abide to their direction. This time, they issued strict direction.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that, it was actually an Audit Observation. They asked that it should be got clarified/settled from the Government of Punjab and the Government of Punjab has issued this letter. The problem is that in spite of Audit Para, they had received this letter from the Government of Punjab.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, it is very-very serious matter because it affects a large number of employees, who actually are the backbone of the University. Majority of the members did not know the background that at least it was being paid and then there was an Audit Objection and the Government of India wrote a letter that they should get it done/settled by the Government of Punjab. If the Government of Punjab took this stand and as Professor Navdeep Goyal told they had been taking this stand for so many years and every time the Board of Finance as well as the Syndicate were not agreeing to them. They have not written this letter not only to Panjab

University but also all the three Universities of the State because after Panjab University, the other Universities also started paying Secretariat Pay to their employees on the pattern of Panjab University. He reiterated that the Government had written to all the other Universities, which would follow their directive immediately. The only difficulty, as told by the representatives of Government of Punjab, was from the Panjab University. Their attitude at that time was that they have to do the service when they had made several pleas to them not to enforce this decision on the Panjab University and they should be given at least a month. At that time, there were only two things in mind whether the grant should be allowed to be stopped or the directive of Government of Punjab should be implemented and later on persuade the Government of Punjab to reconsider its decision. Obviously, nobody was in favour of getting the grant stopped because that would have been direct confrontation with the Government of Punjab. They pleaded with them that they would convince the Government of Punjab, but they said that they stop the payment of Secretariat Pay to their employees and thereafter, they might take up the matter with the Government of Punjab for reconsideration. Then it was thought that today is 7th January and the next pay would be disbursed on 1st of February, perhaps they would be able to get something done from the Government of Punjab within these three weeks and they had requested the Vice Chancellor to take up the matter with the Government as everybody readily accepted his request. He thought that perhaps nothing has been done on this front. However, what Ms. Anu Chatrath has said, if they approached the Court, they would immediately get the relief, though he is not sure whether they are going to the Court or not. However, it is a great injustice to them.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that since technically they would approach the Court, if they should say that the Syndicate had decided it unanimously, perhaps, they would lose in the Court. That was why, he is getting is dissent recorded.

Shri Jarnail Singh proposed that the Syndicate should pass a resolution that the Government of Punjab should be written and requested to reconsider its decision.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is seconding the resolution proposed by Shri Jarnail Singh.

Dr. Satish Kumar requested Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to withdraw his dissent and the resolution proposed by Shri Jarnail Singh should be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thought that a resolution could be passed by the Syndicate that the Government of Punjab be requested to reconsider their decision and continue paying the Secretariat Pay to the non-teaching employees of Panjab University.

The members in one voice said that they could this.

Shri Jarnail Singh added that the *status quo* should be maintained, so that the non-teaching employees continue getting the benefit, which they are getting.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that this could not be done as the Government of Punjab has already taken the decision. He suggested that they should persuade the Government of Punjab to reconsider their decision.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari asked, "Whether a request or appeal is to be made to the Government of Punjab".

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 07.01.2020 (Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 13), be endorsed to the Senate for approval.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

1. The directive of Government of Punjab dated 27.12.2019 relating to Secretariat Pay, be implemented; and
2. an appeal be made to the Government of Punjab to reconsider its decision, keeping in view the fact that the employees of Panjab University were allowed Secretariat Pay/Allowance in the year 1980, after due approval of the Governing Bodies of the University, including the Board of Finance, in which the representative of Government of Punjab had participated.

3. Considered minutes dated 05.10.2019 of the Regulations Committee (18 items).

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to addition of Regulation 14 for B.Ed. Special Education (Learning Disability) page 15 of the appendix, said that it should be clarified as they are unable to understand as to what they want to add. At the bottom under 14(i), it is written that “B.Com./B.B.A./M.Com. graduates/postgraduates.....”. What does it mean? Are B.Com. and B.B.A. not graduate courses and M.Com. not postgraduate?

It was said that it is not required.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the courses have been mentioned, where is the need for mentioning graduates and postgraduates.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that either the nomenclatures of all the degrees should be mentioned or graduates or postgraduates should be written.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that basically these are commerce courses, but the wording is wrong.

Professor Navdeep Goyal remarked that since these are Regulations and if any ambiguity remained, it created a lot of problem for them.

The Vice Chancellor said that a couple of members should sit and look into these regulations again.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that 3-4 persons would look into the language of these regulations.

The Vice Chancellor said that 2-3 persons would be assigned the job of looking into these Regulations carefully and make recommendations. When Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the Dean, Faculty of Business Management & Commerce (Professor Keshav Malhotra) is here, he should also be involved in this task.

The Vice Chancellor said that the task of vetting the language of the additions, deletions and amendment of Regulations, which are under consideration, is assigned to Professor Keshav Malhotra. If he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) needed any assistance, he could take help of 1-2 persons.

This was agreed to.

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

4. To appoint the following Committees for the period noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
1.	Revising Committee	Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32, P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007	Calendar year 2020, i.e., 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2020
2.	Regulations Committee	Regulation 23.1 at page 33, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007	Calendar year 2020, i.e., 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2020
3.	Youth Welfare Committee	Regulation 4 at pages 155-56 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e. 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2021
4.	Publication Bureau Committee	Regulations 3.1 and 3.2 at page 179 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e. 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2021
5.	Standing Committee to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations	Regulation 31 at page 14 of P.U. Calendar Volume II, 2007	Calendar year 2020, i.e., 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2020

- NOTE:**
1. Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 for composition of Revising Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019 enclosed **(Appendix-I)**.
 2. Regulation 23.1 for composition of Regulation Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019 is enclosed **(Appendix-I)**.
 3. Regulation 4 for composition of Youth Welfare Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019 **(Appendix-I)**.
 4. Regulations 3.1 and 3.2 for composition of Publication Bureau Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019 **(Appendix-I)**.
 5. Regulation 31 for composition of Standing Committee along with the list of the members of the last Committee w.e.f. 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019 **(Appendix-I)**.

Principal I.S. Sandhu proposed that, as per previous practice, a Committee of two Syndics, i.e., Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal, should be appointed to constitute the Committees to be constituted under Items 4, 5, 6 and 23, on behalf of the Syndicate, in consultation with other colleagues.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th January 2020

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that, according to him, as had been practice earlier, the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to constitute the Committees, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that a Committee, comprising Syndics, should be authorized to constitute the Committees, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he has made the proposal keeping in view the practice being followed for the last few years.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, last year also, these two persons (Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal) were there in the Committee, which had constituted the Committees, on behalf of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that it is for them to take the decision.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Ms. Anu Chatrath jointly said that they would form the Committees in consultation with other members.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he has a request to make that in other Committees (Approval Committee of which he was also a member), if someone is no longer a member of the Syndicate, he/she should be substituted with a member of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that, it meant, these two persons (Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal) would form the Committees, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Ms. Anu Chatrath replied in affirmative.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the another issue raised by Principal I.S. Sandhu would also be taken care of by this Committee.

Ms. Anu Chatrath reiterated that the Committee being appointed by the Syndicate would form the Committees in consultation with other members.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that to whom's house he would go for consultation. If they wish to assign this job of formation of Committees to him, he would not be able to do the job in this manner.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that if they authorize the Chair, it would be better.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that two members of the Syndicate should be assigned the job of formation of Committees.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that, last year also, two persons were assigned this job of formation of Committee and they had formed balanced Committees.

The Vice Chancellor said that what decision they wished to take, should be taken.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that two-member Committee of Syndics should be constituted to form the Committees.

To this, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this is the majority view.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th January 2020

Rajinder Bhandari, referring to the remarks made by Professor Keshav Malhotra that last year 'balanced Committees' were formed, remarked that they have just now come to know about the balanced Committees.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that if they make if and butts to the proposal made by Principal I.S. Sandhu, a lot of layers would be opened. He, therefore, requested that the Committee of Syndics should be constituted, which had been the practice. This is the majority view and if anybody has doubt, they could have voting on the issue.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur suggested that a Committee comprising 5-6 Syndics should be constituted to form the Committees.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that one should be allowed to express his/her viewpoints. It is not that voting is to be allowed even for making a proposal or express someone his/her viewpoints. So far as remarks made by Professor Keshav Malhotra about the 'Balanced Committees' is concerned, this issue should not be raked up. Balance meant, balance in the Committee. Members would be made in such and such manner, is neither a balance nor a proper way. However, since they had majority, they could take decision, whatever they wished.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that either they should not talk about balance or they should constitute a balanced Committee of Syndics.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that both Principal R.S. Jhanji and Rajinder Bhandari should not try to put words in their mouth. He (Professor Keshav Malhotra) has not said that this Committee was balanced. What he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) has said is that last year also this Committee of Syndics was constituted and it had formed balanced Committees. So they should talk here in a very cordial atmosphere. Of course, difference of opinion could be there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since the proposal has been made and seconded, the same should be approved.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the same very Committee is authorized to substitute the member(s) of Syndicate Committee(s), who are not longer the members of the Syndicate.

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

1. Revising Committee for the term beginning from 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2020, under Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007;
2. Regulations Committee for the term beginning from 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2020, under Regulation 23.1 at page 33 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007;
3. Youth Welfare Committee for two Calendar years, i.e., from 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2021, under Regulation 4 at pages 155 and 156 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007;
4. Publication Bureau Committee for two Calendar years, i.e., from 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2021, under Regulations 3.1 and 3.2 at page 179 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007; and

5. Standing Committee to deal with the cases of alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations for the term beginning from 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2020, under Regulation 31 at page 14 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the above-said Committee of Syndics, comprising Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal, be also authorized to substitute the member(s) of Syndicate Committee(s), who are not longer the members of the Syndicate.

Principal R.S. Jhanji and Principal Sarabjit Kaur recorded their dissent on constituting the above-said Committee for forming Committees under Items 4, 5, 6 and 23 as also substituting the member(s) of Syndicate Committees.

5. Considered the formation of Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 1.1.2020 to 31.12.2020. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-II**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The composition of Joint Consultative Machinery was as under:

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

RESOLVED: That a Committee of Syndics, comprising Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal, be constituted to form Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2020, on behalf of the Syndicate.

6. **Item 6 on the agenda was read out, viz. -**

6. To appoint two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2020 to 31.01.2021, under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

RESOLVED: That a Committee of Syndics, comprising Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal, be constituted to appoint two members of the Syndicate, on behalf of the Syndicate, on the Board of Finance for the term 01.02.2020 to 31.01.2021, under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

- 7.** Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Professor Nandita Singh, Department of Education, be allowed to continue as Dean of International Students till further orders. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-III**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 1, page 108 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“The Senate, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, may from time to time, appoint one of the University Professors to hold the office of Dean of Foreign Students. The term of appointment shall be for one year, renewable from year to year, but the maximum period shall not exceed three years (consecutively). The amount and nature of the allowance to be granted to the Dean of Foreign Students for performing the duties attached to the Office shall be determined by the Syndicate at the time of his/her appointment”.

2. Professor Nandita Singh had joined as Dean of International Students w.e.f. 14.11.2018 and her term of one year had completed on 14.11.2019.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that one issue is involved in it as it has been mentioned that Professor Nandita Singh would continue as Dean of International Students **till further orders**, but no reason has been given for the same. Otherwise, the Regulation clearly says that the term of appointment shall be for one year, renewable from year to year, but the maximum period shall not exceed 3 years (consecutively). However, the year would commence from the end of the last term and not from today.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they are unable to understand that as to why the item has been placed before the Syndicate so late as Professor Nandita Singh has completed her term as Dean of International Students on 13.11.2019. He urged the Vice Chancellor to disclose the reason as to why the item has not come to the Syndicate in time.

A couple of members were of the view that the item should have come to the Syndicate much earlier.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it should not be taken otherwise, but he would like to bring to their kind notice that he (Vice Chancellor) had given a very good message on the occasion of New Year while addressing the non-teaching employees of the University. When the Vice Chancellor asked that it meant they have listened it, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the message had been viralled. In the message, the Vice Chancellor had said that the Vice Chancellor did not have even 25% of the work according to his potential. He should be given the work according to his potential so that he could take the University forward. Second thing, which the Vice Chancellor said was that no file remained on his table for more than three hours, whereas the case under consideration is more than 3 month old.

The Vice Chancellor said that there must be some issue in this case.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that from this it is being observed that during the period starting from 14th November 2019 to January 2020, they have not been given any extension, but they are continuing as such and also dealing with the financial matters, which meant that they are doing all these things unauthorizedly.

Principal I.S. Sandhu intervened to say that their (his and Professor Keshav Malhotra) question remained as such. He urged either the Vice Chancellor or Shri Ashok Goyal should disclose the reason as to where the case remained pending for so much time.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal replied that he had opened these papers just now.

The Vice Chancellor said that no clear-cut paper/file remained on his table for more than three hours.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the papers/files, which are not clear, should be referred back to the person concerned so that the same might not remain pending.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that regarding pendency of the files, she has two issues. One is that the advocates of Punjab & Haryana High Court are doing LL.M. from Kurukshetra University through Correspondence. Resultantly, the entire amount of fee goes to Kurukshetra University in spite of the fact that Panjab University is here. She had been told that at one point of time the Syndicate had accepted the request of both the students as well as advocates to start LL.M. course at University School of Open Learning. If the other Universities could start LL.M. course through correspondence, why could not Panjab University? If they introduced LL.M. course through correspondence, it would be generating resources for the University. Secondly, it would be convenient to the students/advocates of the Tricity.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be got noted and the final discussion/decision would be taken during zero hour.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that they could discuss this issue during zero hour, but by then the file should be sought and got ready for reference.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this issue is related to zero hour. Perhaps, Ms. Anu Chatrath is not aware of it. In fact, it is a very-very serious matter. Actually, in 2018, probably in the month of May or April, the Vice Chancellor had come with the statement that to generate revenue, they plan to start these many courses and the last course in that list was LL.M. at University School of Open Learning. He remembered that at that time he had objected to the words "to generate revenue" because he did not look nice in academic institutions and those words were deleted also. In accordance with the statement of the Vice Chancellor he conveyed to so many people that from this year they are going to start LL.M. course through correspondence in Panjab University also that was in year 2019. The Vice Chancellor is saying that the item is not on the agenda, but he was thinking for seeking action taken report on the issue. In December, it was decided that since 31st December is the last day by which they have to abide the same and it was reiterated that they are going to start this course from coming session. He thought that for reasons best known to the Vice Chancellor in spite of the department having followed with the office of the Vice Chancellor that the information has to be sent to them as their window was open only up to 5'o' clock on 31st December 2019, they only needed two names of the teachers which were to be identified in the fields meant for them. Finally, he had given to understand that the Vice Chancellor is not interested. If this is going to be the fate of the decision of the Syndicate and that too an academic matter having so many implications and with the credibility of the University at stake as they had conveyed to the peoples that they are starting this course (LL.M. through correspondence), he thought that the Syndicate definitely needed to know is there any authority vested even in the Chancellor to overrule the Syndicate not to start the course. So this is a very serious matter. It was also explained that how many crores of rupees Kurukshetra University is earning out of this course. With due regards to late Sh. Gopal Krishan Chatrath as he had been following it in every year

that they should start the course in case they wanted the University to come out from the financial crunch, under which the University was going at that time. Somehow, after he (Vice Chancellor) joined, he himself came with the ideas that they wanted to start this course, but he did not know as to why this idea was shelved. Thereafter, again in 2019 the decision had been taken why it was decided otherwise or the last day of December. It is the matter to be discussed with the Syndicate. After having said that, of course, pending his (Vice Chancellor) reply, he proposed that as far his knowledge goes, the best way is that they open their windows once more in the month of April also, so that the candidates could get another chance to apply. They must start this course. If any kind of apprehension is in his (Vice Chancellor) mind or somebody else had put the apprehension in his mind, he thought that it is imperative for him to discuss with the Syndicate; otherwise, it is resolved that the LL.M. course will be started through correspondence courses in USOL from 2020-21 and as and when the immediate opportunity comes to apply for them for permission, the University would apply for that after having missed the goal.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be relooked into.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that what he would contribute in this, being the representative of the Bar, is that they had been trying for starting of LL.M. course through correspondence for the last so many years. There are about 10,000 lawyers practising here in the Punjab & Haryana High Court. There are three District Courts in the Tricity, i.e., Chandigarh, Mohali and Panchkula, which would make 25,000 lawyers residing in Chandigarh, Mohali and Panchkula. There is a constant demand from them that LL.M. course through correspondence should be started without having any hesitation, so that firstly, the University would get benefit out of revenue generation and secondly, it would be imparting education to those, who could not come as regular students to attend full-time course. They would have a chance to enhance their educational skills. Hence, it is his humble submission.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would see to get this (LL.M.) course started.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to why LL.M. course has not been started.

The Vice Chancellor said that this item is not on the agenda and this are discussing it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have not sought action taken report; otherwise, they could have sought action taken report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 13th December 2019.

The Vice Chancellor said that the action taken report is sought, but at a proper time and not spontaneously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that usually the first item is the action taken report.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested the Vice Chancellor to appoint a Sub-Committee comprising Dean, Faculty of Law and the Committee be requested to submit its report/recommendations before the next meeting of the Syndicate, so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting for consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not against it. What Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is telling is 101 per cent correct and the University is in great need to fulfil this great demand. However, transfer of two persons was involved in the introduction of LL.M. course through correspondence. Although he is not against anyone, but at the same time, he did not want to weaken any sector or department.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th January 2020

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that name(s) is/are to be given, and they would continue to work there.

The Vice Chancellor said that the problem is that if tomorrow something is written and they refused to teach there, then what would happen. Under the circumstances, a new court case would be there, which might create a new problem for them. He urged the members to find a solution to this problem.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if that was so, they appreciated whatever apprehension he (Vice Chancellor) had, but what the Item has not been brought to the Syndicate for reconsideration.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if he (Vice Chancellor) wanted to start LL.M. course through correspondence and is agreed in principle.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did agree to start LL.M. course through correspondence.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that then please act.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has only one apprehension that tomorrow they might not face any problem owing to this.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that they had the support of the Bar Council.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not want to transfer anyone in haste. He requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to get it (about transfer of persons) properly in writing.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if he (Vice Chancellor) wished, each advocate would be ready to pay a fee of Rs.50,000/- per annum. They could even start this course on self-financing basis.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that apart from the advocates of Tricity (Chandigarh, Mohali and Panchkula), there are several advocates in Ludhiana (Punjab), who had made demand for starting LL.M. course through correspondence. That was why, he is saying that this course should be started.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has only one apprehension that tomorrow one might not create a new problem in the course for the University for suggesting two names for transfer.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that they could also appoint Coordinator and Deputy Coordinator.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that a 3-member Committee should be constituted and the result(s)/recommendation(s) would be with them before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay, done".

Ms. Anu Chatrath remarked that the Bar Council has nothing to do with this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal urged the Vice Chancellor to at least inform the House that the Bar Council has nothing to do with it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the apprehension, which is being expressed by the Vice Chancellor, would be sorted out.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that a Committee comprising Dean, Faculty of Law, and two other members (including Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa) should be constituted. The Committee would definitely submit its report well before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that Committee, comprising Dean, Faculty of Law, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, should be constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay".

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that she has a humble submission to make on Item 4. She pointed out that the Inspection Committee, and the Selection Committees, constituted during the last 3 years did not comprise any Principal.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that this issue has neither to do anything with the Inspection Committees nor Selections Committees as the same are being dealt with by the Dean, College Development Council and the Vice Chancellor.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that so far as the issue under consideration is concerned, the Committee should comprise of 4-5 members instead of 3 members, so that a considered view comes out.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the decision on the issue of starting of LL.M. course through correspondence has already been sorted out. Now, they should take up the next agenda item for consideration.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur remarked that it is nothing, but monopoly. Hence, her dissent should be recorded on this decision.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Professor Nandita Singh, Department of Education, be allowed to continue as Dean of International Students till further orders, but not beyond 13.11.2020.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the following Committee be constituted to look into the entire issue of starting of LL.M. course through correspondence, including transfer of two teachers:

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|-----|----------|
| 1. | Shri Ashok Goyal | ... | Chairman |
| 2. | Ms. Anu Chatrath | | |
| 3. | Professor Navdeep Goyal | | |
| 4. | Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa | | |
| 5. | Assistant Registrar (General) | ... | Convener |

Principal Sarabjit Kaur recorded her dissent on constitution of above-said Committee.

8.

Considered recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies, be allowed to continue as Dean of Alumni Relations till further orders. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-IV**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:** 1. Regulation 1, page 109 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“The Senate, on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate, may appoint a Dean of Alumni Relations, such appointment may be renewed from year to year, but the maximum period for which a person may hold this office shall not exceed five (consecutive) years”.

2. Professor Deepti Gupta had joined Dean of Alumni on w.e.f. 10.12.2018 and her term of one year had completed on 09.12.2019.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that so far as appointment of Professor Deepti Gupta as Dean of Alumni Relations is concerned, it needed to be checked that the persons, who have already been appointed as Chairpersons of their respective Department and are also acting as such, and already have a lot of work to do, could be given such a big assignment, i.e., Dean of Alumni Relations. If they allowed this, either the Department concerned would suffer or the office of which they had been given additional responsibility. Hence, it is his humble submission and request that one person should be given only one assignment because he is feeling that what they are doing at the moment is not good from any angle for the functioning of the University. Therefore, somebody else should be appointed as Dean of Alumni Relations in place of Professor Deepti Gupta.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has said is absolutely correct. They should adopt the policy of one man one post. The initial proposal, which has come from the Vice Chancellor, till further orders, they would accept to it. However, he (Vice Chancellor) should call her and ask as to what she wanted. Thereafter, the matter should be placed before the Syndicate, i.e., in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Alright”.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is good if she is asked as to which position she wanted to retain, but he should take decision as Vice Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that either she should leave the Chairpersonship or the position of Dean of Alumni Relations.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa remarked that it is a respectful way.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that they should not take the final decision now. It would be nice to discuss the issue with her once.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that whatever position be there, the matter should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

RESOLVED: That Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies, be allowed to continue as Dean of Alumni Relations till further orders, and in the meanwhile, the issue be discussed with Professor Deepti Gupta based on the discussion taken place above.

- 9.** Considered if Dr. Kamiksha Narda Sharma, Medical Officer, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, be designated as Senior Medical Officer, w.e.f. 01.02.2016, with benefit of increment after completion of 9 years service as Medical Officer, as per decision of the Senate dated 22.03.2014 (Para VIII) on the recommendation of the Board of Finance/Syndicate dated 06.02.2014 & 22.02.2014, respectively. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-V**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.07.2019 (Para 10) (**Appendix-V**) considered the promotion case of Dr. Kamiksha Narda Sharma, Medical Officer, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, as Senior Medical Officer, w.e.f. 01.02.2016, with benefit of increment on re-designation as per the promotion policy of Medical Officer approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 22.03.2014 (Para VIII) and it was resolved that all the facts relating to this Item (Item 10) be checked & verified and thereafter, the item along with the relevant documents, be again placed before the Syndicate.
 2. Dr. Kamiksha Narda Sharma was appointed as Medical Officer at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, vide No. 225-29/Estt. dated 4.1.2007 (**Appendix-V**), she joined on 1.2.2007.
 3. The Senate in its meeting dated 28.03.2004 (Para XXXIV) (**Appendix-V**) considered recommendation of the Syndicate dated 13.03.2004 (Para 28) with regard to recommendations of the Committee dated 10.03.2004 regarding the request of Medical Officer of P.U Health Centre for designating them as Senior Medical Officers and Chief Medical Officer and it was resolved that the Medical Officers be designated as Senior Medical Officer after nine years service and the Additional Chief Medical Officers after 14 years regular service. The said provision is available at page x of Budget Estimates (Appendix-II) of P.U.
 4. The above policy was modified by the Senate meeting dated 22.03.2014 (Para VIII) (**Appendix-V**) on the recommendations of the BOF/Syndicate meeting dated 06.02.2014 & 22.02.2014.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that Dr. Kamiksha Narda Sharma, Medical Officer, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, be designated as Senior Medical Officer, w.e.f. 01.02.2016, with benefit of increment after completion of 9 years service as Medical Officer, as per decision of the Senate dated 22.03.2014 (Para VIII) on the recommendation of the Board of Finance/Syndicate dated 06.02.2014 & 22.02.2014, respectively.

- 10.** Considered if –

- (i) the pensionary benefits such as Pro rata pension contribution and Provident Fund be transferred in respect of Shri Rakesh Dhar, Ex-Junior Instrumentations Officer, Central Instrumentation Laboratory w.e.f. 17.1.1990 to 9.11.2008 to Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar on the basis of requirement of G.J.U.S. & T. Hissar.

- (ii) the account branch also be allowed to transfer the pro rata gratuity (if not transferred earlier) to the G.J.U.S. & T. Hissar in term of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.09.2012/06.10.2012 (Para 12) (**Appendix-VI**) already communicated to the Director, Centre Instrumentation Laboratory/O.S. Salary/O.S. (P.F. Section)/O.S. (Pension Cell)/O.S. Budget/ Dr. Rakesh Dhar vide No. 22568-73/Estt. dated 09.11.2012 (**Appendix-VI**).

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

NOTE: Dr. Rakesh Dhar, Ex-Junior Instrumentations Officer, Central Instrumentation Laboratory was appointed as Reader in the Department of Applied Physics at G.J.U.S. & T. Hissar and he was granted extraordinary leave without pay for one year w.e.f. 25.09.2006 to enable him to join the post of Reader at G.J.U.S. & T. Hissar by the Syndicate dated 29.10.2006 (Para 16).

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) the pensionary benefits such as Pro-rata pension contribution and Provident Fund be transferred in respect of Shri Rakesh Dhar, Ex-Junior Instrumentations Officer, Central Instrumentation Laboratory w.e.f. 17.1.1990 to 9.11.2008 to Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar on the basis of requirement of G.J.U.S. & T. Hissar; and
- (ii) the Account Branch also be allowed to transfer the pro-rata gratuity (if not transferred earlier) to the G.J.U.S. & T. Hissar in term of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.09.2012/06.10.2012 (Para 12) (**Appendix-VI**) already communicated to the Director, Centre Instrumentation Laboratory/O.S. Salary/O.S. (P.F. Section)/O.S. (Pension Cell)/O.S. Budget/ Dr. Rakesh Dhar vide No. 22568-73/Estt. dated 09.11.2012 (**Appendix-VI**).

11. Considered recommendations (4, 5 & 6) dated 22.11.2019 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the papers relating to this Item in the Appendix has been attached in a very odd manner owing which they are facing a lot of problem in reading. An issue had come to the Syndicate in one of its earlier meetings relating to appointment of Mr. Puneet, who was grandson of an employee, on compassionate grounds, but since complete details relating to the case were not provided, i.e., whether the employee was in service at the time of his/her death, etc., the case was kept pending. The said case should have been placed before the Syndicate, but has not been. Neither the case had been considered by the Committee nor the same has come to the Syndicate. In fact, they had sought details pertaining to the case. Although the details had not come, he has unofficially collected the details. Actually, the employee concerned was in service at the time of his/her death.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could appoint him/her on compassionate grounds, but it is mentioned here that there is no such provision.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is proposed because they had already made appointment(s) on compassionate grounds of grandson(s).

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that then first they should make the provision. Though it is written that there is no provision, they are doing it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that he is not talking about the appointment of Mr. Sahil and instead he is talking about the appointment of Mr. Punit on compassionate grounds. Mr. Sahil case is a different one.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to how could they make the appointment of Mr. Sahil, who is a grandson of an employee?

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that they had not approved the appointment of Mr. Punit, who was a grandson of an employee, on compassionate grounds, because the details were not available. While discussing appointments on compassionate grounds, what they saw is whether there is provision as well as the compassion. In this case, compassion is there, but provision did not. If the provision is not there, they must be aware as to what type of compassion is there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No". If the provision is not there, that meant, appointment on compassionate grounds could not be made. Already thousands of people are roaming on the roads, who had much more compassion. What could they do in their cases?

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that such persons could be appointed on temporary basis.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this a good suggestion and they should adopt this.

The Vice Chancellor enquired could they do like this.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that keeping in view the sentiments of the House, they should find a solution.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) Mr. Samdarsh S/o Late Shri Brij Basi Ram, Peon, Department of Sports, be appointed as Peon on compassionate grounds in the pay-scale of Rs.4900-10680 plus Rs.1650/- G.P. (with initial pay of Rs.6,950/-) plus allowances admissible under the rules;
- (ii) Mr. Gurminder Singh S/o Late Shri Kesar Singh, Security Guard, Central Instrumentation Laboratory, be appointed as Peon on compassionate grounds in the pay-scale of Rs.4900-10680 plus Rs.1650/- G.P. (with initial pay of Rs.6,950/-) plus allowances admissible under the rules; and
- (iii) Mr. Sandeep Singh S/o Late Shri Gulab Singh, Daftri, Establishment Branch-II, be appointed as Peon on compassionate grounds in the pay-scale of Rs.4900-10680 plus Rs.1650/- G.P. (with initial pay of Rs.6,950/-) plus allowances admissible under the rules.

- 12.** Considered if, Ms. Pammi Sharma, Workshop Instructor (Electrical), UIET, P.U., be granted, leave of kind due, *post facto* as recommended by the Committee dated 9.07.2019/01.04.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**), as mentioned below:

Child Care leave w.e.f.	Leave of kind due w.e.f.
20.08.2018 to 08.09.2018 (20 days)	09.09.2018 to 03.12.2018 (86 days) E.L.
04.12.2018 to 18.12.2018 (15 days)	19.12.2018 to 09.01.2019 (22 days) E.L.
10.01.2019 to 25.01.2019 (16 days)	26.01.2019 to 14.02.2019 (20 days) E.L.
15.02.2019 to 04.03.2019 (18 days)	

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

- NOTE:**
- Ms. Pammi Sharma applied for Child Care Leave w.e.f. 20.08.2018 to 04.03.2019, but she proceeded on leave without getting it sanctioned by the competent authority.
 - A memo bearing No.18923-24 dated 31.10.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**) along with copy of charges was served to Ms. Pammi Sharma in terms of the recommendation of the Committee dated 09.07.2019.
 - In response to above said memo she submitted her reply on 19.11.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**). After considering her reply she has been warned to be careful in future, vide letter dated 18.12.2019 (**Appendix-VIII**).

Initiating discussion, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have not been able to understand this item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal also said that they have not been able to comprehend it. On the one side, show cause had been issued, and on the other hand, the item has been placed before the Syndicate for grant of leave to her as in the end it had been written that she should be pardoned. Now, the case has been placed before the Syndicate for grant of leave. That meant, one could do anything and they would ignore everything.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that the Committee went to another direction. The problem is that the Committee set aside the main issue and went to another suggestion that the charges should be ignored and leave should be granted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that at least the period of absence should be treated as leave without pay. In fact, the unauthorized leave should be without pay.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if any employee proceeded on leave without information, should they not pay him/her the salary or anything else is to be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that if any employee proceeded on leave without information, his/her period of absence be treated as without pay.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if they took a lenient view in this case, the University would face a big problem in future.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the item, which has come to the Syndicate, is to consider grant of leave of the kind due to Ms. Pammi Sharma, Workshop Instructor. He enquired as to which Committee has recommended that she may be granted leave of the kind due. In case any light could be thrown on it by the office, he would be very happy, but what he had been able to understand is that the Committee had been chaired by a person, who has actually called for his explanation and also the Chairman of her department that why she has proceeded on leave. The Committee has recommended "keeping in view the service and conduct rules quoted by the office, the Committee unanimously recommended that appropriate action may be taken by the competent authority as per Panjab University Rules in case of Ms. Pammi Sharma, Workshop Instructor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology". Wherefrom the consideration/idea of grant of leave of the kind due has come?

The attention of Hon'ble member was sought to page 130 where the details have been mentioned. In the minutes of the Committee dated 01.04.2019, it has been mentioned, "As Ms. Pammi Sharma has already availed leave and joined back on 05.03.2019, the Committee unanimously recommended that she be granted the following leave".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant, the Committee has given two findings and both are contradictory. As such, the show cause, which was issued to Ms. Pammi Sharma, she has denied all the charges. Now, they are considering to grant her leave, which she availed without getting it sanctioned, and the Syndicate is now sanctioning it. Are they awarding her or punishing her.

Ms. Anu Chatrath drew the attention of the members towards page 129, where it has been written, "the Committee in the subsequent meeting held on 9th July has reviewed the recommendations of the meeting held on 01.04.2019".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that was what, he is saying that both the recommendations are contradictory.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the minutes towards which the attention of the House was sought, are not even in existence now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whether the Committee has got any authority to review its own decision(s). What is happening? The decision has already been conveyed to her by the competent authority by warning her. Which is the competent authority in her case? In fact, the Syndicate is the competent authority in her case, but the Syndicate has not issued any warning to her, whereas it is written here that the competent authority has warned her. The letter of warning has also not been attached. Had the warning letter appended, they would have known as to which authority has warned her.

Shri Jarnail Singh pointed out that firstly, she proceeded on leave in the month of August (20.08.2018 to 08.09.2018), then in the month of December (04.12.2018 to 18.12.2018) on the same pattern, i.e., without getting the leave sanctioned. Thereafter, again in the month of January (10.01.2019 to 25.01.2019), she proceeded on leave, and then again in the month of February (15.02.2019 to 04.03.2019), she proceeded on leave. What is this? This is nothing else, but mockery of the system. This meant, one could proceed on leave at any time and join back in accordance to his/her will and get leave of the kind due sanctioned.

Principal R.S. Jhanji remarked that she is habitual offender.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it could not be considered child care leave.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, in this case no kind of leave could be granted except to treat her on authorized absence and on leave without pay, and the leave without pay has to be counted for the purpose of shifting her increment and the competent authority has to initiate action against her in terms of disciplinary action as per the rules of P.U. Calendar(s). The same Committee first gave its recommendations, but she wept, the Committee reviewed and changed its own decision. How could the Syndicate approve it, when it had never been placed before the Syndicate that Ms. Pammi Sharma is on unauthorized absence?

Ms. Anu Chatrath, drawing the attention of House towards page 129, said that the Assistant Registrar (Estt.) had suggested that her leave could be converted into child care leave instead of leave of the kind due. It has been mentioned at page 129, "In the light of rules quoted by the office in the case of Child Care Leave of Ms. Pammi Sharma". Their own office is saying that the unauthorized leave could be converted into Child Care Leave.

Dr. Satish Kumar suggested that instead of mixing the things, the case should be decided in accordance with the rules.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired had the warning been given and the reply to this was given in affirmative. Which is the competent authority in this case? The person has been written to that her leave case is being placed before the Syndicate and the warning had been given by the competent authority. Which is the competent authority? When it was told that for warning, the competent authority is the Vice Chancellor, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) enquired who told. Here the person had been issued show cause as per the rules. If the warning is to be issued by the Vice Chancellor, the same could be given without issuance of show cause. If the show cause is issued and replied also came, then it became a charge sheet. The reply to the charge sheet needed to be placed before the competent authority, which has to decide whether any punishment (minor or major) is to be imposed and how that period of authorized absence is to be treated. Anyway, now they ratify the action of the Vice Chancellor that he has warned her, but her period of unauthorized absence be treated as leave without pay and in remaining things the rules be followed.

RESOLVED: That the unauthorized period absence of Ms. Pammi Sharma, Workshop Instructor (Electrical), UIET, P.U., from 20.08.2018 to 04.03.2019 be treated as leave without pay and the leave without pay be counted for shifting her annual increment, etc. and the Rules of Panjab University Calendar(s), be followed.

13.

Considered fee bill (**Appendix-IX**) amounting to Rs.74,600/- submitted by Shri Arun Gosain, Senior Counsel and Rs.1,20,000/- (Rs.72000/- Bill No.2 + Rs.24000/- Bill No.3 + Rs.24000/- Bill No.4) (**Appendix-IX**) submitted by Shri Satya Pal Jain, Senior Advocate, Additional Solicitor General of India, for appearing on behalf of Chancellor, Panjab University, before the Punjab & Haryana High Court in the CWP No.22684 of 2018 (Madam 'X' Vs. Chancellor, Panjab University & Others.) duly forwarded by Under Secretary, Vice-President's Secretariat, New Delhi vide letter No.VPS-15/1/2018 dated 13.12.2019 (**Appendix-IX**). Information contained in office note (**Appendix-IX**) was also taken into consideration.

Initiating discussion, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she wanted to draw the attention of the House towards page 146 of the appendix, wherein it has been written, "Please find enclosed the Fee Bills-3 & 4 of Shri Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India and Fee Bill of Shri Arun Gosain, Senior Counsel, for appearing on behalf of Chancellor, Panjab University, in the CWP No.22684 of 2018 before the High Court of Punjab & Haryana for your appropriate action as per norms of the University".

Since he is the Chancellor and she believed that as per the norms of the University, they should approve it.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that a news item had also appeared in the Press on this issue and Shri Satya Pal Jain had said that he had never taken any monetary benefit from Panjab University. Perhaps, he might have submitted the bills with the intention that the bills would be paid by the Chancellor's Secretariat. The University should ask him that earlier he had never taken any monetary benefit whether now he would like to take the monetary benefit from the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No". As Ms. Anu Chatrath has suggested that in accordance with the letter of the Chancellor, the payment of bills be made.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Alright".

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that since Shri Satya Pal Jain is a senior and respectable member of the Senate, they should not do anything, which did not look nice.

Ms. Anu Chatrath reiterated that the payment of bills be made in accordance with the letter of the Chancellor and as per norms of the University.

RESOLVED: That the payment of fee bill (**Appendix-IX**) amounting to Rs.74,600/- submitted by Shri Arun Gosain, Senior Counsel and Rs.1,20,000/- (Rs.72000/- Bill No.2 + Rs.24000/- Bill No.3 + Rs.24000/- Bill No.4) (**Appendix-IX**) submitted by Shri Satya Pal Jain, Senior Advocate, Additional Solicitor General of India, for appearing on behalf of Chancellor, Panjab University, before the Punjab & Haryana High Court in the CWP No.22684 of 2018 (Madam 'X' Vs. Chancellor, Panjab University & Others.), be made.

14. Considered the minutes dated 09.05.2018 (**Appendix-X**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to amend the service Regulations/Rules in the light of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

- NOTE:**
1. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.05.2018 (Para 3) (**Appendix-X**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred. Thereafter the item along with the other certain pending items of 26.05.2018, were placed before the Syndicate in its various meetings but the same could not taken up.
 2. The DUI vide his latest note dated 5.09.2019 (**Appendix-X**) has observed that the Committee in its meeting dated 9.5.2018 had already gone through Panjab University Service Rules and Regulations in the light of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) very deeply. The recommendations of the Committee duly approved by the Vice-Chancellor are very comprehensive. The minutes may be placed before the Syndicate meeting.
 3. The latest update submitted by Professor Meenakshi Malhotra was as under:

"To the best of my knowledge, there have been no new circular/instructions from government or concerned

departments regarding any changes/ modifications in the above mentioned act, since the amendments in the service rules were proposed by the committee”.

4. The Vice-Chancellor has desired that the comments of the Professor Devinder Singh, Professor Rajinder Kaur and Dr. Bharat may be obtained.

Professor Devinder Singh, Professor Rajinder Kaur and Dr. Bharat have given comments that found it in order and appropriate.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that at certain places, they have slightly deviated from the Act.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Committee has drafted the report very. This Act has come into existence in the year 2013, but their service rules are old. As such, the provisions of this Act needed to be incorporated in the service rules of the University and those provisions are to be incorporated as such and not by modifying the same. It is being felt something is left out, which could be unintentional and the same needed to be corrected.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that when the provisions of the Act are to be incorporated in the service rules, the same are to be incorporated as it is. Meaning thereby, that they could not adopt in parts.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to who could check the wording.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would check the wording.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 09.05.2018 (**Appendix-X**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to amend the service Regulations/Rules in the light of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, as per **Appendix-X**, be approved, with the stipulation that the wording be got checked from Shri Ashok Goyal, Ms. Anu Chatrath and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa.

- 15.** Considered recommendation dated 20.11.2019 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that Rule 10 at page 442, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016 for evaluation of answer books, be amended as under and given effect from, December 2019 (session 2019-20):

PRESENT RULE	PROPOSED RULE
10. No examiner shall be allotted more than 400 answer-books for B.A/B.Sc. and B.Com. Examinations. For B.Sc. Part I (Medical/Non Medical) examinations the maximum limit of answer-books shall be 300 .	10. No examiner shall be allotted more than 800 answer-books for B.A/ B.Sc. and B.Com. Examinations. For B.Sc. Part I (Medical/Non-Medical) examinations the maximum limit of answer-books shall be 500 .
NOTE-(a)A Head Examiner shall not have more than 10 examiners, i.e., 3000 answer-books of B.Sc. Part I (Medical/Non-Medical) examination.	NOTE- (a)A Head Examiner shall not have more than 10 examiners, i.e., 5000 answer-books of B.Sc. Part 1(Medical/Non-Medical) examination.

(b) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Controller of Examinations may permit an examiner to be given answer-books in excess of the specified limit in a special case.	(b) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Controller of Examinations may permit an examiner to be given answer-books in excess of the specified limit in a special case.
---	---

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the main issue in this item is that the payment of certain examiners was not being released as it has been mentioned in the rules that an examiner could not evaluate more than 400 answerbooks. Since he was the Chairman of the Committee, he is well versed with the issue. The office had suggested that the maximum number of answerbooks to be evaluated by an examiner should be enhanced to 1000 answerbooks. They had examined the issue in totality and found that in certain cases the number of answerbooks sometime goes to 750. Keeping this in mind, the limit of 400 answerbooks has been recommended to be raised to 800 per examiner.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they should examine the issue carefully as the limit of 400 answerbooks has been raised to almost double, which might also reduce the efficiency. Sometimes, on revaluation the results are drastically changed. He therefore, stressed that the matter should be looked into in depth. Professor Navdeep Goyal had a point, but they should not enhance the number of answerbooks to be evaluated by an examiner to such an extent.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that although the Controller of Examinations could throw much light in the issue, but according to him very less number of Professors and Associate Professors of the University as well as of good affiliated colleges did not evaluate the answerbooks. Only the teachers, who needed money, evaluated the answerbooks. If they restricted the number of answerbooks to be evaluated by an examiner to 400, the evaluation would not be possible in the subjects like Punjabi owing to which they would not be able to declare the results in time. He sorry to point out that the Professors of the University returned the answerbooks after keeping with them for sometime saying that they are not in a position to evaluate the answerbooks. Since the teachers of the University are getting handsome salaries, they did not evaluate the answerbooks. Evaluation is being done only by those College teachers, who are getting salaries between Rs.10000/- and Rs.15000/-p.m.

It was informed that each and every evaluator is not evaluating maximum number of 800 answerbooks. They tried their best to ensure that every teacher participate in the evaluation. The original limit was 400 answerbooks, but sometimes they have to get more than 400 answerbooks evaluated from an examiner. Resultantly, the payment of the examiner got stuck. Keeping this in mind, the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor has constituted the Committee on the request of the office so that the problem could be solved forever.

Ms. Anu Chatrath enquired is it not mandatory that a faculty member has to evaluate minimum of this number of answerbook.

It was informed that though the Syndicate had approved the minimum number of answerbooks to be evaluated by the examiner, the same is not being strictly followed.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that then they must expressed their serious concerned that the teachers who are getting handsome salaries are not evaluating the answerbooks and the evaluation is being done by only those teachers, who are getting

salaries between Rs.10000/- and Rs.15000/-p.m. Certain cases had come to their notice where the original marks secured by the students were between 8 and 10, but after evaluation they got more than 45 marks because the persons, who are getting limited amount as salary, might also have their own interest.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that a check should be imposed on the Secrecy Branch that they should not send the bundles of answerbooks only to a few selected teachers/examiners because if they did so, the number would definitely exceed 400. Citing an example, he said that as there are number of papers in the subject of Punjabi (General), the Secrecy Branch should ensure that the name of a particular examiner should not be got repeated.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Controller of Examinations to take care of the point made by Principal I.S. Sandhu.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur pointed out that generally the vacations (Summer and Winter) fell during the marking of answerbooks, owing to which a large number of teachers could not participate in the evaluation. Certain teachers did not evaluate intentionally as they have to go somewhere during the vacations. Sometimes it is very difficult for the Principal to assign evaluation duty to the teachers because the classes of the new semester also start after a few days.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it had been generally observed that the teachers, who are well settled enjoyed vacations and only those, who needed money, did the evaluation. He suggested that the process of marking should be started before the vacations, so that the teachers might not be deprived of the vacations.

Professor Keshav Malhotra remarked that the number of holidays (vacations) was enhanced, so that the teachers could do the evaluation.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that through him (Vice Chancellor), he would like to make a request to the Controller of Examinations that sometimes the candidate secured a 4 marks in the original evaluation but in revaluation they got enhanced to 25 marks and when the case goes to the third examiner, he/she award 35 marks, but neither the examiner, who awarded 4 marks nor the one who awarded 25/35 marks, is penalised. One of the two might be at fault. This is common in Law.

Ms. Anu Chatrath intervened to say that even this has also come to her knowledge that the standard of persons, who are evaluating the answerbooks is not up to the mark.

The Vice Chancellor said that the biggest problem the Controller of Examinations is facing that they had a shortage of examiners.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that even if they had shortage of examiners, it did not mean that they should get the answerbooks evaluated from the local market. It is better not to get the answerbooks evaluated than getting the same evaluated from a person, who awards 4 marks to a student who deserved more than 40 marks.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it meant that either the persons who awarded the 4 marks, is wrong or the one who has awarded 40 marks.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has a suggestion in this regard that he (Vice Chancellor) should instruct the Controller of Examinations to take a sample from the answerbooks and get an inquiry conducted, and they would find that the same set of people doing the same thing again and again.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to tell as to what is to be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the examiners, who are indulged in such types of practices, should be debarred. Provision for punishment must be there.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that Shri Ashok Goyal has given a good suggestion. However, such type of cases should be got examined by a Committee to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor. Thereafter, if anybody is proved to be guilty, he/she should be punished. If one examiner is punished for his/her wrong doings, the others would automatically follow the right path.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she fully endorse the views expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal and Principal I.S. Sandhu.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Controller of Examinations should preferably send the answerbooks to Professor and Associate Professors for evaluation and if someone refuse to evaluate, it should be seen as to what action is to be taken against the examiner concerned. It had been observed that people are ready to perform any duty at the time of appointment and taking promotion, but after that they tide their hands.

Principal I.S. Sandhu remarked that declaration of results got delayed only because of such teachers, who returned the answerbooks after keeping the same with them for quite sometime.

The Vice Chancellor said that being a member of a UGC Committee where the issue had arisen that certain teachers refuse to evaluate the answerbooks, he would like to bring to their kind notice that it was made abundantly clear there that evaluation is a part and parcel of the duties of the teachers. As such, they could not refuse to perform the evaluation duty.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa through the Vice Chancellor he would like to ask the Controller of Examinations to provide them the data as to who and how many examiners had refuse to evaluate the answerbooks from 1st January 2019 to 31st December 2019.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Controller of Examinations that in the meanwhile it should be reiterated that evaluation is a part and parcel of duty of each and every teacher.

It was said that unless and until the answerbooks are evaluated by the examiner, who is expert of that area, the situation is not going to improve. This could only be ensured by the Chairperson of the department as only he/she knew as to what area/subject the teacher belonged to. Citing an example, he said that they had sent the paper of 'Company Law', but the same was evaluated y the teacher who was expert in jurisprudence, which is entirely different.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that 4 years before they had suggested that the specialization of each and every teacher should be uploaded on the University website. If they check the websites of Cambridge University, Oxford University, Stanford University, Harvard University, they would find the specialization of each and every teacher on their respective website.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Controller of Examinations has informed is that the Chairpersons knew specialization of teachers of their department, but they handover the same to the teachers, who is expert in different field.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the Principals of the affiliated Colleges should be involved in this process. In fact, the answerbooks should be sent to the Principal with the request to get the same evaluated from the concerned teacher.

Principal R.S. Jhanji pointed out that the qualifications of the teachers are required to be mentioned in the *pro forma* meant for evaluation.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that as per practice there is a provision for spot evaluation, under which all the teachers of the affiliated colleges are supposed to come to the evaluation centre for spot evaluation. However, as there is a lot of pressure on the University staff to get the evaluation at the earliest so that the results are declared in time, the in-charge is forced to send the answerbooks to the teachers at their homes.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that this is a very serious issue as the student studied during the whole year in accordance with the instruction imparted by the teachers and perform well in the examination. If his/her answerbook is not evaluated properly, that means they are playing with their career. In fact, it is a big responsibility and maximum evaluation should be got done from the so-called good scholars.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is surprised by the sentiments expressed by his fellow colleagues. So far as the University is concerned, they followed the internal system of evaluation. Here the teachers themselves set the question papers, evaluated the answerbooks and show the same to their students.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is talking about the teachers, who evaluate the answerbooks of postgraduate classes. Even he could also name the teachers, who are involved in this practice.

Professor Keshav Malhotra reiterated that 80% evaluation in the University campus is internal.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that the problem is only in the Arts subject. He suggested that a Committee, comprising senior Professors should be constituted, to find out a solution to the problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that they needed at least half an hour to check a paper in the subject of Physics. If they had to check 60 papers, it took minimum two months as they have to find a time of half an hour or so every day.

Principal I.S. Sandhu remarked that if 60 answerbooks are to be evaluated in two months, then they should opt for the Annual System of evaluation as they would not be able to run the Semester System in such a manner.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he would like to inform his fellow colleagues, especially Principal I.S. Sandhu and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, that the answerbooks, which are evaluated by the University teachers, are not to be re-evaluated because the evaluated answerbooks are always shown to the student concerned and convince him/her about the awarded marks.

The Vice Chancellor said that a transparent system of evaluation existed in the University Campus.

RESOLVED: That Rule 10 at page 442, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2016 for evaluation of answer books, be amended as under and given effect from, December 2019 (session 2019-20):

PRESENT RULE	PROPOSED RULE
<p>10. No examiner shall be allotted more than 400 answer-books for B.A/B.Sc. and B.Com. Examinations. For B.Sc. Part I (Medical/Non Medical) examinations the maximum limit of answer-books shall be 300.</p> <p>NOTE-(a)A Head Examiner shall not have more than 10 examiners, i.e., 3000 answer-books of B.Sc. Part I (Medical/Non-Medical) examination.</p> <p>(b)The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Controller of Examinations may permit an examiner to be given answer-books in excess of the specified limit in a special case.</p>	<p>10. No examiner shall be allotted more than 800 answer-books for B.A/ B.Sc. and B.Com. Examinations. For B.Sc. Part I (Medical/Non-Medical) examinations the maximum limit of answer-books shall be 500.</p> <p>NOTE- (a) A Head Examiner shall not have more than 10 examiners, i.e., 5000 answer-books of B.Sc. Part 1(Medical/Non-Medical) examination.</p> <p>(b)The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Controller of Examinations may permit an examiner to be given answer-books in excess of the specified limit in a special case.</p>

16. Considered minutes dated 06.12.2019 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for making necessary amendments in the existing *Pro forma* for appointment of teachers (open selection) in the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh

Initiating discussion, Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that it should not be discussed right now as it is not entirely merit based.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if they kept in 100 per cent interview based, it would be violation of settled Law.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a ruling has been given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that 100 per cent marks could not be allocated for the interview.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that as per the ruling of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, they could not allocate 100 per cent marks to the interview.

It was informed that the recommendations have been made on the basis of UGC Regulations.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the Regulations of UGC could be wrong, but they could not violate the Law.

It was said that if they have to make a selection, they are not debarred for fixing the criteria. They have not made pre-screening the base. There is no problem in determining the criteria and the same is based on the performance in the interview.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that only in University Campus 100-150 applications are received. They had also devised new template. If the College had advertised 8 posts

and criteria is fixed that maximum 10 candidates for a post are to be called for the interview. The candidate with a merit of 60% would have to be appointed. Citing an example, he said that a day before, they had to appointed a candidate with a merit of 68%. If it is based 100 per cent on interview, they have to appoint the candidate even with a merit of 42%. With the current template, they could not ignore a candidate having a merit of 68%.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if they made selection 100% based on interview, even the Gold Medalist would be got ignored.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that how could they ignore a person having 18-20 years experience as also having published work at his/her credit? Anyone could be left in scrutiny. According to the existing template, only meritorious person would be got selected.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that the short-listing should be done with this, but for interview they should evolve their own criteria specifying as to which marks are to be taken into consideration.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that a Committee should be constituted to look into this matter.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they are authorising the Vice Chancellor to constitute the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Alright".

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Committee to be constituted should comprise of Dean of Faculties.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that since the matter related to colleges, Principals and teachers of the colleges should also be included in the Committee to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that maximum members in the Committee should be from the affiliated Colleges.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that majority of the members should be from the Colleges; otherwise, the meritorious candidates would be got ignored and the candidate placed at No.10 would be got selected.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he has a suggestion to make and the suggestion is that the criteria for short-listing should be as suggested/recommended by the Committee.

Some of the members intervened to say a Committee is being constituted to look into the whole issue, which would also take care of the concerns shown by the members.

RESOLVED: That a Committee, comprising Principals and teachers of affiliated Colleges, be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the whole issue and make recommendations.

17.

Considered if the donation of Rs.5,00,000/- made by Dr. Rakesh Kochhar (Professor & Head), Department of Gastroenterology, PGIMER, Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of an Endowment to be named as 'Prof. Suman Kochhar Gold Medal'.

The investment of Rs.5,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector 14, Chandigarh, @ maximum prevailing rate of interest up to 15.03.2020 and the interest so accrue there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140. The Gold Medal will be awarded to the Best Outgoing student of M.D. (Radiodiagnosis) of GMCH, Sector-32, Chandigarh, at Department level function annually, on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions:

- a) The Endowment will be named as 'Prof. Suman Kochhar Gold Medal'.
- b) Gold Medal to be awarded to the Best Outgoing student of M.D. (Radiodiagnosis) of GMCH, Sector-32, Chandigarh.

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

- NOTE:**
1. Requests dated 23.04.2019 and 14.11.2019 of Dr. Rakesh Kochhar were enclosed **(Appendix-XII)**.
 2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.10.2019 (Para 12) **(Appendix-XII)** had approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 19.09.2019 with regard to review existing system for the institution of endowments of awards, medals etc. Accordingly, Dr. Rakesh Kochhar was apprised about the decision of the Syndicate vide letter dated 08.11.2019 **(Appendix-XII)**.

RESOLVED: That the donation of Rs.5,00,000/- made by Dr. Rakesh Kochhar (Professor & Head), Department of Gastroenterology, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education & Research (PGIMER), Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of an Endowment to be named as 'Prof. Suman Kochhar Gold Medal'. The investment of Rs.5,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh, @ maximum prevailing rate of interest upto 15.03.2020 and the interest so accrue there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140. The Gold Medal will be awarded to the Best Outgoing student of M.D. (Radiodiagnosis) of GMCH, Sector-32, Chandigarh, at Department level function annually, on receipt of the interest from the amount, on the following terms and conditions:

- a) The Endowment will be named as 'Prof. Suman Kochhar Gold Medal'.
- b) Gold Medal to be awarded to the Best Outgoing student of M.D. (Radiodiagnosis) of GMCH, Sector-32, Chandigarh

RESOLVED FURTHER: That thanks of the Syndicate be conveyed to the Donor.

- 18.** Considered if, Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) **(Appendix-XIII)**, be executed, between University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), Panjab University, Chandigarh and Monash University, Malaysia, SDN. BHD. to promote academic exchange programs between the Institutions.

NOTE: The MoU has been legally vetted by the S.L.O.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that Chairperson of the concerned Department/Institute is always involved in the MoU; otherwise, everybody would start signing MoU individually.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Alright".

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that it should be got corrected and the Chairperson should be included in the MoU.

RESOLVED: That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XIII**), be executed, between University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), Panjab University, Chandigarh and Monash University, Malaysia, SDN. BHD. to promote academic exchange programs between the Institutions, with the stipulation that Chairperson, UIPS, be included in the signing of MoU.

19. Considered minutes dated 31.12.2019 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Revising Committee, regarding list of Paper-Setters and Examiners/Evaluators recommended by the various Board of Studies, against the vacancies occurred on account of completion of prescribed term of Paper-Setters/Examiners or due to any other valid reason, i.e., cancellation of appointment, debarring a person, death of person, person going abroad, etc. in the various subjects/faculties for the examination 2019-20.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Revising Committee dated 31.12.2019, as per **Appendix-XIV**, be approved.

20. Considered if, recommendation (Item No.1) of the Academic & Administrative Committee dated 11.09.2019 (**Appendix-XV**) that fee structure of NRI students for M.Sc. Forensic Science & Criminology, be charged as USD 2860 per annum (at par with Department of Microbiology, Department of Bio-chemistry), as Tuition Fee and Development Fund.

- NOTE:**
1. The above item was considered by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 16.10.2019 (Para 8) (**Appendix-XV**) and it was resolved that consideration of the item 8 on the agenda, be deferred.
 2. The decision was communicated to the Chairperson/FDO vide No.10595-96 dated 19.11.2019 (**Appendix-XV**). The Chairperson vide letter dated 26.11.2019 and 29.11.2019 (**Appendix-XV**) has again requested that the case be again put up to the Syndicate, as the fee structure for this course was not defined.
 3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 11.05.2019 (Para 3) had approved the fee structure (Tuition fee, Development fee, etc.) for International Students for the session 2019-20 for various courses being offered at the University Campus, but the course M.Sc. Forensic Science & Criminology does not exist in the **Appendix-XV**, approved by the Syndicate.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the matter had come to the Syndicate earlier, but the same was postponed as the relevant papers were not appended with the item. The students had already been admitted and the fee structure of this course has been fixed, which had been determined for other such courses. By chance, the fee structure of this course could not be mentioned in the booklet, which contained fee structure of various courses.

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Academic & Administrative Committees dated 11.09.2019 (Item No.1) (**Appendix-XV**), the fee structure from NRI students of M.Sc. Forensic Science & Criminology, be charged as USD 2860 per annum (at par with Department of Microbiology, Department of Bio-chemistry), as Tuition Fee and Development Fund.

21. Considered minutes dated 12.12.2019 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to revise the rates of Registration fee and Security amount of the Publishers regarding submission of books to be prescribed in the various graduate classes. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XVI**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The Registration fee of Publisher for submission of books was enhanced from Rs.50/- to Rs.250/- vide Syndicate decision dated 8-9/6.10.2012 (**Appendix-XVI**).
 2. The amount of security has not been enhanced since last 45 years. Presently the amount is Rs.600/-

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the Committee has recommended enhancement of Registration Fee from Rs.250/- to Rs.5,000/-, but the existing amount of Security has not been mentioned, although the revised amount has been mentioned, i.e., Rs.5,000/-.

The Vice Chancellor said that, it meant, they wished that the amount should be mentioned in comparative mode.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the first case, the amount has been mentioned in comparative mode, but not in the second case. Now, they are approving enhanced security from Rs.600/- to Rs.5,000/- and registration fee from Rs.250/- to Rs.5,000/-.

RESOLVED: That as recommended by the Committee dated 12.12.2019, with effect from the session 2020-21, the amount of security and registration fee for the Publishers be enhanced as under:

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | Annual Registration fee | : | From Rs.250/- to Rs.5,000/- . |
| 2. | One-time Security | : | From Rs.600/- to Rs.5,000/- . |

22. Considered recommendation dated 05.11.2019 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that there will be only one paper w.e.f. the session 2020-21, which be named: "Environment, Road Safety Education, Violence against Women/ Children and Drug Abuse" comprising four parts as under:

Part-I: Environment

Part-II: Road Safety Education

Part-III: Violence against Women/Children

Part-IV: Drug Abuse: Problem, Prevention and Management

Principal I.S. Sandhu clarified that there would be only one paper as earlier existed in the case of Environment. However, the paper has now been divided into four parts.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is very good recommendation, but at least one question from each unit should be made compulsory, so that the students studied every topic.

Ms. Anu Chatrath suggested that the short answer type compulsory questions should be set from all the four units so that the students studied the entire prescribed syllabus.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the paper relating to Road Safety is important because though the people obtain even Postgraduate and Ph.D. degrees but they did not know the correct way to cross the road as also how to behave. These (Environment, Road Safety Education, Violence against Women/Children and Drug Abuse: Problem, Prevention and Management) are a very effective subjects and must be taught. However, all the parts should be compulsory for the students for qualifying and the question paper should be set accordingly.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that this is definitely for the welfare of the younger generations and is a really good step. They must complement the Committee for doing a wonderful job.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since it is a qualifying paper, questions should be set from all the four units so that the students studied each and every part of the syllabus. Though the syllabus and modalities had been framed, it should be ensured that the chapters are not so lengthy as the time available with the students is limited. Moreover, classes which are held for this subject is also very limited.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to provide the input, which is available with them, to the Committee already constituted for the purpose.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he is a member of the above referred Committee and he would like to inform them that there are instructions/directions of Punjab Government that this paper (Drug Abuse: Problem, Prevention and Management) should be introduced. However, the Colleges are already under stress and if this paper is introduced, they have to acquire new infrastructure as also to appoint teacher(s). Keeping this in mind, they had suggested that the earlier paper, which was maximum of 50 marks, should be made of 100 marks and its units be enhanced from 2 to 4. The chapters have also been decreased, but it needed to be checked that minimum contents of the chapters are kept in the syllabus.

Principal R.S. Jhanji pleaded that the contents in the syllabus should be minimum to minimum as regular classes for this paper would not be conducted/taken. Hence, the paper should not be much lengthy.

Shri Jarnail Singh pointed out that earlier the examination of this paper was taken on OMR sheet. Now also, the examination of this paper should be taken on OMR sheet.

Ms. Surinder Kaur pointed out that there is book on 'Environment' as well as on 'Drug Abuse'. She suggested that small and interesting topics on these subjects should be included in the syllabus, so that the students take interest in studying them and attempt the questions easily.

In a lighter vein, Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it was raised in the meeting of the Committee that such topics should not be included in the syllabus which related as to how the drugs are to be taken. Meaning thereby, that only those contents, which related to demerits of drugs, should be included in the syllabus.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari said that although it has been informed by Principal I.S. Sandhu that this paper is being introduced on the instructions of Punjab Government, it should have been studied by the Government as to which subject is to be taught at what level. If the paper like Drug Abuse is to be taught at College level, what the Government had done in the case of students, who start taking drug while studying in schools, i.e., at 9th, 10th or 12th level. Similar is the position of the subject of Road Safety. According to him, the paper(s) like Environment and Violence against Women/Children are such, which are needed to be taught at the higher level. However, the Government should think that the papers like Drug Abuse and Road Safety should at least be introduced in the schools at the secondary level.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever Professor Rajinder Bhandari has said is correct, but the problem is that the Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD), Government of India, had suggested paper(s) time and again, and the University was in a fix whether one paper is to be introduced or two or four. Now, they have recommended one paper having four units, but they have followed the guidelines of the Government.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that some practical contents should also be included in this paper, so that the students could know traffic rules, etc.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a good suggestion, but at the same time, it is also being pleaded that the paper should not be lengthy. If practical part is also incorporated, then how it would be managed?

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that instructions should be given to the affiliated Colleges to get lectures delivered by the Traffic In-charge of their respective areas in the Seminars, etc.

Principal R.S. Jhanji pointed out that they did conduct seminars on Environment, Road Safety, etc.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they had already conducted this exercise and before that, the students were supposed to attend only seven lectures on Environment. Thereafter, they started written paper and then taking examination on OMR sheets. It would be better to take the examination on OMR sheet.

RESOLVED: That, w.e.f. the session 2020-21, there be only one paper namely: "Environment, Road Safety Education, Violence against Women/Children and Drug Abuse" comprising four parts as under:

Part-I: Environment

Part-II: Road Safety Education

Part-III: Violence against Women/Children

Part-IV: Drug Abuse: Problem, Prevention and Management.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the examination of paper "Environment, Road Safety Education, Violence against Women/Children and Drug Abuse" be taken on OMR sheet.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma pointed out that Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, has come to attend the meeting.

The Vice Chancellor extended a warm welcome to Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director, Higher Education, Punjab.

23. Item 23 on the agenda was read out, viz. –

23. To appoint a Committee comprising 3 members of the Syndicate nominated by the Syndicate annually for the Calendar year to decide objections if any, against the decision of the Registrar regarding entry in the Register of electors for the Election of Ordinary Fellows-2020, under Regulation 7.4 at page 63 of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1, 2007 which reads as under:

“7.4: Objection, if any, against the decision of the Registrar, if received within the prescribed date, shall be decided by a Committee, comprising 3 members of the Syndicate nominated by the Syndicate annually for the Calendar year.”

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

RESOLVED: That a Committee of Syndics, comprising Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Navdeep Goyal, be constituted to appoint a Committee, comprising 3 members of the Syndicate nominated by the Syndicate annually for the Calendar year, to decide objections, if any, against the decision of the Registrar regarding entry in the Register of electors for the Election of Ordinary Fellows-2020, under Regulation 7.4 at page 63 of P.U. Calendar, Volume 1, 2007.

24 Considered minutes (Item 12, 13, 14 and 18) dated 25.11.2019 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of Executive Committee of PUSC (Items 12, 13, 14 and 18) dated 25.11.2019, as per **Appendix-XIX**, be approved.

25. Considered recommendation dated 04.12.2019 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Board of Control in Economics that:

- (i) any other degree awarded by a UGC recognized University/ Institution that is equivalent to either of the mentioned degrees of the Panjab University be added in the existing eligibility condition (**Appendix-XX** for admission to M.A. Economics in the Department of Economics under PU-CET-2020.
- (ii) M.A. (Economics) be added under Clause No.8 of Important notes (**Appendix-XX** common to all the courses.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that a condition has been imposed (page 198 of the Appendix) that the examination date may not be clashed with other entrance tests of the neighbouring Universities. Though they ensure this, but never approved such a condition.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the Controller of Examinations always ensured that the date of entrance tests should not clash with the entrance test of other neighbouring Universities.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that they should not approve this condition.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th January 2020

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not formalizing it as the Controller of Examinations would be ensuring that the dates of entrance tests do not clash the entrance tests of neighbouring Universities.

It was pointed out that, in fact, it is a letter written by the Chairperson, Department of Economics. There are only two recommendations, which have been enlisted in the agenda.

RESOLVED: That –

- (i) any other degree awarded by a UGC recognized University/Institution that is equivalent to either of the mentioned degrees of the Panjab University be added in the existing eligibility condition (**Appendix-XX**) for admission to M.A. Economics in the Department of Economics under PU-CET-2020.
- (ii) M.A. (Economics) be added under Clause No.8 of Important notes (**Appendix-XX**) common to all the courses.

26. Considered if, an Inspection Committee be constituted to visit to new proposed College namely – Rayat Bahra Degree College, Bohan, District Hoshiarpur, for grant of temporary affiliation for (i) B.A.-I Punjabi (C), History and Culture of Punjab, English (C), Mathematics, Hindi, Economics, Adult Education, Education, History, Political Science, Human Rights and Duties, Statistics, Physical Education, Psychology, Ancient Indian History, Computer Science, Sociology, Agriculture and Environment Conservation (ii) B.Sc.-I (Agriculture) 4-Year course (iii) B.Sc.-I (Medical) (iv) B.Sc.-I (Non-Medical with Chemistry/Computer and B.Com.-I (one unit) for the session 2020-2021.

- NOTE:**
1. Request dated 25.11.2019 of Director (Planning) Rayat & Bahra Group of Institute-An Educational & Charitable society is enclosed
 2. An office note is enclosed.
 3. Sequence of event in the case of grant of temporary affiliation to new proposed college namely – Rayat Bahra Degree College, Bohan, District Hoshiarpur is enclosed.

Initiating discussion, Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that Principal Sarabjit Kaur should be made a member of the Committee to be constituted for inspecting this College as she belonged to Education College.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that the College (Rayat Bahra Degree College, Bohan, District Hoshiarpur) is seeking temporary affiliation for subjects like Punjabi (C), History and Culture of Punjab, English (C), Mathematics, Hindi, Economics, Adult Education, Education, History, Political Science, Human Rights and Duties, Statistics, Physical Education, Psychology, Ancient Indian History, Computer Science, Sociology, Agriculture and Environment Conservation and courses like) B.Sc.-I (Agriculture) 4-Year course, B.Sc. I (Medical) and B.Sc.-I (Non-Medical with Chemistry/Computer and B.Com.-I. As such, it is a degree College.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they should not take decision in respect of this College in haste. They needed to evaluate as to what the College has acquired and what is yet to be acquired.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the reply on the observations of the Survey Committee had not been received, but the College wrote every time that affiliation should be granted to it.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that Rayat Bahra College is situated on a link road.

On point of order Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that now Rayat Bahra is established as University.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that C.L.U. is not available with Rayat Bahra College which is a basic requirement.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in the Engineering College the salaries of 8-10 months were pending.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as has been informed earlier by him the observations of the Survey Committee had not been received.

The Vice Chancellor directed Dean College Development Council to give his input on the issue.

It was informed that this item was also brought in the meeting of the Syndicate held in the month of March and it was deferred at that time. The observations of the Survey Committee were not placed in the Agenda but it was done after considering the observations.

Dr. Navdeep Goyal said how it can be done without dealing with the observations of the Survey Committee.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said this item should be deferred due to lack of the document relating to the observations of the Survey Committee and could be placed in next meeting for further action.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that if Dean College Development Council can provide the documents relating to the observations of the Survey Committee, it can be discussed.

Principal R.S. Jhanji asked whether the queries/observations of the Survey Committee had been sorted out.

Dean College Development Council said that these queries are still there.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that these queries should be got verified.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the College of Education is being run, a surprise visit should be conducted to know whether the students are attending the classes or they only conduct the examinations. One more College is also affiliated by the Panjab University at the same campus, i.e., Rayat Bahra College of Education where non-interested students are being admitted by them and no student is attending the classes.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma seconded the issue raised by Sh. Jarnail and said that this is a very big fraud being done there.

Sh. Jarnail Singh further said a surprise visit should be conducted there to know whether any student is present there or not for attending the classes.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said as Shri Jarnail Singh belonged to Hoshiarpur, he used to observe daily that no student is present there for attending the class.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that surprise visit from the office of the Dean College Development Council should be conducted there. He further stressed that Surprise should be Surprise visit without informing any one for the visit.

The Vice Chancellor asked the members to consult the information mentioned at Page No. 109.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said surprise visits can only be done in the case of affiliated college whereas that College is not affiliated to Panjab University.

Principal R.S. Jhanji asked whether classes are going on there or not

In response to his query Shri Jarnail Singh informed him that classes are going on there.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said here they are talking about B.Ed. College

Dr. Rabindra Nath Sharma said that the discussion is on the Degree College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per his view Dean College Development Council would be able to explain as he had never come across during his days in the University about any such incident where University is writing to the College to apply for this. What is this? They applied for the session 2018-19, thereafter they said it should be treated for the session 2019-20 and in 2019-20, University is writing to them to apply for the session 2020-21 and accordingly they applied for the same. The College had written that they applied for the same as per the directions of the University. They wrote in the letter "as desired by the University, they are applying for the same". Why the University is doing this. He pointed out firstly the Dean College Development Council would be in a position to explain "What is this? Secondly, whatever observations were raised by the Survey Committee, that should be considered. Merely by writing that the College had done this as per the direction of the University is not sufficient. The Survey Committee should again visit to verify whether their claim is right or wrong, only then the question of sending of Inspection Committee would come. Earlier Survey Committee had given the wrong recommendations that University had raised some objections and said that in the meantime the Inspection Committee will be constituted. Where is the hurry in constituting the Inspection Committee, till the clearance is given by the Survey Committee? His opinion in this regard is that if they complied with the instructions of the Survey Committee, the Survey Committee would visit again to see whether all the observations were complied with and they themselves decide "What is the reality? And thereafter that Survey Committee report should be submitted be put up before the Syndicate, only then the question of sending of Inspection Committee would be considered. That is the procedure which is required to be followed.

Sh. Jarnail Singh, while supporting the viewpoints of Shri Ashok Goyal, said that this procedure had also been followed in the past. In many Colleges same rule is applied in the matter. If the rule is applied for one session it would not be desirable to carry forward in the next session.

Ms. Anu Chatrath directed Dean College Development Council to see the judgements of the Supreme Court in the cases where affiliation is to be granted on the new *pro forma*. If there is delay on the part of University for granting the affiliation, then the responsibility lies with the University and the litigation cases would arise.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he would like to know whether the NOC was obtained from the Government before the visit of the Survey Committee

Shri Ashok Goyal, while replying to the query of Principal I.S. Sandhu, said that NOC was given at that time by the Government and new NOC is not being issued by the Government as per the reply of the College.

Principal I.S. Sandhu that the NOC was given by the Government, when College had applied at that time, but it is not known whether the NOC is given for seeking affiliation from Panjab University or some other University.

Professor Emanuel Nahar requested humbly that whenever this case comes the application should be taken from them.

Shri Jarnail Singh pointed out if the management is changed then the case would be different altogether.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Survey Committee should see all these things.

The Vice Chancellor said that this input would also be taken care of.

RESOLVED: That the Survey Committee be again sent to Rayat Bahra Degree College, Bohan, District Hoshiarpur, to verify whether the observations made by the earlier Survey Committee have been complied with as also to verify whether the NOC had been given by the Government to the College for seeking affiliation from Panjab University and make recommendation(s). The recommendation(s) of the Survey Committee be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

27.

Considered minutes of the Committee dated 3.11.2019 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 18.11.2018 (Para 11) to look into the various aspects of Pension Policy of Panjab University.

Dr. Rabindra Nath Sharma said this is very important issue. Hence, the related papers should be delivered to them at home, so that they could study the same thoroughly. Since the papers have been provided to them on the tables, they could not apply their minds and arrive at such a big policy decision. He requested the Vice Chancellor to kindly defer the consideration of the item.

The Vice Chancellor asked the member that this item may be deferred or some Committee should take responsibility to consider the same.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Committee had already taken the decision in the matter and this item was rejected many times. He said that this policy should not be reopened and that would be discussed at a later stage.

Shri Ashok Goyal supported the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Rabindra Nath Sharma that he is right that unless the papers relating to the policy be checked they could not come to the conclusion. But the statement that this item had been rejected time and again is completely unfounded and wrong. It has never been done, it is only out of jurisdiction and without authority that some orders had been passed by taking into account the requests of employees of the federation. The Committee was constituted of which he was the Chairman, the said Committee was constituted by the Syndicate and not by the Vice Chancellor. It was constituted in 2019 and number of meetings were held as the Vice Chancellor added two other members in the Committee i.e., Professor of Law and custodian of the finances of the University the F.D.O. The said Committee had not given any recommendations; they had only concentrated on the

existing rules of Panjab University Pension Scheme. It is the interpretation of pension rules based on which the recommendations were given and he do not know whether the members had gone through or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal, Principal R.S. Jhanji and Dr. Rabindra Nath Sharma said that the item may be deferred.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay".

RESOLVED: That consideration of Item 27 on the agenda, be deferred for next meeting.

28. Considered following recommendations of the Joint Consultative Machinery (items 1(ii), 5 and table agenda Item 1) (constituted for the year 2019) dated 28.11.2019:

Item 1(ii)

That the eligibility condition for promotion as Stenographer be reduce from 15 years to 5 years and Rule 4(ii) (class 'B' post) at page 79 of P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2019 be amended accordingly.

Item 5

That:

- (i) Uniform be provided to all the Drivers and Helpers irrespective of nature of job either on regular or contract or D.C. rates.
- (ii) The stitching charges be allowed to the Drivers and Helpers in the University at par with Punjab Government.

NOTE: The demand regarding overtime to remaining Drivers and Helper irrespective of the nature of job, will be considered in the next meeting of JCM.

Item 1(table agenda item)

That four chances should be allowed to the confirmed University employees to apply for jobs outside the Panjab University and Rule 9 at page 63 of P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2019 be amended accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he does not know as people are more intelligent by placing/attaching the papers along with the agenda item in such a manner that it is not possible to read the size of the font.

Dr. Rabindra Nath Sharma endorsed the view point of Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is right, this font is not readable, the size of the font is not legible to read

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that this item should not be deferred keeping in view of the interests of the employees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is OK then it should be passed without reading the same and they all should apply on it in the meeting for consideration.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said if he desired that this item should be deferred for one month.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not in favour to delay this item for a month, but at the same time he would also like to point out the intention of the dealing officials of the concerned branch, when they feel the contents of the paper are not in their favour, they create the same in small font so that the item could be passed without having knowledge otherwise a normal font is being sent. By doing so, they are saving paper. In whole case as read by him in one case the condition of service is reduced from 15 years to 5 years. Is the same at par with the Punjab Government? In future the complications would arise relating to it. In some cases it has been referred that it is done as per High Court, Supreme Court, Centre Government or Punjab Government.

Dr. Satish Sharma intervened and said they might have followed the pattern of some Government in this matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if they followed the pattern, then it is "OK".

The Registrar while updating in the matter said that this pattern is not being followed. There are two cadres of employees, i.e., Ministerial and Secretarial staff. Ministerial staff consists of Clerks & Assistants whereas Secretarial Staff consists of P.A.s and Stenographers. In the cadre of Secretarial staff there is stagnation in promotion of Stenographers whereas there is acute shortage of staff in this cadre and condition of 15 years is a barrier in their promotion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he understood that there is stagnation for the promotion in the cadre of Stenographers. He said why the University is quoting the precedents of High Court in that case. It would be better to state that the exigencies of services demand that they should be promoted to the post of Stenographers.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa intervened and said this condition is changed from 15 years to 5 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said on what grounds the condition of 5 years had been changed. Which pattern they had now recommended to be followed?

Ms. Anu Chatrath also pointed out on what basis and at what par the said condition of 15 years had been changed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra also said that in the High Court the retirement age is 65 years.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be brought in the next meeting in a large font.

The Registrar requested that it should be considered as major employees are suffering. Even though a Committee may be constituted to deal with these two or three items of JCM and other items pertaining to change of condition from 15 to 5 years.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said there is no reason of constituting a Committee over the JCM. JCM itself is the statutory Committee. This item should be brought to the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said this should be placed in the next meeting in large font for consideration.

Proceedings of Syndicate meeting dated 18th January 2020

The Vice Chancellor said that as it is very urgent and keeping in view the urgency of the same, informally 2-3 members can sit and discuss on this issue as no Committee can be constituted over the JCM.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if there is no contraction relating to the rules of the Punjab Government then there is no problem in it.

Principal I.S. Sandhu and Ms. Anu Chatrath said that 4-5 local member can discuss in the matter.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that it can be discussed in the presence of the employees who are involved in it.

Ms. Anu Chatrath intervened to say that it is not possible to consider and discuss the issue in the presence of those employees who would be benefitted/affected. There should be a rational decision in changing the condition from 15 to 5 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it would be considered by 4-5 members but honestly this paper is not readable.

The Vice Chancellor said, "I do agree to it" but the problem is that the decision should be taken in compatibility with Punjab Government instead of making own condition that same is required to be changed from 15 to 3 or 5 years.

Ms. Anu Chatrath as also being remembered to Vice Chancellor in the previous meeting of JCM, it was decided that at par with the High Court, the service of 10 years is required for regularisation of any employee. It was the decision of the JCM that as when the employees complete 10 years, they would be absorbed on regular basis. But that challenge was also stayed. If the condition from 15 to 5 years would be changed, it will affect the promotion of someone and he can go in Court for the same.

The Vice Chancellor said his intention is always on the matter that whenever there is need of changing the conditions or eligibility criteria, the rules/regulations of U.G.C./MHRD and Punjab Government should be followed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that for non-teaching employees, the pattern of Punjab Government should be followed whereas U.G.C./MHRD is applicable only to teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said he is clear on this issue, he will not implement the pattern of Punjab Government on teaching faculty.

Ms. Anu Chatrath requested the Registrar to fix the meeting of 4-5 local members to deal with the issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the photograph could not be clicked as Dr. H.S. Dua is not present in the meeting today, it can be clicked in the next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not against anyone; it is the first meeting of the Syndicate so everyone should be present in the meeting. A new ritual is going to be started from this year with the permission of the House. He said that this should be brought in the agenda that this time the photograph should not be clicked.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as this is the last term of the Syndicate and Senate therefore, this is very important to click the photograph of the same.

The Vice Chancellor while deciding on the Item 28 said that 4-5 members will look into it.

RESOLVED: That, for the time being, the consideration of Item 28 on the agenda, be deferred and the same be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting after getting the minutes of Joint Consultative Machinery in 12 font size.

29. Considered minutes dated 20.12.2019 (**Appendix-XXI**) of the College Development Council.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the College Development Council meeting dated 20.12.2019, as per be approved.

30. Considered minutes dated 14.10.2019 and 09.01.2020 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor, in terms of the discussion held in Syndicate meeting dated 30.07.2019 to look into the issue of Advertisement No.1/2019 for appointment of 26 posts of Assistant Professors in the University and to proceed ahead with the selection procedure of the cleared posts.

NOTE: The Committee, constituted by the Vice Chancellor in its meeting dated 14.10.2019 desired that the office may provide the information regarding number of faculty members (department-wise) who have got retired after attaining the age of 65 years either on completion of their re-employment or court case or resignation or any other reason during the years 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20.

Professor Emanuel Nahar enquired as to what Item 30 related to.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that there is no problem in Item 30, it should be approved.

Discussion shifted from general discussion.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Jarnail Singh said that this item is included in the Table Agenda which is not being taken up. If the Table Agenda is to be considered then the item relating to pension should be also be considered.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that as told by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that Table Agenda will not be taken up, therefore, the said item was not taken up.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that this matter is relating to advertisement of 26 posts but it would not be done in a haste manner.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Navdeep Goyal to update in the matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this item had been recommended by him as he was the Chairman of the Committee.

Ms. Anu Chatrath and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if the said item was placed in advance then it would be considered.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the said item is done by Professor Navdeep Goyal then it would be considered and taken up but Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma had decided that the table agenda would not be discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is on the part of the House whether they want to discuss the said item or not. On the one hand they are discussing on the issue of NAAC and to fill up the posts on priority basis and on the other hand the same item relating to it is not being discussed. The said Committee which was constituted by consulting the members of the Syndicate had made the recommendations which are required to be considered. It is not that these are done with some hitches in it. However, the members of House could do whatever they deem fit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first of all it should be decided whether the Table Agenda should be considered or not. He said that the items which were on the Agenda, but it was written there that the relevant papers would follow had not been taken up for consideration. How the item which has been made available to them on the table just before the start of the meeting, could be taken up for consideration. He did not know as to when this item was taken up.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that she did not make the agenda on the basis of Table Agenda. She just discussed her problem which is being faced.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it is good that Principal Sarabjit Kaur had talked about the same whereas the Vice Chancellor had apprehension in his mind that the said item had been passed.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that every issue should not be placed in the Agenda item, if there is an urgency in some matters to decide, the same could be decided without following the process.

The Vice Chancellor said, that "I do agree".

Professor Keshav Malhotra said in the items of information and ratification such cases are being placed.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Ms. Anu Chatrath said that cases which Principal R.S. Jhanji had placed regarding withholding of roll numbers could be considered on urgent basis without including in the Agenda.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said he had his reservation with regard the case of filling up of 26 posts of teachers. He had observed some gaps in the Agenda as it had come on the Table for discussion so he would like to study it thoroughly as when this case was decided he was the member of the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor said that the decision regarding the ratio of 3 or 6 was taken by the Committee constituted for the purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal, Ms. Anu Chatrath and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this item would not be discussed and they further suggested that this should be brought in the next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is their choice whether to discuss the same today or in the next meeting. However, if his hands would be tied in such a manner then how the University would be able to function?

Shri Ashok Goyal while addressing to Vice Chancellor said that when the issue of pension had come, he told that does not matter it would be discussed in the next meeting, whereas the Vice Chancellor is showing his anger on this issue of teachers when it is not being discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that issue of pension should not be mixed the case of appointment of teachers.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue of pension had also been recommended by the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said if their meaning is that both the cases should be considered then both the issues could be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they would not approve without reading the same as this item was placed on the table just before the start of the meeting. At least this would be seen whether the Committee had recommended as per the instructions given to them by the Syndicate. He should be clarified as this should be done or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that one should at least trust on the recommendations of the Committee as there are senior members in the Committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Committee did not accede to the instructions of the Syndicate whereas he was also present at the time of the meeting of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said firstly he would ask Professor Navdeep Goyal as to how he had done in such a manner without following the instructions of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not have grudge against anybody but if the trust is not there on each other then it would be difficult.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is the matter of trust? Is the roster available with the Vice Chancellor?

The Vice Chancellor replied that roster is not there and the solution to this effect should be raised.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as the roster is not available, therefore the Syndicate had decided that these positions should be placed according to the procedure as per U.G.C. guidelines, so the same should be brought in the approved manner. Neither the roster is included in the same nor the positions are mentioned in accordance with the U.G.C.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that one section of teachers who are being suffered on this ground, approaching them to look into the same as he felt shocked to see this on the Agenda papers.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said if the previous item is postponed on the same criteria then the said item is also required to be postponed.

The Vice Chancellor said while keeping in view the discussion relating to Roster that the Committee had very judiciously taken the decision in the matter by consulting the members informally. Even he himself talked on the issue with the members there after but still they do not have trust on the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they believed that the same was placed as per the approved pattern but it had been brought to the notice today itself that it is without roster and not accordance with the instructions of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the meeting should be called after 10 days on this issue.

The Vice Chancellor replied it is not that he is there only to conduct the meetings for discussing the issues. He thought that it is in the interest of the University/House that item is approved on urgent/priority basis.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had the Vice Chancellor desired that litigation cases would come by taking such decisions and people would knock the doors of the High Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not want the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if this is approved then the litigation cases would be raised.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that people are approaching them that they are being ignored.

The Vice Chancellor said that this item should be postponed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said this item should be brought in the next meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that the said item would be placed in the meeting when all the papers and procedure would be completed.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that Committee should not be constituted on such issues, the decision should be taken in the meetings of Syndicate itself if the decision is not to be taken as per the recommendations of the Committee. It is not right that more and more Committees are being constituted and no decision/conclusion is. The decision should be taken in the Syndicate even by voting or some other method.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the statement of Principal R.S. Jhanji is correct and they should take the decision as suggested by him.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would decide the same as per the suggestions/views of the members.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they should not argue with each other on the issue that Committees are not required to be constituted, this cannot be done. All the suggestions/recommendations are always placed in the Syndicate for decision and approval.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is in the interest of the University to consider the same, if possible after the photography, they could discuss on the issue.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this item is required to be thoroughly read and doing research by exploring the history of the case before coming to any conclusion.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice Chancellor and Professor Navdeep Goyal knew the details about this case. But as per his knowledge even the Vice Chancellor and Professor Navdeep Goyal did not very much about the details. Only they knew about the decision taken in the meeting of the Board of Finance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what and how it has been done in the Committee, is better known to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if the said recommendations are made according to the decision of the Syndicate. Firstly it should be informed whether the Roster is available or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Roster is not available but as per the decision of the Syndicate

The Vice Chancellor intervened to say that there are two methods of doing the things, one is to facilitate the system and the other is that Roster had not been prepared to which he is 100% agreed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Roster had not been prepared then anybody can approach to Court.

The Vice Chancellor replied if he wishes to go in the Court then it should be Okay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this would let down their position if any incumbent would move to the Court.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that two Rosters had been prepared by the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether these two Rosters prepared by the office had the approval of the House. Why these two Rosters prepared by the office are not being placed before the Syndicate?

The Vice Chancellor said if they do not want that this item would be approved, then it is Okay. He said that he would make the way only by consulting them and according to their view points. There used to be many issues which were placed in the meeting and the same were withholding as per their decision. He should be allowed to make the appointments so that he would be in a position to explain to the Ministry as to what he had done in the matter.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that a meeting could be called again so that they could come after reading the same.

The Vice Chancellor replied that meeting would not be conducted according to their wishes as there are majority of matters which are lying pending.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that some date could be fixed for the finalisation of the Roster.

The Vice Chancellor replied that it would be done by taking the opinion of other members by conducting the one or more meeting to discuss the same in accordance with the decision of the Syndicate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that it was recommended in the meeting of the Board of the Finance that appointments would be made on vacant positions where the retirements had taken place but there the fresh appointments are being taken up.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no issue relating to fresh appointments in it; every matter used to be discussed and decided with the approval of the Syndicate. 1000s of activities had been done by them as now he is also very well versed about the same. Even the affiliations of the year 2018 had been granted by the Committee which was approved from the back date. Isn't it a crime? And that too there is not mind

interest in it. His main concern is about to do the same on priority basis, if the members are willing to do then it would be done.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the major section of Society is of teachers and they were approaching and asked how their matter would be considered without the Roster.

The Vice Chancellor asked him "Where was he from the last many days?"

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he did not know that the said item is being brought in the Agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this item was brought in the Agenda but the relevant papers had reached on the table.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was informed to Professor Navdeep Goyal that the papers were ready and this item was being placed in Table Agenda and the members agreed to discuss the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not declining it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now the Vice Chancellor is taking the consent of the other members whereas some members are of the view that they would not discuss/consider the item which had been placed as Table Agenda. Then, should he not agree to it?

The Vice Chancellor said that they should also accept his request by taking the consent of the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this means that this item should be discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that lot of exercise had been done in the matter; therefore, this item should be allowed to be discussed as it is in the information list.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that this is not for the information this item is for the purpose of consideration. This item was to be placed before the Syndicate as told by the Vice Chancellor he thought that this item had not been placed in the Agenda.

The Vice Chancellor said that this item was very much shown to them, this is another thing that they would not like to consider it.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that when it was said by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that the Table Agenda would not be considered, everybody got relaxed that Table Agenda would not be considered/discussed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he would like to make a suggestion in the matter that let it be allowed to happen. However, in future first the agenda should be prepared and only thereafter the meeting of the Syndicate should be fixed. Further, the Agenda should reach them at least a week before the meeting. Sometimes the vehicles are arranged to deliver the supplementary agenda to them at odd hours due to shortage of time.

The Vice Chancellor said that his request is gladly accepted but there are certain matters which are beyond his control. For example he made some one the Chairman of

the Committee, but due to his busy schedule sometimes the meetings could not be held for 1 to 1.5 years.

Shri Jarnail Singh requested that this item should be brought in the next meeting.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that a decision to this effect should be taken whether this item is to be discussed or not. If not, the said item should be deferred.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he should be informed by Professor Navdeep Goyal regarding the same so that it could be discussed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this item needs to be discussed in a detailed manner, but it did not mean that they did not apply their mind at all. Of course, they have not recommended filling up those posts, which have been got sanctioned from the U.G.C./MHRD. Under this some posts of Hotel Management course had been created.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that this matter is not being discussed then there is no need of giving the inputs for the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that if some of the posts can be declined it can be done so that the case can be considered.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this case is very much clear from the day when he was the member of the Board of Finance, he committed at that time to Government of India

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that these issues were discussed in his absence in the previous meetings of the Syndicate. In the light of that, the decision to this effect was taken in the meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that then the issue was raised that the Roster was violated, whereas it is known to everyone that Roster had not been prepared.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the Roster has not been prepared then how its violation can be ensured by them.

The Vice Chancellor that the Committee has ensured by applying its mind that the violation of Roster is not there because there is a sufficient number of posts.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that even if a single point of difference is found after the preparation of the Roster, the violation of Roster would itself be there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there are divergent views which had been noticed when they attended the meetings related to the Roster.

The Vice Chancellor said that what is the guarantee of that Roster would be prepared and every time he stressed and urged to each and every member to prepare the Roster.

While adding to this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this should be decided in principle that this would be decided without the Roster.

The Vice Chancellor said that in such a situation, it is very difficult to prepare the Roster.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be presumed that the posts would be filled up without the Roster.

The Vice Chancellor said that where he is saying that posts would be filled without Roster. He said the esteemed Committee had passed 3+6 whereas he is talking about the same in brackets.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as everyone knows, if they have to move ahead then the Roster is very much required and the task for the preparation of Roster should be entrusted to a responsible person and before the next meeting of the Syndicate the Roster has to be prepared.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that unfortunately the Syndicate had become the substitute of the office which is not fair.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that office had already prepared the Roster and the same should be checked and they would be informed in what manner it should be prepared/modified.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked he want to know about the details regarding the teachers who had crossed the age of 65 years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this information had already been included. 3 posts are approved where as the six posts are not

Principal I.S. Sandhu said it should be made time bound and the Roster should be prepared in the time bound manner.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had fixed the last date as 31st January, 2020. If I order to deal with the cases in time bound manner, then it is being said that Vice Chancellor used to dictate the things.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it has been done in the cases where 50% posts are lying vacant.

Ms. Anu Chatrath asked who are the members of the Committee constituted for the preparation of Roster?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there were divergent views from the PUTA on the issue of Roster.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it is not advisable to prepare their seniority/Roster by themselves. It is the duty of the office to prepare the Roster.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Establishment Department of Panjab University had prepared the Roster and after modifications/amendments, it would be circulated.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said if the Roster had been prepared then the same should be brought to the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are certain modifications which have to be incorporated in it and he discussed the same with Professor Navdeep Goyal. He directed to complete the Roster by 31st January, 2020.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if they started to meet the conditions up to the satisfaction of the PUTA then it would be difficult to prepare the Roster.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, Ms. Anu Chatrath and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the same should be prepared according to the rules and regulations under law.

The Vice Chancellor said that what is to be done by him in the situation when he is directed to run with his tied hands.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Roster should be got technically cleared under the law by holding the meetings.

The Vice Chancellor said that lot of reminders had been sent but every time the Ministry used to ask him what has been done till date and only the Vice Chancellor is answerable for the same not the Syndicate. He is answerable for all these things and there is no time left for the year 2022 to come when grades are to be given. He is keeping in mind the grades for the future as he had also vast experience of these things from the service of 35 years in Banaras Hindu University. At that time the drawing/map of salary/pension/project would be visible in such a way that cannot be imagined by any one.

Professor Navdeep Goyal expressed his view point on the statement of Ms. Anu Chatrath that it is rightly said by her that the affected member/teacher would not be made the member of the Syndicate. Neither he nor Professor Keshav Malhotra and other teachers should be made the members of the Committee. Other teachers of the College should be included in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Roster is ready if the members devote time on it, the same would be made available by a week.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that during the last year it was observed that in Panjab University there are seven seniority lists which had been prepared. All the seven seniority lists are different. Therefore, it is proved that when the person is involved in same, they cannot prepare it in a right manner.

The Vice Chancellor said that when there is subjectivity then it would be done in the same manner.

Professor Keshav Malhotra expressed his view point relating to the statement of Ms. Anu Chatrath that there is subjectivity in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that at least some decision should be taken today may be a conditional decision so that the same can be intimated to the Ministry.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the decision relating to it was taken in the month of September and it was said at that time to bring the same in the next meeting. He said that he told the Vice Chancellor at that time that it would not be possible to complete till the next meeting and he suggested that 2 months time could be taken to complete the same. Now the 4 months had elapsed and it is being said now that it would be difficult to prepare the Roster whereas he had already intimated at that time that it would not be completed within 2 months. At this point of time, no law of land permits to advertise the posts without the Roster.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not arguing on the statement made by Shri Ashok Goyal. He would like to know whether they should move ahead or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice Chancellor wanted to fill up the posts without the Roster, let the same be filled, but it will not meet the scrutiny of law.

The Vice Chancellor said that again the matter has been generalised. It is very unfortunate that there is mistrust in it. He is saying that it should be considered as the Roster has to be prepared and there is no violation in it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that no violation is being done for those things which are not even in existence.

Principal R.S. Jhanji and Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a concrete decision should be taken in this matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two things which had already been informed one is to prepare the Roster according to the decision of the Syndicate and the other is that the office had prepared the two types of Roster. One Roster is prepared on the basis of department as a unit and other is University as a unit. These two types of rosters had been taken up in which the conditions of both had been covered. Later on the conditions which were sent to the U.G.C. were also considered. The remaining which had been sent was found to be violated according to the Roster. It is not that only three posts were sent to the U.G.C. the other posts were also submitted to the U.G.C. but the same were totally violated as per the Roster. The decision which was submitted to the U.G.C. was that in the year 2016-17, those teachers who had crossed the 65 years of age, only those posts were demanded to be filled. There were many members in the Committee and out of them one view had come that in various departments major posts were lying vacant, that should also be considered. 50% of the data regarding the number of sanctioned and filled posts was required to be submitted from the Establishment Branch. Now the decision which had been taken is that in the department where more than 50% posts are vacant while keeping in view these two Rosters, these posts should be considered.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he could not understand the same.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that this matter is being discussed from the last half an hour without any conclusion/result. Therefore it is suggested whether a Committee for the preparation of Roster should again be constituted, or it should be made time bound by entrusting the responsibility for the preparation of Roster.

The Vice Chancellor clarified with the members regarding the resolve part with regard to Item 30 is that they should not move ahead till the Roster would be completed and approved. So, it should be resolved.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said he want to see for his satisfaction whether the decision taken in the meeting of the Board of Finance was implemented or not.

RESOLVED: That the process for filling up position of Assistant Professors be not restarted unless and until the roster is prepared and approved by the competent authority.

31. Information contained in **Items R-1 to R-7** was read out and ratified, i.e. –

R-1. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Mr. Saumyadeep Bhattacharya, Assistant Professor in English (temporary), P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. 17.12.2019 (A.N.), as he has deposited Rs.60480/- in the account No.11389618105 as one month salary in lieu of one month notice period, under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

NOTE: 1. Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, reads as under:

“the service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

2. Mr. Saumyadeep Bhattacharya vide his request dated 14.12.2019 (**Appendix-XXII**) had written that he has been selected as Assistant Professor in English for Govt. College in M.P. Public Service Commission.

3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

R-2. The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Committee dated 03.12.2019 (**Appendix-XXIII**) and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate has approved the following revised guidelines for implementation of “Earn While One Learn Scheme”:

1. Work Assignments eligible for “Earn While One Learns Scheme”

The students can be engaged for the following work assignments eligible under the scheme of “Earn While One Learns Scheme”

- a) To operate the Libraries and Laboratories beyond the normal office hours or on holidays.
- b) Assignments pertaining to mini IQACs of the Teaching Departments or in the office of Director IQAC.
- c) Assignments pertaining to placement related activities in departments.
- d) Assignments pertaining to department level Alumni Associations.
- e) Time bound assignments pertaining to NIRF data, IQAC report, digitization of legacy data in various administrative offices.
- f) Any other activities with the special permission of worthy Vice – Chancellor.

2. Working hours under “Earn While One Learns Scheme”

- a) No student/research scholar shall be work under this scheme for more than 40 hours a month (students/research scholars who are availing any kind of fellowship/scholarship shall not be eligible for this scheme).
- b) The maximum number of students in which a department can engage in a month under this scheme shall be as under:-

Students Strength	Maximum number of students which can be engaged in month	Total working hours in a month
Upto 100	05	200
101 to 200	10	400
200 or more	15	600

“In case of non-teaching department/ administrative office (such as IQAC Cell, Administrative Office etc.) the maximum number of students which can be engaged in a month shall be as per the lowest slab, i.e. 5 only. In case of A.C. Joshi Library the maximum number of students which can be engaged in a month shall be as per the maximum slab, i.e.15”

3. Procedure for assignment of work

- a) Whenever there is a need to engage students for the prescribed assignments (as per para 2 above) the concerned head of the teaching/administrative department shall assess the total estimated number of working hours to be put in to complete such assignments. On the basis of such assignment the concerned HOD shall seek the application from the students/ research scholar for the identified assignments through departmental notice board. A circular (through email) shall also be forwarded to all other departments seeking applications from students/research scholar of the other departments also.
- b) The notice/circular of must specify the nature of work assignments to be carried out, the tentative working hours per month as well as the last date of receipt of application.
- c) The application of students/research scholars shall be screened by; in case of teaching department by the academic/ administrative committee of the department and in case of administrative departments/offices by a committee to be constituted by the Registrar.
- d) After screening of the applications, the concerned committee shall recommend the names of students/research scholars to DSW. The DSW after verifying the due compliance of the procedure and other names of the scheme shall issue administrative orders for engagement of the concerned

student/research scholars for the prescribed assignment within 3 working days from the date of receipt of request.

4. Preparation and Processing of Bills

- (a) After the end of each month the concerned HOD shall prepare a bill in the prescribed format (**Annexure-A Page 12**). Such bill shall be submitted to the office of A.R. Accounts-II on or before 5th of the concerned month.
- (b) The office of ARA-II shall scrutinise those bills within 3 working days and submit it to the audit for final pass and payment order.
- (c) The audit shall process such bills within 2 working days. After getting those bills cleared from the office of ACLA, the office of ARA-II shall submit such bills to Cheque Writing Section within 1 working day.
- (d) The Cheque Writing Section shall issue cheque payment advice to the Bank for credit of amount to respective beneficiaries within 1 working day.

NOTE: 1. A copy of circular dated 06.12.2019, 27.11.2019 and 20.09.2019 enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

2. The Senate in its meeting dated 15.12.2018/ 08.07.2018 had noted the recommendation of the Syndicate dated 26.05.2018 with regard to recommendation of the Committee dated 04.04.2018, be approved and the scheme be named as "Earn While You Learn" with provision of experience certificates to the students.

R-3. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted post facto sanction of Medical Commuted Leave w.e.f. 15.06.2019 to 20.06.2019 (06 days) and Earned Leave w.e.f. 21.06.2019 to 22.11.2019 (155 days) to Late Sh. Harish Chander, Superintendent, SC/ST Cell Panjab University, with the permission to avail prefix and suffix holidays, if any.

R-4. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the appointment of Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma as Temporary Programmer in the Department of Computer Science and Applications, P.U. Chandigarh, against the vacant post of Programmer in the department.

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXIV**).

R-5. The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the appointment of Shri Trilok Chand, ATO (G-II), Department of Geology, as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I), in the Department of Art History & Visual Arts, Panjab University, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/-

with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible from time to time on the terms and conditions.

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

R-6. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has condoned the shortage of lectures of the following students of certain teaching Department/s, for the session 2019-2020:

Sr. No.	Name of the Student/ class	Department
1.	B.Sc. (Hons.) 2 nd year (3 rd Semester) 1. Akshita Negi 2. Moumi Ray Karmakar 3. Shivi Gilhotra B.Sc. (Hons.) 3 rd year (5 th Semester) Mimansa Negi	Department of Biochemistry
2.	Master of Social Work 1 st Semester. Ms. Navdeep Kamboj	Centre for Social Work
3.	M.Sc. (Hons.) 1 st Year, 1 st Semester. 1. Ms. Shruti Garg 2. Ms. Madhuri	Department of Chemistry & Centre of Advanced Studies in Chemistry
4.	M.A. Geography 3 rd Sem. 1. Abneesh Panwar 2. Manpreet Kaur Masters in Remote Sensing & GIS III Semester. Vicky Anand	Department of Geography
5.	M.A.I (Semester II) Ms. Meenu Ranga M.A.II (Semester III) 1. Ms. Prajikta Sheoran 2. Ms. Ankita Kumar	Department of English and Cultural Studies
6.	1. Anjan Bhattal B.A. (Hons.) Semester 3 rd 2. Angad B.A. (Hons.) Semester 5 th 3. Sang Priy B.A. (Hons.) Semester 5 th 4. Amit Punia M.A. Semester 3 rd 5. Vaibahav Sabharwal M.A. Semester 3 rd	Department of Economics

Sr. No.	Name of the Student/ class	Department
7.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simranpal Singh (M.A. Economics 3rd Semester) 2. Gaurav Bansal (M.A. Economics 3rd Semester) 3. Nikita Singh (M.A. English 1st Semester) 4. Moninder Kaur (M.A. English 1st Semester) 5. Ashima Dhiman (B.Com. 5th Semester) 6. Vrinda Kakar (B.Com. 5th Semester) 7. Akash Parihar (B.A. 5th Semester) 8. Kiran Bala (B.A. 5th Semester) 9. Shehbaz Kumar (B.A. 5th Semester) 10. Vijay Kamboj (B.A. 5th Semester) 11. Satnam Singh (B.A. 5th Semester) 12. Gagandeep Singh (B.A. 5th Semester) 13. Dilpreet Singh (B.A. 5th Semester) 14. Mansi Nagoria (B.A. 5th Semester) 15. Sachin (B.A. 5th Semester) 16. Manpreet Singh (B.A. 5th Semester) 17. Abhishek Yadav (B.A. 5th Semester) 18. Habel Bhatti (B.A. 5th Semester) 19. Mohit (B.A. 5th Semester) 20. Sankalp Chandra (B.A. 5th Semester) 	Department of Evening Studies- MDRC

Sr. No.	Name of the Student/ class	Department
	21. Davinder Singh (B.A. 3 rd Semester)	Department of Evening Studies- MDRC
	22. Pargati (B.A. 3 rd Semester)	

R-7. The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Committee dated 13.01.2020 (**Appendix-XXVI**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the students from Law Courses to attend classes (provisionally) from one institution to the other within the Panjab University System of Institutions on medical and sports grounds, for one semester only at a time and they will have to pay facility charges duly approved by the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 39) as under:

1. Students from PU Regional Centres/PU Campus @ Rs.40,000/- per semester.
2. Students from Colleges/Institutions affiliated to PU @ Rs.1,00,000/- per semester.

32.

Information contained in **Items I-1 to I-12** was read out, viz. –

I-1. The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed Dr. Vandana Chhabra as Associate Professor (on temporary basis) w.e.f. 22.11.2019 for 11 months i.e. upto 21.10.2020 on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier, at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital.

NOTE: An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).

I-2. In pursuance of orders dated 13.11.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 32650 of 2019 (titled Dr. Kiranpreet Kaur & others. Vs. Panjab University and others, vide which the following faculty member has been granted same relief as in CWP no. 26006 of 2017 and CWP no. 26730 of 2018, wherein in pursuant to the orders passed in LPA no. 1505 of 2016, she has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case:-

Name of faculty members	Department	Date of superannuation (60 years)	W.e.f. The date they continue in service as per interim orders
Dr. Neerja Sood	Hindi	31.12.2019	01.01.2020

The LPA no.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 15.01.2020, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) the above faculty member be considered to continue in service w.e.f. the date mentioned against her, as applicable in such other

cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No.26006 of 2017 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per Performa.

- (ii) she be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

I-3. In pursuance of orders dated 13.11.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 32650 of 2019 (Dr. Kiran Preet Kaur Vs Panjab University & others) has been tagged with LPA No.1505 of 2016 and the petitioners has been granted the benefit to continue in service beyond 60 years on the same terms.

The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) and the connected bunch of cases relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) are now fixed for hearing on 15.01.2020 wherein the appellants/petitioners have been allowed to continue in service regardless of their turning 60 years and attaining the age of superannuation, the CWP No. 32650 of 2019 is now fixed for hearing on 24.01.2020, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Kiran Preet Kaur, Professor, Department of Sociology, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.12.2019 in compliance of the order dated 13.11.2019 passed in CWP No.32650 of 2019 and she be paid the salary which she was drawing on attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by her. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking as per performa.

I-4. In pursuance of orders dated 13.11.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in Cwp no. 32650 of 2019 (Titled Dr. Kiranpreet Kaur & others. Vs. Panjab University and others, vide which the following faculty member has been granted same relief as in CWP no. 26006 of 2017 and CWP no. 26730 of 2018, wherein in pursuant to the orders passed in LPA no. 1505 of 2016, he has been given the benefit of continue in service, in view of the similarly projected cases in the said case:-

Name of faculty members	Department	Date of superannuation	W.e.f. the date they continue in service as per interim orders
Dr. Sukesh Chander Sharma	Biochemistry	30.11.2019	01.12.2019

The LPA no.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) was fixed for hearing on 26.11.2019, the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that:

- (i) the above faculty member be considered to continue in service w.e.f. the date mentioned against him, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No.26006 of 2017 & others similar cases and salary be paid which he was drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him will be adjustable against the final dues to him for which he should submit the undertaking as per Performa.
- (ii) he be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

I-5. The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to count previous service for pension, under Regulation 3.14 at page 185 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, rendered by Dr. Sushil Kumar Tomar at Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Yamunanagar (w.e.f. 18.11.1988 to 19.07.1995) and P.G. Regional Centre, Kurukshetra University later on upgraded to Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar (w.e.f. 19.07.1995 to 06.01.2000).

I-6. To note revised minutes dated 20.08.2019 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Committee, for framing guidelines/rules for award of Ph.D. scholarships (Fellowships), pursuant to the decision (Para 7) (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Syndicate dated 16.10.2019.

NOTE: A copy of letter dated 02.12.2019 of Dean Research enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

I-7. To note that the recommendations dated 27.02.2019 (**Appendix-XXIX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, relating to CET-UG admissions, already approved by the Syndicate dated 16.03.2019 (Para 28) for the session 2019-20 (**Appendix-XXIX**) be made applicable for the academic session 2020-21 also.

NOTE: A copy of letter dated 29.11.2019 of Dean, Sciences enclosed (**Appendix-XXIX**).

I-8. To note circular No.11138-12228/Estt.I dated 25.11.2019 (**Appendix-XXX**) with regard to promotion under the CAS in accordance with the old UGC guidelines, to apply under the new UGC guidelines, 2018.

NOTE: The above circular was appended under Item C-3 relating to promotion cases of Career Advancement Scheme, placed before the Senate in its meeting dated 14.12.2019.

I-9. The Vice-Chancellor has disqualified Ms. Shavita D/o Jiya Lal, student of B.A.-1st Semester, M.C.M. DAV College, Sector-36, Chandigarh, for three years i.e. for the session 2016-17, 2017-18 &

2018-19 as per Regulation 4 at page 15 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 and her result for the said period be treated as cancelled.

NOTE: 1. The mark sheet and migration certificate submitted by the candidate obtained from Bihar School Examination Board, Patna were found doubtful and the matter was referred to that Board for confirmation of the said documents. The observer of the Board has informed as under:

“student-Shavita, roll code-7117, roll no. 30302, examination year-2015, faculty-science is not inscribed in the Board record. The name of some other student is inscribed on the said roll code, roll number, examination year, faculty”

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXI**).

I-10. The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mrs. Anita Rani Wd/o Late Sh. Harish Chander, Superintendent, SC/ST Cell, Panjab University, who expired on 23.11.2019, while in service:-

1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
3. Encashment of Earned Leave up to the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

I-11. The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Ms. Sarita Goyal Assistant Registrar University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, P.U.	24.07.1980	31.01.2020	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere
2.	Shri Kashi Nath Pandey Junior Technician G-III Department of Statistic	01.12.1980	31.12.2019	

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
3.	Ms. Raminder Kaur alias Ram Dulari Estimator Construction Office, P.U.	10.12.1980	31.01.2020	during the period of Furlough.
4.	Shri Sunil Kumar Gupta Assistant Registrar University School of Open Learning, P.U.	20.07.1984	31.01.2020	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
5.	Shri G.J. Hardy Assistant Registrar Re-Evaluation Branch, P.U.	09.11.1982	31.01.2020	
6.	Mrs. Shakuntla Kumari Superintendent UIET, P.U.	26.03.1987	31.12.2019	
7.	Shri Hari Krishan Sr. Technician G-II Department of Zoology	10.07.1985	31.12.2019	
8.	Ms. Reena Bali Senior Assistant University Business School, P.U.	13.08.1993	31.01.2020	
9.	Shri Jaspal Singh Chargeman Grade-1 Construction office, P.U.	02.04.1993	30.09.2019	
10.	Shri Saini Ram Daftri U.S.O.L, P.U.	24.06.1977	31.01.2020	
11.	Shri Amarjit Singh Head Mali Construction Office, P.U.	02.05.1990	31.01.2020	
12.	Shri Bas Dev Security Guard Department of Geology, P.U.	08.05.1976	31.01.2020	

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

Referring to Sub-Item I-3, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said in this case also the case of Dr. Ahluwalia is attached. He wants to know as to "What is the stand of the University in this case?"

Ms. Anu Chatrath intervened and said that University is saying from the very beginning that age of retirement be enhanced from 60 to 65 years, but the Punjab and Centre Government are not agreeing on it.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that this is wrong that they agree to raise the age of retirement from 60 to 65 years as it will create the problem of unemployment.

Professor Keshav Malhotra that this case has got the stay order from the Court.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that even houses had been allotted to the persons who are serving under Stay Orders of the Court.

Referring to Sub-Item I-5, Professor Keshav Malhotra said regarding counting of past service for pension by Dr. Sushil Kumar Tomar, that this is not the item for the Syndicate. The information of the same should not be brought to the Syndicate. This new practice should not be initiated. If the said case is cleared by the Audit, the same is not required to be placed before the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the information contained in Item 32 (I-1 to I-4 and I-6 to I-11) on the agenda, be noted; and
2. Sub-Item I-5 be treated as withdrawn.

When the discussion on the agenda items was over, the members started general discussion.

1. Professor Navdeep Goyal said he had received two representations from the students of Faculty of Law in which one student had backlog in 4th Semester. He applied for the re-evaluation, whereas as being told by some of the members that papers are not being checked, therefore, his result was declared at the last stage and he was admitted in next semester on provisional basis. Now in the 6th Semester he had passed as per the information received through RTI. There is a very serious position for such candidates. For such candidates where University is at fault, a special provision is to be made by the University to give admission in 6th Semester. So a Committee has to be constituted for framing the rules to deal in such type of cases. A Committee is to be constituted to deal with such type of cases in future and in the present case, they may be allowed for admission in 6th Semester as a special case.
2. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa while quoting the case of Dr. Prem Nath Sharma said that there is delay in releasing the retirement benefits to him. His representation had already been sent to the office of F.D.O. which is now again being given to F.D.O. for consideration.
3. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he would like to bring to the notice is about the letter issued by the University bearing No.19306/C dated 19th December, 2019 relating to Dr. Kapil Dev, Department of Commerce, S.D. College, Sector 32, Chandigarh in which an explanation letter was called for him regarding some paper made by him as examiner. It was specifically written by him that paper is for September, 2019 and that is to be used only in September and not in December, 2019. The lapse on the part of the University should not be blamed on the part of the teacher. The papers/representation is being given to the Vice Chancellor for consideration.
4. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa further said that he want to know about the status of introduction of L.L.M. Course.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the same would be initiated soon, the Committees for the same had already been constituted.

5. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa pointed out that there is a sum of Rs.50 Lacs with Dr. Deepak Manmohan Singh, the same information had already been conveyed in writing. He desired to donate the said money to the University and he should be given accommodation in the University. He requested the Vice Chancellor to consider on his case.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education requested that as stated by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa regarding Dr. Deepak Manmohan Singh, that should be favourably considered.

6. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa would like to bring the case of Mr. Abhinav Chohda who had been migrated from Amity University to Rayat Bahra College, Railmajra but the Amity University is not issuing migration to him intentionally.

The Vice Chancellor intervened and said that the decision had already been taken in the meeting of the Syndicate for this case as the said case is continuing from the last 1.5 years.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa requested the Vice Chancellor to discuss the said issue on the fresh representation keeping in view the current circumstances and the case may be reopened in the interest of the student.

7. Ms. Anu Chatrath said there are two law institutions in the Panjab University one is Department of Laws and the second is University Institute of Legal Studies. In every department of the University there is separate Research Centre. It was also passed in the Faculty of Laws that a separate Research Centre should be created in the University Institute of Legal Studies as the students had to go in the Department of Laws for their requests on small matters like extension etc. That file is kept pending in the office of the Vice Chancellor since 5-6 months. Therefore the Research Centre should be established in the UILS. She asked with the Regional Centre is in every department then why the Department of UILS be deprived of this facility. The same should be established.

8. Ms. Surinder Kaur said his request that the approval of teachers are not being done since a very long time. There are grant-in-aid Colleges also where the approval of teachers are pending from the last 3 years. She requested that the same should be done at the earliest.

Principal I.S. Sandhu intervened and said that there is some lacuna in it as earlier the nominee was not being invited for dealing with the case of approval of teachers. But now the nominees are being invited for the same. The previous approval of 2-3 years for the teachers are pending so, these should be approved at the earliest.

9. Ms. Surinder Kaur while quoting the matter relating to the elections of the Academic Council said that the lists had been sent by the University but the teachers are not being provided the list by the Principals. The Principals did not provide the list of the approved teachers to the concerned candidates. She requested that the same should be provided to them.

10. Principal I.S. Sandhu said that his query is mostly related to the F.D.O. and he can be better known for this. He said that in his College there is one case of Security Guard and he want to enquire whether the Security Guard on daily wage basis can be given higher salary than the Security Guard on regular basis. How a person on same designation on daily wages could get higher salary than a person on regular appointment. This practice is being done in his College.

Ms. Anu Chatrath intervened on the issue raised by Principal I.S. Sandhu and asked whether the University had adopted the letter of Punjab Government issued in the year. 2015. A notification from Punjab Government had been issued that 3 years before the regular appointment, consolidated salary be given to the concerned.

The Vice Chancellor said, "OK."

11. Professor Emanuel Nahar said that he want to bring the request of the students for consideration. He said that the entrance tests are being conducted in May/June and admissions used to be done in the month of July/August. The classes for students are being started in the month of September/October whereas the Hostel fees are being charged from July to December. The students are pressing hard for the same that how it is justified to charge the hostel fees from July to December when the classes commences in the month of September/October.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Controller of Examinations to update on the issue.

It was informed that this problem, which is being told by Professor Nahar, had come to the notice of the authorities last year. Last year, the entrance tests were conducted in the first week of July and the results for the same were declared at the end week of July. This year onwards the process is being more improved. The entrance tests which are scheduled to be conducted are being interfaced by the Computer Branch and the office of the Examination. The late results are being sent to all the Chairpersons and they were requested to make a plan for the same and they are over-conscious for this year.

On a point of order, Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the students have to pay the Annual charges. If the candidate took admission in October and the examinations are being held in the month of December, then they can also object that they are not going to pay the fees for the whole year which is not acceptable.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that the students are facing problem in paying the fees again as they had paid the same for six months earlier. Therefore he requested that fees should be charged on tri-monthly/quarterly basis in instalments.

12. Professor Emanuel Nahar said that there is one more issue related to University School of Open Learning is that in printing of lesson material, there is difference of opinion between Press, Chairperson and staff of the Department. The lessons are not being printed for a long time due to this reason. He further said that one more decision had been taken that research scholars cannot evaluate the assignments; this should also be looked into.

The Vice Chancellor assured that the same would be looked into by him.

Professor Emanuel Nahar requested that a meeting with Senior Officers of the Department of USOL should be conducted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while supporting the view point of Professor Emanuel Nahar said that in every department/good institutes the assignments are being evaluated by the research scholars.

The Vice Chancellor responded that a meeting of Senior Officers of USOL would be conducted to deal with these issues.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that there are five subjects in which there is not even a single teacher in the USOL. At least the Guest teachers/part-time teachers can be provided to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the barrier of 530 is removed then the case of providing the teachers can be considered and provided and a meeting with Chairperson and senior Professors of the Department of USOL would be conducted which would be convened by Professor Emanuel Nahar.

13. Principal R.S. Jhanji said a letter had been issued on 10th January that the University will not issue Roll Numbers to SC/ST students of all affiliated Colleges w.e.f. the next Semester examinations if the arrears of examination/late fees are not cleared. He said that Rs.10 Crore of Panjab University is also outstanding on Punjab Government and how can they expect that the Colleges can deposit the same. This letter should be immediately withdrawn as the Colleges have no money in their account. They made all the efforts in collecting all the dues/arrears but when such type of letter is received, then they would be in trouble some situation. He said as the DPI (Punjab) also better known for the same, but the College did not know what amount and to whom this amount is to be disbursed. The representations for the same had been given to the DPI (Punjab).

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education, said that she had taken up the case with Chief Secretary and the Chief Secretary had directed the worthy Principal Secretary, Director Social Welfare and Minority Cell to do the needful in the matter. In the meeting held with the associations of the Principals in Mohali in which Principal R.S. Jhanji and the Principal of Ferozepur College had informed about the same. Later on the meeting was held with the Chief Secretary and she had raised the point to him and he directed to Sh. Prithipal Shankar Saroj, IAS and Principal Secretary to send the data student wise/college wise with Name, Aadhar number, Account number, Audit number and IFSC code from the Welfare Department regarding the amount sanctioned to the student for a particular year

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he would like to say that the further development in the case is that they contacted the Department of Social Welfare and they said they cannot inform the Colleges how the money can be disbursed till the list is provided by D.P.I. (Punjab). When they visited the office of D.P.I. (Punjab) they said that the said information has been sent to the Department of Social Welfare. There is

no co-ordination between the Department of Social Welfare and the office of D.P.I. (Punjab). Due to this reason most of the Colleges cannot pay the salaries to the teachers as the sanctioned amount of the students are not being received. The letter sent by the University should be re-considered regarding withholding of Roll numbers of the students.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education said that these roll number cannot be withhold by the University as there are clear directions from the Centre Government that these things should not be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not against the students but their main concern is about the outstanding amount of Rs.16 Crore with Punjab Government.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education said that an amount of Rs.16 Crore was due to the University but it is said that from year 2014-2015, no audit has been done in the University. When it came to the notice of her knowledge, a special the audit was conducted.

It was informed by the Finance and Development Officer informed that all the verification was done by the Department of Social Welfare. The University wrote many times to send the team for audit for the year 2016-17. The claims were sent by the Panjab University. This audit process was never intimated to Panjab University, if the same process was intimated to the University, the University would have got it done. Recently the process of audit was intimated and the Audit for the year 2016-17 was got done by the Panjab University. All the verification up to the year 2016-17 is up to date.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education said that now all the claims have been sent to the Department of Welfare and whenever the next instalment of Centre Government will be released, the outstanding amount of Panjab University will be sent.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said their problem is very much different from the same as the amount is available in their accounts but the same cannot be disbursed. If they disburse the amount at their own level then after the audit the amount will be shown as recovery. The ratio with regard to fees for disbursement of the amount is not being understood at their level. If the said amount is distributed to the students in excess by their calculation then it would be difficult to collect the excess amount back from the students.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education said that the same issue was raised earlier by Principal R.S. Jhanji which has been intimated to the Principal Secretary and Department of Social Welfare for further action.

Principal R.S. Jhanji urged the Vice Chancellor to withdraw the letter sent by the Panjab University relating to it.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education said that letter has to be withdrawn as it is against the instruction of the Government of India.

Professor Rajinder Bhandari and Dr. Jarnail Singh said this letter should not be withdrawn, it should be kept in abeyance.

Principal I.S. Sandhu and Principal R.S. Jhanji stressed that the letter should be withdrawn as the roll numbers of SC/ST students cannot be withheld by the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired which letter is to be withdrawn. That letter should be brought to his notice which is required to be withdrawn. He asked Principal R.S. Jhanji to read the contents of that letter.

While continuing Principal R.S. Jhanji read out the contents of the letter which were *“Letter No. FC dated 31st March, 2019 and F.C again dated 06.06.2019 respectively through the above letter the status of pending examination fee/late fee for the session upto December, 2018 was intimated, however , as per the quoted rule is pending. In view of the decision of the Syndicate vide Para X of the meeting held on 16th October, 2019, the University shall not issue the roll numbers of the SC/ST students of affiliated Colleges w.e.f. the next semester examinations if the arrears of examination/late fee are not cleared. You are, therefore, requested to deposit the pending arrears immediately to enable this office to adjust the late fee account of your College.”*

It was told by the Finance and Development Officer firstly that this arrear has two aspects one is late fee and the second is examination fee. Secondly from the year 2018-19, the system for re-disbursement of fee by the Government has been changed. From the year 2018-19, the Colleges would not get the amount reimbursed, the same would be sent directly to the students by giving the undertaking to the College. The decision regarding late fee is to be taken separately but the examination fee is to be charged.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education intervened and said that as per the directions of the Government the roll numbers of students, admission or degree cannot be withheld. The orders to this effect had already been passed by Mr. Verma, Principal Secretary to all these three Universities and 16 private Universities. If the same is withheld against the direction of the Government then the cases of CWP would come.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that Syndicate is guiding the Vice Chancellor to review on the said letter.

Shri Jarnail Singh said as per their notice, the said letter has to be withdrawn as it is against the instructions issued by the Government of India.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per his knowledge, the spirit behind the decision of the Syndicate was that no late fee is to be charged from the SC/ST students. The letter had been issued for examination fee as well as late fee. As far as examination fee is concerned, they have to recover the same. But as rightly said by Madam (Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education) as per the direction of the Government of India, they cannot put the condition that roll numbers to the students will not be issued. If that letter is there and they cannot take the

decision then that means that it was without jurisdiction. That decision is required to be reviewed by denying only the late fee.

At the last she would like to request to Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education which has also been conveyed by Principal R.S. Jhanji that the bifurcation details of the Colleges should be provided so that these funds could be used as the RTI applications are being received from the students for the same.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education assured that the same would be provided to them.

At the last she would like to request to Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education which has also been conveyed by Principal R.S. Jhanji that the bifurcation details of the Colleges should be provided so that these funds could be used as the RTI applications are being received from the students for the same.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Director Higher Education assured that the same would be provided to them.

14. Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that as already intimated by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa that an open letter has been received in the office of Vice Chancellor, she suggested that the same should be taken into consideration.

15. Principal Sarabjit Kaur pointed out that NAAC Accreditation of University is due and the posts of 26 teachers which had been advertised are not filled till date. How the Government would allow the Vice Chancellor for filling up the posts as the earlier one was not considered, this should be given a re-thought. These posts should be filled up at the earliest so that the grade of the Panjab University would be better.

The Vice Chancellor said that the meeting has been fixed with the Minister in this regard. He had requested for filling up the posts of 40 teachers and then again he went to pursue the case of other 40 teachers and he was told by them that 530 posts would be given to Panjab University and the appointments would be made at the earliest possible.

Principal Sarabjit Kaur said that as per her knowledge from the last 1.5 years, even 26 posts have not been filled up. They could well imagine when the 530 posts would be filled up.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked whether the issue relating to 26 posts are placed in the Agenda.

The Vice Chancellor informed the item was on the Agenda and the same has been approved.

Detailed discussion taken place on the issue of filling up of 26 posts of Assistant Professors shifted to Item 30.

16. Principal Sarabjit Kaur while continuing the matter which she would like to submit at the time of Zero Hour discussion is relating to the letter which was circulated to the Colleges that the Education Colleges could not be entertained in the Degree Colleges. The papers with regard

to the same are being submitted for consideration. She also submitted the papers also with regard to give affiliation to Teacher Education Institutions for running the degree Colleges under the new education policy. In the second representation it is being stated that as per new education policy it should be given only to degree colleges, whereas the Teacher Education Colleges who are running these courses are not being given the affiliation by 2030. In this regard she would like to submit that University should consider one unit whether it is Science, Commerce or Arts to allow degree colleges so that the future of the Colleges could be saved. The management is ready to provide the required faculty and infrastructure of the laboratories for the same.

17. Shri Jarnail Singh said that there are two categories of teachers, some are working on contractual basis or the others are on temporary basis but in the University there are no persons who are on contractual basis. In the Regional Centres two categories i.e., temporary or contractual are working but the salaries of both the categories are different, they both should be merged and converted into one.

The Vice Chancellor said that the decision had already been taken in the matter.

Ms. Anu Chatrath asked whether all the teachers had been granted on the regular scale.

Shri Ashok Goyal replied that they all had been placed on the initial of the regular scale.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that interview of the teachers should only be conducted after following the complete procedure of scrutiny and screening. The date for the same should be fixed after completing the screening and scrutiny of the case. It had been noticed regarding one case where neither the screening nor the scrutiny had been done and it had been asked to the members of the Committee to sign in the office of the Registrar so that the interviews could be conducted. This is very arbitrary method.

18. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma congratulated the Vice Chancellor for the printing of diary in the month of January as every time it is being published in February. He said that the name of the dairy should be re-named as Directory-cum-Diary as it consists of 200 pages indicating there in the addresses and telephone numbers which is a repetition. He suggested that it should be simplified as it is very bulky and there is very less space for writing.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said the diary should be sent to the members of the Senate by post and they receive the same in the month of March. Therefore, it should be sent to them either by post or by hand.

19. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further said that in the schedule for the Senate Election for Graduate Constituency, the last date was fixed in the month February; it should be extended at least till 30th April.

On point of order, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said as already conveyed by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, in the previous term of the Senate when he and Dr. B.C. Josan was the member of the

Committee and improvements relating to bogus voting or voting at sensitive places, were recommended at that time. He is of the view that the persons who are contesting the elections can better contribute for the same, their contributions/suggestions could be beneficial for the timely preparation of electoral roll. Polling should be done in a right manner as it was done in the previous elections that voting was done in front of cameras and bogus voting was almost nil.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the Committee to be constituted for the purpose, the names of Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa should be included.

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

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the voting should be allowed only with the identity proof of the Election Commission of India.

Clarification given by the Vice Chancellor as well as statement made by Professor Keshav Malhotra shifted to Item 30.

20. Mrs. Surinder Kaur said that in most of the Colleges, the teachers are against the Principals as on the recommendations of the Inspection Committees, they appoint the teachers but their approvals are not being sent by the University.

It was said by the Dean College and Development Council that this would be taken care of.

Karamjeet Singh
Registrar

Confirmed

RAJ KUMAR
VICE-CHANCELLOR