

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the meeting of the **SENATE** held on **Saturday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2023 at 10.00 a.m.** at Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**PRESENT:**

1. Professor Renu Vig Vice Chancellor ... (in the chair)
2. Professor Akhtar Mahmood
3. Shri Amandeep Singh Bhatti, DHE, Chd.
4. Shri Amarpal Singh, IAS, DHE, Punjab
5. Dr. Amit Joshi
6. Professor Arun Grover
7. Professor Ashok Kumar
8. Dr. Balbir Chand Josan
9. Shri Davesh Moudgil
10. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
11. Professor Devinder Singh
12. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
13. Professor Gaurav Gaur
14. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi
15. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
16. Dr. Gurmit Singh
17. Dr. Harjodh Singh
18. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
19. Professor Hemant Batra
20. Shri Honey Thakur
21. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
22. Professor Jagat Bhushan
23. Shri Jagdeep Kumar
24. Dr. Jagdish Chander
25. Dr. Jagtar Singh
26. Dr. Jagwant Singh
27. Professor Jatinder Grover
28. Dr. Jatinder Kaur
29. Dr. Jayanti Dutta
30. Dr. K.K. Sharma
31. Dr. Kirandeep Kaur
32. Dr. Krishan Gauba
33. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk
34. Dr. Latika
35. Shri Manish Wayyer
36. Professor Mukesh Kumar Arora
37. Dr. N.R. Sharma
38. Shri Naresh Gaur
39. Dr. Neeru Malik
40. Dr. Neetu Ohri
41. Dr. Nidhi Gautam
42. Dr. Nisha Bhargava
43. Dr. Parveen Goyal
44. Shri Prabhjit Singh
45. Professor Prashant Gautam

46. Dr. Priyatosh Sharma
47. Professor Rajat Sandhir
48. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mahajan
49. Shri Ravinder Singh
50. Professor Ravi Inder Singh
51. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
52. Dr. Rupinder Kaur
53. Professor Rumina Sethi, DUI
54. Dr. Sandeep Kataria
55. Shri Sandeep Singh
56. Shri Satya Pal Jain
57. Professor Savita Gupta
58. Dr. Savita Kansal
59. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
60. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra
61. Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon
62. Professor Supinder Kaur
63. Professor Sonal Chawla
64. Professor Sukhbir Kaur
65. Professor S.K. Tomar
66. Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha
67. Professor Sushil Kansal
68. Shri Varinder Singh
69. Professor Y.P. Verma ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Sardar Amritpal Singh Sukhanand
2. Dr. Aruna Goel
3. Dr. Arvinder Singh Bhalla
4. S. Bhagwant Maan
5. Shri Dharam Pal Adviser CHD-UT
6. S. Harjot Singh Bains
7. Professor Harmohinder Singh Bedi
8. Shri Kapil Sharma
9. Smt. Kirron Kher
10. Dr. Kuldeep Agnihotri
11. Mr. Justice Ravi Shanker Jha
12. Sardar Ranbir Bhullar
13. Shri Sanjeev Kumar Bandlish
14. Shri Som Parkash
15. Dr. Suresh Kumar
16. Professor Yojna Rawat.

The Vice Chancellor said, "I take this opportunity of welcoming all the Members of this august House of Panjab University, Chandigarh and would like to wish a very Good Morning to the esteemed members of the Senate. I look forward to your valuable guidance for the growth of this historic University.

**I.** The Vice Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the members about the sad demise of Professor Virendra Mehndiratta, former Chairman, Department of Hindi, on 02.06.2023".

Dr. Jayanti Dutta suggested that the name of Dr. Mohan Maharishi, former Professor, Department of Indian Theatre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, who died on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2023, should also be included in the Condolence.

Dr. Jagdish Chander suggested that the death of father of Professor Ravi Inder Singh should also be condoled.

The Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Prof. Virendra Mehndiratta, Dr. Mohan Maharishi and father of Professor Ravi Inder Singh and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

**RESOLVED:** That a copy of resolution be sent to the members of the bereaved families.

**II.** The Vice Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the Hon'ble members of the Senate that Panjab University is leading by winning 26 Gold, 12 Silver and 20 Bronze medals in the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of Khelo India University Games.

Shri Prabhjit Singh stood up and said that he would like to say something on the Vice Chancellor's Statement. He pointed out that certain things are missing in the Vice Chancellor's Statement, which are very important. In fact, those things should have been in the Statement of the Vice Chancellor. Certain things had come to his notice through the social media, general public, etc. One of the issues is that the Punjab Government had sanctioned a sum of Rs.49 crore to the University for construction of a hostel.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University has not received any communication from the Government in this regard.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the official(s) of the University had gone and attended the meeting on Friday. If the University has not received any communication, it is very surprising.

The Vice Chancellor said that when official communication would be received, obviously, the same would be brought for the information of the House.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is talking about the sanction alone, which has been sanctioned by the Punjab Government. Meetings had been held at the level of Chief Minister and the official(s) of the University (Executive Engineer) had attended the meeting. At least, the House should be informed that a sum of Rs.49 crore has been sanctioned by the Punjab Government for construction of a hostel.

The Vice Chancellor said that no communication in this regard has yet been received.

Shri Prabhjit Singh pointed out that an hour's debate is coming in social media and National TV regarding affiliation being sought by the Haryana Government for the Colleges situated in the Districts of Panchkula, Ambala and Yamunanagar. Affiliation could not be decided by the Government as the same is the prerogative of the University.

He enquired as to what is stand of the University/Senate on this issue. Several things had been mentioned in the Calendar and who were earlier members of the Senate and how the members from Himachal Pradesh and Haryana were included in the Senate. He would not like to go into the details. But it should be made clear as to what is the stand of the Vice Chancellor, Syndicate and Senate on this issue, as it is a very important issue. If they wanted to bring it to the House as an agenda item, an item should be drafted and placed before the Senate after the lunch. If wished, the issue could be discussed right now, but it should not be allowed, because at the moment, the University is unable to manage the Colleges, which are already affiliated with it. Moreover, if they allowed the Haryana Government, tomorrow the Himachal Government might say that the Himachal Colleges situated in the nearby areas, should also be affiliated with Panjab University. Earlier, the Colleges situated in the State of Himachal Pradesh were also used to be affiliated with Panjab University. The things, which are being heard by them, perhaps, might not be in the knowledge of the Vice Chancellor. The Colleges situated in Andaman and Nicobar are affiliated with Pondicherry University, Pondicherry. About 4-5 years ago, they made a request to the University that its Colleges should be affiliated with Panjab University. A team was also sent without the knowledge of the Governing Body, which did the survey and recommended that the Colleges of Andaman and Nicobar should be given affiliation. When the matter went to the Government of India, the Government rejected the request stating that it is not within the jurisdiction of Panjab University. What is the use/advantage of Governing Body, if only promotion cases of teachers under CAS are to be placed before it and not the public issues? If they deliberately do not want to disclose/put before the Senate the public issues, it is very shocking. It is not her fault, but the fault of the office, which had not brought to the notice of the authorities as to what the jurisdiction of the University is. Jurisdiction is such an important issue that they could not get the Colleges situated in Mohali District affiliated with Panjab University as also the Colleges situated in nearby Districts, e.g., Ropar, Nawanshahr and Patiala, which are very close to Chandigarh. As such, they would oppose grant of affiliation to Haryana College tooth and nail. He requested that they have to make their stand clear on this critical issue. Meetings of Chief Ministers of both the States (Punjab and Haryana) are being held under the chairmanship of Governor, but those, who are supposed to grant affiliation, did not know anything about the issue. In the end, he said that he had just briefed the House, but before the meeting ends, a decision should be taken as to what are the views of other members on the issue as also the stand of the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that their stand is crystal clear that this is the University of Punjab and it would remain as such. Nobody could enter into the jurisdiction of Panjab University.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

The Vice Chancellor said that, as of now, there is no proposal from anybody. Whenever certain written documents are received, the same would be placed before the Senate. Hence, they should start with the agenda.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that whatever the Vice Chancellor has said is absolutely correct, but question is .....

The Vice Chancellor said that they had a long agenda at hand. Let they first take up the agenda items.

Shri Prabhjit Singh, seeking only a minute, said that the Haryana Government had itself got its Colleges disaffiliated from Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that, as of now, there is nothing on papers. She requested Shri Prabhjit Singh to be seated and let the House start with the agenda.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it meant, whatever is coming in the social media, debated on National TV and the meetings held by the Governments, is to be ignored.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is a difference between the discussion and a final concrete proposal.

At this stage, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stood up and the sentiments of the House should be conveyed.

The Vice Chancellor said that to get the sentiments of the members conveyed, she would send the list of members of the Senate to the Governor with the request that these members of the Senate would represent her. When Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua intervened, she would not go and send 2-3 members to attend the meeting(s) on her behalf. When Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua continued to argue, she requested Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua to sit down and let the House take up the agenda. There is a meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June, and they should decide as to who would represent the Panjab University.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a din got created.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is his request that the Vice Chancellor should attend the meeting and convey the sentiments of the members to them.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the issue of admission in about 200 affiliated Colleges is a very sensitive one and the teachers, Principals and persons belonging to managements are staging protest outside. He requested that their issue should be resolved first.

The Vice Chancellor said that, first, they would take up the agenda.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that everybody in Punjab, including teachers and students are crying. Moreover, the admissions of the Colleges are falling down badly.

Dr. Jagtar Singh stood up picking up a paper and said that this should not have been provided to them on the tables, but should have been included in the agenda.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that several teachers and Principals are protesting outside. In fact, the leadership of Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers' Union is protesting outside.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that since the representative of Punjab Government is present in the House, the issue should be discussed right now.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that if the admissions are made in the Colleges, only then the Colleges would be able to function.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar and Dr. Amit Joshi said that they as Senate reject the portal of Punjab Government and this should be conveyed to the Government.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

Dr. Jagtar Singh pointed out that it has come in the Statement of the Vice Chancellor that Panjab University has won 26 gold, 16 silver and 23 bronzes in Khelo India Games. The sportspersons are given the benefit by the Colleges as they are given admissions directly. If they made admissions through centralized portal, the sportspersons would not be able to take admission directly; rather, they would take admissions in private Universities.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that they should be allowed to make admissions as before and the Governments should not interfere in the admission process.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

When Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that could he speak on this issue, the Vice Chancellor said that their sentiments would be conveyed to the Government that the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University do not want to make admissions through the centralized portal of Punjab Government.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that all the teachers, Principals and persons belonging to managements of all the Colleges of Punjab, had come and are protesting outside.

The Vice Chancellor said that they at the most could talk only about the Colleges affiliated with Panjab University.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that they reject the decision of Punjab Government that the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab should make admissions through the centralized portal of Punjab Government.

When the members requested that the decision taken by the House should be read out, the Vice Chancellor said that this is the decision of the Governing Body that the Colleges affiliated with the Panjab University do not want to make admissions through the centralized portal of Punjab Government.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that now they should start with the agenda.

When the members again requested that the decision taken by the House should be read out, the Vice Chancellor said that they should themselves write down the decision and handover the same to the Registrar.

At this stage, the members entered into discussion/arguments with one another and a din got created.

Dr. Amit Joshi handed over the paper on which the decision written by the members themselves to the Registrar.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in Vice Chancellor's Statement at Sr. Nos. I, be noted.

**III.** **Item C-1** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

**C-1** To elect (by simple majority vote) a representative of the University as a member of the Dental Council of India, under Section 3(d) of the Dentists' Act, 1948.

**NOTE:** 1. Section 3(d) and 6(i) of the Dentists' Act reads under:

“3(d). One member from each University established by law in the States which grants a recognized dental qualification, to be elected by the members of the Senate of the University, or in case the University has no Senate, by the members of the Court, from amongst the members of the Dental Faculty of the University or in case the University has no Dental Faculty, from amongst the members of the Medical Faculty thereof.

6(i). Subject to the provisions of this section an elected or nominated member shall hold office for a term of five years from the date of his election or nomination or until his successor has been duly elected or nominated, whichever is longer.”

2. The term of present member, Dr. Jagat Bhushan, representing the University on the Dental Council of India, is already over on 26.05.2023.
3. A letter dated 19.5.2023 (**Appendix-I**) has been sent to the members (through e-mail) of the Medical Faculties to send the nomination on or before 28.5.2023 upto 1.00 p.m.
4. Valid nomination of only Professor (Dr.) Jagat Bhushan, Former Principal, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, has been received within the stipulated date.

After some discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That Professor (Dr.) Jagat Bhushan, Former Principal, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, be declared unopposed elected a representative of the University as a member of the Dental Council of India, under Section 3(d) of the Dentists' Act, 1948.

**IV.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-2 and C-3** on the agenda were read out and unanimously approve, i.e. -

**C-2.** That Dr. Ramesh Sahni, Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) w.e.f. 16.04.2017 instead of 06.06.2017, under UGC Regulations, 2010 (4<sup>th</sup> Amendment).

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para15)**

**C-3.** That Dr. Anil Kumar, Assistant Professor, UIET, be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) w.e.f. 01.03.2017 instead of 28.02.2017, under UGC Regulations, 2010 (4<sup>th</sup> Amendment).

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para19)**

**V.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-4** on the agenda were read out, viz. -

**C-4.** That Dr. Bhupinder Singh be promoted w.e.f. 18.05.2016 from Assistant Professor in Punjabi (Stage-3) to Associate Professor in Punjabi (Stage-4) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to third amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The office orders of promotion of Dr. Bhupinder Singh have been issued in anticipation of approval of Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 22)**

Professor Akhtar Mahmood enquired, why it has been delayed for so long and who are responsible for the delay. He pleaded that the persons responsible for the delay should be identified, their names should be disclosed and strict action should be taken against them.

Dr. Supinder Kaur said that all the promotions/selections should be processed and made in a time bound manner.



The Vice Chancellor said that when she took over as Vice Chancellor, the files along with minutes of the meeting were lying in the almirahs of the SVC, and they brought them as agenda items to the Syndicate.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the responsibility of the person should be fixed.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he appreciated the Vice Chancellor, but such type of incidents should not be happened in future.

Dr. Jayanti Dutta requested to Vice Chancellor that all the CAS promotions should be processed immediately and the process should be completed within stipulated period, so that the promotees could get promotions from the date their promotion is due. None of the cases should be delayed under any circumstances.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-4 on the agenda**, be approved.

**VI.** Considered the following Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) promotion cases **(Item C-5 on the agenda):**

(i) That Ms. Ravinder Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor in English (**Academic level 10**) to Assistant Professor in English (**Senior Scale/Academic level 11**) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 30.05.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/- , at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the grade/ score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(ii))**

(ii) That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Academic Level 10**) to Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), w.e.f. from the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11)</b>
1.	Mr. Jaswinder Singh	UIH&TM	24.07.2021
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(lvi))</b>			
2.	Dr. Nitin Raj	Community Education & Disability Studies	18.09.2021
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxxv))</b>			

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the grade/ score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letters have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(iii)** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Academic Level 10)** to Assistant Professor **(Senior Scale/Academic Level 11)**, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2018), w.e.f. from the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/- , at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11)</b>
1.	Ms. Nidhi Singhal	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology	12.07.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xlvi))</b>			
2.	Dr. Harjit Kaur	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology	02.06.2019

Sr. No.	Name	Department	Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11)
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2 (xlvii))</b>			

- NOTE:** 1. The Committee felt that the grade/ score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
3. The appointment letter have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(iv)** That the following persons have been promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level-11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level-12**) under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) with effect from the dates mentioned against each in the pay-scale of Rs. 1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

Sr. No.	Name	Department	Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12)
1.	Dr. Anish Slath	UIH&TM	15.10.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(lv))</b>			
2.	Dr. Manu Sharma	UIAMS	12.09.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xlii))</b>			
3.	Dr. Arunachal Khosla	UIAMS	21.07.2019
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xliii))</b>			
4.	Dr. Aman Khera	UIAMS	21.09.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xliv))</b>			
5.	Dr. Kalpana Thakur	IET&VE	14.09.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxxvi))</b>			
6.	Dr. Amritpal Kaur	IET&VE	16.09.2021
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxxviii))</b>			
7.	Dr. Puja Ahuja	IET&VE	01.10.2020

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12)</b>
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxxix))</b>			
8.	Dr. Kuldeep Singh	Centre for Police Administration	24.12.2019
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxxi))</b>			
9.	Dr. Anupam Bahri (Assistant Professor in Sociology)	UILS	19.10.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxxiii))</b>			

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the Grade/ score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letters have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

(v) That the following persons have been promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level-11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level-12**) at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib, with effect from the dates mentioned against each in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12)</b>
1.	Dr. Angrej Singh Gill Assistant Professor in Economics	30.08.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(x))</b>		
2.	Dr. Rajneesh Assistant Professor in Sociology	28.07.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxxii))</b>		

- NOTE:**1. The Committee felt that the Grade/ score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letters have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(vi)** That Ms. Seema Sood be promoted from Assistant Librarian (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Librarian (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh w.e.f. 08.10.2020 in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/- ,under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (18.07.2018), in the pay-scale of under UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2018, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:** 1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xiii))**

**(vii)** That Dr. Rajnish Saryal be promoted from Assistant Professor in Political Science (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor in Political Science (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at Panjab University, Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 12.09.2020**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:** 1. The Committee felt that the grade/ score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxv))**

- (viii)** That Dr. Vishwa Bandhu Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Senior Scale/Academic Level 11)** to Assistant Professor **(Selection Grade/Academic Level 12)** in the Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 19.03.2022**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxvi))**

- (ix)** That Dr. Ashu Pasricha be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Selection Grade/Academic Level-12)** to Associate Professor **(Academic Level-13A)** in the Department of Gandhian and Peace Studies, Panjab University Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 21.06.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xix))**

- (x)** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Selection Grade/Academic Level-12)** to Associate Professor **(Academic Level-13A)** under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) ) w.e.f. the date mentioned against each in the in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of

Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level-12) to Associate Professor (Selection Grade/ Academic Level-13A)</b>
1.	Dr. Jagandeep Singh	UIAMS	21.07.2021
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(i))</b>			
2.	Dr. Nidhi Gautam	UIAMS	19.12.2021
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(liii))</b>			
3.	Dr. Jaskaran Singh Waraich	Defence & National Security Studies	04.01.2021
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xv))</b>			
4.	Dr. Rajesh Kumar Chander	Women Studies & Development	08.11.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxviii))</b>			
5.	Dr. Ameer Sultana	Women Studies & Development	10.11.2019
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxix))</b>			

- NOTE:** 1. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
3. The appointment letters had been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(xi)** That the following persons be promoted from Deputy Librarian (**Academic Level-12**) to Deputy Librarian (**Academic Level-13 A**) with effect from the dates mentioned against each in the pay-scale of Rs. 1,31,400-2,17,100/- under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) 2018, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date of Promotion from Deputy Librarian (Academic Level-12) to Deputy Librarian (Academic Level-13 A)</b>
1.	Dr. Neeru Bhatia	A.C. Joshi Library	01.01.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xviii))</b>			
2.	Dr. Neeraj Kumar	A.C. Joshi Library	16.03.2021
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xvi))</b>			

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letters have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(xii)** That the following persons have been promoted from Assistant Professor (**Academic Level-12**) to Associate Professor (**Academic Level-13 A**) with effect from the dates mentioned against each in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/- under the U.G.C. Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level-12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level-13 A)</b>
1.	Dr. Harpreet Kaur Vohra nee Sophia Alphonse	PURC, Ludhiana (English)	11.07.2019
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(iv))</b>			
2.	Dr. Akwinder Kaur Tanvi	School of Punjabi Studies (Lexicography)	18.07.2019
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(vi))</b>			
3.	Dr. Simran Kaur	DES-MDRC (Economics)	24.11.2021
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(vii))</b>			
4.	Dr. Kuljeet Kaur Brar	USOL (Education)	21.12.2018



Sr. No.	Name	Department	Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level-12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level-13 A)
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xl))</b>			

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the Grade/ score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letters have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(xiii)** That Dr. Madhu Bansal be promoted from Assistant Librarian **(Selection Grade/Academic Level-12)** to Deputy Librarian **(Academic Level-13A)** in the Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2018, **w.e.f. 13.03.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letters have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xvii))**

**(xiv)** That the following persons be promoted from Associate Professor **(Academic Level 13 A)** to Professor **(Academic Level 14)** under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) with effect from the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs. 1,44,200-2,18,200/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University. The Post would be personal to the incumbent and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date of Promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 13-A) to Associate Professor (Academic Level-14)</b>
1.	Dr. Namita Gupta	Centre for Human Rights & Duties	14.08.2022
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxi))</b>			
2.	Dr. Navreet	Public Administration	03.11.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxx))</b>			
3.	Dr. Tejinder Pal Singh	UBS	16.11.2020
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(li))</b>			
4.	Dr. Gurmeet Singh	Hindi	27.07.2022
<b>(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(v))</b>			

**NOTE:** 1. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2. The appointment letters have been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(xv)** That Dr. Rakesh Malik be promoted from University Deputy Director Physical Education & Sports (**Academic Level 13 A**) to University Deputy Director Physical Education & Sports (**Academic Level 14**) at Directorate of Sports, Panjab University Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 20.03.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

**NOTE:** 1. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xli))**

**(xvi)** That Dr. Pankaj Srivastava be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Philosophy, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 29.05.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of

Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxiii))**

**(xvii)** That Dr. Gaurav Gaur be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-1)** to Assistant Professor **(Stage-2)** at Centre for Social Work, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 17.08.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxxiv))**

**(xviii)** That Dr. Meenu be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-1)** to Assistant Professor **(Stage-2)** in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4<sup>th</sup> amendment 2016), **w.e.f. 22.11.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the (4<sup>th</sup> amendment) of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xi))**

**(xix)** That Dr. Kanwalpreet Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-1)** to Assistant Professor **(Stage-2)** at Institute of Educational Technology and Vocational Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 01.08.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxxvii))**

**(xx)** That Dr. Arun Singh Thakur be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-1)** to Assistant Professor **(Stage-2)** at University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 28.05.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xlviii))**

**(xxi)** That Dr. Rajesh Kumar Mishra be promoted from Assistant Professor in English **(Stage-2)** to Assistant Professor in English **(Stage-3)** at Panjab University, Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment), **w.e.f. 10.11.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 8000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(ii))**

**(xxii)** That Dr. Smita Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-2)** to Assistant Professor **(Stage-3)** in the Department of Economics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4<sup>th</sup> Amendment 2016), **w.e.f. 18.11.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800 -2,11,500, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xii))**

**(xxiii)** That Ms. Mona Pall be promoted from Assistant Librarian **(Stage-2)** to Assistant Librarian **(Stage-3)** at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (4<sup>th</sup> amendment 2016), **w.e.f. 11.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xiv))**

**(xxiv)** That Dr. Navdeep Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-2)** to Assistant Professor **(Stage-3)** in the Department of Indian Theatre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2010, **w.e.f. 14.08.2016**, in the pay-scale of

Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the fourth amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(liv))**

**(xxv)** That Dr. Monica Bansal be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-2)** to Assistant Professor **(Stage-3)** at Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (4<sup>th</sup> amendment 2016), **w.e.f. 23.08.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xlv))**

**(xxvi)** That Dr. Meenu Saihjpal be promoted from Assistant Professor in Economics **(Stage-3)** to Associate Professor in Economics **(Stage-4)** at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 10.03.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment, 2016 of UGC Regulations, 2010.

3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(viii))**

**(xxvi)** That Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi be promoted from Assistant Professor in Economics **(Stage-3)** to Associate Professor in Economics **(Stage-4)** at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4<sup>th</sup> amendment), **w.e.f. 08.04.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the (4<sup>th</sup> amendment) of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(ix))**

**(xxvii)** That Dr. Manish Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-3)** to Associate Professor **(Stage-4)** in the Department of Gandhian and Peace Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4<sup>th</sup> amendment 2016), **w.e.f. 03.11.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the (4<sup>th</sup> amendment) of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xx))**

**(xxix)** That Dr. Nisha Jain be promoted from Assistant Professor in Political Science **(Stage-3)** to Associate Professor in Political Science **(Stage-4)** at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 27.03.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37,400-67,000 + AGP Rs.9000, at a starting pay to be fixed

under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxiv))**

**(xxx)** That Sh. Shashi Kapoor be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-3)** to Associate Professor **(Stage-4)** at University Business School, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 1.07.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(lii))**

**(xxxi)** That Dr. Ashish Saihjpal be promoted from Assistant Professor **(Stage-3)** to Associate Professor **(Stage-4)** at University Business School, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 17.07.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xlix))**



(xxxii) That Dr. Amandeep be promoted from Associate Professor in English **(Stage-4)** to Professor in English **(Stage-5)** in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4<sup>th</sup> Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 04.07.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment, 2016 of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(iii))**

(xxxiii) That Dr. Shivani Sharma be promoted from Associate Professor **(Stage-4)** to Professor **(Stage-5)** in the Department of Philosophy, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment), **w.e.f. 28.12.2014** (subject to decision of CWP No.17953 of 2005), in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10000, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
  2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.
  3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxii))**

(xxxiv) That Dr. Roshan Lal be promoted from Associate Professor **(Stage-4)** to Professor **(Stage-5)** in the Department of Psychology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 31.05.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2010.
3. The appointment letter has been issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 2(xxvii))**

Dr. Parveen Goyal, referring to page XI of the agenda, pointed out that there is a mistake in the item relating to promotion case of teachers under Item xiv (date of promotion from Assistant Associate Professor to Professor. In fact, it should be “Date of promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13-A) to Professor (Academic Level-14)”. Professor Gurmeet Singh had already pointed out this mistake to the Deputy Registrar (Estt.) that this is a clerical mistake. Perhaps, Deputy Registrar (Estt.) has not taken it seriously. He requested that the Deputy Registrar (Estt.) should be asked to take it seriously and make necessary correction.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-5 on the agenda**, be approved.

**VII.** The recommendation of the syndicate contained in **Item C-6 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-6.** That Dr. Bhupinder Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi, USOL, P.U., be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage 3) to Associate Professor (Stage 4) w.e.f. 17.09.2014 under UGC Regulation (2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment) (as recommended by the Pre-Screening Committee), after counting of his previous service, and the letter of promotion be issued to him in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**NOTE:** That, in future, whenever the promotions of teachers, under Career Advancement Scheme of the UGC, are approved by the Syndicate, the letter of promotion should be issued in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 35)**

**VIII.** Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 27.12.2022 (**Item C-7 on the agenda – Appendix-II**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the confirmation case of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital.

**NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 08.01.2022 Para XV(R-5) (**Appendix-II**) had resolved as under:

“the confirmation of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor in Orthodontics, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital (Sub-Item R-5), be not ratified and his case of confirmation be reviewed”.

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

Dr. Jagwant Singh stated that the Committee Report spoke volume as to what is happening here. While recommending, the Committee is of the opinion that the concerned officials of Panjab University did not pursue the case on merit and was not presented well. The opinion of the Senior Law Officer, Panjab University, was not taken into consideration on time, which leads to awarding the benefit to the petitioner in the said case. In this case, if they go through the other documents, at one place it has been clearly mentioned that the candidate was not even eligible on that day. If the eligibility of the candidate was under question, it needed to be seen as to who appeared in the interview, what were his credentials, and what was his eligibility, should have also been taken into consideration. If the candidate was not eligible, how he was appointed? Maybe, no other candidate was available and they appointed him on contract basis, and if an ineligible candidate, who should have not been selected, even on *ad hoc* basis, finally gets confirmed in the University, is very strange. And if this is the one, there could be some other cases also. They have to confirm them also. Where is the responsibility that the legal position taken by the office of the Registrar through Senior Law Officer and the Advocates in the Court did not defended it properly. This complaint is continuously emerging that their representative(s)/ counsel(s) did not defend their cases in the court properly. In this case, unless they bring those documents on tables, he could not express his considered opinion. However, he still believed that this might not have gone against the University, because the case is not represented well. There might be some corrective action still possible as per law. If that was possible, they should not lost that. And for that they need to know what was the eligibility, what was the advertisement, how many candidates had appeared and why they could not defend the case in the Court? Without going into that they should not be approving the confirmation.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that the case should be properly studied and for the time being the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that in the case of Professor Deepak Gupta, the post was advertised on regular basis on March 2012 and he appeared in the interview on June 2012. The result was declared on February 2013 and Professor Deepak Gupta joined the Dental Institute of Sciences as a Professor on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2013. On 27<sup>th</sup> November 2013, an another appointment letter was issued to him in continuation of letter of 14<sup>th</sup> March 2013 with a probation period of one year on regular basis, in anticipation of the approval of the Senate. The decision taken in the meeting of the Senate dated 8<sup>th</sup> December 2013 came on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2014, in which the post was declined and it was said that this post is on contract basis and not on regular basis. In July 2014, Professor Deepak Gupta approached the Court and the stay was granted to him in the first hearing. From 14<sup>th</sup> March 2013, Professor Deepak Gupta is continuously serving in the Dental Institute. The case went in the Court continuously and was decided in favour of the petitioner on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2019, stating that the petitioner is right and all the benefits should be given to him from his joining. In September 2019, the Panjab University had also issued a compliance order stating that all the benefits should be given to Professor Deepak Gupta in accordance with the Court orders and the decision of the Senate was also quashed by the Court on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2019. Today, he would only like to say that Professor Deepak Gupta should be confirmed on his post as everything has been examined by the High Court.

Dr. Supinder Kaur said that Professor Deepak Gupta should be confirmed on his post. Since the entire process has been followed and the decision of the Court is also in his favour, how the Committee could challenge it?

At this stage, certain persons started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired, had they checked his eligibility for the post when he appeared in the interview? He said that sometime the University did not plead the case properly. If they had papers, which vouch for confirmation of Professor Deepak Gupta, the same should be shown.

Professor Jatinder Grover remarked that the Advocates/Lawyers appointed by the University did not defend the cases properly in the Courts. Moreover, they are doubting on their own House. Secondly, they are trying to flout the orders of the Court.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he also agreed with Shri Varinder Singh that majority of their Advocates did not defend the cases of the University properly and lose the cases.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that none should suffer owing to Court case. The High Court has given the decision, they should implement the same.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the appointment letter issued to Professor Deepak Gupta should be shown to them.

As several members started speaking together, the Vice Chancellor requested the members to speak one by one.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood pointed out that a note had been given under the item, "The Senate in its meeting dated 08.01.2022, Para XV(R-5) (Appendix) had resolved that the confirmation of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor in Orthodontics, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences (Sub-Item R-5), be not ratified....". He enquired as to what is the difference between then and now. What new development(s) in the case had taken place?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he is not saying anything for and against in this issue. His only concern is on point of order. The acts of Lawyers are being evaluated in this House, which is a very sad part. They are making such decisions before reading the file(s). When they did have their own Law Officer(s) and given their replies in the Court, nobody could go beyond those words/submissions. So, it is the duty of the University to send their own Law Officer and just raising these issues in a vague manner(s) that the Lawyers are not defending the University properly, is very wrong and a wrong practice. The Judge has to give a decision, which could be in their favour or against.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that he had given his opinion keeping in view the recommendation(s) of the Committee on the basis of which the decision had been taken. The Committee has pointed out in its minutes as to where and what mistake had taken place. The opinion of the Senior Law Officer has also been specified. Now, only thing which left to be seen is whether the incumbent was eligible for the post or not. If he was not eligible, the question of confirmation did not arise.

Dr. Supinder Kaur enquired, how could the Committee give its recommendation(s) after the decision of the Court?

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that he would like to make two points. First of all, it is a separate issue – whether the case has been defended by the Advocates properly or not. He would like to draw the attention of the House towards pages 297 and 298, wherein under paragraph 48, the Judge had concluded, "As a result of the above

discussion/observations and conclusions and in the peculiar circumstances of the case, the writ petition is allowed in following terms:

- a. The Senate's impugned resolution dated 08.12.2013 (Annexure P/11), pursuant to recommendation of Syndicate contained in item C-6 on the agenda, is quashed to the extent of its contents showing that the petitioner's appointment is on contract basis;
- b. The impugned letter/order dated 25.02.2014 (Annexure P/8), issued by respondent No.1 is also quashed to extent of its content showing that the petitioner's appointment is on contract basis;
- c. Respondent No.1 is directed to give/allow to the petitioner all consequential benefits flowing from the directions given at (a) and (b) above by treating the appointment of petitioner as regular."

The orders had been passed by the Court on February 07, 2019, i.e., more than four years ago. The people, who at that time had been managing the affairs of the University, had the option to file an appeal. There is a limitation of 30 days, within which an appeal could be filed. If there were certain things, which were not in the notice of the Judge or certain people had given sweeping statement(s) that the Lawyers of the University did not defend the case properly, the University could have filed the appeal. The Panjab University did not choose to file an appeal till date. Though the limitation is 30 days, they had crossed 30 months. Secondly, he would like to make an appeal to the Hon'ble members that it is a sweeping statement that the Lawyers of the University did not defend the case(s) properly. He had earlier also suggested that they should form a Legal Affairs Committee comprising of 5-6 persons having legal background, which should monitor and regulate each and every case. If the concerned officials of the University did not go to the office of the Lawyer with file, did not give para-wise comments and did not file the reply within the stipulated time, the Lawyer did not have magic to file appropriate reply to win the case. Citing an example, he said that a teacher taught the class, but the students did not secured equal marks but different. Is the teacher incompetent? Hence, they should not doubt the ability of the Lawyer(s) on the basis of success rate. Yes, he agreed that sometime, carelessness took place. He, therefore, suggested that a Legal Affairs Committee comprising of 5-6 persons having legal background should be constituted to monitor and regulate each and every case. If they go through paragraph 47 of the orders of the Court, they would be able to see as to what had been argued by the Lawyers and what not, but to make comments without looking into these things, is not in the interest of anyone. At the moment, they had no choice/option, but to comply with the orders of the Court. And if they violated these orders, the person could go against them for contempt.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that, as pointed out by Shri Satya Pal Jain, the limitation period of 30 days is already over. Hence, they could not choose that they would not implement the orders of the Court. Secondly, the item itself has been framed in a very wrong manner, and it should have come as a confirmation case. Earlier, when this case had come for ratification, the Senate had rejected it. Lastly, he would like to say that the Committee at page 277 has written, "...the Committee observed that while presenting the case before the Hon'ble Punjab and High Court, the concerned official/s of Panjab University did not pursue the case on merits and was not presented well...". This is something really shocking for him. Are they evaluating the performance of the Court as well as the Advocate(s)? Whatever they wanted to say, they should have sent much earlier. If they started evaluating/analyzing every judgement, the University would

be in trouble because these would become public documents in future. Being a law student, he is not in favour of such statements, which are coming from the Committees these days. They had just criticized without citing anything potential. They should have quoted the particular fact(s). They had just used the word 'merit', but they had not told as to which merit they are talking about. There is no reasoning. They should have pointed out the deficiencies/shortcomings along with the documentary proof. His only concern is that when they talked about merit, they should have written as to which merit they are talking about and what are other shortcomings/deficiencies. Why they had written only half paragraph? They should have prepared a 10-page report stating that these were the deficiencies/shortcomings in placing the matter before the Court, so that everybody knew as to what has not been placed before the Court.

Shri Satya Pal Jain enquired, had they a copy of the judgement with them?

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that item should be reframed and Professor Deepak Kumar Gupta should be confirmed on his post. Otherwise, if they approved the recommendation(s) of the Committee, it would not be known as to what they are approving. Otherwise, as said by Professor Akhtar Mahmood, it is not clear as to what they are approving.

As this stage, several members started speaking together and a din got created.

Professor Hemant Batra said that since it has been said that the Committee did not see all these things, let him clarified that the committee has examined all these things. To say, why it has not been mentioned in the report of the Committee, the Committee very clearly asked the Establishment Branch and the establishment Branch told that the appointment letter very clearly says that the appointment of Professor Deepak Kumar Gupta was on contract basis for one year. Did they have any right to change the appointment from contract to regular basis? The letter, which had been given to Professor Gupta, clearly says that his terms and conditions would be explained to him later and on this basis the petitioner went to the Court. Second thing is, if they read the Court orders, his plea is the Service Book. How could they prepare the Service Book of a person, who is not confirmed? They could see the date of confirmation from both the records. These are the true facts, which he is giving to them. If they wished, he could provide the original Service Book. They should not unnecessarily muffle the words which had been presented to them. These were the things, which were presented at that time, but not presented before the Court by their Senior Law Officer.

Shri Satya Pal Jain pointed out that if they see page 297, they would find that the Judge has dealt with the point and written, "that the petitioner's appointment was on contract basis. Consequently, I also hold that the impugned letter/order dated 25.02.2014 (Annexure P/8), issued by respondent, to the extent of its contents showing that the petitioner's appointment was on contract basis, is bad in law and therefore, the consequential re-advertisement of the post held by petitioner is equally bad in law". As such, this point has been dealt with by the single Judge.

Professor Hemant Batra said that the Senior Law Officer presented this to the Registrar and the Registrar was given two options ('X' and 'Y') – whether it is to be presented in accordance with the petition, whereas the Syndicate and Senate had rejected this case earlier. When the Syndicate and Senate had rejected it, how could they take it without placing the same before the Syndicate and Senate? How could the Registrar take decision on it himself? That was what, the Committee asked?

On a point of order, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that it was not rejected by the Syndicate and declined by the Senate in 2014. An online meeting of the Senate was held on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2022, in which none was given an opportunity to speak and the matter had gone for review.

Professor Arun Kumar Grover stated that he would like to plead to the House that more than a decade has passed since initial start of the process to seek faculty for a new Dental Institute, which needed continuous approvals from the Dental Council of India. His predecessor had advertised the positions and everything is available in the record. It would be clear to anyone, who has patience to read through all this, that the University at no stage hidden anything from the Governing Body. Everything has been described as to under what circumstances a post on regular basis was advertised and when no suitable candidate was found, then considering the very special circumstances pertaining to a new Institution, the then Vice Chancellor and the members of the Selection Committee made certain recommendations. His predecessor had done all these things two months before he (Professor Grover) arrived, and he arrived on 23<sup>rd</sup> of July 2012, but all this happened in the month of June 2012. All this had been done in the interest of new Institution of the University by the then Vice Chancellor and the then Selection Committee. He had put up a note and took it to the Syndicate and Senate and everything had been described there as to how regular position was offered on a contract basis for a period of one year, and later on, extended for six months and how the appointment was converted to regular basis, etc., etc. Very long time has passed. They have to first consider these things from these points of view, because this Professor of Orthodontics has been serving in this institute for the last 11 years and performing his duties. In that context, when the very first time his case came, so many things were discussed. There are so many people in this institution, who are continuing on contract basis for the last so many years though they were appointed only for one year, and in this manner decades have passed. All these things would not stand in the scrutiny of law and the Governing Bodies of this Institution would come under serious review of the public as to what they are doing on behalf of public funds. Had this been happened in any other public institution, it could happen only in Panjab University, because they are an autonomous body and had a certain ways of governance, which had been continuing for longer than for any other governing body/institution. They are the only institution, which is still governed by the provisions of Universities Act, 1904. The bodies of the University are constituted in a certain manner and these bodies functioned under autonomy. Governing body people are functioning following certain traditions. It is not that they had any ill-will against anyone or the institution of which they are members of a governing body, but they had a very unique situation in which things are continued to revolve. At this juncture, he would like to recommend that the matter should be considered from this person's point of view and the Institution's point of view. He is a Professor of Orthodontics at the Institute. Somebody has acted as Professor of Orthodontics competently and they had also no complaint as well as the students or the public at large that he has not performed his duties as a Professor of Orthodontics in a proper manner. So in view of this and taking everything into consideration, they should go by what the Judge has pronounced and put his case to rest, and confirm him as a Professor of Orthodontics and also take into cognizance the fact that they have more than 100 faculty members at this University, who are continuing on *ad hoc* basis for so long. Their cases have also to be considered appropriately protecting their interests as well as the Institution's interest to which they are serving. They should also take lessons from it and must resolve today and put a time frame as to how they would handle so many cases, which are continuing on behalf of this University – Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, University Institute of Legal Studies, University Institute of Engineering & Technology and so many newer institutions, which they established in the wake of newer

offer that they would remain to the Panjab University after 2008. They had enhanced the sanctioned strength of the University by several hundred, but they have not been able to fill them up. Today, the situation is such that the number regular faculty members in the University have gone 50% down. Hence, they needed to take a call as to how they could have more faculty on regular basis and should not take a narrow view of this thing. Something erroneous had happened at one stage and they should go back and rectify it. He personally recommended that Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor of Orthodontics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, should be confirmed

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that he had seen the judgement of the Court and para 26 of the judgement says, "There are also other reasons for holding. The whole of the Selection Committee has confined to determine the eligibility, suitability and selection of candidate for appointment as per the requirement in the advertisement and recommending them to the employment. The Selection Committee having found the petitioner eligible and suitable had selected him for the post and simply has to recommend his name to the prospective employer for appointment. If the Selection Committee could not assume the larger and higher function of appointment Committee, authority to suggest change for appointment of the candidate on contract basis, even though the process of selection was for appointment on regular basis. The perusal of the minutes of the Selection Committee also reflects that it is nowhere stated that the petitioner was not suitable for the post so advertised. The Selection Committee after having found him suitable and eligible as per the advertisement and having found him fit for appointment after interview, if at all, it has recommended that the petitioner be appointed on contract basis, and in such case, the same would be liable to be questioned on the ground that the Selection Committee clearly introduced its role and functions and took upon itself the task for appointment authority. As such, all points had been dealt with.

Professor Krishan Gauba said that one thing is very clear about it. No doubt, the post was advertised on regular basis, but the Selection Committee appointed him on contract basis. Secondly, at no point of time, the Syndicate and Senate had ever approved his appointment on regular basis. Hence, from that angle, the question of confirmation does not arise. The only thing is that the University legal authority somehow could not put up the case in the Court properly, and the Court has ordered. That meant, for all appointments and confirmations of such like cases, the Court would decide and not the University authorities, which is really disturbing. He felt that the whole House should relook into it, and if possible, as has already been recommended by the Committee and even Professor Hemant Batra and former Vice Chancellor, Professor Arun K. Grover, had also explained very explicitly, the University Syndicate and Senate are supreme bodies so far as appointments are concerned. Hence, they should go to the Court to get the case reviewed and he should not be confirmed until he is appointed on regular basis.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that this is contradictory to the report, which they had given. Interestingly, the Committee in the very first line said that the Committee is of the opinion that confirmation of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta be done as per the orders of the Hon'ble High Court. Later on, they have given the observations of the Committee. He did not know whether they are supposed to accept this or not. In case, the recommendation(s) of the Committee is/are accepted, Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta would get confirmed automatically.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that Professor Krishan Gauba had just now expressed his views and the others had also expressed their viewpoints. Now, there is simply one question only – do they have time frame or the case has already been decided by the



Court? The legal luminaries and legal experts could say whether they could make an appeal or not. The other queries could be settled down, but if they wanted to improve the system, because it was the duty of the concerned official(s) to put the case before the Syndicate and Senate at that time. The case had been lingering for the last so many years. Today, there is only one question before them, whether they could go against this judgement or not. If yes, they should go for it, and if no, they should accept it. In future, they should take corrective measures.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired, is it possible for them to go against a judgement of the Court, which had been delivered by the Court four years ago. Why are they discussing the issue, if they could not do anything?

The Vice Chancellor said that so, they accept the judgement of the Court. At the same time, they needed to strengthen their legal system.

Shri Varinder Singh said that, as said by Shri Satya Pal Jain, it is true that they could not go against the decision of the Court, but it should be clarified that as Professor Deepak Kumar Gupta is being confirmed today, would his seniority be considered from today only or from the back date.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the seniority of Professor Deepak Kumar would be considered from 14<sup>th</sup> March 2014.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if the seniority of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta is to be determined from the back date, then there are several cases in which people had got confirmed with the orders of the Court, and one such case is of Dr. Khushpreet.

The Vice Chancellor said that so far as seniority is concerned, they would take legal opinion.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the seniority is always determined from the date the person completes the probation period.

Shri Varinder Singh said that everybody knew that the selection of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta has been done wrongly. The members of the Selection Committee themselves are saying that the selection has been done wrongly. As said by Principal R.S. Jhanji that there is a problem in the system, and if there is a problem in the system and the University lawyers did not plead the cases in the Court properly, how could they confirm a person, who had been appointed on contract basis?

On a point of order, Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he objected to this. If somebody is saying something about the professional conduct of the lawyers, which is totally wrong.

At this stage, Shri Varinder Singh and Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stood up and started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that nobody could object like this.

Shri Varinder Singh said that today, they are facing only one problem that they could not approach the Court.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that is he (Shri Varinder Singh) above the law of the land.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the selection of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta has wrongly been done.

The Vice Chancellor requested both Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa and Shri Varinder Singh to sit down.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could not go against the orders of the Court.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, be confirmed on his post from the due date.

**Items C-8, Item C-11 and C-28 were taken up together.**

**IX.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in Items **C-8 and C-11** on the agenda were read out, viz. –

**C-8.** That the U.G.C. guidelines for Curriculum and Credit Framework for Under graduate Programmes aligned with NEP-2020, be adopted/approved from the academic session 2023-24.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022 Para17)**

**C-11.** That the Regulations for 4-Year Undergraduate Honours Programmes, under NEP, 2020 framework, to be introduced at the Panjab University Campus and Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, for the following Programmes effective from the academic session 2023-24, be approved:

1. B.A. Honours
2. B.Sc. Honours
3. B.Sc. Honours (Under Honours School Framework)
4. B.Com. Honours
5. B.B.A. Honours
6. B.C.A. Honours.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023 Para 16)**

**C-28.** That the Regulations for following 4-year Undergraduate Honours Programmes, under NEP, 2020 framework to be introduced from the academic session 2023-24, be approved:

1. B.Sc. Honours (Home Science)
2. B.Sc. Honours (Dairying and Animal Husbandry and Agriculture) for Colleges affiliated to Panjab University
3. B.A. Honours in Economics at Panjab University Campus
4. B.Sc. Honours in Fashion Designing.

**(Syndicate dated 27.05.2023 Para 15)**

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he would like to request the House that they should pass a one-line resolution because they all drafted all these Regulations in a hurried manner, even though they worked very hard. He requested the House that authority should be given to the Vice Chancellor that in case of any typographical error or some mistake is there in calculating some credits, that may be done at the level of the Vice Chancellor, rather than bringing it back to the House. In case, it is resolved, it would be better. He requested that the Vice Chancellor may be authorized to make only typographical changes.

Principal R.S. Jhanji asked whether this is the adoption of NEP from the session 2023-24.

It was replied that the adoption of NEP-2020 would come under Item C-11.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they have started U.G.C. Regulations and guidelines as per their suitability. In some cases, they preferred to adopt in toto and whereas in other they made additions or deletions. The document relating to Item C-8 has come from the Syndicate to the Senate for approval. Under this item, they are approving the adoption of NEP-2020. Their cognizance on item C-8 is that the Committee formed for the purpose, had worked very hard. The persons/Faculty which were associated with adoption of NEP-2020 had given valuable inputs but it should also be agreed that as on date the exact framework is ready. Since this item was placed in the meetings of the Syndicate on 25.03.2023, 23.04.2023 and 27.05.2023, he and Principal R.S. Jhanji had consistent stand, that this policy should be implemented in phased manner. As per Vice Chancellor's opinion, she is saying that this policy is adopted and implemented for the Colleges, but they are not listening to the view points of the College representatives. If this policy can function with this frame work in the University, it should be implemented in University. They are saying that they had procured the data of the courses from all the Colleges, could they assure that with the adoption of this policy, services of any teacher would be retrenched. If this issue was debated, the controversy which took place in Punjabi, would never prevail. He reiterated that the Colleges are not against this policy, but no admission guidelines have been provided so far whereas the admissions have been started from 15<sup>th</sup> of May. They could not tell the students that in which course the student would get admission and under which bracket he would be offered courses. This should not be considered that Colleges are reluctant in adopting the NEP policy. The perspective of teachers and stakeholders should be taken into account. A statement should be issued from the Registrar that the student who would be admitted in B.A. and B.Com. as to what subjects he would study. Instead of implementing in this way, an exact draft of policy should be placed completely and thereafter the same could be implemented. The teachers are unrest hence the implementation of policy should be reviewed.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that two days before an e-mail was received from the office of D.C.D.C. that list of value added courses be sent. When they would prepare the list, approve and when the students would be made aware about the value added courses? All are aware that from 15<sup>th</sup> May, the process of admissions has started. They themselves, are not aware about Value added courses, what could they tell the students. Secondly, did they obtain the acceptance of the Colleges through google form, whether the Colleges are ready to adopt this policy? A workshop and meeting was organized and decided that NEP-2020 has been implemented in the Colleges. How is it possible? They should see what are the problems in the Colleges in implementing this policy? They are ready to adopt the NEP, but they should prepare them. When queries are raised, it is

replied that they would get the answers, but when they would get the answers? The classes are commencing from 15<sup>th</sup> July, how could it be possible to implement NEP, this issue should be resolved first and thereafter the NEP may be implemented.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that in the state of Punjab also, in other Universities, NEP has not been introduced in all the Colleges. Secondly, during the workshops, where queries of the teachers were raised and it was replied that the queries would be answered later. They all are ready to implement positively but this policy should be implemented in the P.U. Campus in the first instance and next year, it could be introduced in Colleges and uniformity would be attained for all the Universities of the Punjab. There would be no problem in it, all of them would support her (Vice Chancellor). The teachers of the rural Colleges are raising queries as to how the list of value added courses is to be prepared. They did not know the contents of the value added courses.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that first of all he would like to submit that even the Governing body (Senate) is not clear on the NEP policy. Previously the issue pertaining to Punjabi language was raised to a large extent, it is only because the same is implemented in a hurried manner. Later on, this issue was resolved and rectified. Hence a special meeting of the Senate should be called for making discussion and deliberations in NEP-2020 so that complete discussion/deliberation could be held. If the University is having pressure to implement the same, it could be implemented in P.U. departments and Colleges should be left and after complete discussion it should be implemented in the Colleges also.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that a number of issues on implementation of NEP, had also been discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate. Some new issues are raised on daily basis and they have to modify and amend the curriculum. They initiated with 1 major and 1 minor subject, later on with 1 major and 2 minor subjects and on next day it was decided that neither any subject is major nor minor, all the subjects are uniform. Their framework is not ready, if they have to start the four-year course, the structure for four-year course should have with them. As of date, they are only taking about two semesters i.e., semester 1 and 2. Owing to this, the teachers have resentment and confusion, as what would be their workload of teaching. The Punjab Government had earlier filled 1925 posts out of which  $\frac{1}{4}$  posts were given the approval under functional English. Could they opt functional English as major or minor subject, which should be decided? What would be the workload in skill development courses, which student would opt or not? They have to deliberate on it. In Science stream, in the prevailing and latest decision there should be three subjects, no major or minor. For example, in practical subjects like Physics, Chemistry, Botany, Zoology, a student used to study 10 hours under the old pattern whereas in new pattern, he/she is to study for 5 hours. He used to study Mathematics for 12 hours, whereas under the new pattern he would study for 5 hours which is  $\frac{1}{3}$ <sup>rd</sup>. Were they doing justice with the student, subject and the teacher? Were they offered the same syllabus which was being taught earlier? There are still many issues related to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Sandhu was the member of the Committee, he should have raised such queries in the meeting of the Committee itself.

Dr. Jagdish Chander Mehta said while endorsing the view point of Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua that neither the Colleges of Punjab and Chandigarh have the required infrastructure nor the resources for implementation of NEP-2020. The number of options and choices are on larger side and they have to recruit more teachers for different subjects. The existing teachers would be spared from the Colleges and their services would have to be retrenched. The issue is not only raised for the teachers but it would

also be raised for students. The student would also have to face problems, if they have to adopt the new pattern. Neither the Faculty is prepared nor they have the required infrastructure and resources for the same. It is very strange that Board of Studies had prepared the syllabi in a very hurried manner that they did not create any difference between the major or minor subject. On the one hand, one course is for 4 credits and the other is for 2 credits and the syllabus is the same. The syllabus remained the same due to the pressure of management as due to lack of workload and teachers, the classes could be clubbed. They should go through the syllabus prepared by the Board of Studies. He felt surprised to know that syllabus of both major and minor subjects are same. How it could be the same for major or minor subjects? The Value added courses are not yet defined and prepared; hence, this policy should be implemented in Colleges from the next academic session.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they have no objection that NEP is implemented in the Colleges, but it should also be seen, whether the same is implemented in the neighboring Universities.

The Vice Chancellor said that CBCS system had been introduced in the neighboring Universities.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the introduction of CBCS should be left.

The Vice Chancellor said “Why to leave this”?

Several members said that if the introduction of NEP would not succeed, the University has to face slur.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that they had also had to face criticism as till date CBCS is not implemented in the Colleges.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is absolutely correct that there is a need of change. The NEP has been made flexible as per the convenience of the students. But this should not be implemented in a hurried way, as they would have to face agitation.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said, while endorsing the view point expressed by Shri Sandeep Singh that there is always a need of change, it should be so. The NEP should be implemented, but the way its processing has been done, is very fast even more than computer. They should give time and its implementation should be deferred for 365 days, as it is not implemented in other States of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh.

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

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that NEP-2020 is a good policy, which should be implemented. Now the question is, there is never a good time to start a change. This policy has been hanging in fire for the last three years. It is not sudden that this policy is being implemented. One of the fellow members said that it is being processed more than the speed of computer, but it is not so. The NEP is there for the last three years, rather they are late in adopting the same. They would be unprepared for the next year also. There are some technical difficulties which could be resolved as they go forward. But it should not be postponed for one year, if they do so, this would never be implemented. In that case, they would be criminally responsible for their actions, as they have to implement the new policy. The Colleges should start following the NEP, now they can change time frame of implementing the same in Colleges e.g., they could take more 30 or 40 days. But it must be implemented from this year otherwise it would never be implemented.

Dr. B.C. Josan suggested that the NEP should be implemented in the University. After going through the syllabus of D.A.V. College, Sector 10, it is observed that more than 70% of teachers would be in surplus under this policy. He requested that some time should be given to the Colleges and the same should be discussed with the Government, so that the Colleges would not be in a position to retrench the services of the teachers already working in the Colleges.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that a decision was taken in the meeting of the Syndicate that NEP-2020 should be implemented. It has rightly been pointed out by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu that while going in discussion, day by day, new things are evolved and it has come to notice that it is a very complex system. In the meeting of the Syndicate, the D.U.I. Madam had explained that she had held discussion with all the stakeholders but the issue is that after the meeting of the Syndicate, after holding of meetings in groups and on hearing their viewpoints, they are also of this view that this is not the right time. They are not pointing out as who is at the fault? It is all about taking the right decision at the right time. Under the previous item it was being discussed that Court had ordered, but the University did not move towards filing of LPA. They had not taken the remedy to file an appeal against the order. They had not taken the right decision at the right time. This is all about the leadership, as the University had taken the stand to lead in implementing the NEP, then let it be. But the right decision is to be taken. Under item 9, it is written that earlier English, Hindi, Punjabi and History & Culture of Punjab were the compulsory subjects and Environment was also the compulsory subject now in the proposed Regulations, something else has been written. As far as the subject of Environment is concerned, it is the specific order of the Apex Court that this subject is compulsory. After making discussion with the Hon'ble members, who are the members of the Board of Studies, they said that Environment is not huge subject, it has only two credits and hence the same is included in the Value Added Courses, as it has not much value. Were they serious about it? He had taken all those stakeholders and met the Dean and had come to the conclusion that Environment has the ample scope, they could do much more with the subject of Environment. The buildings are being constructed and to protect the environment and majority of funds are allocated to the Colleges for environment. The NEP-2020 should be implemented, but as stated by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua in the meeting of the Syndicate, it has to come in a phased manner, yes, it has to be come in phased manner. When they were entering for the meeting of the Senate, the stakeholders including Lecturers and teachers approached them and requested that with the introduction of NEP, their services would be in surplus. It was explained by D.U.I. Madam in the previous meeting of the Syndicate that they had taken into confidence the Principals of the Colleges, those minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate should be brought to the House, so that everybody could know as what discussion was taken place. Had they said that the services of the teachers of the Colleges should be retrenched? The syllabus which had been sent to the department for a particular subject, they are saying that this subject would come in M.Sc., meaning thereby that this subject should have been introduced in M.Sc. and hence the M.Sc. would take care of it. If the subject is excluded from B.Sc. and included in the Value added courses, then who would come for taking admission in M.Sc. They have to be very reasonable and could not go like this. All the stakeholders should be invited for discussion, if that practice had already been done, the Board of Studies and other related Committees brought the minutes and a meeting of the Stakeholders including Lecturers and teachers of the Colleges and without the discussion with stakeholders, this policy should not be finalized.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that they understood that University is for the students and students are not for the University. Keeping in view the interest of the students, they

should go on way to meet the interest of the students. So this National Education Policy-2020 highlights the quality of higher education and multi-disciplinary education with the freedom for the students to shape their studies. As per NEP-2020, they had observed that U.G.C. has revised Choice Based Credit System and maintained new curriculum and credit framework for U.G. programme, so this system is very flexible for learners. Multidisciplinary and holistic education across the Science, Social Science, Arts, Humanities, Engineering, Medical, all are extensive use of technology in teaching and learning, CIL is also there. So, in this very flexible system they could see whether it is three year or four-year course consisting of 40 credits for one year, 80 credits for second year and 120 credits for third year. In some of the cases, they could observe that for one or another reason due to mishap, a student could not complete his/her degree and he/she has to leave the studies in the middle. Under NEP-2020, he would get the certificate of one year, if he left the course after one year. After the second year, he would get diploma certificate and on completion of third year, degree would be awarded. One of the Fellows said that there should be right time for right work and right decision. If right work is to be done, it is to be done at the right time and the right time is this time only. The Dean of University Instruction had worked very hard since her joining on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2023, number of workshops and meetings were conducted and its result should be fruitful and NEP-2020 should be implemented. They should improve their system in such a way that no such example would be set that private University weakened the strengths of the Panjab University and students would not go in Private Universities.

Shri Davesh Moudgil, said that first of all, he would like to submit that as all are aware that change is the rule of the nature and after a very long time, in India, through the New Education Policy, a new policy for facilitating education to all has come into existence. He would like to convey through the Vice Chancellor his gesture towards the Central Government, also convey that whole of the House felt happy that this New Education Policy has been accepted by the all the members of the Senate. The solution is to be made for the practical problems being faced by the Colleges in implementing the New Education Policy. For the purpose, as suggested by other members, the deliberations and discussions should be organized and such a system should be devised that if University adopt the policy in the first instance and Colleges get some time. It has been accepted by all on one voice, but secondly, if the Colleges want time to implement the same, then there should not have any problem in giving the time to Colleges. This policy should be implemented in an experimental way and a system should be adopted in the University by forming a Committee regarding its implementation and a special meeting of the Senate should be called so that after detailed discussion, Colleges could be mentally prepared and work according to the resources and implement the same.

Professor Ravi Inder Singh said that a good deal of discussion is being held on NEP-2020. Everybody is accepting NEP but is saying that it should be implemented from the next session. He had gone through the advertisement of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar they had already introduced four-year undergraduate programmes. He felt that their University is lacking behind, but it is not so. Besides that Guru Jambheshwar University and other Universities, has started advertising the new programmes in accordance with New Education Policy. The Panjab University has a huge name and they are the leaders and he felt that they all are capable. All the apprehensions are correct, but they all should sit over, as they have more capable teachers and strategic planners and they all should try to implement the NEP-2020 from the session 2023-24, because whenever change comes, apprehensions are always there. They have seen at the time, when the banks had introduced computerization, there were a lot of apprehensions, but today the number of benefits are attained. The changes like liberalization, globalization and privatization that took place had also faced a lot of hick-ups and apprehensions but

today it is observed that that all these were beneficial. The NEP-2020, as stated by Dr. Parveen Goyal, is in the interest of the students, if they would not implement it right now, the students would attract towards other State Universities wherein NEP is implemented. When the students observed that Panjab University is not offering those kind of facilities, do they take that they will come to them. They all are capable and he felt that they can do it and they should not delay it.

Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa said that before speaking on NEP-2020, he would like to read the introduction, that the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, recognizes that higher education plays an extremely important role in promoting human as well as societal well-being and developing India as envisioned in its Constitution – a democratic just, socially conscious, cultured and humane nation upholding liberty, equality, fraternity and justice for all. Referring to page 310 sub-para (vi) which reads that extensive use of technology in teaching and learning, removing language barriers, increasing access for Divyang students, and educational planning and management and sub-para (ix) mentioned that Rootedness and pride in India, and its rich, diverse, ancient and modern languages, knowledge systems and traditions, he said that this is not the first time that any Government has given a new education policy. Since the independence they had Dr. Radha Krishnan Commission in 1948 and in late sixties they had Kothari Commission, since 1978 and then in 1986 and all. In this case if they study or whatever apprehension is coming through social media, through press and other things he would like to put some light on that. Firstly, on the subject of Punjabi, a huge issue was raised and for the same according to him, it is justice for all the languages and culture, till the culture and language of the particular area is not promoted, it would not be considered as justice for all the languages. He opined that when they talk of studying in some other country, where English language is not in existence like German or Russian, the students have to study language for one year in that country. Luckily, under NEP-2020, the Graduate courses are of four years' duration. They have the opportunity that the students who are coming to study in Panjab University, irrespective of his nationality, region or religion, he/she should be taught Punjabi as it is the Panjab University. In that additional year, a student who had not studied Punjabi, they should be given one additional year to study Punjabi and after that for the next three years they should be taught Punjabi as they are being taught to their regular students. Secondly, there is another apprehension amongst the teaching community that if the work load is reduced, what would happen to them. In his opinion, any person who is appointed for the Panjab University and he/she is performing the duties sincerely, irrespective of the fact whether he/she had taken 10 or 20 lectures in a year. The services of those persons should not be retrenched. Those persons should be associated with research work and assigned with new targets, so that he/she could work. There is such type of issues due to which the implementation of NEP is taken with different view. The third issue which he would like to say is what had been stated by Shri Davesh Moudgil and other Senators that a special dedicated meeting of the Senate regarding taking decision with regard to implementation of NEP, should be conducted so that the issues raised could be taken care of. Hence, a special meeting of the Senate or Syndicate should be convened on this subject and everybody should give their contribution to it. It should also be assured that employees would not have to face any type of insecurity that with the implementation of NEP-2020, their services whether teaching or non-teaching employees would not be dispensed with.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that first thing is very much clear, as also stated by other Fellows that this policy is very good and its implementation should be done. This is an issue question before them as to how this could be implemented. He stated also in the conference of the Principals and also in the meeting of the Syndicate that he and Dr.



Harpreet Singh Dua stood strictly and stated that as they are working at the ground level and are dealing with the Colleges that it should not be implemented from the current session. The bodies which were involved in implementation of this policy like Faculties, Board of Studies, would stand and made a statement assuring that there are no flaws in it and they are ready to implement it. Secondly, they should give an assurance that no retrenchment would be made in the first, second or third year. Thirdly, which had also been endorsed that this policy has been implemented in Guru Jambheshwar University and Guru Nanak Dev University, they would have done lot of exercises, which should also be checked. The University had initiated the process of implementing NEP-2020 after 15<sup>th</sup> May when the admissions were started. They agreed and committed that NEP-2020 would be implemented in Colleges in toto as it is a student centric policy. Those who had implemented the policy had made strenuous exercises whereas the University is holding even now the meetings of the Board of Studies. The students are contacting the Colleges from 15<sup>th</sup> May for taking admissions, they could not inform them, as they would be admitted in three year or four-year course. Whereas the meeting of the Senate is being held on 3<sup>rd</sup> June and admission have been started from 15<sup>th</sup> May. They could not make the students understand as what major or minor subject would be offered. They did not know, as what would be the future of the students and they are making the admissions from 15<sup>th</sup> May. The summer vacation will commence from 4<sup>th</sup> June and the Colleges would re-open on 9<sup>th</sup> July, when the students would be guided about the NEP. Since the teachers and stakeholders are not involved, it is absolutely right that the team of the Vice Chancellor had worked very hard and conducted the meetings of the Board of Studies day and night, but it is also correct that Colleges would be closed for summer vacation from 4<sup>th</sup> June, whom the Colleges would make understand about the NEP. His contention is only that stakeholders should be fully involved and while accepting this plea of the Colleges, that it would be difficult for them to implement the NEP from this session. Why U.G.C. had asked to depute 300 ambassador students to make the students of the rural area aware about the NEP-2020. The letter had also been received in the Colleges that that 2-3 P.G. students should be deputed to make aware the students of the rural area about the NEP, it is also being done at the national level. In his opinion, the policy is quite good but the homework of the University is not correct. The homework would be done correctly, if they involve the Principals of the Colleges and guide them about NEP. It would be easy for them to implement the policy as they are aware, but in the rural Colleges, the students are not aware of the NEP. It could be asked from the Senate comprising of 90 persons as to how much they know about the NEP. They are not even clear on all the concepts of the NEP and he felt that if it is framed by the University, then the same could be implemented in the University. It would serve as a help and support and they would also implement the policy from the next academic session in the Colleges.

Professor Latika said that the work related to NEP-2020, which was initiated by the University, is very praiseworthy because in it, the interest of the students is at the forefront. The University could become the beacon of light for the Global South region by taking this initiative to implement NEP by involving all the stakeholders. The U.G.C. guidelines for FYUP were received in December, 2022 and on basis of these guidelines, the ground work had been done continuously by duly constituted NEP committee. The discipline specific curriculum frameworks were decided with the active involvement of Deans of the various Faculties from April onwards. She would like to inform the House, as also stated in the meeting of the college Principals and NEP Co-coordinators, that the framework has been designed with little change in the existing system. The teachers would be asked to give their support in teaching of value added courses, skill enhancement courses, multidisciplinary courses. The committee already has the lists of courses which have been received through the Board of Studies in every discipline. These lists of value added, skill enhancement and multidisciplinary courses will be available for the basket

of common courses. She would like to inform the house that not much has been deviated from the old structure where in its first year the students selected three elective subjects. In the New structure the student selects three subjects under the category of major/minor courses. Besides, these components of 10 credits are framed consisting of AEC, SEC, MDC, where the workload of teachers has also been spread out. This task was given to the NEP Committee and the Committeemembers have been consistently and continuously working in consultation with the Deans of the Faculties and teachers of every discipline to prepare the framework and the syllabi. She really appreciated the work which had been undertaken collectively at a very fast speed in which meetings of Board of Studies were conducted and new syllabi were created by every department. The syllabi of different courses of the components in the curriculum framework are available for all undergraduate courses at the colleges. This policy is allowing the students to develop their quality of skills and personality. The students belonging to rural areas who would like to study other languages can do so under AEC. They can undertake internship and field based projects to enhance their skills and confidence. Such opportunities are being given under NEP. Hence, with all the work done up till now, the new curriculum framework should be implemented. More Faculty Development programmes and workshops for college teachers can be planned, so that, apprehensions of the Colleges would be removed. As far as workload is concerned, it is going to increase and not decrease because every teacher is not only going to teach his/her own subject but also teach two or a three credit course like AEC, VAC and multidisciplinary course. The questions raised about practical hours and so on, would be resolved as soon as the LTP hours are given by the Deans. As of today, it is possible to launch the Four year undergraduate programme, and apprehensions if any will be cleared as the plan is put in practice. With this, she felt that the policy should be implemented.

Professor Gurmit Singh said that he fully agreed with most of the members that University is ready and they can implement the policy in the University. It was stated by Dr. Latika Sharma that lot of efforts were put in the meetings of Board of Studies, but he did not find anything in Board of Studies in Education.

The Vice Chancellor replied that NEP is not applied to Education. Education is not the part of NEP.

Continuing, Dr. Gurmit Singh said while referring to page 304 where Dr. Neeru Malik had raised the issue, which is supported by him that in Education Colleges, this should be applied after 2028. Because they had the problem that in Education where we have traditional B.Ed./M.Ed. and other integrated courses, but what is the stand about single faculty/stand alone colleges of Education.

The Vice Chancellor said that presently they are not changing anything in Education Faculty.

Professor Prashant Gautam said that he would like to draw the attention of the House on one point that there is some apprehension that under NEP, the retrenchment would be there. In the credit frame work it is mentioned that 1200 hours would be taught in a year meaning thereby in 180 days, 1200 hours would be taught. The appointment of teachers is not on the basis of credit perspective rather it is done on the basis of number of hours for which a teacher is engaged. If it is considered on the basis of behaviour terms, then the hours would come as 6.67 hours per week and when it is multiplied by 5, it would become 35 hours which meant that the requirement of services of teachers would be generated. When they consider on the basis of choice based credit system, then one class would be divided into more classes. They need more persons for more options.

He could not understand from where this narrative is originated that retrenchment would be done rather he felt that more recruitment would be required to be done.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said as stated by everybody, they welcomed this policy and he would like to say that when semester system came they all were against it. When Choice based credit system (CBCS) came they were reluctant and Panjab University had started it in the Campus itself, but the Colleges did not start till date. It had been 10 years now they did not start Choice based Credit system in the Colleges. It is always high time they need to start on this New Education Policy and there would be some issues that had been raised by his colleague fellows, they could take care of these issues, bringing amendments and those issues could also be taken care later. He felt that they should not isolate Panjab University Campus and Colleges, when they start for a policy. And the other thing is that NAAC visit is round the corner, if they do not start the policy now they all would go down in scoring. This had also happened at the time when the choice based credit system (CBCS) was not started at that time.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that during the meeting of the Syndicate, he had deliberated on this issue where similar points had come forward. He felt that NEP-2020 is existed from the last 3 years in documents and is discussed for its implementation. One year before they were at this stage, he felt that if the same is not implemented now, they would be in same stage in the next year also. This is the high time; they have to enter into this system. If some problems are raised, they should become flexible to the extent that these problems could be solved in one or two years. He requested the Colleges that they should enter into the system if the problems are raised, then these should be resolved with joint efforts. They should not delay in implementing the NEP. Whatever be the object, either it is the concern of language or culture, everything would be taken for in this particular New Education Policy. So, without any hesitation, they should go ahead from now onwards. The issue that whether it is to be implemented in University or Colleges, it is opined that as NEP is very much clear; hence, it should be started in U.G. courses in University as well as in Colleges. If any problem, come it would collectively and flexibly be resolved.

Dr. K.K. Sharma asked whether this policy is implemented in Himachal Pradesh.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it is absolutely right that NEP is good policy which should be adopted by everyone. This policy should be implemented from the next academic session. As stated by Professor Rajat Sandhir regarding Choice Based Credit System, the introduction of choice based credit system was approved in the meeting of the Syndicate in the year 2014 to adopt the Choice based credit system in the Colleges. It was decided that it should be approved in principle and would be implemented from the next year. After expiry of 10 years, that next year had never come. It should be resolved on the behalf of the House that from the next year the NEP would be implemented in the Colleges otherwise they would have to face the same situation in the next year. If they have to adopt the NEP, the shortcomings arisen at the later stage could also be removed. They should be prepared for implementing the same from the next academic session. It would be good if they prepare mentally for the implementation of NEP-2020 from next year.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that as stated by other members, the Colleges are treating its implementation as a problem. But the problems which had come into notice for the last 6-7 days, he stated that these were solved in consultation with Dean of University Instruction, either the issue of Punjabi or of language and workload of teachers. The issue raised by the Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu, pertaining to practicals of Science, after consulting with Dean, Faculty of Science, the issue of practicals of

Science and of the issue pertaining to Environment Science raised by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk had also been taken for solution. When new things are introduced, some shortcomings are left. There is one book on “Educational Research”, whenever they read the book again and again, they find something new in it. So, when a policy is gone through again and again, some things are coming to their knowledge by various stakeholders. It is the right time to implement this policy. He submitted that they should devote some more 6-7 days in it and the modifications/changes pointed by the members of the Senate in consultation with the colleagues of the Colleges within a week, may be sent to through e-mail to the University. Thereafter, a Consultative Committee may be formed to suggest its implementation from the current academic session.

Professor Rumina Sethi, Dean of University Instruction stated that she would like to tell everybody that there is a lot of discussion about haste and postponement. Everyone has said enough that there would never be a right time and examples have also been quoted from CBCS. She would like to tell them that the things are changing constantly, because the core of this policy of NEP is flexibility. It would never be settled stone and she felt that that should be embraced something which is very positive, because as they are getting feedback every day, there would never come a time when the feedback would stop. This feedback would continue to come even after one year of its implementation. Therefore, what they are doing is that they are taking every suggestion on board and moulding, re-moulding, changing, reframing a lot of things, this is for which authorisation is sought. The reason that they are doing this is not because that they are not ready and prepared, the reason that they are doing is because this is the policy that is supposed to have as its hallmark. Inclusivity, which is very important to understand, that this policy has been floated by the Government keeping in mind that everybody has to be included in it. So, they would continue to change that. There are a lot of misconceptions (major and minor) which are being noticed. Citing an example, she said that one of the narratives which is going on is that Punjabi has been included in the minor subjects. For that reason, they have to understand what are the major and minor subjects? Both major and minor subjects have four credits each. So far as English language is concerned, minor always meant something lesser and major always meant something enormous and bigger, but it is not what is intended to be. They have to see that major and minor subjects have four credits each and the reason they call them major and minor subjects is, because after one year the students would be able to change their options. They could then embrace their major subjects and say that this is something which they would like to specialise. Because after one year she/he would get a better sense of what is going on. They should understand that there are certain nomenclatures, that are given, do not have to be taken as face value. Now, regarding apprehensions, she would like to confess that she is also very apprehensive too. Every time when they are going to start something new, they are always apprehensive. The students’ leaders, who came to her office, said about Punjabi language and asked her to give guarantee on one pretext or the other. Enough people have spoken about how there could not be any guarantees. They are hopeful that is very positive thing about it. They have to understand, moreover, what VAC and SCC meant. It was not easy for her and her excellent team which worked with including Professor Latika, NEP Co-ordinator, who had spoken a little before. What she is trying to tell them is that they also did a lot of hard work. There is a 32-page brochure which they are reading over and over again. She requested all the people present here to read it carefully, even though it is difficult, it is not that difficult that they could not implement it. They are even apprehensive of changing the syllabi within the existing system. Every new thing does bring about an apprehension. But they have to give it some kind of positive outlook so that they are able to take on something and take it as a challenge. They are going to make it worth and they should not worry about that. The last which she would like to say is that they are

not hasty, but anything that is momentum needs to be given a push at the end. Whatever they are organising or at stake, in the last few weeks, the work become very rapid. Rapidity did not mean that they have been hasty in implementation. Last few days/weeks, a lot of hard work was involved. At the moment, they are in momentum, as they wanted to implement it. The Colleges would benefit greatly, if they join this momentum with the University at the moment. They said that let this be started in a phased manner. Yes, of course the University is going to start it. But it would be benefitted to every College that at every step that they face a hurdle or obstacle or a glitch, the University would be there to hold their hand and take them forward. This she could guarantee whole heartedly.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that Professor Rumina Sethi, D.U.I. had clarified all the points, which were being discussed since morning. He would like to tell them that not only the Senate of this University, but the entire country is unanimous on the NEP. He would like to congratulate Centre Government led by Shri Narindra Modi ji, which has formulated a well drafted National Education Policy as was being demanded by various sections for the last so many years. So far as he knew, the NEP had also been discussed in the Parliament, where persons across the States participated in the discussion. In the meeting of the Senate also, none of the members had opposed it. So far as its implementation is concerned, it has rightly been said that apprehensions are always there, whenever they start any new thing. Even when the computerisation was introduced, people had debated a lot apprehending that there would be a lot of retrenchment. Though Professor Rumina Sethi had clarified in detail, he would not like to go into the details and would only like to submit that this policy should be implemented. He had also listened to the viewpoints of the College teachers who had gathered outside and found that some of their apprehensions could be genuine. Keeping in view the apprehensions, they should implement the policy in the House and authorise the Vice Chancellor to approve changes/modifications to be pointed out by the stakeholders at later stage. If they did not implement the policy, the entire country would go far ahead and they would lag behind. They should move with the nation as there is no such thing which could not be resolved within 2-3 months.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that first of all she would like to congratulate the Panjab University for placing the NEP before the House for consideration. In fact, it is not a choice for them but it is a compulsion for them to implement it. She has gone through the guidelines of U.G.C. carefully and it talked about the sustainability, and sustainability talked about instilling academic & curricular activities amongst the students and encouraging the students participate in co-curricular activities. If these competencies are to be developed in the students, how it is to be done. Yes, there are apprehensions which are genuine, because there is no brainstorming of the Managements and of the Principals as well as the teachers in complete sense. She had earlier opined that the University had different zones. If brainstorming of teachers and Principals in these zones is done, they would be empowered to reply to the queries of the students/parents; otherwise, they would not be able to do so. In rural areas, what happened is that the parents asked the merits of the newly introduced policies before the students. So far as apprehension of the teachers that they would be retrenched is concerned, least changes have been recommended to be made in the curriculum of first year, so that the existing system did not get drastically affected. Undoubtedly, certain new terms, which have already been explained by D.U.I. Her colleagues from the Colleges would agree with her that they make admissions with major and minor subjects, but there is no major change in major and minor subjects. In fact, both have been treated equal. Moreover, nothing would be mentioned in the degrees to be awarded to the students.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that till a number of points have been discussed, she would like to draw the attention of the House to two three things that it should not be assumed that Colleges are not efficient. The Colleges could do the work related to NEP. The matter is not for pointing out the deficiencies in the NEP, the matter is related to the awareness. She asked, whether quantum of work done in the University is the same as done in the Colleges? The deficiencies would only be pointed out by the Colleges, if they would have been aware of this NEP. A number of phone calls are received in the Colleges regarding clarification for major and minor subjects. As stated by Dr. Latika that no major changes are being done in 1<sup>st</sup> year. Citing an example, she asked that if a student is interested in pursuing Post-graduate in a particular subject, there is no answer for this whether he/she is eligible to pursue Masters in major or minor subject. For the first year, he would study first paper in the 1<sup>st</sup> year and in 2<sup>nd</sup> year, options are allowed, whether he is aware that he would have to study 4 papers of the subject in 3<sup>rd</sup> year. They are proposing syllabi to be studied as per NEP only for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> semester. All the Colleges are agreed for implementation of NEP. She requested that as they have the shortage of time, as today is the last working day in the Colleges, they desired that they should work on NEP and would not implement this policy in a state of fear. This policy should be implemented with complete preparation. As stated by Principal R.S. Jhanji, if complete deliberations on NEP are held, all of them would work on it. B.Voc. courses are offering in the Colleges but they are not aware as under what Faculty they would be considered. They are not aware regarding their eligibility for pursuing Post graduate courses. It is supposed that in Ludhiana Colleges, the students were made aware, but what about areas in Hoshiarpur and Dasuya. The rural areas of Hoshiarpur and Dasuya have recently been aware about the introduction of NEP during the meeting of the Principals. The College teachers which had been involved in Board of Studies, only their Colleges might be aware about the NEP. The homework which had been done at the University, if so much homework would have been done in the Colleges, the problem would not have come. The Colleges can start running the courses as per NEP but time should be given.

The Vice Chancellor said that she would also like to make a request to the Colleges that, whenever the policy has been in existence, the departments of the University had been regularly organising events around National Education Policy, so that everybody could understand what the policy is. The Colleges should also need to take initiative. They could not depend on University that University would organise events for all the Colleges. The Colleges have to organise events around NEP to understand the same so that they could be in the position to answer the queries of students. It is very strange that teachers are saying in the year 2023 that they are not able to answer the questions of the students. She asked why? Why they are not ready till now? They all are teachers sitting here, they all should study that document and they should be in a position and that awareness should be with all the teachers of Colleges. For that workshops and seminars should be organised regularly and if support from University is required some Faculty which are Drivers of this change, they could facilitate the Colleges and also can recommend the names of the people who could be called to interact with the Faculty and students also. This awareness drive has to be carried out by the Colleges. They have to come forward and lead this. They should give suggestions as to what should be done for the Colleges. It is their Agenda and not the Agenda of the University, so they have to own this Agenda.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that he fully agreed with the Vice Chancellor, but the College persons should be made aware of it. But when they came for the first time in the meeting of Board of Studies on 25<sup>th</sup> April, they were told that these are major and minor subjects. He asked as to who would prepare the framework for minor subject, they were

replied that it would not be dealt with by them. Thereafter, the request was sent that they are not aware about it and then the meeting was again held and stated that those subjects which are major subjects are also the minor subjects. When changes are made within a span of 15 days how could they be aware about it.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Rumina Sethi had already explained. Stating the difference between major and minor subjects, she replied that if a student is doing major subject in a particular area then that means that he has to earn 60 credits, so he has to study 15 courses of that discipline then he would get a major. For major subjects, as per this framework, total credits assigned to major subjects are 60 and for minor subjects, it is 24. The same subjects could be there. Citing an example she said that if a student has to study major in Punjabi then he has to do 60 credits of Punjabi, but he has to do minor in Punjabi, he has to do 24 credits in Punjabi. So for those 24 credits, the courses in minor and major could be same and 60 minus 24 would be additional if he has to do in Punjabi. These things, should be understood by everybody. They are the members of the Governing body of Panjab University, each one of them has to understand it.

Principal S.S. Sangha, while endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Mukesh Arora, said that he fully agreed that decision to implement the NEP from the next academic session in Colleges, should be taken today itself so that next time there would be no need of convening any meeting. He would like to inform the House that under the existing system, they could initiate the certificate course, diploma and degree for the students after completion of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year respectively as there is no change in it. It could be implemented as it is the part of the NEP and he felt that there is no hitch in implementing it and it would not require any change. He felt that this part of NEP that after completion of 1<sup>st</sup> year, the students will be awarded Certificate course, should be implemented and accepted and the remaining part of NEP should be implemented from the next session.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should accept multiple entry and exits of the students as per NEP.

Professor Ravi Inder Singh said as also stated by Principal R.S. Jhanji, that they could not guide the students whether they are offering three-year or four-year course. In four-year course, a student can leave after one year, two years or three years.

The Vice Chancellor said that the students should be informed that it is their choice whether they would like to opt for three-year or four-year course.

Continuing, Principal S.S. Sangha said that he had only put forth his suggestion pertaining to multiple entry and exits of students. The another point is whatever issue was raised on Punjabi, he felt that the Vice Chancellor did not make any statement on Punjabi as she had no objection over it. He opined that there might be no person in the House who would have any objection with Punjabi. It should be made clear by making a statement that in Panjab University, Punjabi language would be in existence so that the confusion could be sorted out.

The Vice Chancellor said that she had already made the statement that in B.A. course consisting of 6 semesters as of now Punjabi is being taught, which would also continue to remain in times to come. In one week there are 6 period of Punjabi subject which would remain as same, which had already been decided.

Professor Sonal Chawla said that a lot has been discussed on NEP, therefore, she would not dwell on it. She would like only to highlight one of the discrepancies in Annexure-I at page 459 that in the Colleges in B.A. (Hons.) as elective subject, the subject of Computer Applications/Computer Science and IT was used to be offered. Earlier, the students could opt for Computer Applications as an elective subject with Physics and Chemistry, which had been approved by the U.G. Board of Studies, so that the admissions in the Colleges might not drop as the students go for opting these three subjects. These courses have been included in the eligibility criteria, but unfortunately what she had observed that B.Sc. (Hons. School) the subjects Computer Sciences and Information Technology are existed but the subject of Computer Applications has been omitted for some reason. This would affect a lot on the admissions of the Colleges. She had received the concern of the Colleges over it also. This had also been sent after its approval by the U.G. Board of Studies. She humbly requested that this should be got rectified, so that the admissions may not affect due to the implementation of NEP.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he was not aware as in what form the NEP is being implemented. He only knew that NEP has different components. It had been pointed out that College teachers should take initiative but College teachers are more concerned in going through the document pertaining to NEP, instead of University teachers. The difference between the University and the College is that in the University set up, it is being stated the credits are changed, the credits are enhanced. If the credits are enhanced, it should also be kept in mind that in accordance with the framework of U.G.C. the degree has 120 credits. If they enhance these credits, it would come to 170 credits. In Panjab University, the students of only Punjab region will not join, there would not be any state whose student is not existed in Panjab University. Whether they would come to study these additional 40 credits? Would it not affect their admission? It is only the one component which he is talking about. There is one-way traffic in the University, it is agreed that a lot of work has done in it, but they should be given time to implement it. In the framework whether they are accepting single major subject, double major subjects or multidisciplinary subjects. This might be possible that even the members of the Senate might object that this clause is not mentioned in writing. He knew that only single major subject is accepted and double major subjects and multidisciplinary subjects are not mentioned. Why it is not pertinent to mention here that the teachers of subjects of Bioinformatics and Biotechnology would not be surplus. These teachers would become surplus. The problem is faced at the place that they did not have any support from the Government. It had repeatedly been said by everyone present here that nobody is against this policy. The viewpoint expressed by his colleagues that University would lag behind, they should make clear as from whose Universities they would lag behind. Would they do not know as to how the policy is being implemented in other Universities? The other Universities are implementing this policy only on P.G. courses and only in Campus also. They just have to show to the Centre that they had implemented the NEP. If there is any rider for release of grant on the Vice Chancellor, they all are with her. Hence this policy should be introduced in the University in a phased manner so that they could also say that they have implemented the policy in the University Campus. He had just pointed two subjects but several other similar subjects are also there. They had aided posts in the Colleges in several courses including Commerce and Management and the University had already received representation that those subjects have not been included in the framework of NEP. They should not treat it like this, that this issue related only to the Colleges rather they should say that this issue related to them and it should be allowed to be handled by them and a Co-ordination Centre should be established wherein the data should be made available as to how many subjects/teachers are there in a particular College? Would anybody admit his ward under this policy keeping in view only the revised curriculum of first year? Though they had safe guarded the subject of Punjabi, could



they say that the subjects of Hindi and English would not be compromised? If they enhance the credits, the degree to be awarded to the students would not be of the course, but of the language, whereas the student has not joined the course to do degree in language but to compete in the competitions. He is, therefore, requesting them to review this policy in the light of observations made by the members. At the moment, this policy should be implemented in the University in about two-three courses, so that the Government could see that NEP has been implemented by Panjab University. Later on, this policy should be implemented in Colleges.

Shri Ravinder Singh said that there should be a change as the change is always for betterment. Citing an example, he said that previously when the bills of agriculture were passed for the reason to promote agriculture, but at that time the stakeholders including farmers etc. could not made understand about the bills resultantly agitation was took place. Hence, it is his request that stakeholders, students and teachers should be made clear about the policy and explained to them that this policy is for their betterment only. This could only be done to avoid agitation. He requested that time should be given to the Colleges, if possible, the policy in the Colleges should be implemented from next year.

Professor S.K. Tomar said that he would like to point out that at page 459, one course of B.Sc. is missing, which was started a year before and the name of the course is B.Sc. (Mathematics & Computing). In fact, it is a very important course.

Professor Sonal Chawla replied that this course existed and listed in the list of major subjects as this course is not for the Campus and for the Colleges. For the campus portion, B.Sc. (Mathematics & Computing) is existed.

Professor S.K. Tomar said that if it is for the Colleges, then it should not be B.Sc. (Honours), and instead it should be B.Sc. (Hons. School), which is wrong and a major flaw existed.

The Vice Chancellor stated that for University campus the course is under the name of B.Sc. (Hons.). The framework for the course of B.Sc. (Hons. School) is defined separately, because now if a student opts for a four-year course, then he would get the degree with Honours even in College. The nomenclature of B.Sc. (Hons.) and B.Sc. (Honours School) is different both in Campus and Colleges. There is a difference in the structure also, in the Colleges the credits of major and minor subjects are four for the B.Sc. course, whereas in the University campus, per subject credits for major subjects are six including theory + practical.

Professor S.K. Tomar said that he felt that there is need of clarification in it. If Honours is defined, it should particularly in Mathematics, Physics or Chemistry, but these subjects Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics should be existed.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the word, "Honours" is not correct rather U.G.C. had objected to use this word.

Continuing, Professor S.K. Tomar also stated that the word "Honours" is wrong. The U.G.C. had objected it. Nowhere in U.G.C. guidelines, the word "Honours" has been mentioned.

Professor Arun K. Grover said that he would like to give them the historical perspective something very credential for what has been discussed so far. Eventually it is linked to whatever has been stated so far. In 1904, Indian Universities Act was brought in for five Universities and it stated that the Universities must appoint teachers, enrol

students and produce such students, who would be structured and would not seek jobs, but would become providers of jobs. This was a directive, but the Government even in 1904 did not provide any resource to the then Universities of the era exactly like today. NEP is a very idealistic kind of document for implementing globally in many nations across the world. If they have to bridge the gap, they have to do it sooner or later or to do it the issue in the backdrop of not adequate resources. What did the Universities do in 1904? The Calcutta University had a visionary Vice Chancellor Dr. Ashutosh Mukherjee, he decided to do it in one way but rest of the country could not follow it. No resource was there and English teachers who were then the teachers in the Government Colleges of the University which were the nuclei of the then University. Calcutta University was a Presidency College. The Madras University was again the residential College. The Lahore University was also a Government College and Allahabad University was the only University which has some resemblance of start of a Campus, but rest of the Universities got respite. Out of four Universities, the Bombay University was built around the residential College, no University has any campus and that Englishmen who were teachers in Government Colleges did not take any interest in having students being groomed for research at all. The Indian teachers were typically very small and they were not exposed to research and how could they nurture students for research? It is in that backdrop that Dr. Ashutosh Mukherjee had got the endowments and he had tried that only Indians would be employed as Professors on behalf of the endowments in the Calcutta University. He went on to create a College of Science in Calcutta University and that along with the then presidency College of Science. That assumed the responsibility for the science departments of Calcutta University. These two Colleges were intermediary separate, but undertook some things together and got the rank of Post Graduate Colleges in the parallel. The Colleges of Science only runs the Post-Graduate courses, whereas the Presidency Colleges runs both the Under-graduate and Post-graduate Courses. The Madras Distant College and certain Colleges in Madras came up in composition in 1911, which is exactly equivalent to today's four-year Graduation course. They gave it a nomenclature Honours exactly that they are saying today Honours with three or four-year course. The Presidency College Madras and the Madras Distant College, they instilled the notion of three years' honours in different subjects. At that time, B.A. was the only degree, the Science students were also got the B.A. degree, B.A. was two-year course. They introduced the notion of three years' B.A. Honours both in the Science stream as well as in the Humanities. It was implemented only in these two Colleges of Madras University. In rest of the affiliated Colleges of Madras University, it could not be implemented as they were facing difficulties. Because to implement anything which is equivalent in Honours as it is being rightly stated they need larger and stronger faculty who is exposed to take students to the threshold of research. If they are saying that these are the four years' graduation in the NEP, they are implicitly saying that at the end of the four years, students would go towards the research and would enrol for a doctoral programme. If they want to exit after one year, they would get their Master's degree equivalent to present a Master's degree, which is under 3+2 system. As if present Master's degree would be get due to them after 4+1 which is the first year of the start of the so-called doctoral programme. It is a kind of Master's degree where they have the different exits and can come back at any stage for the doctoral degree and resume their doctoral. These two Madras Colleges introduced the three-year B.A. (Honours). After that the students would come back and complete their M.A. degree with one-year association with the University. They could go to somewhere else, do some research and come back and said that this additional had been done for pursuing M.A. in Madras University. This is how the Madras University had implemented. The University of Punjab at Lahore taking cue from what was done in Presidency College of Madras and the Madras Distant College, Madras, instituted a proposal to have Inter Collegiate teaching in Lahore and the Syndicate of the University accepted it after lots of

deliberations in the year 1919 and thus started Honours School system at Lahore in the form Inter Collegiate Teaching. In the sense, the Colleges would admit a small number of students in different subjects. These students would be taught by Inter Collegiate faculty, faculty got from all the Colleges including senior people would teach handful of students for the Honours school course and these people were supposed to have a three-year course. Panjab University even at that time had the notion of three year course with B.A. (Hons.) with 75% marks. In order to distinguish between normal honours in U.G. three-year course and the newly introduced three-year course, which had been given the nomenclature of Honours School. To co-ordinate with honours school, the University also made 10 appointments in different subjects. They were appointed as faculty members on behalf of Punjabi University in 1919. Some of them were College teachers, but now they got employment of other Universities like Shree Ram University and Government teachers in Government College. Now, he was the Professor in the University or on deputation in Government College. It is in that sense a University with handful of teaching positions and with handful of laboratories, some of them inside the Government College or some of them outside the Government College. The University Chemical Laboratory was established after passing of resolution by the Syndicate and allocating money for constructing the University Chemical Laboratory and Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar was appointed as first Director Professor of Physical Chemistry at University Chemical Laboratory, Lahore. At that time the Government College already had the Professor of Organic Chemistry. What he is trying to tell them that this four-year course with one additional year of Graduation, it is something which had been in practice not only in the campus at Lahore. It was implemented by the College of Lahore, but every College of Lahore did not implement it. It was done on an Inter Collegiate basis because no single College could do it. Now coming to nomenclature, they had B.A., Matriculation, 10+2 as it was a kind of education policy in 1944 which recommended to abolish the +2 status. That meant, that in 10+2, +2 should be abolished, one year or the two, should be added to the matriculation and whichever is higher secondary education. Now, one year should be added to the two-years' B.A. so that they should have a three-year degree in B.A. It took 10 years to get it implemented, it could not be implemented in India all across the country at all. At some stage, they reverted back to 10+2+3 and higher secondary was disappeared from India. They converted all schools, which were earlier up to 10 to 11 (higher secondary schools). They said no, now they have schools, which would be made 10+2 schools. There were schools which were only upto 10<sup>th</sup> and there were Schools which were up to 10+2. In the New National Education Policy, what they are saying is that they would have a four-year schooling, which meant that all schools would be up to 12<sup>th</sup> and all High Schools would be upgraded to Senior Secondary Schools, because they were going to have a four-year schooling system. Whether it would happen across India or not that only the time would tell. This is the directive from New Education Policy if they want to have this 3+4+.....etc. In that schooling of 4 years, there is supposed to be no matriculation examination. Examination is only after Class XII and entry into the Colleges and University would be only after four years of schooling. After the four years of schooling, they come to a College for Bachelor's degree, whether it is in campus or in the Colleges. NEP says that it is four-years' degree course, so under four-year degree course since an exit is allowed after one year or three years, as if their old B.A. degree which is 10+2+3. They can get an equivalent of an old B.A. degree after three years of exit. If they exit after four years, they would get a new Graduate degree and since NEP directive is to call it honours, so they have the four-year degree course in which the Honours means completely the four-year course. What happened to a Campus Honours School system? Campus Honours School system at Lahore was one year extra than normal.

Dr. Jayanti Dutta intervened to say that could they restrict the time for everybody to speak as everybody has to speak in a very short time as deliberations should be there.

Some other members said that let him (Professor Grover) complete his statement.

The Vice Chancellor requested Professor Grover to complete his statement.

Continuing, Professor Arun K. Grover stated that they have understood everything, some things are new and some things are not new. This University has implemented NEP ahead of all other Universities of the Region. The Madras University adopted the Honours School after independence in the year 1960. During the time of 1960, when the Panjab University had a campus of its own for the first time under Chandigarh campus started to come in domain after 1958. So, the Madras University closed the honours school system, but this campus implemented the Honours school system successfully and in a manner that no other University in the country had done in that year. In their departmental structure, they had this Honours School system and they continued this up to the year 1986, they did not have this honours school classes in the Colleges, because they did not say that the Colleges could do this exercise as they did not permit that in the Colleges. NEP allowed certain uniformity in the Campuses and the Colleges so, today, when the Colleges with the strength of 5000 students with more than 400 faculty members, such Colleges if they give them enough time they would happily and gladly implement what the Campus desires to do for this year itself. If some time is given, big Colleges would come forward to do at their own it would also like of students of Delhi Colleges are doing something, why would the big Colleges of Punjab, why not D.A.V. Colleges in Amritsar, Jalandhar, MCM DAV College and Government Colleges of Chandigarh, Government College, Ludhiana and all such large Colleges which compete in getting good students. Why would they not compete with the Colleges situated at Delhi, Bombay and Madras? All this would happen; it is the Colleges which made the success of Honours school system. Campus teachers only extended what the Colleges had in Lahore did. The Colleges today have the same terms and conditions, the quality of Faculty that gets inducted in Colleges and Campuses, they gone through the same filter, so if they put faith in the Colleges, he is sure that with the passage of time slowly they would be able to do it. So they need to remain a mix system just as they are saying that in a four-years' system, they could have an exit at three years and get the degree equivalent of today's B.A. degree and if they want four years' they would get degree in B.A. Honours. For a while, in principle, they should accept this policy but give the Colleges one to two years' time to get back to them.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he would like to clarify as stated by fellow colleagues that firstly it was major and minor subject, he was the one who had proposed for making change from major to minor subjects as earlier there were variation in Arts and Science discipline. That variation would cover the fear of retrenchment. Hence, he persistently requested the Committee also, being the member of the Regulations Committee, to make changes as in accordance with NEP. It is for the student to opt in the second year as to which subject he would like to opt as major and which subject as minor subject. Hence, the courses introduced for the first year, 4 equal credits had been marked for the same. A small video presentation on the NEP was sent on Whatsapp group by him, they could see the video on it also. As per the existing B.A. structure, it is only a pass course where 18 credits are being offered whereas in Honours course, a student has to study 22 papers. Under NEP for three-year course, 24 subjects would be offered and in four-year Honours course 30 subjects would be offered. First thing which is appearing that number of papers is increasing under NEP. The second thing which is going to be increased that under semester system, they were putting 200 hours for teaching 3 major subjects, now they would teach for 180 hours, but when the 45 hours for multidisciplinary subjects

would be added, the workload would automatically become 220 hours as compared to earlier 202 hours. Similarly, by adding 60 hours for AEC courses, 45 hours for Skill Enhancement courses, 30 hours for Value Added courses and 60 hours for compulsory Punjabi subject. Ultimately, if saw the PPT video, they could observe that earlier they were teaching for 337 hours and now they would be teaching for 420 hours. It is better to understand that what they are doing. His most serious concern was about Punjabi language; it was published in the newspapers that Punjabi was not made as compulsory. He clarified that Punjabi was earlier also the compulsory subject now a new segment has been prepared wherein Punjabi and History & Culture of Punjab were included as mandatory. Then the questions were raised as to what would happen for English and Hindi subjects as these subjects have also more teachers. This issue had also been addressed by earmarking the workload of 6 hours each as per prevailing practice. Lastly, what he would like to inform is that for first year either they are opting the subject by terming it as single major subject, but after one year, they would adopt the Regulations for Multi-Disciplinary courses as students could only decide after completion of one year, whether they wanted to go for major or for B.A. with multidisciplinary subjects. If this would be decided for the first year, there would be no effect on the workload of any teacher. Citing an example, he said that if a student is admitted in B.A., as asked by one of the member that in which subject the student would pursue M.A. It is very clear that out of the major subjects offered by him and out of the minor subjects comprising of 24 credits, he/she could pursue M.A. and Ph.D. If they consider Multidisciplinary subjects, the three subjects offered by him could be continued for three years, in first year, he would study 9 credits, in second year 8 credits and in third year 6 credits. Calculating by any method, it is found that at nowhere the workload would be reduced. The last thing where they used the word "Basket", the purpose of the basket is not that University would burden additional paper on them. In a particular College where teachers of particular subjects are available, the College would only offer that particular subject to the students. It would not be burdened on the Colleges to offer additional subject for which the teachers are not available in the Colleges. For example, in D.A.V. College, teachers of English and Mathematics are more in number, they would have to offer English and Mathematics as major subjects and guide the students accordingly. It is desired that a small video of 15 minutes should be prepared and put on the University website so that every student could see as to what is being offered under NEP. He had also requested to the Regulations and Core Committee that workshops on zonal level could be organised to resolve this issue, as it is not a major issue, no retrenchment would be done in it. He being the member of Regulations Committee, is informing these things to them. They are ready to address every issue raised pertaining to it and this policy should be implemented from this session, the first year would only pass as such under the prevailing system. The changes would only take place from the second year. From second year only the NEP would be initiated to come. The first year would only be certificate course.

Professor Ashok Kumar said that he would like to express his viewpoint on languages. It was published in the newspapers but nothing is like that, he had sent the PPT to Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa and it would also be sent to Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, wherein it is clearly mentioned that Languages being their mother tongue, and for the regional languages, the Government is very much concerned in NEP that no changes have been done with the regional languages. The Punjabi language was never removed from the languages and it is mandatory for the students of Punjab to study Punjabi. Their only concern is that no harm is to be done to any regional language. It is necessary for the students to study all the languages.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that under Multidisciplinary vertical, the students could opt other languages also.

Continuing, Professor Ashok Kumar said that as Punjabi is the regional language and it is assumed by the people of Punjab that Punjabi language is finishing. But it is not so. In Multidisciplinary vertical, Hindi and other regional languages are included in it. Sanskrit is added in the Multidisciplinary languages.

The Vice Chancellor stated that those languages which have been studied till 10<sup>th</sup> and not studied in XI and XII would come in Multidisciplinary vertical.

Professor Ashok Kumar said that though the CBCS was recommended 8 years before, the framework of CBCS had not yet been implemented. The problem would always come, but they should be ready to solve the same. As such, the new National Education Policy should be implemented because Panjab University has its own status.

Dr. Jayanti Dutta said that she would only like to say that the implementation of NEP is seen as a human problem, because apprehensions are there which are very natural. Since the need for implementation of NEP has already been stated by her Fellow colleagues, she would not like to repeat it. She said that there should be very clear lines of information between the University people and the Colleges and they should be troubleshooting. It should be done as quickly as possible. She did not think that there are confusions. If they read it properly, they would find it is very clear and whatever confusions are there for that handholding is needed. As Dr. Dinesh Kumar had also said that there could be different Committees, which would be co-ordinating with the College persons. There should be very clear need to bridge the gap between the College people and the University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is necessary to inform the House that it is not that only framework of 1<sup>st</sup> year has been prepared, the framework for 2<sup>nd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years had also been prepared, but annexures had already been annexed for the first year, so that no confusion could be raised.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he would like to express his viewpoint on NEP in brief that this National Education Policy is a students' friendly and it should be adopted and problem faced in its adoption is that as the status of the University is quite different from that of the Colleges. The Vice Chancellor should visit the Colleges of the rural area; it could be observed that the Colleges did not have the teachers for the existing syllabi. He suggested that as an administrator, she could see whether it would be implemented. In Punjab, 138 aided Colleges and approximately 5000 Lecturers are there. Why the University is interested in implementing the NEP, whereas the Colleges are reluctant to do so. It is being said that Colleges should come in forefront, but they are not coming forward, because they have the apprehensions that the retrenchment would be there. Even if implemented by the University, the Colleges would not be in a position to implement it. Had it been implemented by him, he would have not implemented it knowing that retrenchment is bound to be there. For the purpose, Refresher courses should be got conducted from Deputy Director, Academic Staff College and Principals and teachers of the Colleges should be called, so that they could be aware about the NEP. Even the Senate members are not aware about the NEP, then how they could make students understand in which discipline they would get degrees. Moreover, the discussion took place in the House is held keeping in mind that if any candidate is to be considered for appointment as Lecturer, the Ph.D. degree is mandatory, for other jobs such as for appointment as Inspector in Punjab Police and for clearing P.C.S. examination, which degree either of three-year or four-year would be valid. There is a lot of confusion as the students are not studying only for appointed as Lecturers or pursuing Ph.D. degree or research work. The today's position in Punjab is that rather than opting for courses in private Universities, students are more in number for doing ILETS. They

should see practically how this policy would be implemented. It should be resolved today, also stated by former Vice Chancellor Professor Arun K. Grover, that they are implementing the NEP in the University from the current academic session and it should be decided today itself that in Colleges, the NEP would be implemented from the next academic session. In that year, Refresher Course to guide the Principals and lecturers of the Colleges should be organised. There are 8 members from the Lecturers' Constituency and 8 from the Principals' Constituency and even one Principal Dr. B.C. Josan from the Graduates' Constituency is also on the Senate. The team comprising of University Professors should be sent to the Colleges to make them aware as what is the NEP? Why the Colleges not worked in the NEP as they had no direction from the University.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is very much clear that nobody is against the NEP. The Colleges are asking that they should be given time of one year for implementation of NEP. The preparation on the part of the Committees constituted for NEP and Regulations Committee have been completed and they are saying that they are ready to implement it whereas the Colleges are ready to do. If the University could prepare for implementation of NEP by putting strenuous efforts and devoting additional hours, why could not the Colleges? If the Colleges would put their time and efforts, then there would be no problem in implementing it. The reason is that they are only demanding time for its implementation. Either they would be against this policy notified by Centre Government or they should make their stand clear. On the one hand, the Colleges are saying that they need one year for preparing them for the implementation of NEP, but if the University is ready in its implementation, then by taking 7-8 days more they could resolve the problems and discrepancies. The second thing is that as Punjabi is their mother language, hence there should be no reduction in the syllabus of Punjabi, it should remain as per earlier practice. Secondly, as also stated by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua that Punjabi should be placed only at the place where it was earlier. It should not be such that other languages should be made equivalent with Punjabi, because it is the Punjab where their sentiments are closely connected with Punjabi language. The suggestions put forth by Shri Prabhjit Singh and Shri Lajwant Singh Virk are very good that this policy should be approved in principle. If the University is prepared and it should be asked from the Committees that if they have fully prepared for the implementation of NEP for University as well as for Colleges, then Colleges should also devote additional time for its implementation and the same should be implemented within week, but the syllabus of Punjabi should be remained as it was earlier.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said while referring to page 459 where it is mentioned as also pointed out by Professor Sonal Chawla that subject Computer Science & Applications has been missed which had already been approved through the Board of Studies.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that a lot of discussion was held on NEP and also being debated by several learned colleagues. When the computerisation of banking sector was introduced and the discrepancies which were there also remained intact. Resultantly, more than 2 lac posts have got surplus due to computerisation in banking sector. He reiterated that it is only one part which has been elaborated, but others have not been. Recently, the Prime Minister had ordered to open bank accounts under 'Jan Dhan Yojna'. 42 crores bank accounts had been opened out of which 41 crores 90 lacs accounts were opened in public sector banks, but private banks had not opened even a single bank account. One of his colleagues had suggested that they should either register their protest against NEP or approve it.

On a point of order, Shri Varinder Singh intervened to clarify that he had not said that either they should be against this policy or approve it, rather he had said that since nobody is against it and they agreed at one point that sometime should be given to get

them familiar with this policy. If the University had fully prepared itself, let it implement the policy at the campus.

Continuing, Shri Naresh Gaur said that although they are at a one platform on this issue, both the colleagues from the University and affiliated Colleges are present here, but none of them had said that they are prepared for the implementation of this policy. Nobody is aware as to what is going to happen in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year under NEP. The students to be admitted in the first year under this policy would not be made known as to what they are supposed to study in 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year. He, therefore, requested the entire House to take into consideration the interests of the students of all the affiliated Colleges and not only of the campus students. Panjab University, which has a name in the country, should not be afraid of Private Universities and implement the policy only because of their fear. They should keep in view that none of the neighbouring States (Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh) had implemented this policy. Hence they should not implement this policy only because of fear due to which the image of the University get tarnished and affected ranking. It is true that they all are agreed that NEP is to be implemented one day or the other, but even if they wanted to implement it today, they should implement it at the campus as a pilot project. In the meantime, a deadline should be fixed as to when it would be implemented in the affiliated Colleges, so that the Colleges could prepare themselves accordingly. The concerned persons of the University should be deputed to give orientation to the faculty members of the affiliated Colleges to make them aware of this policy. The special meeting of the Senate should be convened especially on NEP.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that as this is the first meeting through offline mode after the appointment of Professor Renu Vig as Vice Chancellor on regular basis, they should have formally given their best wishes to her rather than starting the discussion in a changed atmosphere. Perhaps, they had forgotten to extend good wishes to the Vice Chancellor and thank the Hon'ble Chancellor for appointing the Vice Chancellor in a shortest period and ended the uncertainty which was prevailing in the University. He is not much involved in the NEP process, so deeply as Dr. Dinesh Kumar, Professor Latika and other colleagues were. He would like to clearly tell her that this is the first litmus test of her leadership. As directed by the Hon'ble Chancellor, they all are supposed to cooperate with her to take the University to newer heights. He would like to make them remember with the couplet of St. Kabir, "Kal kare so aaj kar, aaj kare so ab, pal mein parley hogi, bahuri karega kab". She should listen to the viewpoints of the members, but take the final call on the issue herself, because even if the 90 members say that the sun rises from the west, it would never be. They should see the issue in a wider perspective. He would again like to request her that they would not learn to swim unless and until they jump into the deep water. Whenever a new system is introduced, problems are bound to arise, but with the fear of problems, they should not refrain from introducing new things. He is sure that they would be able to resolve the problems as and when they would crop up. He would like to point out that his colleagues from the Colleges are facing so many issues which they could not resolve from the last so many years. The faculty members of the Colleges, including newer ones, could be made familiar with the pros and cons of the policy within a week, because the young minds only needed opportunity. He suggested that the teams should be prepared and sent to the Colleges for giving orientation to the faculty and Principals. The Colleges should start something new in creative writing, public speaking, if the University's Board of Studies had not framed so, they should take initiative and frame at their own level. From this, several new doors would be opened. The workload of Colleges would rather get enhanced as a result of the implementation of NEP. Rather than doing retrenchment, they would have to make new appointments for running these courses. The New Education Policy should be



implemented in first instance and whatever the problems would arise, that could be solved as also stated by other members. They could review on some things as such there is no hard and fast rule that it could not be reviewed. As this is implemented for the first year, he suggested that the University should take a clear cut stand and whatever decision, the Vice Chancellor deemed fit, may take. The House could authorise the Vice Chancellor to make modifications as per the suggestions, so that the same could be clarified as had been done in the case of Punjabi language.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that his viewpoint is slightly different from Professor Gurmeet Singh as in the existing system of Colleges, the curriculum and syllabi designed by the University is taken into account for moving forward. The Colleges are not autonomous; they should not say that Colleges should put efforts and devote one week to create the framework at their own level.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that he felt that it would not be such that a long debate was needed to be done on this policy. The reason is that as per his observation, there is lack of procedure. The NEP had also been placed on the portal about two year ago to give feedback and suggestions on it. During the meeting of the Principals, it was said that this should be conveyed to the Colleges that they should prepare mentally as the University is going to implement it. This was not conveyed through the University to the Colleges that from this year NEP would be implemented. All of a sudden, they are saying that they have to implement the policy, Colleges are not resisting in its implementation, Colleges are only saying that there are some questions and problems that is why they are not in a position to convey to the students. Firstly, he would like to state, as the letter from Higher Education and U.G.C. had been received, so it is their duty to implement it, so it should not be implemented in such a way. The Senate, the supreme body of the University is not the body for framing the syllabus. The Board of Studies and other related bodies are there for framing the framework of the syllabi. It is most relevant as also stated by Professor Arun K. Grover, that if a period of six months or one year should be given to the Colleges for preparing them mentally for the implementation of NEP, there would not be any problem.

Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that to implement any policy, there is one thing which is to be understood as to what would be the effect on the stakeholders. From the last 7 days, the confusion pertaining to NEP is going on, protests are being held. It would be strange to know that even the members of the Syndicate who had given green signal for its implementation, are not satisfied with the policy. They are also saying that they are in haste. So, he requested that time should be given and they should consider the rural areas of Punjab also. Even the Colleges of Chandigarh are not ready to implement it. A number of calls are being received that they are trying to implement this policy in haste, they should be given time. This policy should not be bound to be implemented to those who are not aware about it so far. Let give them time and this policy should be implemented from the next year, as per the viewpoints of various other members.

The Vice Chancellor said that now they have discussed the policy at length. The U.G.C. guidelines for framing curriculum and U.G.C. guidelines for Curriculum and Credit Framework for Under graduate Programmes aligned with National Education Policy-2020, be adopted in principle and it would be implemented on Panjab University campus from the academic session 2023-24 and in affiliated Colleges from the next session 2024-25.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that being the Chairman of the Regulations Committee, all the viewpoints expressed by the members should be absorbed as the decision had already been taken whether this policy is to be implemented from the session 2023-24 or

2024-25. At the meeting of the Regulations Committee, first question which was whether it is for the session 2023-24 and 2024-25. As per the instructions and University set up, it was directed that this policy is needed to be implemented from this session and hence the Regulations for the same are to be prepared. During the first meeting of the Regulations Committee, he requested that the structural framework of the NEP should be kept aside from the Regulations as he had his own experience as he was associated with B.Com. from the very beginning, then it was agreed that structure of this team is to be kept aside from the Regulations, so that the flexibility and changes which are required to be made from time to time, are to be carried out. Whenever the structural changes come into existence, problems are bound to arise, but are needed to be addressed. It was assured by the Vice Chancellor that pain should be relieved or addressed. One or two issues which had been raised such as for Punjabi language and it was decided in the very first meeting that Punjabi would remain as such and there would be no change in it. The question was only that when the structure regarding framework on NEP was prepared by the U.G.C., to fit the same in University's framework, discussions and debates were held and the same were also to be done by the Secretaries and Deans of Faculties. The first decision was that as it would not be possible to run from 120 credits, there is a need to enhance the credits. The old CBCS system was not implemented in the Colleges due to the reason that as it was to be fixed for 120 credits, which would not be able to serve the purpose. At present, there are 145 credits, besides these, if they want, the credits could be enhanced, because ultimately the structure which is developed in the framework of NEP, it is necessary to comply with the U.G.C. Regulations for the award of the degree in 2024. When the U.G.C. Regulations for the award of first degree 2023 were gone through, they would observe that any problem for a particular subject could be addressed. He felt that at one place which could be understood by Dean of University Instruction, that if there is need of enhancing the credits, the same could be got enhanced. The second part was of structure, when the 24 credits were enhanced, the meaning of 24 credits was only for redressing the problems. This matter was also discussed with the Deans also and they were confidently saying that this has been addressed and there is no problem in it. The Dean of Science had assured also that all the issues would be resolved. The issue was not raised in the Commerce as it had a huge exercise in it and Principal Kirandeep Kaur and Principal Purv Aggarwal had after meeting for hours, addressed the issue. The structural change which had come into existence, wherein the structure had been given for 1<sup>st</sup> year, all the Deans assured that syllabi of the previous years had been the same. Besides these, there were some other issues also which are needed to be addressed. He felt that Vice Chancellor should be authorized to make changes in the structure and Regulations, on behalf of the House, so that all the issues could be addressed accordingly.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar and several other members said that it should be recorded in the resolved part that for making modifications pertaining to minor typographical mistakes, the Vice Chancellor should be authorized.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said it should also be added in the resolved part that in the implementation of this New Education Policy, whatever time frame is given shall have not any effect on Punjabi language and its teaching as in the past.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he felt the Vice Chancellor should be authorized on behalf of the House, not only the typographical errors, but also the changes which are needed to be carried out in view of the inputs of members of House.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that he would like to thank the Vice Chancellor on behalf of the whole teaching fraternity that she understood the sentiments of the Colleges. He would only like to say that the colleagues should not differentiate between College teachers versus University teachers, it is the community and they should also not

pressurize the Vice Chancellor saying that war has come before her. There is no war, she had already resolved the issue related to Punjabi in a very religious manner and resolved the issue pertaining to NEP also.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. the U.G.C. guidelines for Curriculum and Credit Framework for Under-Graduate Programmes aligned with National Education Policy-2020, be approved and adopted in the University Campus from the academic session 2023-24 and in the affiliated Colleges from the next academic session, i.e., 2024-25; and
2. the Regulations for following 4-Year Undergraduate Honours Programmes, under NEP, 2020 framework, to be introduced at the Panjab University Campus and Colleges affiliated to Panjab University effective from the academic session 2023-24, be approved:
  1. B.A. Honours
  2. B.Sc. Honours
  3. B.Sc. Honours (Under Honours School Framework)
  4. B.Com. Honours
  5. B.B.A. Honours
  6. B.C.A. Honours.
  7. B.Sc. Honours (Home Science)
  8. B.Sc. Honours (Dairying and Animal Husbandry and Agriculture) for Colleges affiliated to Panjab University
  9. B.A. Honours in Economics at Panjab University Campus
  10. B.Sc. Honours in Fashion Designing.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Vice Chancellor be authorized to approve modifications/changes, which would be necessitated to be made.

**X.** Considered (**Item C-9 on the agenda – Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 22**),  
and

**RESOLVED:** That the following recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 13.12.2022, be approved:

**ITEM 1**

That following additions be made in Regulation 2 for Advanced Diploma in Computer Applications (Semester System) (effective from the session 2022-23):

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>2. The minimum qualifications for the course shall be:-</p> <p>(i) Graduate (B.A./B.Sc./ B.Com./ B.C.A. under 10+2+3 system of examination) having Mathematics as main subject up to 10+2 level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) B.E/B.Tech.</p> <p>(iii) Any other examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (i) or (ii) above.</p>	<p>2. The minimum qualifications for the course shall be:-</p> <p>(i) No change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) No Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><b><u>(iii) B.Voc. (Software Development), B.Voc. (Hardware and Networking) and B.Voc. Multimedia (Graphics &amp; Animation) with at least 50% marks.</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(iv) Any other examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to <b>(i), (ii) or (iii) above.</b></p>

**ITEM 2**

That following addition be made in Regulation 2.1 for B.Ed. (Yoga) (effective from the session 2022-23):

PRESENT REGULATIONS	PROPOSED REGULATIONS
<p>2.1. Admission to B.Ed. shall be made on merit on the basis of marks obtained in the entrance test or any other selection process as per policy of state Govt./U.T. administration and the University.</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b></p>	<p>2.1 No Change</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b></p>

<p>A person who possesses the following qualification shall be eligible to join the course:</p> <p>(i) A candidate required atleast 50% (Fifty Percent) marks having the qualification i.e. B.A. (Yoga), M.A. (Yoga) or Graduation with one year diploma/certificate in Yoga Education equivalent thereto is eligible for admission to the programme and preference will be given to said qualifications.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>OR</b></p> <p>(ii) Candidates with at least 50% (Fifty Percent) marks either in Bachelor's degree, and/or in the Master's degree in Science/ Social Science/Humanities/ Commerce/Home science/B.A. LLB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>OR</b></p> <p>(iii) Candidates with at least 55% (Fifty five Percent) marks Engineering or Technology.</p> <p>(iv) The reservation and relaxation for SC/ST/OBC and other categories shall be as per rules of the admission policy of State Govt./Chandigarh Union Territory Administration, as the case may be.</p>	<p>A person who possesses the following qualification shall be eligible to join the course:</p> <p>(i) No Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) No Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(iii) No Change</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><b>(iv) A candidate having any other qualification equivalent thereto is eligible for admission to the Programme.</b></p> <p>(v) No Change</p>
--	---

**ITEM 3**

That following amendment be made in Regulation 11.1 for Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) (Two-Year course-Semester System) course (effective from the session 2019-20):

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>11.1. A person who has already passed the examination for the degree of Bachelor of Education may offer, as an additional teaching subject. He may be admitted to the examination on submission of application on the prescribed form and payment of admission fee as prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time.</p> <p>Provided that –</p> <p>(i) she/he has already passed the first degree/Post Graduate degree examination in that subject.</p> <p>(ii) in addition to the written paper of the teaching subject in semester –I &amp; II , the candidate shall have to complete the school internship requirements as per existing syllabus and shall undergo a practical test in the teaching of the additional subject taken by him/her.</p>	<p><b>11.1 No Change</b></p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>(i) <b><u>the candidate seeking additional examination for B.Ed. course shall have to appear with the current syllabus irrespective of the fact that whether the candidate has completed his/her degree in annual/ semester system (one year/two year)</u></b></p> <p>(ii) he/she has already passed the first degree/Post-Graduate degree examination in that subject.</p> <p>(iii) <b><u>the additional paper should be completed in three (3) semesters (1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> semester for theory and 3<sup>rd</sup> semester for Practical examination) and the candidate can not appear in 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> semester simultaneously. They have to apply separately for each semester.</u></b></p>

**ITEM 4**

That following amendment be made in Regulation 1.5 for B.E./Integrated B.E. (Chemical)-MBA (effective from the session 2021-22):

<b>PRESENT REGULATION (effective from the session 2014-15)</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION (effective from the session 2021-22)</b>
<p>1.5 The admission shall be open to a candidate who has passed 10+2/Equivalent qualifying examination with the following subjects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Language</li> <li>2. Physics</li> <li>3. Mathematics</li> <li>4. Any one of (Chemistry, Biology, Biotechnology, Technical Vocational Subject),</li> <li>5. Any other subject. With at least 45% (40% in case of candidate belonging to reserved category*) marks in above subjects taken together.</li> </ol> <p>*The candidates belonging to Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribes and Persons with Disability (PWD) shall be eligible on the basis of relaxed criteria determined by CBSE for the year 2014 for Central Counselling as indicated above.</p> <p>*The candidates belonging to Backward Classes shall be eligible on the basis of relaxed criteria determined by CBSE for the year 2014 for Central Counselling for Other Backward Class (OBC) if they belong to Non-Creamy Layer (NCL).</p>	<p>1.5 The admission shall be open to a candidate who has passed 10+2/Equivalent qualifying examination with the following subjects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Language</li> <li>2. Physics</li> <li>3. Mathematics</li> <li>4. Any one of Chemistry/Biology/ Biotechnology/ Technical Vocational Subject</li> <li>5. Any other subject.</li> </ol> <p>Only those candidates are eligible who have passed class 12<sup>th</sup> in the above subjects taken together.</p>

**ITEM 5**

That following amendment be made in Regulation 1.5 for B.E./Integrated B.E. (Chemical)-MBA (effective from the session 2022-23):

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b> (effective from the session 2021-22)	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b> (effective from the session 2022-23)
<p>1.5 The admission shall be open to a candidate who has passed 10+2/Equivalent qualifying examination with the following subjects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Language</li> <li>2. Physics</li> <li>3. Mathematics</li> <li>4. Any one of (Chemistry, Biology, Biotechnology, Technical Vocational Subject),</li> <li>5. Any other subject.</li> </ol> <p>Only those candidates are eligible who have passed class 12<sup>th</sup> in the above subjects taken together.</p>	<p>1.5 The admission shall be open to a candidate who has passed 10+2/Equivalent qualifying examination with the following subjects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Language</li> <li>2. Physics</li> <li>3. Mathematics</li> <li>4. Any one of Chemistry, Biology/ Biotechnology/ Technical Vocational Subject</li> <li>5. Any other subject.</li> </ol> <p>Only those candidates are eligible who have passed class 12<sup>th</sup> in the above subjects taken together <b>or Passed 10+3 Diploma examination with Mathematics as compulsory subject.</b></p>

**ITEM 6**

That following amendment be made in Regulation 9 for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. Four Year Integrated Course (Semester System) (effective from the session 2019-20):

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>9. Candidates will be allowed to improve their performance in any paper. The number of chance will be governed by the prevailing University rules.</p>	<p>9. A person who has qualified for the award of the Four-Year Bachelor's degree in B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. from the Panjab University may be allowed to re-appear as a private candidate in a subject in which he/she appeared earlier, with a view to improve his/her previous performance. <b><u>He/she may reappear in the first, second, third and fourth year examinations or any of the examinations, as per odd/even system of examination.</u></b></p> <p>For this purpose he/she may be given two chances within a period of two years from the year of passing the fourth year of B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. examination. He/she may avail of these chances along with next two annual examinations.</p>



**ITEM 7**

That following addition of nomenclature, i.e., “Drug Abuse: Problem, Prevention and Management” be made in Regulation 2.2 meant for B.A./B.Sc. (General and Honours) (effective from the session 2020-21):

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>2.2 The structure of the first year of B.A. course w.e.f. admission of 2014, shall be as under:-</p> <p><b>(i) Compulsory subjects</b></p> <p>(a) Punjabi two papers/ *History and Culture of Punjab- One paper } 100 marks (b) English-one paper }</p> <p><b>(c) Environment, : 50 marks</b> <b>Road Safety : 20 marks</b> <b>Education and</b> <b>Marks</b> } 100 <b>Violence against: 30 marks</b> <b>Women &amp; Children</b></p> <p>(ii) Elective subjects</p> <p>xxx      xxx      xxx</p>	<p>2.2 No Change</p> <p><b>(i) Compulsory subjects</b></p> <p>(a) to (b) No Change</p> <p><b>(c) Environment, Road Safety</b> <b>Education, Violence against</b> <b>Women/Children and Drug Abuse:</b> <b>Problem, Prevention and</b> <b>Management comprising four parts</b> <b>as under:</b></p> <p><b>Part-I : Environment</b> <b>Part-II : Road Safety Education</b> <b>Part-III : Violence against</b> <b>Women/Children</b> <b>Part-IV : Drug Abuse: Problem,</b> <b>Prevention and</b> <b>Management</b></p> <p>(ii) No change</p> <p>xxx      xxx      xxx</p>

**ITEM 8**

That the eligibility condition for M.A. (Punjabi) (effective from the session 2018-2019), M.A. (Hindi), M.A. (Political Science), M.A. (Sociology) and M.A. (History), M.A. (English) and M.A. History of Art (effective from the session 2017-2018) for Master of Arts/Science examination, be amended as below:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>11.1. A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognised by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to</p>	<p><b>11.1 No Change</b></p>

<p>join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education :-</p> <p>(i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.</p> <p>(iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>11.2 For the Physical Education course</p> <p>11.3 For Women Studies course</p> <p>11.4 For M.A. Human Rights</p> <p>11.5 For Masters in Public Health</p> <p>11.6 For M.A. Social work</p> <p>11.7 For M.A. Police Administration</p> <p>11.8 For M.A. in the Language Departments</p> <p>11.9 For M.A. (Buddhist and Tibetan Studies) (for private candidates)</p> <p>11.10 For M.A. Sanskrit</p> <p>11.11 For M.A. Economics (Deptt. of Economics)</p>	<p><b>11.2 to 11.11 No Change</b></p> <p><b>11.12 For M.A. Punjabi</b></p> <p>Passed one of the following examinations from a recognized University/Institute:</p> <p>Bachelor's Degree obtaining at least 45% marks in the subject of Post-Graduate course or 50% marks in aggregate B.A./B.Sc./ B.Sc. (Hons.)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Master's degree examination in any other subject provided the candidate has studied Punjabi Compulsory at graduate level.</p> <p><b>Weightage:</b>1. The 15% weightage will be given to those students who studied Punjabi as an elective subject at graduate level.</p>
---	---

	<p>2. The 15% weightage will be given to the students who studied B.A. (Hons.) in Punjabi at under graduate level.</p> <p>3. The 15% weightage will be given to those who passed B.A. (Hons.) School in Punjabi at under graduate level.</p> <p>4. Those who passed elective Punjabi and Hons. (both) will be given 20%</p> <p>5 Any exemption will be given to SC/ST candidates as per UGC norms.</p> <p><b>11.13 For M.A. Hindi</b></p> <p>(i) Bachelor's Degree obtaining at least 45% marks in Hindi or 50% marks in the aggregate <b>provided the candidate has passed Hindi as an Elective/Compulsory Subject.</b> OR</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with (Hons.) in Hindi or B.Sc. with (Hons. School Course) OR</p> <p>(iii) Master's Degree Examination in any other subject provided the candidate has studied Hindi Compulsory and Sanskrit at Graduation level.</p> <p>(iv) Preference will be given only to those students who have studied Hindi (elective), Hindi (Compulsory) and Sanskrit at Graduation level.</p> <p>(v) For M.A. Hindi Part-I examination 45% marks in Sanskrit (elective), or examination (new course) are also accepted.</p> <p>(vi) For Hindi course a person who after passing B.A. examination, has passed the Prabhakar examination securing 45% marks (out of aggregate excluding the additional paper, shall also be eligible.</p> <p><b>11.14 For M.A. Political Science</b></p>
--	--

	<p>(i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45 per cent marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50 per cent marks in the aggregate.</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of the Postgraduate course or B.Sc. Hons. School course.</p> <p>(iii) Master's degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>A person who has passed B.A. with 45% marks in any Social Science discipline shall also be eligible.</p> <p><b><u>Weightage: subject weightage will be given to those candidates who have taken six full papers in Political Science in B.A. course.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Weightage for Hons. in Political Science i.e. 15% shall be given to those candidates who have studied ten papers in Political Science in B.A. course.</u></b></p> <p><b>11.15 For M.A. Sociology</b></p> <p>Passed one of the following examinations from a recognized University:</p> <p>(i) Bachelor's Degree obtaining at least 45% marks in the subject of Postgraduate course OR 50% marks in the aggregate.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of Post-Graduate Course OR B.Sc. (Hons.School) course.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(iii) Masers Degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p><b><u>Subject weightage will be given to candidates who have taken six full papers in Sociology in B.A. course.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Weightage for Hons. in Sociology (15%) (weihtage shall be given in</u></b></p>
--	---

	<p><b><u>Hons. in Sociology in case the candidate has studied ten papers (6+4=10).</u></b></p> <p><b>11.16 For M.A. History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) B.A. with Honours in History</li><li>(ii) Bachelor's degree in any faculty with at least 50% marks in the aggregate.</li><li>(iii) B.A. (Pass) examination in full subjects obtaining at least 45% marks in the subject of History.</li><li>(iv) Master's degree examination in another subject or another faculty.</li></ul> <p><b>11.17 For M.A. English</b></p> <p>A person who has passed one of the following examinations from Panjab University or from any other University whose examination has been recognized equivalent to the corresponding examination of this University:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45% marks in English Elective.</li><li>(ii) A Bachelor's degree obtaining at least 45% marks in English Compulsory subject.</li><li>(iii) Bachelor's degree in any faculty obtaining at least 50% marks in the aggregate.</li><li>iv) B.A. with Honours in English.</li><li>(v) B.A./B.Sc. with Honours in subject other than English obtaining at least 50% marks in the aggregate.</li><li>(vi) Master's degree in any other subject obtaining at least 50% marks in the aggregate.</li></ul> <p><b>11.18 For M.A. History of Art</b></p>
--	--

	<p>Passed one of the following examinations from a recognized University:</p> <p>(i) Bachelor's Degree obtaining at least 45% marks in the subject of Postgraduate course, or 50% marks in the aggregate.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) B.A. with Honours in the subject of Post-Graduate Course OR B.Sc. (Hons.School) course.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(iii) Masers Degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>For History of Art, a person who has passed one of the following shall be eligible-</p> <p>(1) B.A. (Pass) examination with 45 per cent marks in any of the following subjects:-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) Art (b) Music (c) Psychology (d) Philosophy (e) Sociology (f) Sanskrit (g) History (h) English (i) Ancient Indian History Culture &amp; Archaeology (j) Home Science (k) Any one of the Modern Indian Languages/ Classical Languages;</p> <p>(2) B.A. (Pass)/B.Sc. (Home Science) examination in second division with at least 50 per cent marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(3) B.F.A./Bachelor of Architecture examination with at least 45 per cent marks in the aggregate;</p> <p>(4) Masers Degree examination in any other subject.</p> <p>Provided he qualifies in an aptitude test conducted by the Department of Fine Arts as per guidelines laid down by the concerned Board of Control.</p>
--	---

**ITEM 9**

That Regulations for Advanced Certificate Course in Yoga (effective from the session 2020-21, be approved, **as per Appendix**.

**ITEM 10**

That eligibility condition, **as per Appendix**, be added in Regulation 1.3 meant for following M.E. (Two Year Regular course) (Four Semesters) (effective from the session 2020-21:

- (i) M.E. in Mechanical Engineering (Robotics)
- (ii) M.E. in Computer Science and Engineering (IOT-Internet of Things)
- (iii) M.E. in Electronics and Communication Engineering (Artificial Intelligence)

**ITEM 11**

That –

- (i) nomenclatures of Post-Graduate Diplomas being offered at USOL be changed to **that of Advanced Diplomas**; and
- (ii) Regulations for **Advanced Diplomas** (effective from the session 2021-22), **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 22)**

**XI.** Considered **(Item C-10 on the agenda – Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 15)**, and

**RESOLVED:** That the following recommendations of Regulations Committee dated 28.12.2022, be approved:

**ITEM 1**

That Regulation 2.1 for M.Phil. Clinical Psychology, be amended as under and given effect from the academic session 2022:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
2.1 Candidate to be eligible to appear for the M.Phil. Entrance Test, should have passed as a regular candidate, <b>Master's examination in the subject of Psychology with special paper in Clinical Psychology</b> , securing not less than 55% (50% for SC) marks in aggregate from Panjab University or from any other institute/University examination of which has been recognized as equivalent to the corresponding examination of this University.	<b>2.1 Minimum educational requirement for admission to this course shall be 2 years M.A./M.Sc. degree in Psychology from a University recognized by the UGC with a minimum of 55% marks in aggregate. For SC/ST category, minimum of 50% marks in aggregate is essential, as per Govt. of India.</b>

**ITEM 2**

That Regulation 2.1 (a) for Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS), be amended as under and given effect from the session 2022-23:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>2.1 (a) A person who has passed the first BDS examination of Panjab University or an examination of any other recognized University in India considered equivalent for the purpose by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, shall be eligible to join the second year BDS class. However, a candidate who fails in the first BDS examination in the May/June examination for the first time may be allowed to attend the next higher class until December next but if he fails even in the November/December examination, he shall revert to the first BDS class.</p>	<p>2.1 A person who has passed the first BDS examination of Panjab University or an examination of any other recognized University in India considered equivalent for the purpose by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, shall be eligible to join the second year BDS class. <b>Any candidate who fails in one subject in an examination is permitted to go to the next higher class and appear for the subject and complete it successfully before he/she is permitted to appear for the next higher examination.</b></p> <p><b>This Regulation shall be applicable for BDS 1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> year.</b></p> <p><b>The provisional promotion of the students who fail in more than one subject will be reverted back.</b></p>

**ITEM 3**

That Regulation 1.2 for B.E. (Chemical)-M.B.A., be amended as under and given effect to from the session 2022-23:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>1.2 The duration of the course of instruction for Integrated B.E. M.B.A. in all disciplines being offered by the Panjab University shall be Five years. The teaching period will be divided in ten semesters. Each semester shall be at least of <b>fourteen weeks</b> duration.</p> <p><b>For Integrated B.E. (Chemical) with M.B.A.</b></p> <p>The duration of the course of instruction for Integrated B.E. (Chemical) with M.B.A. being offered by the Panjab University shall be Five years.</p>	<p><b>1.2</b> The duration of the course of instruction for Integrated B.E. M.B.A. in all disciplines being offered by the Panjab University shall be Five years. The teaching period will be divided in ten semesters. Each semester shall be at least of <b>fifteen weeks</b> duration.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**ITEM 4**



That the nomenclature of “**Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Divyang**”, be changed to that of “**Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing/Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged persons**”.

<b><u>EXISTING NOMENCLATURE</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE</u></b>
<b><u>Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Divyang.</u></b>	<b>“Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing/Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged persons”</b>

**ITEM 6**

That the following addition in Regulation 1 for Bachelor of Science (Medical Laboratory Technology), Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology (X-Ray) and Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology (Anaesthesia and Operation Theatre Techniques) (three-year integrated course), be made:

<b><u>PRESENT REGULATION</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED REGULAION</u></b>
1. The Bachelor of Science (Medical Lab. Technology), Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology (X-Ray) and Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology (Anaesthesia and Operation Theatre Techniques) will be a three-year integrated course. The course is to be run under annual system for the purpose of University examination. However, for internal assessment semester/House examinations will be held.	1. No Change  <b><u>The students shall be allowed two years’ period beyond the normal period to clear the backlog to be qualified for the degree for B.Sc. in (Medical Lab. Technology), B.Sc. in (X-Ray) and B.Sc. in (Anaesthesia and Operation Theatre Techniques) courses. However, in exceptional circumstances and on the basis of the merits of each case, University may allow a student one more year for the completion of the programme.</u></b>

**ITEM 7**

That the following addition in Regulation 1 for Bachelor of Optometry (B.Optom) (three-year integrated course), be made:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULAION</b>
<p>1. The duration of the course for Bachelor of Optometry (B.Optom.) shall be of four years. There shall be three academic years plus one year Compulsory Internship.</p>	<p><b>1. No Change</b></p> <p><b><u>The students shall be allowed two years' period beyond the normal period to clear the backlog to be qualified for the degree for B.Sc. Optometry (B.Optom.). However, in exceptional circumstances and on the basis of the merits of each case, University may allow a student one more year for the completion of the programme.</u></b></p>

**ITEM 8**

That following Regulation 10.3 for M.Ed. Special Education – (Learning Disability/Intellectual Disability) (Semester System), be added at appropriate place:

- 10.3 Criteria for appointment of Supervisor for M.Ed. Special Education – (Learning Disability/Intellectual Disability):
- (i) Supervisor should be regular Faculty;
  - (ii) (a) Should have minimum 3 years experience in teaching Masters course in the subject concern;  
OR
  - (b) Should have research experience (M.Phil./Ph.D./Funded Research Project) with research publication.

Moreover research experience at M.Phil./Ph.D. level is to be taken care or having undertaken funded research projects.

**ITEM 9**

That Regulations for M.A. (Yoga) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2022-23), **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**ITEM 10**

That Regulations for following Certificate Courses introduced under Certificate course in Governance and Leadership at Department of Women Studies (w.e.f. 2017-18 and 2018-19), as per **Appendix**, be approved:

- (a) Certificate course in Citizenship
- (b) Certificate course in Financial Management in Public Affairs
- (c) Certificate course in Leadership Skills

- (d) Certificate course in Campaign Management 2017-2018
  - (e) Certificate course in Practical Skills in Areas such as Media Skills, Public Speaking, Campaign Strategies, Handling Conflicts
  - (f) Certificate course in Ethics in Public Policy
  - (g) Human Resource Management
  - (h) Political Parties and Electoral Process
- } 2018-2019

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the nomenclature of Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Divyang, be changed to that of **“Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Specially Abled”**.

**Item C-11 was taken up with Item C-8.**

**XII.** Considered (**Item C-12 on the agenda – Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 13**), and

**RESOLVED:** That Regulations/Rules for BHMS framed in accordance with Gazette Notification dated 06.12.2022 (**Appendix-III**), be approved and made effective from the academic session 2022-23.

**XIII.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-13 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-13.** That –

- (i) National Academic Depository (NAD)-Digilocker, be adopted in totality along with Degree Templates of UG and PG courses;
- (ii) as per Communications received from UGC, Academic Bank of Credits (ABC), under Digilocker framework, be implemented; and
- (iii) the following recommendations of the Committee dated 11.08.2022 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to resolve the issue of different degree templates available on NAD-Digilocker not matching with degree templates of Panjab University, be approved:
  1. Firstly, data of only Postgraduate and Professional courses of May-2021, be uploaded on NAD-Digilocker and after that undergraduate course data be uploaded.
  2. The System Administrator must ensure that the data of only those UG/PG degrees is uploaded on NAD-Digilocker, which are already being physically printed, meaning thereby that whose fee is clear.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023 Para 14)**

**Items C-14 and C-30 on the agenda were taken up together.**

**XIV.** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-14 and C-30 on the agenda** were read out, viz.

**C-14.** That –

1. Template for appointment of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors and Principal in Private Aided Colleges in State of Punjab as per UGC Regulations 2018 issued by Government of Punjab vide letter dated 20.02.2023, be approved;
2. Template for appointment of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors and Principal in unaided Private Colleges situated in state of Punjab as per UGC Regulations 2018, be approved;
3. Template for Direct recruitment for private aided colleges in U.T. Chandigarh as per UGC Regulations 2018, be approved;
4. Template of CAS promotions for colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh, located in Chandigarh as per UGC Regulations, 2018, be approved; and
5. Template for CAS promotions in affiliated colleges located in Punjab as per UGC Regulations, 2018, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023 Para 31)**

**C-30.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 05.05.2023 regarding finalizing the template for appointment of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors, Principal for Direct Recruitment and CAS Promotion for Government Aided/Unaided Colleges in Punjab/UT Chandigarh, as per UGC Regulations 2018, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 27.05.2023 Para 31)**

Initiating discussion, Dr. Gurmit Singh said while referring to page 535 wherein under point (v) it is mentioned that “the period taken by candidates to acquire Ph.D. shall not be considered as teaching/research experience to be claimed for shortlisting/appointment”, he would like to enquire if the teacher is working in some College and going for Ph.D., is that teaching experience be counted or not. That teaching experience should be kept in parallel to that Ph.D.

It was informed that teaching experience of the College would be counted.

Continuing this, Dr. Gurmit Singh said that he would also like to ask according to the Regulations, what would be the eligibility conditions? Would it be U.G.C. NET or Ph.D?

It was informed that the U.G.C. Regulations would be applicable.

Dr. Gurmit Singh again enquired whether U.G.C. NET is mandatory or it is exempted for those Ph.D. students who had gone with that course work.

It was informed that U.G.C. NET is exempted for those Ph.D. students who had gone with that course work.

Principal R.K. Mahajan, while speaking on the matter regarding templates, said that he would like to refer to Ph.D. guidelines, 2018. After going through, it was observed that some differences are found as compared to guidelines issued by U.G.C., whereas it has been said by the Registrar that everything issued by U.G.C. should be followed in toto. In the U.G.C. guidelines, 2018, it is mentioned that for College Principals, Professors, Associate Professors with 15 years teaching experience, minimum 10 research papers and minimum 110 research schools as per table II, Appendix-II. It is clearly mentioned that table II of Appendix-II shall be strictly followed as per Ph.D. guidelines, 2018. While referring to template provided with the Agenda, he said that this template is quite different. The most important change in that is, five research papers shall be evaluated whereas nowhere it is mentioned in the U.G.C. guidelines that five research papers would be evaluated. In the templates under the U.G.C. guidelines, 2018, it is mentioned that after clearing 100 marks, interviews would be conducted and selections would be done accordingly. From where the concept of 60:20:20 is originated. If there are some changes, the same should be informed. During the meeting on templates held in the month of February, 2020 in the presence of Professor Sanjay Kaushik, it was decided that guidelines pertaining to 2018 should had been approved. Before the introduction of Care list in 2018, the teachers who had submitted the papers to the U.G.C. list, nothing is mentioned about them in the templates that these papers shall be considered or not.

It was informed that these papers would be considered.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that this should be written on the notes of the templates. Referring to page 543 of the Agenda, it is written that submit five best publications for evaluation of such *pro forma*, whereas it is nowhere mentioned in the Ph.D. guidelines, 2018. If it is existed in the templates, whereas nothing is mentioned in the Ph.D guidelines, how could it appear here?

To this, Dr. Dinesh Kumar intervened to say that U.G.C. guidelines should be applied in toto.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is as per the circulars of Government of Punjab, U.G.C. Regulations issued by the Government of Punjab. The modifications made by the Government of Punjab that have been incorporated.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that when the Government of Punjab has made the modifications, then they should have to get it add their own modifications.

It was informed that both the items C-14 and C-30 can be discussed together.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that criteria of academics are quite different for teachers of Education as well as Physical Education subject. The average of both B.A. and B.Ed. are added which should be written in asterisk. In Masters also the average of M.A. and M.Ed. are given. Hence this correction should be carried out. The average of both these degrees should be added.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that it should also be noted that before the Care list of 2018, the U.G.C. notification should also be included.

It was informed that under Item C-30, the same has been included.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that as pointed out by other members, he would like to intimate the House that a Committee was constituted which was discussed in the Syndicate under consideration item in the previous meeting of the Syndicate held on 25.03.2023. The template sent by the Punjab Government is strictly according to the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018. When the Committee was formed, at that time, Director, Higher Education (Punjab) informed that he would send his nominee, but the minutes of the said Committee has not been attached due to which it could not be established whether the nominee of Director, Higher Education had attended the meeting or not. Owing to this, a letter was drafted in the tabulation form. On the one side, the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018 and on the other side, template of Punjab Government had been appended. 9 points have been mentioned in the minutes, which are required to be placed before the Senate. The templates were earlier also amended, but that were supported by another notification. When the tenure of the Principal was decided as five years, the Punjab Government had notified that another five years' extension could be granted and thereafter, the special notification to this effect was issued. He reiterated that those 9 points should be placed before the House. The disadvantage, which is being faced, got created because of different templates provided by the U.T. Administration and Punjab Government. The template for U.T. Administration is strictly according to the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018, whereas the template for Punjab is deviated on 10-12 places, which were pointed out by him and Principal R.S. Jhanji said that in rural Colleges, the problem of networking is faced. He would like to intimate what were these 9 points, the first is that the candidates/applicants have been asked to apply only through online mode. The applicants have to face problem in applying through online mode, so some via-media of providing hard copy, should be devised. The second problem is that the candidates who applied, for their screening, the Committee was of the Government is to be involved. For example, in 150 Colleges for screening, the representative of Government would come in every Screening Committee meeting and it would be difficult to complete the screening as it might take a year or more. Thirdly, the major point was on the issue as to how much candidates are to be invited for interview. It is not specified in the template as to what is the minimum number of candidates, which can be called. The points earned on account of N.C.C. and N.S.S. had not been included. The deviation on these 9-10 points on account of U.G.C. should not be there. Whenever these candidates are selected, at the later stage when the matter regarding their U.G.C. scales and promotion would come, they might face problem in it. This main issue was annexed with the letter which contained these 9 points.

The Vice Chancellor directed the office to bring the letter pointed out by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he did not speak as after going through the minutes, the House would be aware about the 9 recommendations made by the Committee. He was also the member of that Committee which was formed under the chairmanship of D.C.D.C., in the presence of the representatives of the Government. The Director Higher Education (Punjab) stated that they should not deviate from the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018, which was agreed to and that template was finalized. When the template of the Punjab is not deviated from the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018, why the template for U.T. Administration is different from that? Similarly, when there is no deviation in the template of U.T., there should be no deviation in the template for Punjab

also. When the template of Punjab Government is according to U.G.C. Regulations, 2018 then why the U.T. Administration is rejecting the template and framing its own template. In fact, the template of Punjab is not according to the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018. They did not know how this was framed. They made the 9 recommendations and all of these points were rejected. He felt that this is the major issue for discussion. The recommendations given by the Committee should be circulated to the members of the House so that other members could go through the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that the file is placed with her which includes the points. If the Punjab Government wanted to deviate from the U.G.C. Regulations, what could be done?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the deviation should be supported by the proper notification of the Government. It should be discussed in the meeting of the Cabinet of Punjab Government.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that on the concurrent list, if the Advocate and Legal experts agree that, if on the decision, the legislation of the Central Government and the State Government is conflicted, the decisions of the Central Government would be prevailed. The Regulations of U.G.C. are categorical which is deviated by the Punjab Government, the Punjab Government is not agreed to adopt it. At page 238, where Regulations, 2018, at point 1.2, which clearly says, that these shall apply to every University established and incorporated under Central and State Provincial Act, including affiliated Colleges. Those institutions which have been recognized by the U.G.C. under this section as University or College, this notification of the Central Government applied to these Universities and Colleges. This did not give any authority to State Governments to make changes at their own level. The Punjab Government has no right to change the notification. It is not constitutionally and legally right that Punjab Government is not agreeing to the notification of the Central Government. There is no difference between aided and non-aided Colleges in the University Calendar. The Committee constituted is correct and the nominees of the Government should be considered as representatives of the University. They should not allow such deviations in the functioning of the University. The U.G.C. is directing that these Regulations are to be adopted by the Universities, it did not mention nowhere that it is to be adopted by the State Government. He has the direct experience for the same as under the Regulations, 2010, when the Punjab sought the grant, it was written to the Government of India, and the Government had directed that they would have to forward the same through the University that Regulations of 2010 had to be followed. As per law, it is clear that Regulations of U.G.C. should be followed by the Punjab Government without any ifs and buts. If they stated that their nominee should also be present, which should be considered as nominee of the University. There is no justification for the deviation sought by the Punjab Government. The justification should obviously be given and its credits should be decided, otherwise the merit would be compromised. He would simply say that what Punjab Government is doing, they are deviating from U.G.C. Regulations and they have no right to deviate from U.G.C. Regulations. Each and every University is supposed to go according to this. The only thing, the State Government has the authority is regarding pay-scales and the other is regarding age. These two things are left to the State. For rest of the provisions, they have to follow U.G.C. Regulations.

The Vice Chancellor said that some deviations are there on such points. First point is that online be omitted from U.G.C. Regulations, 2018. This point is related to U.G.C. Regulations, which had also been suggested by the Committee headed by Dean, College Development Council, and Regulation 6(2) of U.G.C. of Regulations, 2018 also

says this. At this place, the Punjab Government is right and also the U.G.C. is saying that online should be omitted. Point No.3 of the SOP is that short-listing of the candidates should be completed at the College level rather than D.C.D.C. level, as suggested by the Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is not the suggestion of the Committee. D.C.D.C. had explained while citing the example that as interviews were going on in Delhi and there all the 100 candidates were appeared for interview, either interview would be completed in one or two days.

The Vice Chancellor said that the suggested model is definitely be not the best model. They could always say that for one post the University or the State Government could take a call to invite 10-15 candidates. They could do that. There has been a long set of criticism of this model. She stated that they should consider it on point-wise basis. The first point is as per U.G.C. Regulation that condition of online applying should be omitted, which has been cleared. On second point, they are saying that it is somewhere mentioned in the U.G.C. Regulations that short-listing of the candidates is to be done at College level.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is mentioned in one of the columns.

Principal R.S. Jhanji clarified that it has been mentioned in the para and has also been quoted at one of the pages.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, charged a fee of Rs.1100/- from the applicants for the post of Principal. Thereafter, they check the API score of the shortlisted candidates in the presence of Dean, College Development Council nominee and three Professors of the University, and after that they called the candidates for interview at the University level.

The Vice Chancellor said that this has been stated by the Directorate of Higher Education that template provides a provision of short-listing candidates at the level of Dean College Development Council.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this model is not correct, it is against the U.G.C. Regulations. The said model is not existed in the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018. The template so prepared should be entertained under U.G.C. Regulations, 2018 and not on the pattern of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. They should not look into the templates of GNDU, Amritsar and Punjabi University, Patiala and of Panjab University, rather it should be made as U.G.C. centric. It should be done according to the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018. How could they say that they could implement the same without getting it approved by the Punjab Cabinet? All are aware about the recent incident where a man changed the whole system of their University.

Dr. Jagdeep Kumar said that this is the question on the Governing body of the University.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this is the an encroachment of in the academic autonomy of the Universities.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the problems they are facing are that such a person should be posted on the chair, who could tell her that in spite of pressure by Syndicate/Senate, that these are the Rules/Regulations which should be followed. One



person reached there and made instructions according to his choice. It is very strange that he never asked any Governing body or sought decision from any Syndicate/Senate, how could this happened. On the day of Convocation, Special Senate was called, whether they were invited to give permission to issue degrees. Would he give approval in 2024? Rather, he would request whole Senate to accord their dissent. At this moment, who is regulating the University? The Chancellor had repeatedly stated that this appointment has been done on the basis of merit. This should be remained on merit; she should work not under anybody's pressure. Whether he and other Fellow colleagues would allow them to sign on these degrees? If 20 dissents are recorded while signing the degrees, what would be the condition of the University? She neither asked any Syndicate and Senate in taking the decision in spite of number of requests made by them through e-mails and phone calls.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are digressing from the agenda. This agenda item is for template. The conduct of examinations is the prerogative of the University whereas right now they are discussing the templates for CAS promotions. She requested him to discuss only the agenda.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that how this University is controlled by a person who is not even member of both these Houses and the officers of the University are bound to dictate by his terms.

Several members including Dr. Jagdeep Kumar, endorsed the view point expressed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua.

The Vice Chancellor said they should come to discuss only on templates.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are only discussing the templates and agenda. He requested her to please go through the books, so that she could know, how much powerful she is. The reputed Chancellors and Vice Chancellors of big Universities have the desire to become the member of the Senate of University. They are the members of the Senate now and earlier they were also there. The uniqueness of this University should be kept intact. It was assured that whole of the Syndicate would be in support of her and would never give dissent on any issue in spite of long debates and deliberations. But when the education in Punjab was going in the commercial hands, she was aware and even intimidated by them, but she did not take stand with the stakeholders. The template which is being approved is against the Regulations of the U.G.C. The item was brought that these points are strictly according to U.G.C. Regulations, 2018, whereas the points, which are being got approved from the House, are against the Regulations of the U.G.C.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that while going to the background, he would like to state that education of the Punjab had also suffered due to the Regulations of the U.G.C. The previous Government had advertised the posts of 1150 of College teachers. The U.G.C. had completely been violated in completing the recruitment process, on which the court had issued stay orders. Due to this very reason, the Colleges of Punjab are without teachers, only 10 to 12% are permanent teachers and rest is temporary. The notification of the U.G.C. of the year 2018 talked about the U.G.C. Regulations on minimum qualification for appointment of teachers and other academic staff in Universities and Colleges and measures for the maintenance of standard in higher education. The second point says that measures for the maintenance for the standard in higher education 2018, but the word "minimum" is applied. The word "minimum" is read under the minimum qualification and minimum standard. The U.G.C. grants are

associated with these things. On the one hand, they are talking about U.G.C. grant, but grant would only be released, if they follow the U.G.C. Regulations. If they deviate from the U.G.C. Regulations, in future, problems might arise. He, therefore, requested that they should write to the Punjab Government that U.G.C. Regulations should be strictly followed, and there should be no deviation, as the University is the custodian for maintaining the minimum standard of education.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that due to clash of ego of some persons, the teachers and Principals, who are eligible for promotion, should not be ignored. This should be taken care of.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that it is absolutely true that Punjab Government had deviated in following the U.G.C. Regulations. Due to this deviation by the Punjab Government, the condition of Colleges situated in the Punjab had got deteriorated. They would inform each and every point on which the Punjab Government had deviated from the U.G.C. Regulations. The U.G.C. Act does not allow deviation; it only says that the defaulter Colleges would be derecognized. They are not moving in that direction, as they have harmed it, otherwise Punjab Government had to disaffiliate its own 100 Colleges. The Punjab Government has deviated to the extent that earlier they allotted the courses at their own level without asking the University. They started encroaching as they want to treat University just like the Department, but University is not their Department. Under the constitution of U.G.C. Act and Parliament, the University is an autonomous body. Their authority should remain with themselves, and should not allow the Government to encroach upon it. It is to be decided whether the process of short-listing is to be done at level of the Colleges or University. The nominee of the Government should be from the University. The Government is misusing the word "Government written in slash" and misinterpreted that nominee of the Punjab Government would do the short-listing.

Principal Sandeep Kataria requested that in the template, the marks awarded for the experience, should be on the minimum eligibility of the Assistant Professor which is NET qualified or Ph.D. The experience should please be counted from the date from which the candidate is eligible as in the past majority of selections have already been done, where there was no eligibility, but the experience was counted, which was proved to be a wrong decision. Hence, this should be specified that experience would be counted from the date of eligibility, but the same is not mentioned in the template. At the time of visit of the Committees, majority of selections have been done, where candidate was not eligible and his experience was counted whereas it should be counted from the date of eligibility.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that she would like to add that U.G.C. Regulations, 2018 should be adopted in toto. It is a request to the Government to review. Secondly, in the deputation policy, a person who is not appointed according to the Regulations of the U.G.C. and he is teaching in U.T. Colleges, how could his CAS promotion and other allied matters like pay protection, etc., be dealt with. The Punjab Government should adopt the U.G.C. Regulations in toto.

Dr. Priyatosh Sharma submitted that the idea that Punjab Government is allowing grant-in-aid, but the idea behind them is trying to control the academics, which they could not, that have been repeatedly said by them. In the 568<sup>th</sup> meeting of the U.G.C., a Committee was formed that if any University violates the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018, the complaint can be sent there and they would look into this. The statement was issued from the Chairman, U.G.C. to this effect before three days. The Punjab Government has

purview only in P.P.S.C. they can do whatever they want in P.P.S.C. Either they conduct the entrance test or whatever they like, but they should not encroach upon the rights of the Panjab University. Hence, the U.G.C. Regulations should be followed in toto. Even if it is to be done, it should be done through the University platform.

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue, which has been going on for the last one and more year is that no recruitments had taken place in the Colleges of Punjab. What is the way forward? They have to start the selection procedure and promotions as well.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said while endorsing the view point of Dr. Priyatosh Sharma that the Government can do whatever they want in P.P.S.C. as the candidates with and without Ph.D. are considered in P.P.S.C. But in Private Colleges, aided and non-aided Colleges, they should follow the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018 in toto. The inspections are conducted in the Private Colleges and the conditions of teachers are very much clear, but in the Government Colleges, no teacher is appointed on regular basis. They treat the teachers in a different way, they transfer them from one place to another.

The Vice Chancellor said that U.G.C. Regulations have been violated for a very long time. In the Colleges of Punjab, teachers are not getting salaries in accordance with the U.G.C. Regulations. It has been going on since ages.

Dr. Priyatosh Sharma said that question is whether they should accept the template in principle or not. In principle, it should not be accepted.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it should be rejected both for the appointment of Principals and as well as for teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that did they mean that in Punjab, the selections are not to be made.

Dr. Amit Joshi expressed concerns over the sincerity of the Punjab Government, sactions in relation to the educational system. He pointed out that on one side, the proforma for CAS promotions are still pending, creating uncertainty for those seeking advancement in their careers. Simultaneously, the Government has advertised for Principal positions. This whole process is problematic since many teachers will not be able to apply just because the Government failed to grant them promotions on their due dates due to the Government's laxity in finalizing the templates. Additionally, he raised the issue of the Government's decision to reduce the age of superannuation for teachers, a decision that was later overturned by the Court. He criticized the government for forcing teachers to resort to legal action, incurring additional costs to them, rather than addressing these matters properly themselves. Dr. Joshi emphasized that the state should work for the welfare of teachers rather than causing them harm, suggesting that such decisions should be resolved internally rather than through the courts.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that he would like to quote the second point on the template for the appointment of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Principals in non-aided Private Colleges. At page 562, the *pro forma* which is annexed therein, the U.G.C. Regulations are wrongly placed regarding submission of five papers, which may be got deleted.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that they should inform their best five papers.

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

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that as per Regulations of U.G.C., the corrections which are being discussed may be sent to the Punjab Government. If they would like to discuss the same with the University, it would be discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that they go through the 9 points of recommendations which are under conflict, no such deviation is found in it that they could say that U.G.C. Regulations are not followed. For example, the point relating to online, the University is saying to omit, but in their template, there is no omission for online, so they have to follow this. As per template, the short-listing of candidates should be completed at the D.C.D.C. level and she herself is also saying that short-listing should be at the University, because when the Committees of the University visit the Colleges, they found that templates are not framed properly. If the Selection Committee checks the applications at the University level, there is no harm in it. It is not mentioned in the U.G.C. guidelines, but the short-listing of candidates is done. Short-listing simply means that to call the number of persons for interview. If they have to fix the number of persons to be called for interview, some shortlisting mechanism has to be there. So if that mechanism is there, template has to be filled, somebody has to check the template and members of the Selection Committees have been protested that in the Colleges they visited, the templates are not properly filled. So, there is no harm if the Selection Committee before going to College, first sit in the office of D.C.D.C. and check the template so that the candidates would be called for interview and it would be assured that persons with right marks are being invited for interview.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the instructions for short-listing should be such that all the eligible candidates are called for the interview.

The Vice Chancellor said that how could it be possible to invite all 100 eligible candidates for a single post?

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that 100 applicants never apply for the post.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that what would be the criteria, because the people, who had publications in fake journals, had been awarded more marks. If the marks would be the criteria, then the candidates with genuine publications are bound to suffer.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is a separate issue that what would be the criteria for short-listing? What she is saying that for one post how many candidates should be called, that criteria are to be framed by them. There is no merit in for calling all the 50 eligible candidates for interview and giving them only two minutes, would itself be a mockery. She agreed that criteria should be well defined. Leaving the appointments on the post of Principals, they should consider about other positions especially at the entry level.

At this stage, couple of members started speaking together and din prevailed.

The Vice Chancellor said that University could decide the criteria for short-listing of candidates.

When Principal Neetu Ohri asked if one application is received then what would be the criteria, the Vice Chancellor replied that it is okay there and no short-listing is required. Short-listing is required only if the number of applications are more than the number of posts. The next point is that the Punjab Government is to give marks to local

awards. Whether they can give marks for local awards, the answer is that this is the dilution of the U.G.C. Regulations.

Several members pointed out that no local awards should be given.

The Vice Chancellor said that next point of recommendation is that Panjab University is suggesting to give marks for teaching experience. Three months teaching would entail one mark for each semester, the total teaching for six months a year, would entail two marks. The reply, which is received, is that 180 teaching days in a year are mandatory. If 180 days of teaching are mandatory, how they could say that for six months of teaching, two marks would be given, and for three months' teaching experience, one mark would be given. Are they following U.G.C. Regulations for all these? The Punjab Government and University both are saying to follow the U.G.C. Regulations, then where is the problem.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are following the U.G.C. Regulations according to their choice. When they found benefit in them, they are following otherwise not.

The Vice Chancellor said that next point which they should first consider is that marks of teaching/post-doctoral experience shall be given only after acquiring eligibility, on which the discussion was held earlier also. The Punjab Government also says that when the person is eligible, only after that his marks of experience would be counted.

Professor Sonal Chawla said that it should also be taken into account whether he is teaching Undergraduate or Postgraduate classes. Under U.G.C. Regulations, 2018, there is variation of marks in the teaching experience whether he is teaching Undergraduate or Postgraduate classes.

The Vice Chancellor said that hence, the word "teaching/post-doctoral experience is mentioned.

Professor Sonal Chawla said that post-doctoral is quite different from that of teaching experience in Master's or Bachelor's course.

The Vice Chancellor said that she thinks that would be as per the U.G.C. Regulations. There is no conflict in it. The next point is assessment of domain knowledge that is the suggestion of Panjab University and it is replied that it is for the Subject expert to decide what methodology to be used, however, seminars and presentations are also in classroom settings. If Panjab University desired that they want to do assessment in domain knowledge, then again Panjab University only has to decide how that assessment is to be done. The next suggestion of the Panjab University is that Selection Committee should have five members, including two outside Subject experts. The suggestion that minimum quorum has been kept on four, the Selection Committee may consist of large number, so this is as per the Regulation. The minimum quorum will be four. The last suggestion is that tenure of appointment; they all know that the term of appointment is not part of the U.G.C. Regulations. As per her opinion, there is no conflict.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that conflict is that, on all these points, the Vice Chancellor/House may refer back the same and get it written on it that it is as per the U.G.C. Regulations, 2018.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that for the post of Principal, no shortlisting could be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that then it would be sent in writing.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when for the post of Principal, the University is taking decision, then why the shortlisting is required for the post of teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are expecting that for the post of Principal, 10 applications would be received and for the post of Assistant Professors 200 applications would come.

Dr. Amit Joshi highlighted that when it comes to applying for the post of Principal, teachers from all streams i.e., Arts, Science and Commerce are eligible. As an example, he pointed out the discrepancy between streams when considering the impact factor in the Science stream. Specifically, if a researcher in the Science stream publishes a paper in a journal with an Impact Factor greater than 2, they receive an additional 25 marks because of the augmentation formula of the UGC, raising their total to 33 marks. However, given the scarcity of journals with high impact factors in the Arts and Commerce streams, teachers from these disciplines would need to publish around 20 papers to match the score achieved from just 2 papers in the Science stream. Dr. Joshi emphasized that this disparity is unreasonable and unfair.

The Vice Chancellor said that this had been there for all times to come. The criteria for award of marks would be same in all the streams whether is Science or Arts.

To this, Dr. Amit Joshi said that then out of 8, all the teachers of Science stream would come.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not in their parameter to decide.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that these 9 points stated by the Vice Chancellor, out of which she talked on one point i.e., assessment of domain. If they consider U.G.C. Regulations, there is nothing written on 60:20:20 anywhere.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that U.G.C. has given the only minimum standards, so they could only rise up to those minimum standards. If U.G.C. did not make it clear as to what would be selection criteria, they could always take a call that it would be so.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he would like to make the House clear that no meeting of the Committee was convened. None of the point has been written by them, the Deputy Registrar of the Colleges Branch had brought the copy of the U.G.C. Regulations. The word 'Panjab University' referred to by the Chair, is only used for writing actually it is the document that has been incorporated in the Regulations of 2018. From the year 1998, no new recruitments have been done, why this point had been raised by the U.G.C., keeping in mind the fact that as compared to fresher students, the old and experienced person having 15-20 publications in his/her credit, hence they would not allow the fresh candidates to recruit. If someone has fresh energy with him/her, with some domain knowledge, he/she should also at least be interviewed as per the version of the U.G.C.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could write to them that in principle, they agree with the template, but these are some of the reservations that for the post of Principal, no short-listing is required. It is also the concern of the House that the U.G.C. Regulations should be followed in toto. In addition, she would request that their drafting

Committee may include the nominee of the Panjab University so that such issues do not arise.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in addition to that, he would like to remind her that in the meeting of the Syndicate, it was decided wherein the letter was received from the Punjab Government that the age of superannuation is reduced from 60 to 58 years. As per provisions of the P.U. Calendar, age of superannuation would be 60 years, on the suggestion of the member, that item was approved that age of superannuation be considered as 60 years. Hence, he requested at that time to convey them the sentiments of the Syndicate that the retirement age of teachers would be according to the Panjab University Calendar. This letter should also be sent along with this. Earlier the superannuation age was 58 years as no pension scheme was implemented. Secondly, when they are going to publish the advertisement for the post of Principal, if his/her age would be reduced then why he would join on the post of Principal.

The Vice Chancellor said that these concerns would be raised with the Government.

Principal Neetu Ohri asked whether the online applications would be accepted at the University level or at the College level.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should inform as what is the prevailing system for the same. The candidate would apply online at one place with a copy to D.C.D.C. The portal can also be created at the level of D.C.D.C., so that the applications are received at the portal and then the same could be passed on to the Colleges. Last time also, the applications were accepted through online, as they have the portal already in place. They could use that portal for Colleges also.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that first point is that in addition to following the Regulations of 2018, the process of implementation of template should be completed at the earliest. As it may take more time, when they would give the concerns in writing?

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no problem in the template, rather, the problem lies in the fact that no short-listing is to be done for filling the post of Principal. It is right that U.G.C. Regulations should be followed. But the concerns raised by the members and replies received from the Punjab Government is as per the Regulations of U.G.C., she could not know where is the conflict? So, they should adopt this template, but if they want to do the screening of applications for the post of Principal, they would write to them that they would not do any short-listing and would call all candidates for interview. The conflict is only at the point of short-listing of candidates. They would tell them that short-listing would not be done by the University and the process would be initiated soon. If they are saying that only 2-3 applications are received for the post of Principal, then what is the need for short-listing?

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he would like to add that the advertisements which had been published costs Rs.1 lac. The advertisement had already been published, but the panels are not given for want of templates in non-aided and self-financing Colleges, he requested that what would be done with the advertisements that had been published.

To this, Dr. Mukesh Arora asked, could it be possible to consider those advertisements for giving the panels?

Principal S.S. Sangha endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Principal R.S. Jhanji.

The Vice Chancellor said that University would decide whether those advertisements could be considered for giving the panel or not. Whether extension in date for receipt of applications could be given or not? If the candidates had not applied according to this template, they should ask them to apply as per the template.

To this, Principal R.S. Jhanji said that a corrigendum should be given in the newspapers to update the applications by the candidates in accordance with the template.

Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that panel should be given and team for Inspection may be sent to the Colleges.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that by giving a corrigendum, the candidates should be given 15 days' time to update their information as per the template, on the portal.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. Template **(Appendix-IV)** for appointment of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors and Principal in Private Aided Colleges in State of Punjab as per UGC Regulations 2018 issued by Government of Punjab vide letter dated 20.02.2023, be approved;
2. Template **(Appendix-IV)** for appointment of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors and Principal in unaided Private Colleges situated in state of Punjab as per UGC Regulations 2018, be approved;
3. Template **(Appendix-IV)** for Direct recruitment for private aided colleges in U.T. Chandigarh as per UGC Regulations 2018, be approved;
4. Template **(Appendix-IV)** of CAS promotions for colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh, located in Chandigarh as per UGC Regulations, 2018, be approved; and
5. Template **(Appendix-IV)** for CAS promotions in affiliated colleges located in Punjab as per UGC Regulations, 2018, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

1. the Templates (Appendices) for appointment of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Professors, Principal for Direct Recruitment and CAS Promotion for Government Aided/Unaided Colleges in Punjab/UT Chandigarh, as per UGC Regulations, 2018, be approved; and
2. That the following observations made by the Fellows be conveyed to the Government of Punjab:
  - (i) That for the post of Principal, no short-listing is required.



- (ii) That U.G.C. Regulations, 2018, be followed in toto.
- (iii) That the drafting Committee of the Punjab Government may include the nominee of the Panjab University so that such issues do not recur.

**XV.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

**C-15.** That –

- (i) recommendations of the Committee dated 27.02.2023, regarding release Enhanced Salary in pursuance of CAS promotions under 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment of UGC Regulation 2010 of be approved.
- ii) the undertaking as recommended by the Committee, be obtained from the teachers, whose promotions are pending owing to interpretation of UGC Regulations, 2018 (Clause 6.3).

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 34)**

Dr. Supinder Kaur, referring to undertaking to be obtained from the teachers, said that although the teachers had given the undertakings, the Establishment Branch as well as the Audit Department had not cleared the payment, as the Audit has still some objections and the cases are being returned. They needed to look into the matter.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that, in fact, the cases had been sent to the Audit Department through the Establishment Branch. Now, the cases are being returned to the concerned persons to comply with the Audit objection.

Dr. Supinder Kaur clarified that the Audit Department is sending the cases to the Establishment Branch for giving the clarification, but Establishment Branch instead of giving the clarification itself, is sending the cases to the concerned persons for giving the clarification.

It was said that the issue would be taken care of.

Dr. Priyatosh Sharma said that when they took up the matter with the Establishment Branch, they told that certain files are still with them. If the University intervened as vigorously as had been done for giving all the benefits in the case of age of superannuation from 60 to 65 years, the benefits could be got released with the submission of an affidavit.

Dr. Supinder Kaur said that the Audit Department is saying that after the decision of the Syndicate, proper files have not been sent to them by the Establishment Branch for further clarification.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the Finance & Development Officer and the Registrar should have a meeting with the RAO to get the issue resolved instead of the teachers meeting the RAO individually.

Dr. Supinder Kaur said that the Audit Department is saying that they have to get the decision of the Syndicate approved from the Finance Secretary. Perhaps, this point has so far not been taken up. She suggested that the University should take up some initiative in this direction to speed up the resolution of the problem.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-15 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XVI.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-16 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-16.** That Professor Rumina Sethi, Fellow, be assigned to the following Faculties:

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

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023 Para 4)**

**XVII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-17 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-17.** That the recommendations of the Student Aid Fund Administrative Committee dated 09.03.2023, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023 Para 32)**

**XVIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-18 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-18.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 13.03.2023 constituted by the Vice Chancellor to frame general policy to give a general interpretation of clarification of clause 6.4 (Ph.D. Guidelines, 2016) from UGC vide letter No. F.9-1/2020 (PS/Misc.) dated 03.02.2023, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023 Para 33)**

**XIX.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-19.** That the recommendations of the College Development Council dated 27.12.2022, as per Appendix, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023 Para 19)**

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it would be better if the scholarships are awarded to the students in the same year. It could be easily done as the forms for award of

scholarships are got filled in from the students by the month of December. Otherwise, sometimes the students got the scholarships after qualifying the examination.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-19 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XX.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-20 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

**C-20.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 15.03.2023 and 16.03.2023 relating to Ph.D. Guidelines formulated in accordance with U.G.C. Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of Ph.D. degree Regulations 2022, be approved with the modifications that –

- (i) The admissions to Ph.D. Programme be made twice a year instead of thrice a year; and
- (ii) Clause 4.2 of Ph.D. Guidelines be amended and approved as under:

4.2 A candidate need not seek any extension for submission of thesis up to 6 years from the date of registration. After 6 years, a maximum of two years extension be granted while giving the justification. Extension may be granted by the Dean of University Instruction on the recommendation of the Chairperson and the concerned Supervisor. A fee of Rs.35,000/- per year shall be levied from such candidates. **It is clarified that; however, this fee will not be charged from the persons with disability (more than 40% disability).**

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023 Para 29)**

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out that the University used to write that the degree of Ph.D. awarded to the candidate is in accordance with the UGC Regulations 2018, 2019, 2022, etc. However, now the said practice has been discontinued by the University. Resultantly, the administration had started raising objection on the applications of teachers, who requests for grant of increments for doing Ph.D. He, therefore, suggested that it should be written under which UGC Regulations, Ph.D. degree has been awarded to the candidate.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the admission to Ph.D. Program should be made twice a year instead of thrice a year. He remembered that he had earlier also suggested that the students, who have qualified NET and have fellowship, should be allowed to be admitted to Ph.D. throughout the year. If they made them wait for six months, they would join other institutes. They should enrol NET qualified students having fellowship throughout the year so that they could get the benefits of Government/funding agencies schemes. He further said that Clause 4.2 says that students would be charged extension fee after six years. They have to be differential here for women and male candidates. Under all circumstances, the UGC allowed the candidates to complete Ph.D. within 8

years for women and for boys it is 6 years. He suggested that extension fee for women should be charged after 8 years and for boys after 6 years.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that he had raised the same issue in the Syndicate, because in certain departments enrolment to Ph.D. is done only once in a year. So it must be twice in a year, but for JRF, it should be open for the whole year.

Dr. Neeru Malik endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Professor Jatinder Grover.

Professor Sushil K. Kansal endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Professor Jatinder Grover and Professor Rajat Sandhir that for JRF the enrolment to Ph.D. programme should be done throughout the year.

Professor Rumina Sethi said that there is a Pre-Ph.D. Course work for the candidates enrolled for Ph.D. They could not hold pre-Ph.D. course work throughout the year. They had already fellowship holders, who are allowed to do Pre-Ph.D. Course Work twice a year, i.e., in the months of January and July.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that the candidates, who have qualified GATE in English Literature, is eligible for IIT. It would be better, if they exempt them from entrance test for admission to Ph.D. Programme.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that what Dean of University Instruction has said is that if someone takes admission in Ph.D. in November, he/she could do Pre-Ph.D. Course Work in January and if someone takes admission in the month of May, he/she could do the Pre-Ph.D. Course Work in July. It does not make much difference.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the candidates having qualified JRF, NET, GATE and National Level based tests are eligible to take admission in Ph.D. throughout the year. Referring to Page 630 of Ph.D. Guidelines, he asked whether these guidelines have been prepared in accordance with the UGC Minimum Standards and Procedures for award of Ph.D. Degree Regulations, 2022. If yes, as per point 1.2 on page 630, it shall be applicable equally to -, Chandigarh. Moreover, these Regulations shall also be applicable to the UBS, UIAMS & UIHTM in Panjab University, Chandigarh, in terms of eligibility criteria, in terms of procedure for admission, in terms of allocation of supervisors. As per UGC, 4 candidates could be enrolled under Assistant Professors, 6 under Associate Professors and 8 under Professors.

Dr. Gurmit Singh said that it has been written that the admissions in Ph.D. programme would be made twice a year instead of thrice. However, so far as Faculty of Education is concerned, the admission to Ph.D. programme is made only once a year, owing to which they faced a lot of problems as the students joined neighbouring Universities. He requested that the Vice-Chancellor should use her good offices to get the admissions made to Ph.D. programme in all the Faculties at least twice a year. He further requested that uniformity should be got maintained in the case of approval of supervisors, especially from the recognized Research Centres.

Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that several applications have been made by the teachers of the affiliated colleges for appointing them as supervisors, but the Department of Education is not convening the meeting for the purpose, due to which the requests of the teachers are pending since long.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Mukesh Arora.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-20 on the agenda**, be approved with the modification that the candidates, who would take admission to Ph.D. Programme up to November/December, would do Pre-Ph.D. Course Work in January, and those who would take admission up to May/June, in July. However, so far as JRFs are concerned, they could take admission to Ph.D. Programme throughout the year.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Assistant professors, Associate professors and Professors of UBS, UIAMS, UIHTM be allowed to take 4, 6, and 8 research scholars respectively as applicable in all other departments of PU.

**XXI.** The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Items C-21 and C-22 on the agenda** were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

**C-21.** That M.Voc. (Fashion Technology and Apparel Design) (Semester System) course, be introduced, from the academic session 2021-22.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 9)**

**C-22.** That M.Ed. course being offered at Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College of Education, V.P.O. Sukhanand, Moga, be discontinued from the academic session 2023-24, in a phased manner, as per Regulation 13.2, 13.3, 13.4 & 13.5 at page 166 of P.U Calendar, Volume-I 2022.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 11)**

**XXII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-23 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-23.** That Music (Vocal) – Elective subject of B.A. Course being offered at S.D. College for Women, 3, Jawahar Nagar, Moga, Punjab, be discontinued from the session 2023-24 in a phased manner, as per Regulations 13.2, 13.3, 13.4 & 13.5 appearing at page 162 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, subject to the condition that the College would submit an affidavit that none of the employees working in the College on regular basis and involved in the teaching of the subject of Music would be retrenched.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 10)**

Dr. Jagwant Singh showed his concern about the Music Subject. He said that there are certain subjects in which the strength of students is very less. Though the representative of Punjab Government is not present in the House, he would like to say that this problem has come due to them, because they stopped fresh recruitments, banned posts. Recruitment of teachers in the subject of Music has not been made by the Government for the last so many years, which has badly affected the subject of Music. There are certain subjects, which needed to be preserved. When they conduct the Youth Festival, the Music played a very important role. Music teachers are needed in every activity of students. Likewise, the subject of Sanskrit has also been badly affected, whereas the society needs these subjects. He had heard about a boy, who worked as

Tabla Instructor, and he was relieved by the College from the post, but he got a stay from the Hon'ble Court. He suggested that they should keep these things in mind while discontinuing such courses.

Dr. K.K. Sharma said that on this post, 95% Grant-in-Aid teacher was already appointed, who was relieved by them.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the person was working as Tabla instructor in the College against the grant-in-aid post. He was removed from the service due to some politics. Since the services of Tabla Instructors are frequently required, including during Youth Festivals and College Functions, etc., there was no need to remove him.

The Vice Chancellor pointed out that it has been mentioned in the item itself that the College would submit an affidavit that none of the employees working in the College on regular basis and involved in the subject of Music would be retrenched.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is not only happening in the subject of Music, the other subjects like, Sanskrit, Hindi and Punjabi are also treated like this. In fact, the Colleges discontinued the courses, where there is no profit. These courses should not be allowed to be discontinued under any circumstances and he also agreed with Dr. Jagwant Singh on this issue.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-23 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXIII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-24 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-24.** That letter No.F25-1/2018(PS/MISC.) dated 28.01.2019 of Secretary, University Grant Commission, regarding revised guidelines for appointment and enhancement of the rates of honorarium of Guest Faculty, be adopted.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 4)**

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that the new guidelines are generally implemented in the colleges very late. He requested that these guidelines should also be implemented in the affiliated Colleges, because the guest faculty in the Colleges has also been working for the last 15 years at an honorarium of Rs.15000/- to Rs.20,000/- per month. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to get the UGC revised guidelines for appointment and enhancement of the rates of honorarium of Guest Faculty implemented in the affiliated Colleges, so that the guest faculty working in affiliated colleges could also get an honorarium of Rs.50,000/- per month.

The Vice Chancellor said that the honorarium of guest faculty working in the affiliated Colleges has also been enhanced.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that it needed to be monitored as the Management of the Colleges did not implement the decision of the University relating to enhancement of salary/honorarium easily.

One of the members said that how could they expect the Colleges to pay an honorarium of Rs. 50,000/- per month to the guest faculty as they pay a monthly salary of only Rs.21,600/- to the teachers appointed on regular basis for the first three years.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the Government Colleges also paid a salary of Rs.21,600/- per month to the teachers. He requested the Vice Chancellor to impress upon the Director, Higher Education, Punjab, to revise the salary of the teachers working in the Government Colleges.

Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that the Committee of the University went to a College, and in spite of interaction with DR (Colleges), the College told its teachers to take only 50% of the salary. He apprehended that the teachers would be retrenched. The College told the teachers to accept the notice of 50% of already reduced salary or else they would be thrown out after two months. In fact, it is a girls' College and at the moment the strength of the college is about 250 students. There are 11 teachers in the College, who have not received their salary for the last few months. On the recommendation of the Committee of the University, some salaries have been released. He urged that all the recommendations of the Committee should be got implemented. The teachers are ready to work on the salary, which they are getting today and they are not demanding enhanced salary at all, whereas the College is compelling them to accept 50% of the salary.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that right now most worst condition is prevailing in the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab. Everywhere, the teaching and non-teaching staff is suffering a lot. He has seen this across the State. Citing an example, he said that in Akal Degree College for Women even 10 teachers are not there and in Gurusar Sadhar College only 16 teachers are there. Similar position existed in the Bondli College. In Punjab, there are many Colleges, which have basic fundamental problems. As a University, they have to take a firm stand. According to him, they have to convene a special meeting of the Senate only to discuss the issues related to the Colleges.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that they had already submitted the documents relating to certain Colleges, where the teachers have not got salaries for the last 15 months. When teachers requested for release of their salaries, they are removed from the service. There are many Colleges, which have kept documents of the teachers and the teachers concerned had got government job. When they asked the College as to who is teaching the subject in their place, and in whose account the salary is being credited, they did not get any reply?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that, that was why, he was requesting the Vice Chancellor to visit the Colleges in rural areas to know as to what the position of the Colleges is. Several Colleges had been closed down and many more would be closed down in the next 4-5 years. If it continued like this, all the Colleges would get closed down in the next 15 years.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to stick to the agenda.

Principal R.K. Mahajan said that there are many Colleges where teachers are not getting annual increment for the last 10 years. Moreover, the teachers are not being promoted under CAS. He added that even the Provident Fund of the teachers is not being deducted.

Principal K.K. Sharma said that a special meeting of the Senate should be convened to discuss the issues of the Colleges.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as suggested by Dr. Jagdish Chander, letter should be issued to the Colleges. The teachers who are appointed on regular basis are being given a salary between Rs.18,000/- and Rs.20,000/- per month. How could they expect

that the guest faculty would be paid an honorarium of Rs.50,000/- per month by the Colleges. There are several restraints for dismissing persons from the job, but if the salary is stopped, persons would themselves decide to quit the job.. As pointed out by Dr. Jagwant Singh, the teachers appointed on regular basis by the duly constituted Selection Committees against the unaided posts in the Colleges at Sidhwan Khurd and Gurusar Sadhar and approved by the University, are not getting salary for the last 15 months. Similar is the position in the Colleges managed by the SGPC. Even big managements like SGPC, DAV, etc., had stopped payment of salaries to the teachers seeing that no action has been taken by the university against the small Colleges for not paying the salaries to the teachers. The students who are studying in the University are not interested to become teachers for this meager amount of Rs.8000/-. The UGC scales which were enhanced by former Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, are not workable, the same had been flattened. He requested that Vice Chancellor and DCDC should pay a visit to the colleges to know the reality.

Shri Simranjeet Singh Dhillon requested that different members should be sent to the Colleges for Inspections. He urged that a particular set of persons should not be sent to the Colleges for Inspection.

Shri Naresh Gaur requested that periodical inspections should be conducted. He observed that since 2012, no Periodical Inspections had been conducted. They should go through the NAAC reports 2020 of Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, wherein they would find as to how the NAAC team has indicted these Universities. In fact, the NAAC has indicted the office of Dean College Development Council of these Universities stating that this is the main department which had destroyed the affiliated Colleges, because it had not got the inspections of the Colleges conducted. He suggested that they should take cognizance of the said report and must take remedial measures. At the same time, Periodical Inspections should also be got conducted, so that no harassment is done to the teachers. A teacher of Tapprian College was reinstated by the University two years ago, but when the College approached the Court against the decision of the University, the advocate of the University withdrew the decision of the University. He enquired, with whose permission the advocate of the University withdrew the decision? Resultantly, the lady teacher is out of the job for the last 2½ years. What message they would like to give to the Colleges and their managements? Could they do anything, which they wanted? Since the University gave affiliation to the Colleges, it must keep a check on them. Otherwise, the managements of the Colleges are continuously harassing the teachers and he apprehended that the conditions of teachers would further deteriorate in the coming years. As suggested by Shri Simranjeet Singh Dhillon, different members should be sent to the Colleges for Inspections. He has also requested to send different Committees to different colleges from time to time for inspection. If this suggestion is followed, the University would be made aware of the factual position of the Colleges. He was not sent for Inspection in any College after 2012, because he had reported the factual position of the College including that the college had shown certain persons as teacher on its role though they were serving as school teachers at some other places.

Dr. Priyatosh said that since S. Bhagwant Singh Maan, (Chief Minister, Punjab) is a member of the Senate, they could request him to attend the meeting of the Senate to get himself aware of the problems of the Colleges and teachers, because unless and until he did not know the problems himself, the problems could not be solved. He, therefore, suggested that the Senate should make a request to S. Bhagwant Singh Maan, (Chief Minister, Punjab) to attend the meeting of the Senate.



Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they might have learnt about the dummy admission of the students and now they must have received letters/representations about the dummy appointments of teachers. There are several issues relating to the Colleges, including salary, Provident Fund, increment, promotion, appointment, etc. Hence, they needed to bring in reforms for which a small Committee should be constituted, which might be requested to submit its report within a month.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-24 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXIV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-25 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-25.** That, as recommended by the Affiliation Committee dated 3.3.2023, temporary extension of affiliation for the course(s)/subject(s) to the Colleges situated in the Punjab State, for the session 2022-23, be granted.

**NOTE:** That advisory/guidelines be obtained from Punjab Government before recommending grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the course(s)/ subject(s) to the Colleges, situated in the Punjab State.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 13)**

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the University had asked the information from the College(s) till 11.03.2023. Now, it is 3<sup>rd</sup> of June, but the DCDC office has not attached any information received from the Colleges. What is to be done about this item as the affiliation is to be granted to the College for the session 2022-23 based on the input received from the Colleges? They could decide to grant/deny affiliation only on the basis of documentary proof, but the same had not been provided.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had placed the recommendations of the affiliation Committee dated 03.03.2023, temporary extension of affiliation for the course(s)/subject(s) to the Colleges situated in the Punjab State, for the session 2022-23, which is already over, for consideration of the Senate.

Dr. Amit Joshi Said that the information was supposed to be provided to them by March 2023, but the same has not yet been provided.

Shri Naresh Gaur, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Amit Joshi, said that the Colleges were asked to give the information within the stipulated dates.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that they are talking about grant of affiliation for the academic session 2022-23. The Inspection Committees had imposed certain conditions, including appointment of Principals/teachers, but the University has not provided panels to the Colleges concerned. He pleaded that panels should immediately be given to the Colleges for appointment of teachers/Principals, so that they could make the appointments.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he agreed with Dr. Mukesh Arora.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that we are delayed in every field. He said that we have already held a Senate meeting on the same issues of colleges. He said that we are talking about the session of 2022-23, which is already over. From 15<sup>th</sup> May new session i.e. 2023-24 has been started. Now, summer vacations will start from 4.06.2023. The process for grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation should have been completed by March-April, 2022. He further said that until new rules/norms are not finally adopted, the appointments should be allowed to be made in accordance with the old rules. Moreover, all these posts, against which the appointments are being made, are uncovered posts and the advertisements for these posts have already been made. There was a need to take such a decision that they should give them templates and let them conduct the interviews and make recruitments to make the compliance. In this way, the Colleges would also not be able to give excuse that the University did not give them the template, and that is why, they could not recruit the teachers/Principals. He asked, what could the Affiliation Committee do, when they did not give the template? Now, the session and the examinations are over. He reiterated that since the new session has already been started, the University should get the inspections done. Those Colleges, which did not make compliances, should be compelled to make compliances before start of classes in July.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that one of the Principal was found guilty in the enquiry related to misuse of Amalgamated fund and the Principal himself agreed before the University Committee that he has misused the Amalgamated Fund. He stressed that till date the University has failed to initiate any action against that Principal. He cautioned that, if action is not taken against such defaulters, the Principals of other Colleges would also start misusing amalgamated funds.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that all the members are complaining about the Colleges. They are showing helplessness for not doing anything. He wanted to know the weaknesses in the system, which is forcing them to blame the Dean, College Development Council only. Instead of blaming the Dean, College Development Council, they should blame the system/House. He pointed out that Panjab University is giving affiliation for the session of 2022-23 in the month of May, 2023. In fact, the process of grant of affiliation should have been completed by the month of March/April. He, therefore, suggested that all the Committees constituted for the purpose of grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation should be asked to complete their task well in time. If they did so, only then they have right to criticize others. He requested the Vice Chancellor to place the composition of all such Committees before the Senate in its next meeting. He also suggested that the Affiliation Committee should comprise of people, who are not associated with electoral politics in any manner. If it is done, no member of the Affiliation Committee would be able to say that it was beyond their control. With this, several problems relating to the Colleges would be automatically solved. He added that so many times, special meetings of the Senate had been held, but the problems still persisted. Unless they tell the truth, solution could not be found. The Committees should be sent to the Colleges on regular basis. If action is not recommended/taken in time, responsibility for the same should be fixed.

Dr. K.K. Sharma requested that even those, who had applied for new courses within the stipulated time, are unaware about the inspections of their Colleges. He requested that the Inspection Committees should be directed to visit the Colleges as early as possible.

Dr. Parveen Goyal endorsed the points of Shri Jain and said that he wrote a letter on 22.04.2023 to the Vice Chancellor regarding the Inspections Committees. He also read out the said letter in the House:

“It is respectfully submitted that Inspection Committee visits various affiliated Colleges for the grant of temporary extension of affiliation for courses and subjects. However, it is noticed that various allegations are framed against the Inspection Committee members, which brings bad name to the University. By avoiding the physical inspection of the Colleges, valuable time of Committee members and hefty money in the form of honorarium TA/DA paid by the affiliated College can be saved. And so I hereby humbly proposed that extension of temporary affiliation for courses and subjects be based on self disclosure by way of submission of application along with annexure and affidavit by the concern College. The Committee at the University can be constituted to access such applications based on assessment of such applications, the decision of the requirement of the physical inspection can be taken.”

He said that it has solution to all problems. They have to improve the system, so that different types of allegations could not be levelled. The Colleges are waiting for inspections. The Colleges would ask the candidates to apply in accordance with the template, which is being given to them now. It has come to their notice that the Principals of the Colleges just put the stamp and signed the applications. What did the Committee see when it visited the Colleges? Did they see the annexures only? The Principal could send the Annexure with the application as well. When the Colleges would send annexures along with affidavit, they will mention as to how many teachers are available in the College and how many are getting salaries in their account. If they do this, they would have fear that if they lie or if there is any mistake in it, action would be taken against them. As such, he has requested the Vice-Chancellor to take action on his letter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she is fully agreed with Dr. Parveen Goyal. She pointed out that AICTE had the same problem of inspections of the Colleges, but now it had reviewed its system. She directed the Dean, College Development Council, to get all the documents online and get the same checked. The Dean, College Development Council should get the Inspection Committees constituted. She added that the template is being approved by the University today. When the Committees would visit the Colleges, the Committee should not say that there is no faculty.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that if the management puts pressure on the Principal for the affidavit, then the Principal will have to pay, ask the management of the College for affidavits. He urged everyone not to make the Principal a scapegoat.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that they should be told as to what decision has been taken on item C-8. Continuing, he had said that whenever any Senate/Syndicate member points out something, the concerned person must take cognizance and note down the same so that he/she could take action without waiting for the proceedings. The Senate members should take the College name. However, neither the Controller of Examination nor the Registrar took action. Why are these meetings being held, when no action is to be taken? He further said that there is a Women's College in Khanna, where the services of a Home Science Teacher had been terminated after giving a short notice. Moreover, the teachers of Gurusar Sadhar College are not being

given salaries for the last 13 months. Even the retiral and pensionary benefits are not being released to the retirees. He requested the Vice Chancellor to direct the Dean, College Development Council to get these issues resolved. He suggested that those, who raised the problems in this House, should be given reply in the next 15 days as to what action has been taken on the issues raised by them. If the concerned Officers did not take action immediately, they should be taken to task. He further suggested that the Online Portal having full details of teachers, students, and courses in colleges should also be under Dean, College Development Council. There should be the list of colleges, number of courses, number of teachers, and number of students and the bio-data of every teacher should be reflected in that online portal. He had suggested that kindly mention the name of concerned department of the query, name of the member, who raised the query and then address it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the decision of the online portal is very good. But how is this practically possible? 50% of the affidavits are fake. Suppose they have asked for an affidavit online, what action they will take against that College, if it submitted fake affidavit. He cited an example of a College of Education namely College of Education, Malout. Several complaints were made to the Former Vice-Chancellor and Chancellor. An inspection team was also sent to the College for inspection, but the team did not find the College.

Dr. Dinesh said that they are going to open a new chapter. What would happen with the affidavit, if a complaint is filed that a wrong complaint has been given. Then the University would have to file a case in the Civil Court.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Dinesh Kumar to go and check the AICTE Portal where he would find all the details of teacher as well as students of Engineering Colleges.

Shri Satya Pal Jain, citing the example of another University, said that Lovely Professional University (LPU) had given wrong information to NAAC and today a case against LPU is going on in the High Court. He said that any institution, whatever benefit it has taken on the basis of that false affidavit, whether it is affiliation or recognition, University has the every right to cancel it. There is no need to go here and there. If any institution or an individual, if it gives a false affidavit or false information, then University should immediately take an action against that College or individual and he said that the whole House is with the Authority in this issue.

Shri Varinder Singh requested that only Professor, Associate Professors of the Panjab University or the Members of the Senate of this University should be sent to conduct inspections. He requested that Principals of the Colleges and the persons associated with the Colleges should not be sent for inspections. Many students from Punjab preferred to go abroad owing to which the strength of students in the Colleges had depleted, especially in small towns. The main problem of this could be poverty. He further advised that Colleges with low strength needs to be lenient. University needs to call management of these Colleges, and have a meeting with them to discuss these problems.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she had a meeting with the College Managements and the managements requested her not to send Committee for inspection.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the strength of the students in the colleges has come down to less than 50%, so we should look at all aspects. We also have to think about whether qualified children get the good job with good salary. He further said that

he agreed with Shri Satya Pal Jain that the Affiliation Committee should consist of people, who are not associated with its electoral politics. Unless and until they did not force the Government Colleges to meet the requirements for affiliation, how could they ask the Private Colleges?

Professor Sonal suggested to constitute a Committee.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that Principal Jhanji had raised certain issues in a meeting which took place two months six days ago. What he had observed is that the situation has been deteriorated, instead of improving. Now, he is thinking as to how improvement could be made/possible? At the moment, the University had no Standard Operating Procedure for affiliation. There should be a procedure according to the UGC Guidelines. It is necessary to define the procedure for affiliation, but the session 2022-23 could not be reversed.

Professor Devinder Singh has said that Bar Council is an affiliating authority for Law Institutions, Law Colleges & Department of Laws. Before four months, a letter was received in the Panjab University, which is with the Vice-Chancellor or Dean, College Development Council. The Dean, College Development Council is looking into this letter. It is on the record that the Bar Council of India had granted affiliation to 1500 Colleges, out of which 500 are fake. He completely agreed with Principal Jhanji and Dr. Mukesh Arora on the point that this item should be resolved now and make rules and regulations for the next year. He also agreed with the viewpoints of other members that likewise AICTE, that information should be sought on the portal along with the affidavit. A Committee should be constituted to explore this option. Last time, the University Committees had gone for inspections in the Colleges, even then there was dispute. They should try new technological system. There is a system of affidavit for affiliation. It is not saying that it should be implemented now. But a Committee of senior people should be formed for this.

Shri Davesh Moudgil said that the recommendations of the Committees, which had been sent during the last years for inspections in the Colleges, did not suit the University, and the University decided to send other Committees for inspection. He requested that only those persons should be associated with the Inspection Committees, who did not have any interest in the Colleges. He said that he had asked the Registrar/Dean, College Development Council many a times to provide him a list of members, who had gone to the Colleges for inspections repeatedly. One member went for inspection 40 times and another went for 17 times. The Dean, College Development Council didn't say a word, even after asking many a times. He had seen that whenever they demanded this list, he (Dean, College Development Council) turned the paper up and down. If the University Committees did not work efficiently, then they have to take an important decision. As Dr. Jagdish Chander had said that there are 500 fake colleges in the Bar Council, it continues like this, and will continue only like this. He requested to kindly check the members of the affiliation committees before sending them on inspections.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that everyone expressed his/her thoughts beautifully. The members had suggested that a letter should be issued to the Colleges. In the end, he requested that the item should be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that definitely the system is not working properly, but they would try to improve it.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that an item came up in the Syndicate meeting in 2015 that they are purchasing a portal, which would work online. At that time, he had given a proposal that he would provide a portal keeping in mind the University Calendar, which would have all the components of the Calendar. He had made 22 modules and had given the same free of cost and it was implemented from 2015. Certain Colleges, including the College of Principal R.S. Jhanji had uploaded the data on it. A few days back, he has given a copy of the software to the SVC. However, the portal has not been allowed to be implemented in the University. Endorsing the other members, he said that majority of the Committees comprised neither members of the Senate nor University Professors. He pleaded that, in future the Committee should comprise of Fellows and Professors of the University. The one, who has to do work, does not care about his designation. Electoral politics is there and it did matter. I have not gone anywhere for six years. Provide the list that they asked for. The Registrar has not provided a list yet. Among the affiliation committee that have rejected colleges, the number of law colleges is high in it. He said that they are removed, including him from the committee and wrong things are justified and this is happening. What would happen to the five men, who went in a car and claimed TA/DA from the College individually? Who explain to them? To whom will you explain? Before speaking, they should look inside themselves, which would be much better. He has been watching this for the last 20 years, and he had invested so much money from his personal account. Had he been aware of it, he would have written to the UGC and AICTE. On the arrival of new Vice Chancellor, he was hopeful that the software got developed by him would be considered, and that was why, he gave a copy of the same to the SVC. He informed that the Dean, College Development Council, Controller of Examinations, DR (General Branch), etc., were the members of the Committee. The employee was appointed to run the portal and he was given a couple of special increments, but still the portal was closed. All the modules are in that portal, they could verify it by running it.

Shri Naresh Gaur, citing an example of a College, said that they went to a College, the College people themselves put Rs.7600/- in an envelope and gave it to him. When he told that he had come in Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua's car, why are they giving him the T.A.? He told them he would accept only Rs.500/- or whatever is due to him. In this way, the Colleges exploited the Committees and this is the reason, the Committee favoured the Colleges.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that the managements are now requesting the University not to send the Committees. Several managements are telling that it's not going well with them, but some managements are there relating to whom the Committees gave correct reports, even then false complaints are made against them. She requested that the members should also keep this in mind.

Shri Satya Pal Jain suggested that while granting approval, a condition should be imposed that the approval is subject to the condition fulfilment of the conditions imposed by the Affiliation Committee and supply of information sought from the Colleges concerned. If the Colleges violate the condition, the cases of the concerned Colleges should be brought to the Senate in its next meeting.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua requested the Vice-Chancellor to read the decision taken by the House relating to the Portal. In fact, the members had not expressed their sentiments alone, but had taken unanimous decision.

The Vice Chancellor said that the sentiments expressed by the members would be conveyed to Punjab Government; otherwise, there is no need to take a decision.

The other members said that the decision of Syndicate is approved by the Senate.

Certain members requested the Vice-Chancellor to go through the decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 25.03.2023.

At this stage, several members started speaking together and a bedlam got created.

The members requested the Vice-Chancellor to announce as to what decision has been taken on the directive of Punjab Government that the admissions should be made through the centralized portal of Punjab Government.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that the letter, which the University has withdrawn, should again be written to the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Government Colleges are already making admissions through Centralized Portal of Punjab Government. Moreover, the members of the Syndicate had agreed that the Colleges situated in the Union Territory of Chandigarh would make the admission, through the centralized Portal of U.T. Administration.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that the Punjab Government is sending the teachers on deputation to fulfill the requirements of teachers of other old/new Colleges. Earlier, the Panjab University used to take care of admissions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members had agreed to make admissions through the portal.

Shri Varinder Singh said that, actually, when in the Syndicate meeting they were not agreeing to make admission in the colleges situated in UT Chandigarh through the portal of Chandigarh Administration, the Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh had said that if the proposal of Centralized admission through the portal of Administration is not approved, his dissent should be recorded.

The Vice-Chancellor said that certain members had requested their colleagues not to give dissent. It had been discussed in the Syndicate and the members were of the view that the centralized online admissions in Chandigarh Administration is only up to first counseling. After the first counseling, the Colleges would be free to make admissions at their own level.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it was not resolved in that meeting that they will run their own portal, on that day, the only thing was cleared that they will not give dissent. Private Universities are doing their admissions, but they could not do anything in Punjab as well as here also.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said as per the Calendar, admissions are prerogative of the University. Hence, decision should be taken in accordance with the rules and the same should be uniform for all the affiliated Colleges, i.e., Colleges situated in Chandigarh and the State of Punjab.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the Government is already making admissions in Government Colleges at their own level.

The members requested the Vice-Chancellor to read the resolve part.

It was informed that the decision is that the Senate of Panjab University does not approve the directive of Punjab Government and Chandigarh Administration for making the admissions by the affiliated Colleges through the Centralized online portal.

The members said that as per Calendar, admission is the prerogative of the University.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-25 on the agenda**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That it be written to Punjab Government and Chandigarh Administration that the Senate of Panjab University does not approve the directive of Punjab Government and Chandigarh Administration for making the admissions by the affiliated Colleges through the Centralized online portal.

**XXV.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-26 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

**C-26** That the regulations/rules/guidelines/norms of NCTE with regard to grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation to Colleges of Education, be followed.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 7)**

Professor Jatinder Grover stated that relating to affiliation for M.Ed. Course to DK College, he would like to bring to the kind notice of the House that on 28.07.2022, an affiliation Committee went to the College for grant of extension of affiliation and observed that the College needed 1 Professor, 1 Associate Professor and 3 Assistant Professors. The Committee had been constituted only to consider grant of affiliation for M.Ed. Course, because the College had already been granted permanent affiliation for B.Ed. Course. Certain members have suggested that affidavit should be obtained online along with the application and other documents. He has seen the website of the College and found that 22 teachers have been shown on the website, out of them 15 teachers are not even working there. One of the teachers is Mr. Paramjit Singh, whose name is being shown there for the last 12 years even though he had gone to Canada. There is another name who is working in a government school. Those who are saying that only affidavit will work, this information has been put on the college website and there are only 7 teachers on their salary register. 22 teachers are showing on the website. How these types of Colleges get extensions and affidavit? After this, the Committee is saying that it had given permission to the College to make admission for 2022-23, even when there is no teacher. The College has only 7 teachers for B.Ed. Course, whereas it needed 24 teachers (100 seats for B.Ed., 50 seats for M.Ed. and ETT). He said that there is a girl, named, Navkiran Kaur, whose issue has been raised many times in the Senate/Syndicate, who left the college on June 12, 2022 and the inspection took place on 28.07.2022, how many times did that girl request the higher authorities of Panjab University, Chandigarh to give her experience certificate, she was given an experience certificate without date mentioned on it. Even with the interventions of the higher authorities of PU, the girl has not yet received the experience certificate. He asked, if they continue to grant affiliation to such Colleges, they could well imagine what would happen?

The Vice-Chancellor said that permission is not given to such type of Colleges. In the Syndicate meeting it was resolved that norms would be followed.



Professor Jatinder Grover said that the Colleges should be forced to follow the Regulations/Norms and the Colleges which do not follow the Regulations/Norms should not be allowed to make admissions. He suggested that surprise visit should also be conducted to know as to how much staff is appointed for B.Ed. and M.Ed. courses. He reiterated that College should be directed to issue experience certificate to Ms. Navkiran Kaur as per University Norms.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that as the cases are being pointed out here, the affiliation of such Colleges needed to be suspended. So far as disaffiliation is concerned, it is the next stage. He requested the Vice Chancellor to invite the Colleges, which have already received notice, listen to their point of views, and suspend their affiliation, if needed.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-26 on the agenda**, be approved.

**XXVI.** Considered the recommendations of Board of Finance dated 10.04.2023 (Items 3, 8, 9, 10(i) & (iii), 11, and 13), as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 27.05.2023 (**Item C-27 on the agenda**):

**Item No. 3**

That the pay of directly recruited Professors (appointed prior to 1.1.2006 as per applicable UGC Regulations) be fixed at a stage not below Rs.43000/- as on 1.1.2006 in the Pay Band-IV of Rs.37400-67000+AGP 10000 in terms of Clause-4.0 of Schedule relating to main Clause 6.8.0 of UGC Regulations 2010.

**Financial Liability: Rs.23,38,659/- (approx.)**

**NOTE:** This matter was considered by the Board of Finance in its meeting dated 01.08.2016. After detailed discussion, it was decided to seek the formal approval of UGC (**Appendix - IV**) (**Page11-12**). Accordingly, the matter was referred to UGC/MHRD for formal approval. Thereafter, the matter remained under consideration of the UGC/MHRD and finally the MHRD vide its communication dated 21.10.2020 (received through email) forwarded the principle decision taken on this issue by the Ministry vide letter No. F.No.1-4/2017-U.II dated 2.12.2019 (**Appendix -V**) (**Page13-14**). Through this communication, the Ministry clarified that the pay of directly recruited Professors appointed prior to 1.1.2006 shall be fixed at minimum of Rs.43000/- in Pay Band of Rs.37400 67000 with GP of Rs.10000/-. In terms of the above clarification, the case regarding fixation of pay were put up before the ACLA. The ACLA while admitting the pay fixation observed that since the clarification has been sought as per the decision of the Board of Finance, therefore, clarification issued by MHRD be put up to the Board of Finance for taking further decision in this matter and the arrear will be paid after the approval of the Board of Finance.

**Item No. 8**

That the Punjab Government Notification No. FD-FP-203(HCAL)/1/2021-5FP2/1/468381/2022 dated 02.12.2022 issued by Department of Finance (Finance Personnel -2 Branch), be adopted with regard to grant of Handicapped allowance of

Rs.1000/-p.m. to the disabled employees of Panjab University with effect from 01.01.2023.

**Item No. 9**

That a position of Associate Dean of Student Welfare be created to be filled in by giving an additional charge to a Teacher (as in case of Dean Student Welfare) with an Honorarium @ Rs.3000/- p.m. to the teacher for holding the additional charge as Associate Dean of Student Welfare.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 01/15/28 & 29.05.2016 has resolved as under:

*“That a position of Associate Dean of Student Welfare, be created and the proposal be, placed before the Board of Finance in its next meeting.*

*Resolved further: that a person belonging to the reserved categories, be given the charge of Associate Dean of Student Welfare.”*

2. While discussing the proposal for creation of position of Associate Dean Student Welfare in the above mentioned Syndicate meeting, the Vice-Chancellor has observed that they did not want to recruit any additional person; rather, they are hoping to give additional charge to a teacher, who would be given an honorarium of Rs.3000/- per month to assist the office of the Dean of Student Welfare.
3. The above item was placed before the Board of Finance dated 01.08.2016 vide agenda item no. 16 wherein unanimously resolved to send the matter to MHRD for their comments. However till date no comment has been received.
4. The University vide office order No.2103-2253/Estt.I dated 31.05.2021 & No. 4334-4434/Estt.I dated 31.05.2022 has appointed Professor Ashok Kumar, Deptt of Hindi as Associate Dean of Student Welfare w.e.f. 01.06.2021 and Dr. Naresh Kumar, Associate Professor, UIET as Associate Dean of Student Welfare w.e.f. 28.12.2022. But, no honorarium was given to them.
5. The information regarding payment of honorarium to teaching faculty as additional charge was sought from Central Universities i.e. Jawaharlal Nehru University (New Delhi), Central University of Punjab (Bathinda), & Central University of Haryana (Mahendergarh). The Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi vide letter No. Acad.II/Misc./2023/03 dated 04.01.2023 and Central University of Punjab (Bathinda) vide letter No.CUPB/Estt.Misc./2023/180 dated 06.03.2023 has supplied list of Honorarium/Special Pay paid to the Faculty members who are entrusted with the additional assignments, the rate of honorarium/special pay in case of Associate Dean

of Student Welfare is Rs.3000/p.m. **(Appendix-X)(Page 28 to 33).**

6. The approved rate of honorarium of Dean Student Welfare (Men & Women) is Rs.3500/- per month. It has been proposed that the Associate Dean Student Welfare be paid honorarium of Rs.3000/- p.m.

**Item No.10**

That :-

- i) For teachers of Panjab University Campus and Regional Centres the decision of Syndicate dated 19.12.2022 (Para 4) is endorsed and enhancement of honorarium be allowed from the date of decision of the Syndicate.
- iii) The Vice-Chancellor is authorized to approve the recommendation of committee already constituted for revision of pay of contractual/temporary teaching and non-teaching staff for its implementation.

**NOTE: 1.** The above decision of the Syndicate was notified vide No. 1354-1433/Estt.-1 dated 07.02.23 **(Appendix - XII).**

2. With respect to above office order, the audit passed a query dated 17.02.2023.

*“It may be intimated whether concurrence of BOF has been obtained and the provision of Govt. of Punjab in this regard may be intimated, please”.*

3. In response to that the Establishment Branch submitted that in the year 2010, the UGC letter dated 05-02-2010 (regarding revised guidelines for the scheme of appointment/honorarium of the Guest/part time teachers) was adopted by the Syndicate vide Para 23 dated 27.02.2010 and the decision of the Syndicate was implemented. It is specifically mentioned here that the above letter was not placed before the Board of Finance as per office record of the Establishment Branch. The cases had been admitted by the Audit on the basis of Syndicate Para 23 dated 27.02.2010 till the adoption of recent UGC letter dated 28.01.2019 of UGC.
4. On the basis of the proposal of Establishment Section, the Vice-Chancellor approved that the Syndicate decision dated 19.12.2022 (Para 4) shall be got noted from the Board of Finance in its next meeting and the cases for payment of Guest faculty be admitted by ACLA as per decision of the Syndicate dated 19.12.2022 (Para 4). This was notified vide Office order No. 2737-47/Estt.-I dated 17.03.23. **(Appendix - XIII)**

5. The Punjab Govt. Notification regarding revision of rate of honorarium of Guest Faculty is placed at **(Appendix - XIV)**.

**Item No. 11**

That the instructions of the CPWD No. 158/SE(TAS)/409-H dated 30.09.2022, be adopted w.r.t. adjustment in rates on account of change in the rate of GST effective from the date prescribed by the GST authority for the agreements/work contracts drawn on before the date prescribed by the GST authority.

- NOTE:**
1. The GST authority vide No. 03/2022 dated 13.07.2022 has withdrawn the concessional rate of GST i.e. 12%, which hitherto was applicable for government entities in case of construction services. From 18.07.2022 onwards the normal GST rate @ 18% shall be applicable. **(Appendix- XVI)**
  2. Clause 34 of General condition of contract, CPWD is reproduced here below;

*“All tendered rates shall be inclusive of any tax, levy or cess applicable on last stipulated date of receipt of tender including extension if any. No adjustment i.e. increase or decrease shall be made for any variation in the rate of GST, Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Cess or any tax, levy or cess applicable on **inputs**. However, effect of variation in rates of GST or Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Cess or imposition or repeal of any other tax, levy or cess applicable on **output** of the works contract **shall be adjusted** on either side, increase or decrease. Provided further that for Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Cess or any tax (other than GST), levy or cess varied or imposed after the last date of receipt of tender including extension if any, any increase shall be reimbursed to the contractor only if the contractor necessarily and properly pays such increased amount of taxes/levies/ cess. Provided further that such increase including GST shall not be made in the extended period of contract for which the contractor alone is responsible for delay as determined by authority for extension of time under Clause 5 in Schedule F.”*

3. Taking cognizance of the above development, the CPWD vide office Memorandum No. CPWD No. 158/SE(TAS)/GST/2022/409-H dated 30-09-2022 has issued instructions for adjustment in the rate in the wake of enhancement of GST rate which shall be applicable only for those work contracts which were drawn on or before the prescribed date

i.e.,18.07.2022 and within the validity period of which the GST rate has been enhanced.

4. The relevant provision pertaining to taxes in the contract approved by the university is as under:

***“Rates are inclusive of all taxes including GST and No extra taxes will be payable by P.U.”***

As above, the rates were inclusive of GST i.e., 12%, which was applicable at the time of signing of the work contract. However during the validity period of contract, the rate of GST has been enhanced from 12% to 18% and for the adjustment of the rates of contract, the CPWD has issued the above mentioned instructions dated 30.09.2022.

5. If the above is allowed, the Executive Engineer shall assess the impact of increase in overall cost of concerned works and submit the revised provisions for consideration & approval, wherever required.

### **Item No.13**

That the fixed remuneration of Part-time Assistant Professors (in subjects of law) of the Department of Laws, University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. Regional Center, Muktsar, S.S. Giri, P.U. Regional Center, Hoshiarpur and Regional Center, Ludhiana from Rs.22,800/- p.m. to Rs.43,275/- p.m. for a working load of 12 hours a week, effective from 18.01.2023, be enhanced.

***Additional Financial Liability: 58,96,800/- p.a. (approx..)***

**NOTE:** The office note and relevant papers are attached as per **(Appendix - XVIII)**

**(Syndicate dated 27.05.2023 Para 2)**

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that under Sub-Item 10, they had increase the remuneration of guest faculty working in the Campus. He had gone through the notification of Punjab Government relating to remuneration to guest faculty, wherein he had found certain contradictions. Though they had implemented it, they might be facing problem in its implementation. He requested that the guest faculty should be given the maximum benefits, whichever could be given to them in accordance with the decision of the University as well as notification of Punjab Government, and the decision so taken should be placed before the Senate in its next meeting for information. He suggested that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to resolve any issue arising at the time of implementation.

Professor Rajat Sandhir, referring to Sub-Item 13, said that he could not find any rationale for this. Since it is a part-time faculty, it should be treated at par with other guest faculty, i.e., per lecture basis.

Professor Devinder Singh said that this part-time post was made for advocates, to study procedural law and still 8 are in Department of Laws and 8 are in UILS and also in Regional Centres and the majority of them are still Advocates. However, the University

has changed its terms and conditions. Now, UGC NET Qualified and with other qualifications could also join. So these are specific posts and budgeted provision posts. Keeping in view, the number of staff in Laws Department is as; 30 for regular posts and 8 for Guest Faculty, total number is 38 posts in Laws Department. But, today there are only nine regular teachers and 8 part-time teachers in the Laws Department. Guest faculty means they come and take their lecture and leave. For them, this is part-time job. They gave them two sections to study. Their appointment is for 11 months with one month break. Now, they are fully dependent on them. They also reduced their workload. Since there are more than 1000 students in the Department of Laws, more teachers are required to impart instructions to the students. If the work of the part – time teachers seemed to be satisfactory, then there are many temporary teachers in other departments, who get Rs.57,000/- per month. As such, the remuneration of part-time teachers should be at par with the temporary faculty. They appoint advocates, who are fully qualified, as part-time teachers. The advocates, who had 10 years of experience and the others are UGC NET Ph.D. candidates. The Department of Laws is a big department, but the number of teachers is very less due to non-recruitment of teachers. The students should not suffer due to non-recruitment of teachers. Hence, they should appoint teachers at least on temporary basis; rather than, engaging guest faculty just to save some money.

On point of order, Professor Rajat Sandhir said that they are not against in increasing the salary. He would like to say that in 2018, the remuneration was revised from Rs.12000 to Rs.24000/-, and Professor Devinder Singh might be aware of it.

Professor Devinder Singh said that the remuneration/honorarium of part time teachers is usually revised when the honorarium of guest faculty is revised.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that what he meant to say is that there has to be some rationality/reason as to how they arrived at this. They could not enhance honorarium of part-time teachers from Rs.24000/- to Rs.43000/- without any rationality.

Professor Devinder Singh said that he was of the opinion that the part-time teachers should also get respectable salary. But the formula on which the salary of part-time teachers has been used could be elaborated by the Finance & Development Officer.

It was informed that this amount has been arrived on a basis of the basic pay of Assistant Professors as well as normal workload required to be met by them. In fact, the workload of Assistant Professor is 16 hours per week, whereas in this case the workload is 12 hours. Hence, the remuneration of part-time teachers has been increased proportionately.

Some other members said that on per lecture basis, they will get more money?

It was informed that though they will get more money, not on per lecture basis as these are part time teachers. In this case under consideration, the remuneration is about Rs.900/- per lecture and in the case of guest faculty, the remuneration is Rs.1500/- per lecture.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that Panjab University is the Champion in Khelo India University Games. Panjab University has got first position by winning 26 Gold medals and Guru Nanak Dev University is at second position with 25 Gold medals. Thus, there was a stiff competition.

The members appreciated the achievement of the University by thumping of desk.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the Registrar is supposed to give report within a month to the respected members of the Senate. He had asked for the hostel information on November 16 and sent a reminder on December 16 and again in January, but did not get the information. Later on, he had to get the information through the RTI. In the information, he came to know about the number of seats available in the hostels at the Campus. Now, he wanted that hostel accommodation should be allotted online. As per the data of hostels, there are 20 hostels, out of which 12 are for girls and 8 for boys and one hostel is under construction.

The Vice Chancellor requested Dr. Parveen Goyal to stick to the agenda. She added that she had also sought some information about the expenditure incurred by the office of Dean of Student Welfare, but the same is not complete. She has requested the Dean of Student Welfare to complete the information and provide the same to her.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the total number of seats in hostel is 7947 out of which 3862 are for girls and 4085 for boys. At the moment, 1077 seats are vacant. This information is till 31<sup>st</sup> January 2023. His only submission is that, in future, the hostel seats should be allotted through online mode.

On a point of order, Professor Jatinder Grover, Dean of Student Welfare, said that they are going to make admissions in hostels in online mode, but none of them should approach him to allot the hostel on priority and make complaint to the Vice Chancellor.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of Board of Finance dated 10.04.2023 (Items 3, 8, 9, 10(i) & (iii), 11, and 13), as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 27.05.2023, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to resolve any issue arising at the time of implementation.

**Item C-28 has already been taken up for consideration with Item C-8 and C-11.**

**XXVII.** The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-29 on the agenda** was read out, viz -]

**C-29.** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 22.05.2023 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for revision of the fee structure (Tuition fee and other University Charges) in University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres/Constituent Colleges, for the session 2023-24, be approved.

**(Syndicate dated 27.05.2023 Para 28)**

Shri Naresh Gaur said that fees are being increased day-by-day. The fees of those, who are already studying are also being increased by 5%, which they would not believe at all. At the same time, migration fee has also been raised from Rs.500/- to Rs.1000/-. Similarly, the fee for re-admission had also been increased from Rs.500/- to Rs.2,500/-, whereas the fees of foreign students is static. According to him, since the fees are too high, a little attention should be paid to reduce the same to some extent.

Shri Satya Pal Jain stated that in every Senate meeting, certain items related to fee are always there and the reason given is that the financial condition of the University is not well. They all belonged to middle class families and they, of course, do not have any problem. Whereas in today's era, the sons and daughters of peons, farmers, clerks faced a difficulty in getting admissions in Higher Educational Institutions. Though they are saying that only 5% fee hike is affected and 7% in self sustained courses, but for poor, it is too much. Are they trying to deprive the poor people from higher education? People arguing that the persons, who are associated with this University, do not want to get a single penny deducted from their pockets, but got several concessions. On the other hand the entire burden is being shifted to the students. He remembered that it was pleaded in one of the previous meetings of the Senate that the rates of TA/DA, examination, evaluations, etc., should be increased, but from where the additional financial burden would be met; rather, the burden would be put on the students. He completely opposed the fee hike and if it is effected, his dissent should be recorded. Several students are committing suicides because their parents could not afford to pay high fees. Why do they want to deprive the poor section of the society from higher education? They could generate income from some other sources as also seek additional grant from Punjab Government and Central Government. It is not good to take money from students' pocket. He reiterated that he strongly opposed this fee hike and if it is approved, his dissent should be recorded.

Shri Naresh Gaur, endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Shri Satya Pal Jain, said that if this fee hike is approved, his dissent should be recorded. He pointed out that if the members go through page 65 of the appendix, they would find that 15% hike in fee has been recommended.

The Vice Chancellor said that this has been recommended on the request of the students as the students were saying that the building is in dilapidated condition.

Shri Satya Pal Jain intervened and asked, do they take money from the students for building?

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired, why should the poor students suffer just because certain students belonging to rich families agreed to pay?

The Vice Chancellor stated that she just wanted to bring to the kind notice of the House that they have EWS category also and they admitted the students and such students get full fee waiver. Besides, they had given concession, stipends, fee refunds, scholarships to several others during the session 2022-23, which is to the tune of Rs.6,85,41,737/-. On a query made by a couple of members, including Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, the Vice Chancellor said that 1959 students have been benefitted. Giving the details, the Vice Chancellor said that 131 students, who don't have both the parents or only mother is surviving, 203 under 5% freeship to economically weaker sections, 82 sportspersons, 178 student aid fund, 211 merit-cum-means, 82 blind and physically handicapped, 82 other concessions, 94 earn while learn scheme, 65 SET Scholarship, 36 award of stipend to poor and deserving students, 109 for providing subsidy grant assistance to students of SC/ST, 101 merit scholarship given to university students by various departments, 175 sports stipend & 410 students scholarship fund, have got benefitted.

Shri Davesh Moudgil said that the Punjab Government has made all the parameters for award of the scholarships. The students submitted the certificates to get the benefits under these schemes. Only a small percentage of students get the benefits



and a very large section which belonged to lower middle class is bereft of these schemes and they are talking about them. Moreover, there are so many scholarships, which are paid by the Governments, and it is not that the university is supposed to pay. Hence, he requested that the fee hike should not be approved.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he fully agreed with the viewpoints expressed by Shri Davesh Moudgil. In fact, the proposed fee hike is for two types of courses – (i) courses under Grant-in-Aid Scheme; and (ii) Self Finance courses. It is written in the document that the teachers, who teach the self finance courses and the staff exclusively appointed for such courses, are getting salary from the income generated from these courses. In the case of self finance courses, 12.5% fee hike has been recommended.

The Vice Chancellor said that at the moment, they are talking about the fee hike in the University. So far as the fee hike of affiliated Colleges is concerned, the recommendations are separate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he would like to draw the kind attention of the House towards pages. 65 and 68 of the appendix, wherein a fee on account of Infrastructure/Lab Development Fee per annum from University Business School, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, has been prescribed. He is unable to understand as to what kind of labs are being used and for what development fund is taken from the students of the Department of Laws and University Business School. He further said that he fully endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Naresh Gaur, Shri Satya Pal Jain and Shri Davesh Moudgil that where the people belonging to poor sections would go? He added that the University is surrounded by the private institutions where the kids of their own faculty member are taking admissions. How would the poor students coming from outside, who have less money, whose finances and social conditions are not so good, would obtain education? In fact, such students always preferred public universities like Panjab University, because the cheapest education in the entire area is being provided by the Panjab University, Chandigarh. He would like to bring to the kind notice of the Vice Chancellor that it is a matter of deep concern and this mission has been very serious. There had already been a lot of discussion on these issues and agitations had also taken a place, whenever the University tried to hike the fee. FIRs had also been lodged against the students. Though the House tried to cancel the FIRs, they have not yet been informed whether the cases are standing or had been withdrawn by the University Authority. Whatever decision has been taken in the case of the students against whom the FIRs were lodged, they should be informed about the outcome. He stressed that the latest update should be given and if no action has been taken, they should be informed as to why the decision of the House has not been implemented so far and the responsibility of the concerned officials should also be got fixed.

Professor Nidhi Gautam enquired, after how much period they revised the fees? She pointed out that the fee for MBA is stuck at Rs.20815/-. She enquired when the fee for MBA was fixed at Rs.20815/-?

It was informed that the fee structure had been considered by the Committee in two different sections, one is for traditional courses and other for professional courses. Professional courses in the sense where the employment/placement opportunities are very high. For example UBS, Chemical Engineering and in certain other departments, there is consistent demand of contemporary infrastructure, labs, etc. Even in the Department of Laws, they needed very expensive kind of subscriptions for library etc. They are justifying their demand by saying that they are not able to compete with the

students of professional courses being offered by private Universities. After few deliberations, they had discussion with students also. Actually, these are all highly employment oriented courses and placement is almost 100%. In the absence of adequate infrastructure owing to lack of funds with the university, ultimately it is the students, who are suffering. After few deliberations by the respected Chairpersons of these departments, the students agreed to pay for infrastructural development with condition that some portion of the income so generated be given to these departments so that they could utilize the funds for providing facilities and infrastructure to the students, so that their future prospective and placement do not hamper.

Professor Nidhi Gautam enquired when they had enhanced the fee last time.

It was informed that usually only incremental increase in fees is effected.

Professor Nidhi Gautam stated that this hike in fee is not much considering the scope of employability in these departments. Hence there is no problem in enhancing the fee in these departments. It is wrong to say that these departments do not need lab facilities; rather, these departments need good labs. The UIAMS is itself self-financial institution. They have 13 year old computers on which they are not able to run the analysis. They are continuously asking the university to provide funds for creating additional infrastructure including latest computers. Although the fees of UIAMS department are also very high, yet they are not getting it. The fees of these departments are not that much. Hence, they should not stress much for non increase of fees especially when the university is giving so much subsidies to the students including EWS. Moreover, they are inspiring students to join Earn while Learn Scheme. The University is providing funds to needy students. She is fully agreed that the fee should be enhanced.

Dr. Priyatosh Sharma endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Nidhi Gautam. He said fee should be enhanced in University for two reasons; first, the University has sufficient avenues, those who need, can ask for it. If they do not increase the fees, the University would have to face financial crisis and the University might not be able to pay arrears of revised pay scales to teachers and non-teaching staff. If the fees is not to be increased, then the funds should be made available to the University so that they could have funds. Only then they could say that they do not want to increase fees. As long as they do not have other kind of avenues, they should not rob the university in building the infrastructure and providing best facilities to the students because when they interact with students they are usually asked for better facilities, which have to be provided to them. It is observed that since the enhancement in fee is not on the higher side, the hike in fees should be approved.

Shri Naresh Gaur intervened and asked as to what is the link between migration fee, registration fee, admission fee, etc. and the hike in fees. It had been pleaded that the fee has been hiked in consultation with the students. The Vice-Chancellor might not be aware as to how many students had agreed to increase the fees. Majority of the students might not be willing in the fee hike as their parents are unable to pay their fees.

Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that fee should not be increased. He enquired as to how many students of Department of Laws have got placement during last few years. So far as he knew he has not seen any placement of students of the department. He, therefore, requested not to increase the fees.

Shri Satya Pal Jain said that the arguments in support of hike in fee given by Professor Nidhi Gautam and a couple of members, is a serious matter, which should not

be taken lightly. What they had argued is that, in future, if the students want to avail more facilities, they would have to pay for them. It had also been said that the students had been consulted while recommending fee hike, but the impact of fee hike would be on the students, who would join the University after four to five years of this hike. It would not affect the students much who come to the University in cars, but would definitely affect the students belonging to poor families, and they would certainly be deprived of higher education. Who would think for them? Tomorrow, they might say that health facilities would only be provided to those, who could afford. He would like to bring to their kind notice that it has been enshrined in the Constitution that Right to Education is a Fundamental Right of every citizen. He reiterated that the proposed hike in fee should not be approved. Citing an example, he said that they (members of the Senate) could pay high fees because they belong to upper class. They could lay down a condition that the high fee would be charged from the students, who come in cars, and he would support them on this issue. He did not know why did they take consent for hike in fee from the students, who come in car and deprive the other students who belong to poor families. They are arguing that this is the minimal fee hike, but if they visited the homes of poor, they would find as to how parents are worrying for the education of their children as they could not afford to send them to colleges and universities. He reminded the Vice-Chancellor that she is negotiating with the Governments for hike in Grants. He remarked that in Punjab, the Government led by S. Bhagwant Singh Maan is giving free electricity, water, etc. They could request him to give free education too. What is the problem in that? They could also tell him that they have so much expenditure and request him to help them. Although they did not want to pay a single penny from their pockets and expected the poor students to share additional 10% extra. He urged the members not to look this matter from their own perspective rather look from the angle of the poor parents.

Professor Nidhi Gautam said that it has been proposed that some portion of the income so generated would be a reversed to the students in the form of stipends, scholarship, etc. But she did not buy the idea that the entire fee hike should not be approved just on the plea that in such and such departments fee would not be increased under any circumstances.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the tuition fee of every student belonging to Scheduled Caste category is completely waived off by the Punjab government. He had said about 50 times that a letter should be written to the Governments of Haryana and Himachal that the tuition fee of students belonging to the Scheduled Caste category, who are studying in the Panjab University, is being given by the Punjab Government. Similarly, the tuition fee of students belonging to the Scheduled Caste category, who are studying in the Panjab University, should be paid by the government of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh, as the case may be. They could themselves think that a child, who is coming from Mohali and belonged to Scheduled Caste, his total tuition fee is waived off, but this concession is not given to the same child, who is coming from Panchkula. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to get this idea explore. He reiterated that the letter should be written to the governments of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh for grant of this concession. He further said that every child, who is doing Ph.D. in the Central University, gets a scholarship. The students doing Ph.D. from Manipur, Puducherry University are getting fellowships. So, if Panjab University is converted into a Central University, all the students would get scholarships. If they look into the fee structure of GNDU, they would find that the mess charges are very high? When they are short of funds, they are bound to come up with similar proposals. Several times, they discussed different issues in the meetings of Senates, but never talk about the welfare of the students. As said by Shri Satya Pal Jain, there is absolutely no opinion that there are many students who really could not afford to pay even minimum fee. If they want to make Panjab University

different, they have to find ways and means. Whenever the Government other than Punjab proposed to give funds to the University, people started protesting. They must understand that the Panjab University is a University of international repute and does not belong to a particular city. In fact, the University is for students. He elaborated that he is not against any student belonging to SC category of Punjab, but his only concern is that similar concession should be given to the students belonging to other states. He said that the Vice-Chancellor had got an opportunity to take bold decisions. He had been suggesting this for the last 8 years, but not a single letter has been written to the Haryana Government for giving concession to the Scheduled Caste students of Haryana. He further said that a long discussion took place with regard to the proposal for converting Panjab University into a Central University during the tenure of Professor Arun Grover as Vice-Chancellor, but the proposal has hitherto neither rejected nor accepted. Similar is the fate of the proposal being mooted by the Haryana Government.

Professor Arun Grover, thanking the Vice-Chancellor for giving an opportunity to speak, stated that when the university was commenced by the colonial government, the University had no expenses, because University did not provide teaching as the university was a corporate body. The University was conducting school entrance exam, college entrance exam as well as end of the school exam and the examination for the colleges which were affiliated to the University. It had no expenses, no campus. The Panjab University expenses started meeting when the honours school system was commenced in the year 1919 and ten teachers were appointed on behalf of the university. There was no University campus at Lahore. Of course, some money was spent on the building of Law College, Library and the Senate Hall; otherwise, there were a few University laboratories, but there was no other expenses. Private college incurred their own expenses and the Government college expenses, of course, were incurred by the British Government. When the University recommenced on 1<sup>st</sup> October, 1947 by the East Punjab Government or a Governor of East Punjab at that time also they realized that they have no campus of their own. When Chandigarh city was envisaged and it was decided to have the University Campus here, the University was supposed to be provided the land, which was offered to it at Rs.1,000 per acre, it was just a bare land. All infrastructure was to be provided by the University from its own resources. All the sources came once again from the conduct of matriculation examination and the examination for the 70/100 affiliated colleges, which was there in 1947. They had combined Punjab, which today comprised of Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir. The University could do its basic functions of conducting examinations for the schools as well as itself, for which fees had been charged. For the building of the university campus, of course, the money was needed and that money was provided because Punjab government also wanted capital of its own. They did not give huge amount of money, but little bit of money accrued for the creation of university campus from Punjab Government. Fortunately, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar, being the first Chairman of the UGC, started giving Rs.4 lakh. Dr. A.C. Joshi was the DPI at that time, who gave a grant of Rs.4 lakh with which the construction of Chemical Engineering Department had got started. So, somehow the campus got going from 1960 onwards. Number of teachers came to Chandigarh, when the campus commenced, was less than 50. Whatever the number of departments were there, staff was very-very small. Majority of the staff was, of course, the administrative staff, which came from Solan and the staff used to conduct the exams. In 1966, they had a reorganization of Punjab, and at that time, the States got created. Panjab University had Regional Centre in Ludhiana. Regional Centres were created in Shimla and Rohtak. As the States got going, there was no financial orders for Universities in India. What was the financial matter, universities have to have some internal income and to that little bit was added by the State Government. If the Himachal University had to get going, all colleges are to be affiliated with it. Similar was the position of Haryana University.

Initially, there was only one University and only one campus had to be funded. But once they started to have more campuses, including GNDU, GNDU was residential university. How could they fund GNDU? To fund GNDU, they must have some internal income. They decided to affiliate 1/3 of the colleges of Panjab University to GNDU. Kurukshetra and Patiala were also residential campuses but they have to be got going. Every Chief Minister, who came into being, decided to disaffiliate Colleges from this University and affiliated them to the respective University of Haryana. Then school examination was expanding. So everybody wanted to control school education; otherwise, the school examination was controlled by Panjab University. It is in that background, the crises of Panjab University started from mid 70s onwards. First crisis came, when Third Pay Commission was to be implemented in 1973. Professor R.P. Bambha, former Vice Chancellor shared with him what Professor R.C. Paul had to undergo when all these things were happening. So every Vice Chancellor of the University had to make trips to Delhi just to see as to how the expanding/increasing expenses of the University are met because the income of the University was shrinking in terms of decrease in number of affiliated Colleges. In that backdrop, they had law and order problem in Punjab and when it happened, the University's deficit was continuously enhancing as the Punjab was to be attended to by putting a loan on it. All the expenses that happened during the terrorism in Punjab, is the loan given to Punjab. Somehow, peace was maintained in Punjab and the University's expenses were also taken care off. So that happened in the whole of 80s and 90s. From the start of the new millennium, they had popular Governments and it is at that stage the deficit of this University was started to be met 60% from the Union Territory because 40% share of the Haryana was transferred to UT and 40% from the Punjab. In the deficit is Rs.50 crores, Punjab's share was over Rs.19.5 crore, but the Punjab said that they would not give more than Rs.16 crore, which was given during the last year. So, it is in that backdrop, they had a start of deficit. In the start of a deficit, the Punjab Government said that Private Colleges are coming everywhere as well as the self-sustaining Universities. As the University had a huge amount of land in Chandigarh, why could it not start self-sustaining course? It is in that background that the University Institute of Engineering and Technology started self-sustaining Courses because there was a great demand of engineering courses throughout the country. They fixed a fee of about Rs.70,000 and started the UIET. Number of students got enhanced as the time went by. Branches were added and for a few years UIET was subsidizing the regular part of the university and fee of the university was not very much enhanced. But still Panjab University was at place for post graduate studies and selection for the students in the University had always been very selective and best of the students of Punjab colleges aimed to do post graduation from Panjab University. So these students are deserving by virtue of merit to get a scholarship. For these meritorious students coming from all the colleges of Punjab, as Shri Satya Pal Jain said, they had to provide education to the masses in an inclusive manner. That was why, everything was kept going and somehow university was kept on functioning. 4<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission happened in terrorism, but the University did not face any problem. There was demand for pension as the Panjab University did not have pension. He had learnt that pension was approved in 1990s, but they could not implement the same. Ultimately, the pension was implemented in 2004. They had been raising money from UIET, Dental College and UIAMS from the self-sustaining courses, which they had added in numbers. UGC was giving money for starting new self-sustaining courses in new emerging areas, etc., and their record in this field was good. It is in that background, they faced crisis. Luckily for them, Dr. Manmohan Singh an ex-faculty member of this campus, who left this campus and went to Delhi, agreed to help the University as other Prime Ministers did. Dr. Manmohan Singh assured that the University would be funded by the Central Government. They were asked to set up a pension fund, but they were not supposed to pay pension from that fund. The income of the Pension fund was put into the institutes income but the

entire expenses for paying the pension were also to be borne by the Central Government as a part of deficit. Punjab's share still remained at Rs.16 crore, which was there in 2000. Professor R.C. Sobti got all these things done when he joined as a Vice-Chancellor of this University. Thereafter, the University did not face any major crisis as the deficit was met by the Central Government. However, good days had to end, because the bureaucrats at that time, even though a PU Alumnus, was the Secretary of the Higher Education, but did not pay any heed to his pleas. He brought him to the University, but he said that it was difficult for him to pay anything more than 8% on what was given in the previous year. He said this is the base figure on which they could fight. As such, he put the seal on 8%. In 2014, when the new Government came they said, 'no' they would not pay more than what was paid to them in the previous year. And they overcame the crisis as everything was recomputed and in all that re-computation, a new formula emerged that what they were being paid as if they were a centrally funded institution, it had to be respected. The norms of the centrally funded institution means Government of India pays for the teaching and non-teaching staff in the ratio of 1:1.1. They had about 1000 teachers at that time and the sanctioned strength was re-computed and it became 1385. They had been paid salary of teachers between 950-1000 teachers + 1.1 non-teaching staff. They had also put a cap of 6% annual hike on it and they said the University would not induct any non-teaching employee and for every teacher they have to induct, they have to seek permission from them. So, this is the backdrop of the crisis. The new Pay Commission had come. Their teaching strength had been shrinking of whatever reasons and they are not able to fill up the positions. As of today, if they are centrally funded institutions, they are supposed to have full component of teaching strength, because this is the directive of the UGC. The UGC is paying for teachers' recruitment in Delhi University and Jamia Millia Islamia University and both the Universities are situated in Union Territories. UGC is also paying for the teachers in Pondicherry University, which is a rented University in the Union Territory of Chandigarh. Amongst all the Union Territories of India, leave aside J&K and Ladakh for a moment, Panjab University is the only University located in Union Territory for which there is reluctance to pay for all the teachers, payment of salary arrears and give them the development grant. But from the time memorial, this University has been generating internal income. If they pressed too hard with the Central Government, they would say they (University) have started self-sustaining courses, and ask for audit. They might also ask what is the income from the self-sustain courses and what are the expenses, they are going to incur and how they would pay for them? They would further say that since they have started self-sustaining courses, please self-sustain yourself. Every other course in the university for which the teaching strength is below the sanctioned strength, they would say fund it like other centrally funded universities, which are there in the Union Territories of India. Kind of support they provide to the Delhi University Campus, Pondicherry University campus, they are entitled to and the Administrator of UT namely the Governor of Punjab also concurred it. He has taken an interest and this is what they should plead with the Administrator of UT and the Governor of Punjab to get them a huge share, but at the same time, they must continue to enhance their internal income and they have to find noble innovative ways to see that the rate of increase of internal income never slow down. So, they should find innovative ways, the kind of ways which Professor Gurmeet Singh has just suggested. The people, who could not afford, should be provided support from whichever ways, maybe get them loan, scholarship, etc. The University stands at this stage, a loan scholarship of a kind that the people, who could not pay, as and when they start earning and become tax-payers, they would pay back. So very innovative thoughts are to be proposed for which they needed a think-tank made up of people like Shri Satya Pal Jain Ji, who has been associated with University for the last 40 years, the local MP, members of Senate, Chancellors of the Central Universities or their nominees, Advisor, Principals of affiliated Colleges (Government, aided and un-aided) or their nominees.

Some think-tank has to be there, so that this University remains an inclusive University for good students.

Professor Ravi Inder Singh said that some people have spoken that fees should not be increased and certain others are saying that the fee should be increased. He thought that they need to look into reality every year they all are getting 3% increment along with that they are getting DA twice a year. Everybody is getting about 11 to 12% increase and they would have to match their income according to the increase in the expenses of the University. It is true that all the students could not bear the hike in the fee, but there are some students, who could bear the additional burden. They should try to identify the students, who could bear and who could not. There should be criteria of income, those students, who could not bear, could be subsidized. As said by former Vice Chancellor, they need to look into internally as to what are the other sources from where income could be increased. In one of the previous Senate meeting he thought that during the tenure of Professor Raj Kumar, he shared one of the plans, which the Central Government has started. In fact, it was National Asset Monetizing Programme, wherein they tried to identify those assets, which can generate income for Government, and they estimated the income around Rs.60,000 crores from assets. Similarly, they need to identify the avenues of the University like HRDC through which they are providing training to teachers. They have very good faculty in the University which could run management and development programmes for corporate houses. They could charge very hefty fee from those people because they could pay. Secondly, they are giving number of places on rent to the outsiders, like auditorium, seminar halls, conference halls, etc., the rent of which could also be enhanced. So, fee hike should be there, but they could see that those, who could not afford, are compensated. At the same time, they needed to generate income from other sources.

Professor Devinder Singh said that, as said by Professor Ravi Inder Singh, certain members are in favour of increase in fees and certain others are against it. Since the composition of the Senate is not for and against, they should keep their consideration only up to discussion/suggestions. They all were also placed in similar situation and similar problem was faced by their parents. At that time, they did not realize the problem faced by their parents, but now they really understood the problem. The Vice Chancellor had already given detailed information as to how many students had benefitted from different welfare schemes and scholarships. According to him, majority of the students are covered under different schemes of the government. As he is a Chairman and he knows many students got benefitted through financial support or subsidy from these schemes. Now-a-days Government of India has introduced a new scheme for EWS category, but unfortunately the same is not implemented in Panjab University. If this scheme is implemented in the University, half of the students will also be covered under this scheme. Law department is a very old and huge department and as a Chairman he is preparing a list of scholarships. There are more than 30 scholarships (semester-wise –ranging between Rs.20,000/- and Rs.30,000/-) started by various alumni during the last several years. These are mean-cum-merit scholarships. There are certain other scholarships in the centralized budget. Hence, they need to keep in mind all these things while discussing this issue. Their aim should be that maximum students are benefitted and identify the students, who actually needed such scholarships. It had already been said that they had talked to the students and the students had agreed to the proposed fee hike. But it does not seem proper to have consent of present students for hike in fee because the fee hike, which has been proposed, is for future students. It is wrong to say that there is no need for labs in the Department of Laws because the students of Department of Laws compete with the National Law Universities, which provide laptops in classrooms with wifi facility to consult books, journals etc. online. He gets emotional,

when they say that there is no placement of students of Department of Laws. So far as merit is concerned, he could vouch that every student, who took admission in the Department of Laws, is meritorious irrespective of whether he is at number 1 or 300 in the merit list. Since the students are meritorious, they needed all kinds of facilities. He requested the University authority to visit the department at least once to take stock of the situation. When he was a Ph.D. student, 122 journals used to come to the department, but now only 11 journals come. It is only because of lack of funds. Why the students should suffer in the absence of funds? There is not even a single electronic classroom and notice board in the department. If they go to Regional Centres or UILS, they would find best facilities there for the students, which the Department of Laws did not possess. Additional budgetary allocations are not given to this department, because it is not an earning department. People says that he was very close to Former Vice Chancellor Professor Raj Kumar, but when posts were advertised only one post was given to them whereas, three posts were allocated to the UILS. When he enquired why three posts have not been allocated to his department, the Vice Chancellor told him that his department is not an earning department, whereas UILS is. The students should be provided best facilities as they are not at fault. At the same time, they should also try to provide financial support to the students through various schemes. When the students come to him, he asked them to identify those students, who could not pay the fees. He was also the part of centralized meetings, where budget got unspent. Placement Officer is also here. In nutshell, he said that they are not able to give best facilities to the students due to the lack of fund. Therefore, the proposed hike in fee should be approved.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said, could Professor Devinder Singh tell as to what plan has been made by the Department of Laws for placement of students.

To this, Professor Devinder Singh said that Dr. Parveen Goyal has to come to his Department for this purpose.

Prof. Rajat Sandhir said that he had been observing this fee hike for the last two years and hike which has been proposed is nominal and had been a practice from the last couple of years that 5% hike is proposed for traditional courses and 7.5% for self-financing courses except for 4 to 5 departments, the same formula has been used for the last couple of years. He did not see any hefty increase in the fees and the fee of the University is still less than other Public Universities, Public institutions in India. They could compare and see that Government Colleges in Chandigarh, Universities in the region are charging much higher than Panjab University. He would like to endorse the viewpoint expressed by Professor Arun K. Grover that Government of India or Punjab Government also expected them to increase the fees because they could not meet all their deficits. This should also have to be looked into. During the time when this petition was going on, they were asking as to what resources are being generated by the University? He knew that some of his colleagues would not be happy that they are asking for fee increase and they still need to justify the resources. Citing an example of schools at Chandigarh either public or private, they all increased the fees. Some marginal increase which is 5% (for traditional courses) or 7.5% (for self-financing courses) is not too much. The problem happened when after a huge gap of 6 years. From six years (from 2006 to 2012), they did not increase the fees. The problem occurred due to this huge gap which kept them differential from other public institutions. They need to have some nominal fee increase and whatever has been proposed and other practice for last many years should continue. People have opposed to charging of fee for infrastructure, but these charges are absolutely essential as the infrastructure is required to be provided to the students. It is not that only UICET would need infrastructure why not UIET also would need infrastructure. There is a need to think of the resources and the ways by which



they could build up this University. Tomorrow they would have to compete with other private institutions. For fulfilling the dream of excellence, money is required, whereas Governments are withdrawing their hands from meeting their deficits. So, there is a need to look at the avenues.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra, while referring to page 66 regarding specifically fee hike in LL.B course, said that in the session 2022 and 2023, they are proposing Rs.26,235/-. He had also shown the concern in the Syndicate meeting that 100% hike which is proposed, is questionable. The proposed hike in fee hike should be justifiable and reasonable as they would have to give facilities to students. Recently while talking about P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, where Rs.900/- per student is to be charged under the "Student fund" which is to be used for infrastructure. Rs.10,000/- hike is very huge money. It should not be such that as the people have the money so they could propose huge hike in fees. There is a difference between the self-financing courses and additional courses. A student join in Self-financing courses with a mindset that he had to pay the fees where LL.B course is a three-year course which is running with the general fee not from now only but from continuing from several years. This is the liability and the duty of the University to provide the facility. No doubt whatever be the facility, the fee suggested by the Chairperson that must be borne by the University only and not by the students. Hence 100% hike is not justifiable. The hike in fee should be at least 5%, 7.5% or 10%..

The Vice Chancellor, while referring to page 64 regarding traditional courses, said that the recommendation is that fee be enhanced for Rs.500/- per annum and thereafter in the subsequent years, shall be enhanced at the rate of 5% . So, they had done this in previous years also and they should have to continue with this practice. And for present students, fee hike is 5% as has been done in the past few years and for the partially self-financing courses is 7.5% cent enhancement subject to a maximum of Rs.7500/- per annum and in subsequent years, it is 5% enhancement and for the present students also it is 5% enhancement and no enhancement of fees for MBA, PURC Ludhiana and UIAMS. The fee for NRI students is given at Annexure I/II and so far as the fee structure of UBS, UIPS, UICET and the Department of Laws is concerned, so they should go with portion marked at "A" only i.e., what they are doing for other traditional courses so that the students of these departments would not be burdened.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they all knew Government has several schemes. From the year 2016 in the meetings of the Senate, he was continuously raising the issue regarding Post Matric Scholarship scheme. Why the certificates of the students have not been given to the students?

The Vice Chancellor responded that the money under the Post Matric Scholarship had not been released by the Punjab Government.

Continuing, Shri Sandeep Singh said that while enhancing the fee, they should take care the students, who are covered under Post Matric Scholarship Scheme. They should not only keep in the mind the students of rich class.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should do some analysis and there should be some component as to what amount of fee could be enhanced for what cadre. The applications for availing benefit under the schemes for poor should be in accordance with the terms as to what is the total income of the family?

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that nobody would fill the correct information about the income in the *pro forma*.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are talking and helping about under privileged. The income limit which is required for giving the benefit to EWS students is Rs.4.5 lacs, which is on the higher side. A person earning Rs.35,000/- per month could afford to pay the fee.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the welfare schemes of the Government actually do not reach the deserving ones. Hence, the fee should not be increased, and if increased, his dissent should be recorded.

Dr. Jagdish Chander said that Professor Rajat Sandhir had suggested to generate income through other resources. Do they have only one source of generating income i.e., increases in fee. There are many sources in Panjab University namely international students, alumni, CIIPP. Had they ever tried to generate income through these sources? According to him, the fee is not the only medium of generation of income. He suggested that they should focus on international students, alumni, CIIPP, sponsorship, etc., for generating more income for the University.

Professor Jatinder Grover endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Jagdish Chander and said that information asked from him was available with him but some more information was sought from him and after analyzing the income and expenditure of the hostels, he found that salary, water and electricity bills were not included in it. If they include these bills, expenditure of hostels would be equal to income. Since his joining from 6<sup>th</sup> February as Dean of Student Welfare, he approached so many alumni personally but none responded favourably; rather, they commented on social media on the condition of Students' Centre. How could they generate the resources from the alumni? They want that they help them in many ways.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that the fee should be gradually increased, when the fee is increased after a gap of years, then problem arises. Even when the fee is gradually increased, they have to face strong opposition. To maintain the sustainability and for updating the laboratories, for introduction of value added and skill based courses under NEP, funds are required for procurement of infrastructure also. They could only facilitate students if they have sufficient funds.

Dr. D.P.S Randhawa said that there is huge disparity of rate of rent to be charged in Sector 15 market as compared to the old rented shops in Sector 14. Secondly, he would not agree with what Professor Jatinder Grover had said regarding alumni. He would like to enquire as what efforts had been made by Dean International and Dean Alumni from the last five years for generating the resources. They have to make relaxation in terms and conditions for admitting the NRI students. He also suggested they should make arrangement for implanting the solar power project in University to save electricity.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said he fully agreed with the viewpoints expressed by Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa.

Dr. Priyatosh Sharma said that the enhancement of fees and generation of resources are two different things.

Dr. Jayanti Dutta said that she had been following this debate about fee enhancement because earlier also there were misbalance in the Campus because of it

and there was just a meagre creation and all the time they said that the fee should not be hiked as it would be difficult for the poor people to pay. Shri Satya Pal Jain had already said that they want evidence on it. They are saying that poor students are studying in Panjab University but they do not have evidence for it. Do they have any data? What is the evidence on which what they are saying? She is sure that when they have some kind of evidence they would find that rich middle class or high middle class students are coming to Panjab University. Firstly, they need to have data. Secondly, there is a word called equity. In Indian higher education there are three e-words equity, equality and access. Equity means equal treatment. If they don't charge fees from those who could afford it, then they are also doing injustice to the poor students. She said that need to have differential fee structure and there is a need to find out the economic status of the students. There are many ways to know that. They have to create a google link and collect the information. It is not at all difficult to collect the data now-a-days. She would say that let them make this layered, newest and an evidence based exercise. The matter regarding resource generation is very important but all the time it had been heard that after doing a number of sessions, ultimately, no work could be done resource generation.

Professor Prashan Gautam supplemented the statement made by Dr. Jayanti Dutta and said that as IRCTCR is usually used for dynamic pricing, they should also incorporate the same in their theme. They always talked about poor students, but never watch the interest of the meritorious students. He suggested that the policy of dynamic pricing should also be used in the University. Citing an example, he said that for the students admitted in first counseling, a different fee should be charged and for students admitted in second counseling, different fee should be charged and so on. They should try to think to introduce this concept.

Professor Nidhi Gautam said that all are right and she felt that maximum members of the Senate are teachers. At the moment, the University is functioning with half of the sanctioned strength of the teachers, still the ranking of the University is good because the teachers worked a lot despite of the teachers had been given additional charge. All the teachers are working day in and day out just for improving the ranking of the University. Though Panjab University is the oldest University of the country, the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission had been implemented here very late, but arrears are yet to be paid. The proposed fee hike and certain other charges had been recommended just to provide additional facilities to the students and not for payment of arrears etc. She did not know why some of the people are opposing it?

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to suggest others ways through which they could generate more income so that infrastructure of these departments could be strengthened.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 22.05.2023 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for revision of the fee structure (Tuition fee and other University Charges) in University Teaching Departments and its Regional Centres/Constituent Colleges, for the session 2023-24, as per Appendix, be approved, with the modification that the fee structure of University Business School, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology and Department of Laws, be enhanced by 15% and thereafter in the subsequent years (i.e., 2024-25 onwards), the fee be enhanced @ 5% to be rounded off to next hundred.

**Item C-30 has been taken up with Item C-14.**

**XXVIII.**

viz. –

The information contained in **Items R-1 to R-33 on the agenda** was read out,

**R-1.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has appointed Prof. Simrit Kahlon, Department of Geography as Dean of Student Welfare (Women) for a period of one year w.e.f. 01.04.2023.

**R-2.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has appointed Prof. Sushil Kumar Kansal of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology as Dean of International Students till further orders under Regulation 1, page 108 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2022.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(i))**

**R-3.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed Professor Jagat Bhushan, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh to continue work as Controller of Examinations w.e.f. 02.01.2023 (F.N.), in addition to his own duties, till further orders.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 27(ii))**

**R-4.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed Professor Anupama Sharma of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology to continue as Dean of Alumni Relations till further orders, under Regulation 1 at page 109 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(ii))**

**R-5.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Academic & Administrative Committee of USOL and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has granted extension in appointment to Ms. Rajni Chauhan, Assistant Professor in Commerce (purely on temporary basis), University School of Open Learning for the Academic Session 2022-23 till 19.01.2023 in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus allowances, on the same terms and conditions, under University Regulation 5 at Page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(iii))**

**R-6.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed Dr. Khushwinder Kaur as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in the Department of Chemistry for another one year w.e.f. 11.03.2023 with break on date 10.03.2023 or till the posts are filled in, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 27(xiv))**

**R-7.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation approval of the Syndicate/Senate has re-appointed the following as Assistant Professors

(purely on temporary basis) at Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, Distt –S.B.S. Nagar, w.e.f. the date they will start work for the academic session 2022-23 (with one day break), against the vacant post or till the regular post are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100 + AGP Rs. 6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2021-2022:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>
1.	Dr. Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi
2.	Ms. Sukhjit Nahar	Sociology
3.	Dr. Hari Krishan	History
4.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi
5.	Mrs. Ruby	Mathematics
6.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(iv))**

**R-8.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh the following faculty at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 11.11.2022 for 11 months i.e. upto 10.10.2023 with break on 10.11.2022 or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1.	Dr. Lalit Kumar	Associate Professor
2.	Dr. Vishakha Grover	Associate Professor
3.	Dr. Puneet	Assistant Professor
4.	Dr. Poonam Sood	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Sunint Singh	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Neha Bansal	Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Rose Kanwal Jeet Kaur	Assistant Professor

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(v))**

**R-9.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh Dr. Harsimran Kaur Boparai, as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital w.e.f. 09.01.2023 (being Sunday on 08.01.2023) for 11 months, i.e., up to 08.12.2023 with one day break on 07.01.2023 or till the posts are filled in, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 27(i))**

**R-10.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Dr. Rashmi, Medical Officer (Full Time on contract basis), BGJ Institute of Health, for further period of 89 days more w.e.f. 30.12.2022 to 28.03.2023 with one day break on 29.12.2022, on the previous terms & conditions.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 27(iii))**

**R-11.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of Shri Anil Kumar Sharma, Programmer (Temporary), Department of Computer Science and Application, P.U. for further period of one year w.e.f. 26.12.2022 to 22.12.2023 with one day break on 23.12.2022 (24.12.2022 & 25.12.2022 being Saturday & Sunday) or till the post of Programmer is filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms and conditions.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 27(xii))**

**R-12.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Dharampal Singh Punia, Assistant Professor in Law, P.U.S.S.G.R.C., Hoshiarpur, w.e.f. 30.12.2019 i.e. the date he joined as Associate Professor at Central University of Haryana, Mahendergarh, Haryana, under Regulation 6 available at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 27(iv))**

**R-13.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh the following faculty, purely on temporary basis at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital w.e.f. 22.03.2023 for 11 months i.e. upto 21.02.2024 with break on 21.03.2023 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation &amp; Nature of Appointment</b>
1.	Dr. Ruchi Singla	Senior Assistant Professor (Temporary)
2.	Dr. Vivek Kapoor	Senior Assistant Professor (Temporary)
3.	Dr. Rosy Arora	Senior Assistant Professor (Temporary)

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 17(i))**

**R-14.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Dr. Rashmi, Medical Officer (Full Time on contract basis), BGJ Institute of Health, for further period of 88 days more w.e.f. 31.03.2023 to 26.06.2023 (being holiday on 30.03.2023) with one day break on 29.03.2023, on the previous terms & conditions.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 17(iii))**

**R-15.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has appointed Professor Rumina Sethi, Department of English & Cultural Studies as Dean of University Instruction with immediate effect for a period of one year.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 17(vii))**

**R-16.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Arvind Rana, Senior Technician (G-II) as Scientific Officer (G-I), Department of Microbiology, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+ GP Rs.5400/- (with initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) plus allowances, as admissible as per University Rules, with effect from the date he joins the duty against the vacant post of Scientific Officer (G-I). His pay be fixed as per Panjab University Rules.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(viii))**

**R-17.** That in pursuance of the promotion policy already approved by the BOF/Syndicate/Senate meeting dated 10.02.2006, 22.02.2006 & 26.03.2006, respectively for Programmers/ System Programmers/System Analysts, etc. and recommendations of the Committee dated 23.12.2021 and 23.09.2022, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed promotion of the following employees from Technical Officer-III (System Manager) to Technical Officer-IV (System Administrator) and Technical Officer-II (Programmer-Sr. Scale) to Technical Officer-III (System Manager) w.e.f. the date of their eligibility as noted against each subject to condition that:

- i. Their promotion would be personal to them & on vacation the posts shall be filled in lower scale (initial scale) Programmers/System Programmers/ System Analysts.
- ii. They will continue to do the same work and discharge the same duties/responsibilities which they have already been doing as Programmer together with new assignments.
- iii. They will fulfil the commitments as made by them with respect to future plans/duties.

Promotion to the post of Technical Officer-IV (System Administrator) in the pay scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP 8700 (Central Government)

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of employee/ Designation/Department</b>	<b>Due date of promotion</b>	<b>Posted in the Department</b>
1	Shri Harminder Singh Deosi Technical Officer-III (System Manager), Department of Statistics, P.U.	02.06.2021	IQAC, P.U.

Promotion to the post of Technical Officer-III (System Manager) in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 7600 (Central Government)

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of employee/Designation /Department</b>	<b>Due date of promotion</b>	<b>Posted in the Department</b>
1	Shri Sudhir Goyal Technical Officer-II (Programmer- Sr. Scale), IQAC, P.U.	30.05.2021	Department of Statistics, P.U.

**NOTE:** The salary of Shri Harminder Singh Deosi, Technical Officer-IV (System Administrator) will be charged from U.I.E.T. from where the salary of Shri Sudhir Goyal was being charged earlier and the salary of Shri Sudhir Goyal, Technical Officer-III (System Manager) will be charged from Department of Statistics, P.U.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 27(xiii))**

**R-18.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Baljinder Singh, Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis, Department of Biotechnology w.e.f. 21.10.2022 (F.N.), with the condition that he will have to deposit amount in lieu of notice of one month, as he has tendered his resignation without giving one month notice, under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2019.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(ix))**

**R-19.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Committee dated 01.06.2022 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has disaffiliated Mata Gurdev Kaur Memorial Shahi Sports College of Physical Education, Jhakroudi, Samrala, Ludhiana from Panjab University, Chandigarh w.e.f. the session 2020-21 for B.P.Ed. course.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(xiii))**

**R-20.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Aditya Kaushik, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, P.U. w.e.f. 10.04.2018 (A.N.) i.e. the date he has been relieved from Institute, to enable him to join the post of Associate Professor of Mathematics at Department of Mathematics and Computing, Delhi Technological University (DTU), under Regulation 6 available at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2022.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(xvii))**

**R-21.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to convert Govt. College for Women, Machhiwara, Ludhiana into Co-Educational Institute i.e. Govt. College, Machhiwara, Ludhiana w.e.f. the session 2022-23.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(xviii))**

**R-22.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed to convert Mai Bhago College for Women, Vill. &



P.O. Ramgarh, Ludhiana into Co-Educational Institute w.e.f. the session 2022-23.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(xix))**

**R-23.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed that the internal assessment at Undergraduate level (B.A./B.Com.) at University School of Open Learning be approved in the form of MCQs in the Google form, from the session 2022-23 onwards.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 27(xi))**

**R-24.** That recommendations of the Committee dated 30.11.2022 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to work out the detailed modalities to nullify the effect of AFUS (10/20/30 years) ab initio, by re fixation of pay of concerned employees from the year 2012 onwards, i.e. from the date when AFUS (10/20/30 years) was implemented on the analogy of decision of Government of Punjab, whereby in consistencies of pay revision were addressed as a part of pay revision package.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 12)**

**R-25.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Jagtar Singh, Senior Technician (G-II) as Scientific Officer (G-I) in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+ GP Rs.5400/- (with initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) plus allowances, as admissible as per Panjab University Rules, with effect from the date he joins the duty against the vacant post of Scientific Officer (G-I) in Central Instrumentation Laboratory. His pay be fixed as per Panjab University Rules.

**NOTE:** All the other terms and conditions of service and rules of the discipline and conduct as contained in the Panjab University Calendar Volume I & III and other Rules and instructions framed there under from time to time shall be applicable.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 39(v))**

**R-26.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has approved the promotion of Smt. Seema Goel, Assistant Technical Officer (G-II) as Technical Officer (G-I) in Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Computer Centre, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- (with initial pay of Rs. 21,000/- plus allowances, as admissible as per University Rule, with effect from the date she joins the duty against the vacant post of Technical Officer (G-I).

**NOTE:** All the other terms and conditions of service and rules of the discipline and conduct as contained in the Panjab University Calendar Volume I & III and other Rules and instructions framed there under from time to time shall be applicable.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 39(vi))**

**R-27.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed the following Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs) between:-

1. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Fortis Hospital, Mohali.
2. Centre for Medical Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh and PGIMER, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 17(ii))**

**R-28.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Affiliation Committee dated 22.03.2023 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted temporary affiliation for B.A. LL.B. 5 Year Integrated Course Ist Year (120 Seats) for the session 2023-24 at Guru Gobind Singh Law College, Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib instead of session 2022-23 as no admission was made by the college during the session 2022-23, subject to approval of the Bar Council of India, New Delhi and also subject to fulfilment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report dated 04.07.2022.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 17(iv))**

**R-29.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Anil Kumar Sharma, Senior Technician (G-II) as Technical Officer (G-I) in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- (with initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) plus allowances, as admissible as per University Rules, with effect from the date he joins the duty against the vacant post of Technical Officer (G-I) in Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Computer Centre.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 17(vi))**

**R-30.** That the Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 24.04.2023 with regard to fee fund structure for the Academic Session 2023-24 in respect of all the affiliated colleges of Panjab University, Chandigarh, on the following terms:-

- (a) No increase in admission fee, tuition fee and late fee.
- (b) A very minimal increase of 7.5% in the fee and funds to be collected from the students for courses like B.A., B.Com, B.Sc., M.A., M.Com. and M.Sc.
- (c) The increase is 12.5% in Self Finance Courses.
- (d) This increase will not be applicable to the students coming from economically weaker section.
- (e) The increase in Fee and Funds is conditional upon various budget heads such as retiral benefit for which the Management/Principal of the College shall ensure maintenance of separate account for such funds.
- (f) The College/Management will pay the revised pay scales to the staff as per UGC 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.
- (g) enhancement of Rs.50/- each per month under Student Welfare Fund and Development Fund respectively, be made

**(Syndicate dated 27.05.2023, Para 33(vii))**

**R-31.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following recommendation (Item No.10) of the Board of Finance dated 10.04.2023:-

“(ii) for constituent Colleges the notification of Govt. of Punjab dated 15.09.2022 regarding revision of honorarium of Guest Faculty, be adopted”.

**(Syndicate dated 27.05.2023 Para 33(viii))**

**R-32.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi and Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate dated 27.05.2023, Para 33(ix))**

**R-33.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendation (No.4) of the Board of Finance dated 10.04.2023:-

- i) The mileage rate of travel by car/taxi be enhanced from Rs.10/- per k.m. to Rs.14/- per k.m. The toll tax/various State/UT entry tax, as the case may be, shall be paid on actual basis on production of supporting documents. In case of electronic payment of toll tax (through fast tag etc.) the attested printout/receipt of message/ email shall be applicable.
- ii) The rate of honorarium for external experts who serve on selection/screening-cum-evaluation committees be enhanced from Rs.1500/- to Rs.3000/- per day and the rate of Hon'ble Chancellor's/Vice Chancellor's nominee (External experts) be enhanced from Rs. 2500/- to Rs.5000/- per day. (The University Fellows, teachers and other officers who serve on the Selection/Screening-cum-evaluation Committee shall not be paid honorarium as above).

**(Syndicate dated 27.05.2023, Para 33(xi))**

**Referring to R-I,** Dr. Parveen Goyal congratulated Dean of Student Welfare (Women) on her appointment for a period of one year w.e.f. 01.04.2023. He pointed out that the appointment of Wardens must be one year extendable as per P.U. Calendar Volume-I instead of till further orders. As per PU Calendar Volume I, 2022, Page No.114, the period should be from minimum one year to five years for additional charges. Hence, he requested that the appointment of Wardens should also be made for one year. He added that the Dean of University Instruction is also appointed for a period of one year. Similarly, the Controller of Examination has also been appointed till further orders.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the letter has been issued from the office of the Registrar that the DSW (Women) would sit in the gallery of the Senate Hall during the meeting of the Senate. He felt that it is not correct that the woman officer should sit in an isolated place. He requested that DSW (W) should also be asked to sit along with other officers.

Shri Varinder Singh endorsed the view-point expressed by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu.

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

**Referring to R-17**, Dr. Mukesh Arora said, why they used the word 'external'? In the meeting of the Committee, neither any recommendation was made nor Syndicate approved it? Why this had been included?

**Referring to R-27**, Professor Rajat Sandhir suggested that for MoUs, there should have been a note saying that how Panjab University benefits from the MoUs, as it is difficult for them to understand. A note should have been there for all the members to understand how would Panjab University benefit from the MoUs? It could be made a practice, because it is very difficult for them to interpret.

To this, Dr. Neeru Malik said that information should also be sent to Colleges as the affiliated Colleges would also be benefitted.

Professor Sonal Chawla replied that the details of MoUs are already there

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that a brief summary how it would be useful to the University should be provided

**Referring to R-33**, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said, while referring to Page no. 367, 368 and 369, that amount collected under the Head "Retirement Benefits Fund" be maintained separately and Annual statement of account be sent to College Branch of Panjab University by 1<sup>st</sup> of July every year. He would like to ask as to how many colleges submitted the Annual Statement of accounts to Panjab University by 1<sup>st</sup> July of every year. If any college had failed to deposit the same, the concerned College should be asked as to why it had not submitted the Annual Statement in time.

It was informed that so far as the query raised by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu is concerned, it had been directed to the concerned quarters to provide the requisite information, so that the same could be placed before the House.

**Referring to R-30**, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that in majority of cases teachers are not getting the retirement benefits, they had to knock the doors of the Court for getting the same and such cases are lingering on for years. The other issue, which is also linked with is that they had laid down the condition that fee would only be enhanced in those colleges who would pay 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission to their Teachers. It should also be ensured that if the fee enhancement is implemented the teachers would get salaries as per 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.

Dr. Priyatosh Sharma said that while naming the two colleges of Chandigarh, one is D.A.V. College, Sector-10 and the other is Khalsa College, Chandigarh, where there are teachers i.e. on aided and unaided posts, the aided teachers are getting salaries as per 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, whereas the unaided teachers are getting unrevised pay. He suggested that colleges should not follow two practices. In Punjab, he also said that they are not getting their salary as per 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, that is a separate issue. He again requested that if D.A.V College enhance their fees, action should be taken against these colleges who are not paying salary to unaided staff as per 7<sup>th</sup> pay commission. The Panjab University or colleges both are on the same level. He again requested that it should be ensured that unaided staff may also get the same scale like aided staff

Sh. Jagdeep Kumar said that, if any College enhanced their fee, the College should submit the undertaking to Dean, College Development Council that the College is paying salary to teachers as per 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that if the eligibility criteria and scales are the same, the provision for promotional avenues should be made, because they are stagnated since long

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that common seniority should be made both for teachers posted in grant-in-aid Colleges as well as teachers for self-financing Colleges.

Professor Arun K. Grover said that serious action should be taken against the colleges who differentiate the grant-in-aid and unaided teachers. It should not be such that they could not enhance the fee.

Dr. Priyatosh Sharma said that it has been mentioned in the conditions as to what action is to be taken.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that, that is why, they are saying that they are not including the faculty in the seniority list prepared by the Colleges.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that it is not even two colleges rather, it is in all the colleges of Chandigarh that grade is not given to the teachers of self-financing Colleges.

Professor Arun K. Grover said that inspections may be conducted for the defaulting colleges and recommend its disaffiliation. They should have the courage to disaffiliate those Colleges.

Sh. Naresh Gaur said that firstly, he would like to register his dissent against the enhancement of fee. Secondly, with regard to charging of Rs.2412/- as Retirement Benefit Fund from the students, he stated that from the year 2012 this fund was being charged, earlier it was Rs.1800/-. The Retirement Benefit amount collected from the students is never paid to the teachers after their retirement. At that time, it was also decided that a separate account should be opened so that the statement could be tallied with the amount and the superannuated teachers would get retiral benefits. What is the need of collection from the students under the retirement benefit fund, when the amount so collected is not to be used for disbursing the payment to the teachers? Therefore, the Retirement Benefit Fund should be discontinued or it should be laid down in the conditions that if any college charge Retirement Benefit Fund, it would be mandatory for it to make payment of retiral benefits to teachers.

Sh. Jagdeep Kumar said that affidavit should be sought from the College in this regard.

Sh. Naresh Gaur said that it has been laid down in the conditions for the management of the Colleges to pay the salaries as per the revised Pay Commission. If the conditions laid down are not implemented by the Colleges, they should have courage to disaffiliate the defaulting Colleges as suggested by Professor Arun K. Grover. When he was the member of the Syndicate, the condition of 11.2 was imposed on S.D.P. College for Women, Ludhiana, but it seemed that the same has not been implemented properly as they knew that University could not take action due to certain reasons. They all have faith on the Vice Chancellor that strict action would be taken against the Colleges, who failed to comply with the directions of the University. The action should be taken against those defaulting Colleges by giving them exemplary punishment so that the remaining Colleges would also improve automatically. He requested all the members sitting in the House that at least on one or two Colleges, the exemplary punishment should be given.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that it is wrong to charge Retirement Benefit Fund from the students for paying the retiral benefits. It should not be charged from the students in any way. This item is needed to be reviewed and it should be got assessed by the Committee to be constituted under the chairmanship of Dean, College Development Council. The issue pertaining to enhancement of stipend for UG students of Dental Institute had also been raised by him in the previous meetings of the Syndicate. The stipend of minimum of Rs.65000/- is needed to be paid as also being paid in other states of Punjab, whereas the University is paying only Rs.10,000/-. These students are even working in OPDs and performing other allied duties in spite of that they are paying hefty fees amounting to Rs.3.5 to 4.00 lacs. Under these circumstances, the students have to face discouragement as the non-practicing students are getting huge amounts whereas those students, who are not doing practices and pursuing their Master's Degree, but as per rules, they are not getting desired stipend. He suggested that an amount of Rs.65,000/- should be paid to the BDS students, so that they might not face disaffiliation from the Dental Council of India.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it is correct that Retirement Benefit Fund is being charged from the students, but the teachers are not being paid the retiral benefits. The committee was constituted under the chairmanship of Dr. Jagwant Singh, wherein the record from the Colleges was sought pertaining to opening of the separate account by the Colleges. Only 30 Colleges had sent the desired information. Hence, it is suggested that the Retirement Benefit Fund should not be charged from the students.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said after sending several reminders to the Colleges for providing the information related to opening of separate account hardly, 30 Colleges responded. On checking the accounts of the Colleges, it was found that they have insufficient fund under this Head (Retirement Benefit Fund). Thereafter, the Committee made two observations, first is that those Colleges, which had not paid Retiral benefits, be directed to pay the amount with 12% interest. Secondly, the Colleges, which had failed to follow the directions of the University and did not pay the Retiral benefits, shall not have the right to charge Retirement Benefit Fund from academic session 2023-2024. It was also decided on the matter pertaining to fee hike that the aided or un-aided Colleges would pay the salaries to the teachers. Only S.D. College, Sector-32, Chandigarh, is paying the teachers as per 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. None of the Colleges of Punjab and Chandigarh is paying. There is a need to bridge the gap.

Dr. Priyatosh Sharma said that it should be ensured that the amount so collected for paying the retirement benefits should be released.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the action should be taken against those Colleges who are charging Retirement Benefit Fund but not paying the retiral benefits to the teachers.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that Retirement Benefit Fund is only to meet the liability to disburse the payment of retiral benefits to the teachers. It was also mentioned in the circular issued in this regard.

Dr. Neeru Malik said that a committee was constituted in 2021 comprising herself, Principal R. S. Jhanji and Dr. Mukesh Arora. Even Dr. Mukesh Arora and Principal R.S. Jhanji were not aware as neither the information regarding constitution of committee was sent nor the meeting of the committee had been convened. Secondly, a committee was constituted for addressing the complaints of Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce, where she and Dr. Harpreet Dua were also the members, the college was charging double amount of fees from the students. They were charging Rs.65000/- per student per

semester instead of Rs.25000/-. After checking the documents submitted by the College, the University instead of discontinuing B.Com. Course, permitted the College to run M.Com. Course.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said while referring to point (d) wherein it is mentioned that this increase will not be applicable to the students coming from economically weaker section. The background of the case is that in the year 1998, when the Government had imposed banned on new recruitments and for introduction of new courses. The Committees were formed from time to time to revise the fee structure after every two years, keeping in view the financial liability and requirement for recruitment of teachers. Thereafter, some of the funds were transferred to the Head to be spent by the discretion of the Principals, some funds were got rectified after evaluation, and some others were found to be correct; hence, it should be approved.

**Referring to R-33**, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that at point (ii), how the word external is used in the clause “in the rate of honorarium for external experts who serve on selection/screening-cum-evaluation”.

The Vice Chancellor replied that it was added because of the Board of Finance.

To this, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it was wrongly resolved as the Committee was constituted on 29.08.2019, which made three recommendations. These recommendations should not have been placed before the Board of Finance. The word “external” should be removed and it should be approved “for everyone” instead of “external”.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that on the one hand, fees of the Colleges are being increased, and on the other hand, they are taking decision to enhance the honorarium for external experts.

The Vice Chancellor said that this increase is not for the members of the Inspection and Selection Committees; rather, this is only for the experts, who visit Panjab University for Selection Committees constituted for appointment/promotions of teachers under CAS. It is written at the bottom of the point (ii) that University Fellows, teachers and other officers, who serve on the Selection/Screening-cum-evaluation Committee, shall not be paid the honorarium as above (mentioned at point(i)).

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that still there is discrepancy as it is written that the rate of honorarium be enhanced for Chancellor’s and Vice Chancellor’s nominees. Since the Vice Chancellor’s nominee could not be there in the Selection Committees constituted for appointment/promotion of teachers at the University Campus, only Chancellor’s nominee should be mentioned; otherwise, there would be ambiguity.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in Items **R-1 to R-33**, on the agenda, be ratified.

**XXIX.** The information contained in **Items I-1 to I-24 on the agenda** was read out and noted, i.e. –

**I-1.** That the Syndicate has felicitated to the following:

- (i) Dr. Neelima Dhingra, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on her having been

awarded Sarvshreshth Divyangjan Award, 2022 by Her Excellency President of India;

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 1)**

- (ii) Professor Rajat Sandhir, Fellow, on having been awarded Mrs. Abida Mehdi award for outstanding contributions in the field of Neurosciences by the Indian Association of Biomedical Scientists for the year 2022 and also receiving the INSA Teachers Award for the year 2022;
- (iii) Shri Vikram Nayyar, Finance & Development Officer, on having been nominated on the Finance Committee of National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research, SAS Nagar;
- (iv) Dr. Kewal Krishan, Department of Anthropology, on having been ranked at 17<sup>th</sup> position worldwide amongst the highly cited scientists in the discipline of Legal and Forensic Medicine;
- (v) Shri Anup Gupta, our alumnus, for having been elected as Mayor of Chandigarh; and
- (vi) Dr. Rattan Singh Jaggi, our alumnus, and Professor Prakash Chandra Sood, former faculty from the Department of Physics, on having been selected for the prestigious Padma Shri Award by the Government of India.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 1)**

- (vii) Professor Amrik Singh Ahluwalia on having been honored with '**Lifetime Achievement Award**' for his outstanding contribution in the field of Botany by Society for Plant Research.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 1)**

- (viii) Professor Sonal Singhal on having been admitted as a Fellow of THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF CHEMISTRY, UK;
- (ix) Dr. Ashok Kumar Sabarwal on having been got Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Rashtriya Sahitya Samaan 2019;
- (x) Dr. Jivesh Bansal, Deputy Librarian, on having been awarded by Society for Library Professionals and Special Library Association-Asia Community with the 'Professional Excellence Award-2023';

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 1)**

**I-2.**

That the Syndicate has noted the following:

- i) Panjab University secured 1<sup>st</sup> position (Overall Winner) in Punjab State Inter-Varsity Youth festival 2022 held at Punjabi University Patiala from 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> December 2022. The overall trophy to Panjab University was presented by



S. Bhagwant Singh Mann, Chief Minister, Punjab. The University participated in this youth festival on behalf of all affiliated colleges and PU campus under the aegis of Department of Youth Welfare.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 1)**

- ii) I feel privileged and owe my sincere gratitude to Shri Jagdeep Dhankhar ji, Hon'ble Vice President of India and Chancellor of our historic University for having reposed confidence in me for the discharge of the duties of the august office of the Vice Chancellor of Panjab University. Today is my first meeting of Syndicate after having assumed charge on January 16, 2023 as Vice Chancellor and I look forward to your valuable guidance & cooperation in the future endeavors of the university to make it a global player with your profound knowledge and rich experience.
- iii) Our University has won overall second position in men section and third position in women section during All India Inter University Karate Championship held at Attal Bihari Vajpayee University, Raipur, Chattisgarh, from 17<sup>th</sup> January to 23<sup>rd</sup> January, 2023.
- iv) Professor G.R. Chaudhary of SAIF of our University has been sanctioned a grant of Rs.5 crores to procure a new state of the art X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS) by the DST, Government of India, New Delhi.
- v) Professor Kashmir Singh, Professor, Department of Biotechnology, has received project funding of worth Rs.30 lacs under Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) from a company based at Ludhiana. The project is on establishing tissue culture technologies on medicinal plants.

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 1)**

- vi) Professor O.P. Katare has been sanctioned financial assistance for Research and Innovation Activities at Panjab University from CSR funds of Ipca Foundation amounting Rs. 28,60,000/-. (Twenty Eight lac, Sixty Thousand only).
- vii) Professor Indu Pal Kaur, Chairperson, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, was invited by the Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks (o/o CGPDTM) under its National Intellectual Property Awareness Mission (NIPAM) to speak during **“IP Manthan 4.0”** on **“Women in IP: Powering creativity, technology and entrepreneurship”**.
- viii) Professor Rajat Sandhir, Department of Biochemistry, has been awarded Research Project entitled “Development and evaluation of potential LXR modulators against sporadic

Alzheimer's disease" for financial assistance (Rs. 61.74 lakh) by the Science and Engineering Board (SERB), Department of Science & Technology, Govt. of India.

- ix) The Indian Council of World Affairs (ICWA) and Panjab University have signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to promote academic collaboration and exchange of knowledge between the two institutions.
- x) I further congratulate Professor Rumina Sethi for joining as the Dean University Instruction of the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 1 (ii, iv, v, vi, viii))**

- I-3.** In terms of Senate decision dated 14.12.2019 (Para IV), the Vice-Chancellor, has approved the promotion of Dr. Sunita Srivastava, from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13 A) to Professor (Academic Level 14) in the Department of Physics w.e.f. 06.11.2018 in the pay scale of Rs.37400-67000/-+AGP of Rs. 10000/- under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (as per UGC Regulation 18.07.2018) at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 18(i))**

- I-4.** That the following Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), be executed:

1. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Sardar Swaran Singh National Institute of Bio-Energy, Kapurthala.
2. Panjab University, Chandigarh and General Aeronautics Pvt. Ltd., NED 3/401, Shriram Spandana, Off Wind Tunnel Road, Challaghatta, Bangalore.
3. Department of History, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Indian Council of World Affairs, Sapru House, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi.
4. Department of Gandhian Studies & Peace Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh (INDIA) and Gandhi Smriti and Darshan Smiti, Rajghat, New Delhi.
5. Department of Botany, Panjab University, Chandigarh and CSIR-Institute of Himalayan Bioresource Technology, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh.
6. DST-CPR, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Knowledgentia Consultants, New Delhi.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 5)**

7. UIFT & VD, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

8. Directorate of Sports, Panjab University and Border Security Force (BSF), with its Western Command Headquarters, HQ Spl DG, Western Command, Industrial Area, Phase II, 3 BRD, Chandigarh.
9. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Mahatma Gandhi National Council of Rural Education (MGNCRE), Hyderabad, India.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 24)**

10. Department of Biotechnology, P.U., Chandigarh and National Institute for Plant Biotechnology (NIPB), New Delhi.
11. Panjab University, Chandigarh and IIT-Ropar.
12. Panjab University, Chandigarh and Information and Library Network Centre, Gandhi Nagar for Shodh-Chakra

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023 Para 16)**

13. Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Panacea Biotech Limited.
14. Panjab University, Chandigarh and CSIR-IMTECH, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023 Para 28)**

15. That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) be executed between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Yokohama National University (Japan).

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023 Para 6)**

**I-5.** That in pursuance of orders dated 27.10.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in LPA No.944 of 2022 (titled Dr. Navleen Kaur & Ors. Vs. Panjab University and others) tagged with LPA No. 1505 of 2016, the following faculty members have been allowed to continue in service in view of the similarly placed cases as under:-

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of Faculty members</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>w.e.f. the date they continue in service as per interim orders</b>
1.	Professor Navleen Kaur	Community Education & Disability Studies	01.11.2022
2.	Professor Dazy Zarabi	Community Education & Disability Studies	01.11.2022
3.	Dr. Virendra Kumar Alankar	Sanskrit	01.11.2022

In this regard, the Competent authority has ordered that the above faculty members be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.11.2022, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.944 of 2022 & others similar cases and salary shall be payable to the incumbent/petitioner which they were 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 LPA No.1505 of 2016 and other connected cases of the bunch matter. The payment to them will be adjustable against the final dues/recoverable from them, for which they should submit the undertaking as per Performa.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 28(ii))**

**I-6.** That the Vice-Chancellor, has accepted the donation of Rs.5,00,000/- made by Dr. Kavita Chavan w/o Late Dr. B.S. Chavan, Ex-Director Principal, GMCH, Chandigarh, for institution of an Endowment to be named as 'Late Dr. B.S. Chavan Gold Medal' to be awarded to the Best Postgraduate Student Gold Medal Award of GMCH, Sector-32, Chandigarh. 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 25.05.2023 and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140 on the following terms and conditions:

1. Endowment will be named as Late Dr. B.S. Chavan Gold Medal.
2. Gold Medal to be awarded to the Best Postgraduate Student Gold Medal Award of GMCH, Sector-32, Chandigarh.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 28(x))**

**I-7.** That in terms of order dated 15.01.2020 passed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in LPA No. 1505 of 2016 and other connected cases, the Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following retiral benefits to Dr. Cecilia Antony, Professor, Department of French & Francophone Studies, P.U. (upto the age of her superannuation i.e. 60 years on 31.10.2019) and was continuing working in the Panjab University service as per interim orders of the Hon'ble Court beyond the age of 60 years, now, she has withdrawn the case:-

- (i) Pension/Gratuity as admissible under Regulations 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Calendar, Vol.-I, 2022.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned leave as may be due to her but not exceeding 300 days, as admissible as per the decision of the Syndicate dated 01.09.2022 (Para 1).

**(Syndicate dated 04.02.2023, Para 28(v))**

**I-8.** That the Vice-Chancellor has allowed Shri Pankaj Kumar Sharma, Junior Engineer/Asstt. Engineer (Civil) (being senior most as per the common seniority) to officiate as Sub Divisional Engineer against the selection post of SDE vacated by Shri Vinay Lalia, after his promotion as S.D.E. in the pay- scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP-5400/- (initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) w.e.f. the date he joins as such till the final outcome of the Committee (already constituted by the authority to examine the representations of JEs/AEs & SDEs) or till the post of S.D.E. is filled in, through selection, under 50% open selection quota, whichever is earlier subject to the condition that his service will not be counted for seniority as S.D.E.

**(Syndicate dated 23.04.2023, Para 18(vi))**

- I-9.** That the following eligibility criteria for admission to Post Graduate Diploma in Nutrition and Dietetics w.e.f. academic session 2023-24, be approved:

<b>Eligibility Criteria</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B.Sc. Home Science/B.Sc. (Home Science) in any of these streams i.e. Apparel and Textile Design/Composite/ Dietetics/Human Development and Family Relations/Human Development/Interior Design Management from Panjab University/any other degree equivalent to B.Sc. Home Science recognized by the Panjab University</li> <li>• B.Sc. (Honours) Home Science</li> <li>• B.Sc. Nutrition and Dietetics</li> <li>• B.Sc. (Honours) Nutrition and Dietetics</li> <li>• B.Sc. Food and Nutrition</li> <li>• B.Sc. (Honours) Food Nutrition and Dietetics</li> <li>• B.Sc. Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics</li> <li>• B.Sc. (Honours) Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics</li> <li>• B.Sc. (Honours) Community Science</li> <li>• B.Sc. Family and Community Science</li> <li>• B.Sc. Food Science and Nutrition</li> <li>• B.Sc. Integrated Family and Community Science</li> <li>• B.Sc. (Honours) Food Science Dietetics and Nutrition</li> <li>• <b>BHMS/BAMS/BDS/MBBS</b></li> </ul>

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 12)**

- I-10.** That the eligibility criteria for admission to M.Sc. Computer Science under the framework of Honours School of System w.e.f. 2023-24, be approved as under:-

<b>Existing Eligibility</b>	<b>Proposed Eligibility</b>
<p>BCA/B.Sc. (H.S.) Computer Science/ B.Tech./B.E. (Computer Science/ Engineering) or any other examination recognized as equivalent with 50% marks (**) thereto.</p> <p>Candidates who have studied computer science as one of the subject for three years are not eligible (for example B.Sc. with Physics, Mathematics and Computer Science/ Applications.)</p> <p>Admission based on PU CET (PG)</p>	<p>“BCA/B.Sc. (Honours) (Computer Science/Information Technology/ Computer Applications)/B.Tech (Computer Science/Computer Engineering/Information Technology)/ B.E. (Computer Science/Computer Engineering/Information Technology)/ B.Sc. (General) with Computer Science/Information Technology/ Computer Applications as an elective subject/ B.Sc. (Maths and Computing)/ B.Voc. [Software Development/ Hardware and Networking/ Multimedia (Graphics and Animation)] or any other examination recognized as equivalent with 50% marks (**) thereto.”</p> <p>Admission based on PU CET (PG)</p>

**5% Concession is admissible in eligibility requirement to SC/ST/ BC/ PwD candidates.	**5% Concession is admissible in eligibility requirement to SC/ST/ BC/PwD candidates.
--	---

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 20)**

- I-11.** That title “Mata” be added before Savitribai Phule Hall (Girls Hostel No.5), P.U. Chandigarh and the Hostel, be named as “Mata Savitribai Phule Hall”.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 24)**

- I-12.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has re-appointed afresh the following faculty, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 23.02.2023 for 11 months i.e. upto 22.01.2024 at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, with break on 22.02.2023 (Break Day), under regulation 5 at page 111, of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1.	Dr. Amandeep Kaur	Assistant Professor
2.	Dr. Amrita Rawla	Assistant Professor
3.	Dr. Manjot Kaur	Assistant Professor
4.	Dr. Monika Nagpal	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Prabhjot Kaur	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Rajeev Rattan	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Rajni Jain	Assistant Professor
8.	Dr. Vandana Gupta	Assistant Professor
9.	Dr. M.K.Chhabra	Associate Professor

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 39(i))**

- I-13.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has granted extension in term of appointment of Ms. Rajni Rajan Chauhan as Assistant Professor in Commerce (purely on temporary basis) for the Academic Session 2022-23 w.e.f. 20.01.2023 to 17.04.2023 as recommended by the A&AC of USOL, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances, on the same terms and conditions, under Regulation 5 at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 39(ii))**

- I-14.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate has accepted the resignation of Dr. Satya Narain, Associate Professor (Temporary), Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital w.e.f. 10.02.2023 and allowed him to deposit salary of remaining period of 10 days i.e. 11.02.2023 to 20.02.2023 as he

has given notice w.e.f. 21.01.2023 up to 09.02.2023 (20 days), prior in lieu of one month notice period.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 39(iii))**

- I-15.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Mr. Pawan Kumar, Assistant Professor in Computer Science (purely on contract basis) Shaheed Udham Singh, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur, w.e.f. 01.03.2023, under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 39(iv))**

- I-16.** That the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of the following Laboratory Instructors on purely temporary basis at University Institute of Engineering and Technology in the minimum pay scale of Rs. 10300-34800+GP Rs. 5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules w.e.f. 03.01.2023 to 09.07.2023 with one day break on 02.01.2023 (being Sunday on 01.01.2023) or till the vacancies are filled in or regular basis, whichever is earlier:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Post against which salary to be charged</b>
1.	Mr. Nand Kishore, (I.T.)	Technical Officer
2.	Mr. Sandeep Trehan, (M.E.)	Technical Officer
3.	Ms. Seema, (Biotechnology)	Workshop Instructor
4.	Mr. Lokesh, (C.S.E.)	Senior Workshop Superintendent
5.	Ms Sunaina Gulati, (C.S.E.)	Deputy Librarian

**NOTE:** The salary to them be allowed to be charged/paid against the vacant posts of Technical officers/ Workshop Instructor/ Senior Workshop Superintendent/Deputy Librarian as mentioned each in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, as before.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 39(vii))**

- I-17.** That the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-employed Shri Rajan Sharma, A.R. (Retd.), purely on temporary basis for the period of six months w.e.f. the date he joins his duty in the office of the Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor on half of the salary last drawn (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowances) rounded off to nearest lower 100 irrespective of the facts whether he has opted for pension or not. The salary will be met out of the Budget Head 'General Administration Sub-Head Temporary Establishment/ Contractual Services/Outsourcing/Casual Workers' in term of the decision of the Board of Finance (item No. 22 dated 21.02.2012) approved by the Syndicate/Senate vide Para 3 (iii) of the minutes of the meeting held on 29.02.2012 & 31.03.2012, respectively.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 39(xi))**

- I-18.** That in pursuance of orders passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 02.01.2023 in Special Leave to Appeal (C) No (s) SLP No.22871/2022 Gunmala Suri & Ors. Vs. Panjab University & Ors. wherein, the following petitioners have been given the benefits of continuing in service in view of the similarly situated cases, the Vice-Chancellor has allowed the following petitioners to continue in service, on the same terms and conditions, subject to outcome of the orders of the Hon'ble Court:-

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of Faculty member</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date of Superannuation (i.e. 60 years)</b>	<b>w.e.f. the date he/she continue in service, as per interim orders</b>
1.	Dr. Gunmala Suri, Professor	UBS	30.11.2022	01.12.2022
2.	Dr. Deepti Gupta, Professor	English & Cul. Studies	30.11.2022	01.12.2022
3.	Dr. B.B. Goyal, Professor	UBS	30.11.2022	01.12.2022

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 40(ii))**

- I-19.** That in pursuance of orders dated 17.01.2023 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in LPA No.1179 of 2022 (titled Dr. Kirandeep Singh & Ors. Vs. Panjab University and others) tagged with LPA No. 1505 of 2016, the following faculty member has been allowed to continue in service in view of the similarly placed cases as under:-

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of Faculty members</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Date of superannuation</b>	<b>w.e.f. the date he continue in service as per interim orders</b>
1.	Prof. Kirandeep Singh	Education	31.12.2022	01.01.2023

In this regard, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the above faculty member be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.01.2023, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1179 of 2022 & others similar cases and salary shall be payable to the incumbent/petitioner which he was drawing as 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 LPA No.1505 of 2016 and other connected cases of the bunch matter. The payment to him will be adjustable against the final dues/recoverable from him, for which he should submit the undertaking as per Performa.

**NOTE:** The teacher (s) residing in the University campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions,



subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 40(iii))**

- I-20.** That to note that an amount of Rs.20 Crores (Rs. Twenty Crores) has been replenished back from "Revenue Account" i.e. SBI Current Account No.10444978333 to Plan Account i.e. 10444979267.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 40(x))**

- I-21.** That to note the following recommendation of the Committee dated 25.01.2023, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to the issue of allowing the students for appearing in examinations having practical's in private capacity, who got Government Job during the course of their study, provided they are permitted by the Government:

"since from the coming academic session i.e. 2023-24 there is proposal to implement New Education Policy by the University, extension of this provision during the course of study would have no relevance. Hence, there is no logic to make any such provisions. Therefore, status quo be maintained".

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 40(xi))**

- I-22.** That to note the following recommendation (No.12) of the Committee dated 17.01.2023, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to recommend an appropriate mechanism as an interim arrangements, for smooth conduct of various academic activities of the University:

"that the degree of B.Sc. (General) with elective subject of Computer Science, be not equated with B.Sc. (Computer Science)".

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 40(xii))**

- I-23.** That to note that the name of Government College, Talwara, Hoshiarpur, has changed to Mahant Ram Parkash Dass Government College, Talwara, Hoshiarpur (Pb.) as per letter No.2737 dated 16.11.2021 of Department of Higher Education and Languages (Education Cell), Government of Punjab.

**(Syndicate dated 19.12.2022, Para 28(iv))**

- I-24.** That the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Affiliation Committee dated 14.09.2022 and subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation for B.Sc.I (Non-Medical)-2<sup>nd</sup> Unit to Dasmesh Girls College, Chak Alla Baksh, Mukerian, District Hoshiarpur, for the session 2022-2023, subject to submission of proceeding of Selection Committee, appointment letters and joining reports of the two Assistant Professors on regular basis as per inspection committee report.

**(Syndicate dated 25.03.2023, Para 39(x))**

**XXX.**

**ZERO HOUR**

1. Dr. Jagtar Singh said that he went to DM College, Moga, as a member of a Committee and found that the appointment of the Principal, who has been working there for the last six years, has not been approved by the University. Three Committees had been formed, but no action has been taken.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council to bring the list of Colleges, which are to be disaffiliated.

2. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he had raised the issue many times in the Syndicate also, but no solution has hitherto been found. If direction has been given by the UGC, they should allow students to give answers in Punjabi language also, and the relevant rules should also be amended. Why they did not allow the students to write answers in Punjabi language? If certain teachers do not know Punjabi, they should be asked to learn Punjabi, for which they could be given incentives like increments. If need be, a Committee should be constituted for this purpose.
3. Professor Jayanti Dutta said that there are some faculty in the university department who were promoted, but their cases have been still pending in the audit for the last two years. There should have a time limit, within which the audit objection can be removed.
4. Professor Jayanti Dutta said that Right of Persons with Disability Act, came in 2016. They should make all the mechanism and implement it.
5. Professor Jayanti Dutta requested that a shuttle bus service should be run between Sector-14 and Sector-25.
6. Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that golden chance should be given to all the children (open for all).

Professor Jagat Bhushan, Controller of Examinations, said that the University had given a golden chance to the students of all the courses in 2020 and the students had taken the advantage.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that in 2021, they had given the golden chance from the session 2015 onwards.

Professor Jagat Bhushan, Controller of Examinations, said that if the House wished to give another chance, a condition should be imposed that the students would have to take the examination in accordance with the latest syllabus. Actually, last time they had granted the golden chance to the students from 1970 onwards, but they neither had the syllabus for that period nor the subject combination.

7. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that the examination of Environment Education Paper, which is conducted once in a year, should be conducted twice a year.

Professor Jagat Bhushan, Controller of Examinations, said that now they had started conducting this examination twice a year. During Covid-19, they had started conducting Environment Education Paper online and even after that they kept it online. Now, they conduct this paper in online mode only as it is easy for the students.

8. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that result of reappear examination of BBA first year has not yet been declared.

Professor Jagat Bhushan, Controller of Examinations, clarified that there was a complaint with regard to setting of question paper. The relevant file was sent to UBS for review on 17<sup>th</sup> March, 2023, but same has not been received back. When they asked, they told that the file would be sent after 17<sup>th</sup> June.

9. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they had pointed out in one of the meetings of the Syndicate that the question paper of B.Com. 1<sup>st</sup> year was set out of syllabus. In fact, the question paper having 40 marks was out of syllabus. He enquired as to what is the status?

10. Shri Jagdeep Kumar said that he along with Professor Rajat Sandhir had gone to meet the Vice Chancellor on 25<sup>th</sup> May to apprise her about the enhancement of salary of faculty members of Sukhanand College. The College is still paying salary to the faculty @Rs.15000/- per month. He requested the Vice Chancellor to take necessary action as early as possible. He requested while addressing DCDC that the report pertaining to Sukhanand College should be sent to the Syndicate for necessary action.

11. Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that there is a need to improve the functioning of G & P Section in Administrative Block for the motivation of the Principal Investigators.

12. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that there should be single man on single post. They should prefer to give additional charge to those faculty members who were never given additional charge and who are keen to own the responsibilities of additional charge especially for paid posts.

13. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that after going through the CAS promotions, he had observed that case of promotion of Dr. Jayanti Dutta, is still pending. He requested that the promotion case of Dr. Jayanti Dutta should be expedited.

14. Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the digitization of the University would be proved better for the University, which has also been suggested by the Chancellor. It was also made clear by the Chancellor that the concept of digitization is also being promoted in Rajya Sabha, Vidhan Sabha and Lok Sabha.

15. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that request has also been made to SVC regarding changing the Coordinator, Computer Science, Hoshiarpur. But the response to the request is still awaited.
16. Dr. Parveen Goyal requested that Earned Leave of teachers should be updated at the departmental level. This could be allowed as no money is involved in it.
17. Dr. Gaurav Gaur requested that as the admissions to the next session are going to commence shortly, some of the buildings in the Campus, which are not disabled friendly, should be made disabled friendly by providing ramps, wheel chairs, etc., to facilitate disabled persons.
18. Dr. Priyatosh Sharma requested to make arrangement for payment of arrears of revised Pay Scales for the University Professors and other teachers.
19. Dr. Neeru Malik requested that they should also think about the stand alone Colleges of Education. She requested that if B.A./B.Sc./B.Ed. 4-Year Integrated Course is to be introduced under NEP-2020, the same should also be allowed to be started in the Colleges of Education.
20. Dr. Neeru Malik said that the teachers of Baba Nihal Singh Colleges are not being paid salaries for the last 10 months, whereas they are obtaining the signatures of the teachers that salary is being paid to them. Even the salaries are not credited into their accounts; rather they are showing fake bank statements in this regard.
21. Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that he is also requesting the same on behalf of Sh. Varinder Singh and Shri Ravinder Singh. He further said that a Committee was constituted regarding repair and maintenance of P.U. Regional Centre, Muktsar. It has been decided by the Committee that the building is in such a dilapidated condition that it could not be repaired. The Committee has further recommended that a new building should be constructed. For taking action pertaining to construction of new building, a separate Committee should be constituted.
22. Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that in the last examination, it was noticed that many colleges have dictated the answers during the examinations. On inspecting the answer sheets, it came to the notice that all the answer books were written on similar pattern with same minor spelling mistakes. He requested that strict action should be taken against these Colleges. He would not like to disclose the name of any of the College, but several complaints had been received against the Colleges situated in Ferozepur, Muktsar, Abohar. He requested that instead of taking action against the students, they should take strict action against the Colleges. He requested to take strict decision on this major issue. While addressing C.O.E., he also requested that it should be resolved as to how this issue could be solved.  
  
Professor Jagat Bhushan, COE said that if any College is doing such type of things, the same should be informed to the authority for taking strict action.

23. Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that in the case of Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur, where Professor Sukhbir Kaur was the member of the Committee, it had been recommended that the College should be debarred for conducting examination for 5 years.

Professor Jagat Bhushan, Controller of Examinations, said that they had received 3-4 complaints, and had sent Flying Squad team to the Colleges on regular basis.

Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that sending team would not solve the issue. These Colleges are indulged in cheating for enhancing admissions.

Professor Jagat Bhushan, Controller of Examinations, said that they could get CCTV installed in such Colleges.

Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that University had to take strict action against such Colleges as well as against the Centre Superintendents. He reiterated that even after the recommendation of the Committee, the University did not take action against Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur and debarred it from conducting examinations for 5 years.

Professor Jagat Bhushan, Controller of Examinations, said that they had sent the case to UMC Branch for initiating action.

Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that they had taken the action against the students and debarred them for appearing in any University examination for two years. He said that a student met him and told while crying that she/he had come fully prepared to the examination centre, but if somebody dictated answers in the examination hall, what could he/she do? In these colleges, mostly ad hoc teachers are working and they evaluated the answer-books.

To this, Professor Supinder Kaur, being representative of teachers, said that she would like to point out that when the UMC cases are made in Colleges as well as in the University, they got them cleared by taking a lenient view for students.

Professor Devinder Singh said that Panjab University Calendar has no Rules and Regulations regarding giving punishment to teachers for providing help to students in writing papers. Nobody thought that the teachers could dictate to students in exams.

Shri Simranjeet Singh Dhillon said that UMC case filed on whole class. Why the action only taken on students?

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that Shri Simaranjit Singh Dhillon has raised a major issue. In these types of practices, the image of the Panjab University is defamed. He also agreed with Controller of Examinations that CCTV installation is a very good idea and live telecast would be made available in the office of Controller of Examinations.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this is not agreeable.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa again said that Panjab University should implement this suggestion of installation of CCTV cameras in the Colleges, as early as possible.

Dr. Praveen Goyal said that Colleges should install CCTV cameras and they have to send CD to Panjab University.

Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that strict action should be taken against concerned Superintendents & Colleges and to allow the Senate members, without any permission, to visit the college for surprise checking as Flying squad team.

Professor Supinder Kaur suggested that on the day of examination, the change of examination centre should also be stopped.

Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that Controller of Examination had deputed him to visit Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur and College staff had already aware about his visit. They had deputed four security personnel at the entrance of the College but they did not open the gate of the College. He personally knows the owner of the College, when he asked the owner to get in; he found that 15-20 security personnel were roaming in the College premises like GUNDAS.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the issue raised by Shri Simranjit Singh is of major concern.

Dr. Jagwant Singh said that next time, the examination centre of these College students should be made in some other college instead of conducting exam in their own College.

Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that copying is not only done in one college; rather, all the colleges including Dev Samaj College and R.S.D. College are involved in it.

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

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is fully agreed with the issue raised by Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon. The problem is not in all the Colleges. There is a provision of Observers in the Panjab University, they should send only verified Observers as number of problems are associated with the Flying squads.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that action should be taken against only on those Colleges for whom the complaints have been made. He again stated that in these colleges, the Centre Superintendent is deputed from another College, but the Deputy Superintendent and staff is from the same College.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that he visited D.A.V. College, Abohar, twice in 2005, about which Sh. Simranjit is talking about. An English examination was underway and he had asked the students that whosoever had slips/notes, to submit the same. A bagful of slips came out. This incident had occurred about 17 years ago. Thereafter, several Committees were formed. The Principal of Moga College also visited there,

his car was also vandalized and he had been misbehaved, but no action was taken against the said College, till date.

Professor Jagat Bhushan, Controller of Examinations, said that Examination Centre was closed at that time, but on the very next day, they brought the orders of the Court. Hence, in this regard University should constitute a Committee comprising two Senior Fellows and two teachers of the University for the purpose. They should use two or three types of deterrents for obtaining results.

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that COE should take action against those Colleges against whom a great number of UMC cases are made.

Shri Simranjit Singh Dhillon said that matter is not making the UMC cases against the students. He suggested that Controller of Examinations should have the authority to impose penalty against such Colleges. This is not a case of one College rather, there are number of Colleges in Abohar, Ferozepur etc., where such type of mask copying cases is being noticed.

24. Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the other Fellows would also agree with him that comfortable seats should be provided in the Senate as these chairs are not comfortable. These chairs did not give healthy sitting posture. Moreover, the seating arrangement at the Senate is not adequate, when all the members come to attend the meeting of the Senate, it would be difficult to accommodate all of them. He suggested that an estimate should be got made for making provision of better seating arrangement as existed in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha.
25. Professor Gurmeet Singh suggested that in the application form for recruitment of faculty, one column of languages known should be added. At the time of recruitment, all the faculty members have filled this column of languages known as Hindi, English and Punjabi. If any faculty member refuse to check the answer-books in Punjabi, they should check their form whether he/she had filled the option of Punjabi in the Languages known column, so that he/she could not refuse to check the answer-books of Punjabi.
26. Professor Supinder Kaur said that not to allow the law students to appear in punjabi language/medium in the LL.B examination. She said that the punjabi as a language and as a subject can be compulsory at graduation level rather it should be made mandatory/ compulsory as we are discussing since morning about punjabi as a compulsory subject/ option in the graduation courses. but, in case of appearing in LL.B examination, the students shall not be allowed to appear in punjabi medium.

The Vice Chancellor said that a notification has been received from the U.G.C. that students can be given an option of writing the papers in their local language. The question would be in English but the students have the option to give answers in Punjabi.

Professor Supinder Kaur further stated that the law students when appear in competitive examinations like judicial services and UPSC, the

medium is english. Not only this, the english is a compulsory language while appearing as a counsel at the high courts of all states and the supreme court respectively. so at LL.B level, appearing in punjabi medium will lower their calibre further for the competitive world as there, the medium is english and law is the subject where you have to prepare your draft for the courts and for the competitive examinations in the english language only. The same was further stated by Dr. Dinesh Kumar.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not accepted that local languages could reduce the calibre of the students.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the reason is not that local languages can reduce the calibre or otherwise. The reason is that in Punjab and Haryana even at the lowest level to the Court, the Court language is English. In case they go to Rajasthan, up to District Court the language is Hindi. In the court of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, there they are working in district language, which is also their working language. They are not creating any doubt regarding the capability of the students.

27. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that in the year 2015, 1925 posts were advertised wherein 75% grant was sanctioned by the Punjab Government and the remaining 25% was to be given by the managements of the College. It is a huge fraud which is going on, and the Vice Chancellor might be surprised to know that at the time of visit by the Inspection teams for grant of affiliation to the Colleges, the temporary teachers, who are getting Rs.21,600/- and posted there, are counted as regular teachers. This practice is continued for the last 7-8 years. He requested that DCDC should be directed to obtain the list of the Colleges whose affiliation is granted/extended by showing temporary teachers on the rolls of regular grade. These teachers are appointed on contractual basis. They are getting the extension in affiliation by showing the contractual teachers as regular. The management are not regularising their services, rather they are counting their service as regular teachers. There are only 3-4 Colleges which had regularized their contractual teachers. He requested that this should be looked into and information should be sought from the Colleges to stop this fraud. If it is not possible to gather the above said information officially, he would provide the same to them.

To this, the Vice Chancellor replied that he should provide the information pertaining to these Colleges as it would be late in gathering the information officially.

28. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu stated that there are three Colleges in Ludhiana namely, Atam Vallabh College, S.D.P College and Kamla Lohtia College where they have reduced the rate of DA. Rather, they are not giving annual increments to teachers. He requested to take necessary action in the matter.
29. Professor Sonal Chawla said that in the Colleges, orientation course should be made mandatory for newly admitted students, so that they could better connect with students regarding their course, significance, benefits and future outcome. She suggested that there is a need to sensitise the students and made them aware of what they are doing and why they are doing? As a qualitative measure, it should be made



mandatory to induct the students through orientation programme in traditional courses just like in professional courses of the University. When the student enters the course, he does not have the feeling of belongingness for that course, hence there is a need to induce and inculcate that belongingness to the students.

30. Professor Prashant Gautam requested that facilities at Bhai Ghaniya Ji Health Centre of Panjab University should be upgraded.
31. Professor Supinder Kaur said that Screening Committee of Language subjects and other departments have been conducted and promotions have also been done, but for Science Departments, the road is blocked for CAS promotions, so she requested to expedite the same at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor replied that as soon the time from the Chancellor's nominee is received, the meetings of Screening Committee would be conducted.

Professor Supinder Kaur said that in the morning, the issue was raised regarding visit of Inspection Committees and such type of reports are received by joining hands with the Managements of the Colleges, wherein it was also responded by the Vice Chancellor that Managements were also called and they said that the University should not send these Committees for inspections. The solution to all these problems which had also been stated by Dr. Parveen Goyal is that affidavit should be obtained from the Colleges. According to her, the Committees which are being sent for Inspections should give affidavit on their return that the information, so obtained by them is true.

The Vice Chancellor said that she herself had visited as member of the Inspection Committee last year, it is observed as to what things are checked by visiting the Colleges. The things which are being checked can also be checked through online mode by calling the relevant documents. According to her, there is no need to send Inspection Committees every year.

32. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he had also raised these points in the previous meeting held during 2012-2016. The University has various Science departments, but there is no procedure for disposal of chemicals. The Departments usually throw the waste disposal to drains which proves to be a health hazard. In PGIMER and IMTECH, there is a team for the disposal of chemicals. The chemicals are disposed off through the Vendor as per norms of the Government. There is a dire need to frame a policy regarding disposal of chemicals. He requested that this request should be considered on urgent basis.

It was informed that there is a provision of disposal of biomedical waste.

To this, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he is talking about chemical waste as chemical and bio-chemical waste is a different thing.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that the process regarding disposal of chemical waste was initiated in the office of Director, Research &

Development. However, they could not invite tender due to some reasons, they would review that and take action accordingly.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that some Government agencies should have to be identified for the disposal of chemical waste as also done in other institutions like IMTECH and other Government Departments on fixed charges for picking up the waste from the institution. They could be able to show before the NAAC team that how the chemicals are disposed off in the University.

33. Professor Rajat Sandhir said that he would like to raise the issue regarding manpower audit. The comprehensive exercises were done by the University by engaging Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Public Administration. They have given them a lot of inputs which are lying at some place. They should bring those inputs, before the Governing Bodies. The same should give a look and they should prepare a road map, which would be helpful in saving a lot of money of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee of Fellows had been constituted to go through the inputs of the Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Public Administration. She would find out the detailed working of the Committee.

Professor Rajat Sandhir said that was massive exercise done so they should take advantage of the report.

34. Principal S.S. Sangha said that he would like to discuss regarding migration certificates. Citing an example, he said a student had taken admission in Panjab University after attaining the degree of B.Ed. from Punjabi University, Patiala. After pursuing M.Ed. and M.A. (Sociology) from Panjab University, when he applied for migration his result has been declared as RLL (citing that the University had not received migration certificate from previous Institute). He brought the case to the notice of the Registrar and the Registrar had allowed the case. After allowing of the case, desired results could not be achieved. There are similar types of cases also. In this case when the student has the photocopy of the migration certificate and the Registrar had allowed, but still his result had not been declared, so he requested to expedite the matter. He further suggested that the process of issue of migration certificates should be made online as also done in other Universities to save time and money of the students who usually visit from far-off places.

35. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that documents available in Digilocker are considered as valid documents.

36. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that Academic In-charge has been appointed in P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur. When the Co-ordinators are posted there, why this Academic In-charge has been appointed only in P.U. Regional Centre Hoshiarpur and not in P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana?

37. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the issue regarding pension of employees had earlier been raised by Shri Deepak Kaushik and Sh. Honey Thakur several times in the House. But, so far, no final decision

has been taken on it. He requested to focus on this issue and expedite the matter.

38. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that recently some rumours have come regarding move from the Haryana Government to give share in the Panjab University. Such a move should out rightly be rejected and it should be discussed in the House, before it is discussed at somewhere. From this move, would a question on the performance of the Kurukshetra University not be raised? Would it not be a part of the de-organisation of Kurukshetra University that some of their Colleges would be collaborated in Panjab University? It is a political move and not an academic move.

39. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that in previous meeting of the Senate which was conducted through online mode, where the words of Late Shri Arun Jaitley were quoted which he said in the Parliament that pre-retiral judgments are effected by the post retire placements. This is a very important subject. The University had awarded the degree to the retired Chief Justice of India. When they talked about independent judicial system in Indian democracy, any benefit from the Government is not desirable. In fact, he had accepted the offer of the Government of India. As the meeting of the Senate was conducted through online mode, they could not verify before awarding the degree to him. They had taken the decision in a hurried manner and during the online meeting of the Senate, he tried to give his dissent, but it was not workable.

To this, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said he did not give his dissent as it might cause perception outside the Campus.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not raise any question against the decision of Hon'ble Chancellor. Let the past be buried.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa suggested that in future, such issues should be discussed in detail as is being discussed now.

40. Shri Naresh Gaur said that earlier also, this issue was raised in the zero hour that the charges for issue of transcripts is very much high for the students who sent the certificates from foreign countries whereas the charges to be charged from the students located in India are much less. There is a discrimination of charges between Indian and students residing outside India. No Senate had approved these fees to be charged; hence, the charges which are being charged from the students, who are residing in India should be charged from the students who apply for issue of transcripts from foreign countries.

41. Shri Naresh Gaur pointed out that with regard to Kalgidhar College at Tapprianwala, this should be got enquired properly as to who told the Advocate that the earlier decision may be reverted back and which Committee had approved it? It should not happen that after giving a hearing on the issue, the same should be closed. If this issue was not sorted out, he would again raise the issue why after 2.5 years, the decision of the court had been taken back.

42. Shri Naresh Gaur said while endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. D.P.S. Randhawa, that employees who had left to opt for the pension, may be given chance to opt for the scheme.

43. Shri Sandeep Kataria requested that earlier the information regarding approval cases of the teachers of the Colleges were used to be uploaded on the website. But the said practice has been discontinued now. He requested that the concerned officials should be directed to upload the data pertaining to approval cases of the teachers.

44. Shri Sandeep Kataria said that a special grievance for Education Colleges should be created to resolve the problems of Education Colleges, as number of complaints are pouring in.

45. Shri Sandeep Kataria said that in some of the Colleges, the fake information regarding faculty and bank statements have been uploaded on their websites. If the authorities would not go and listen the problems of teachers and students, then he felt that there is no use of granting affiliation to the Colleges. Hence, he requested to attend to these complaints by giving physical visits.

46. Shri Sandeep Kataria said that the posts which were advertised during the tenure of the previous Vice Chancellor, should be reviewed as those were advertised by following some different method, so that the students may not suffer due to shortage of staff.

The Vice Chancellor replied that as the process of screening of applications has been started, hence they would advertise more posts required, instead of reviewing the earlier advertised posts.

47. Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Professor Devinder Singh said that interview for the posts, which had been advertised, should be conducted.

48. Professor Devinder Singh said that there are small issues which he would like to raise is that every Vice Chancellor creates his/her own team for working, but he is of the opinion that outgoing team which had worked, may be given due respect and honour. The Alumni Committee is the Statutory Committee as per the provisions of the P.U. Calendar, where Deans and Secretaries are the designated officers. The delegated Secretary (Dr. Priyatosh Sharma) later came to know that he had been removed from the Committee. He is the Chairperson and the member of the Senate, but he had been removed. Therefore, it should be looked into as it is laid down in the provisions of the Calendar that Secretary is the designated officer.

The Vice Chancellor pointed out that he had not been removed, the duration of the term of the Committee had expired; hence, a new Committee has been constituted.

49. Professor Devinder Singh said that there is one case of Dr. Tamanna Chawla of Hostel No.4, where she had removed from Wardenship on 1<sup>st</sup> of May, whereas her term was upto 31<sup>st</sup> May, as the term of the Warden is for one year. Why there was need of removing the Warden on

1<sup>st</sup> May whereas on 31<sup>st</sup> of May, her term would have to be expired. Such type of situation caused humiliation amongst the teachers.

50. Professor Jatinder Grover said that an incident happened in the Hostel due to the security lapse and for which an Enquiry Committee was constituted and Enquiry Committee suspended all of the employees, she was not removed.

To this, Professor Devinder Singh said that they could change her hostel. The teachers, who have been given additional charge and have 20 years of service to their credit, should not be humiliated rather their talented services should be appreciated by the University. The University created the circumstances to expel her, but she did not choose to resign.

51. Professor Devinder Singh said that Shri Anil Thakur is working as S.D.O. (Horticulture) for the last several years, but he is not being granted promotion on the plea that the subjects of Horticulture and Agriculture did not relate to the University and he could not be designated as Executive Engineer. He suggested that if someone has been appointed as Junior Engineer or Sub-Divisional Engineer, he must be given promotion in accordance with the rules of the University and question should not be raised on the qualification of the person, who had been appointed 15-20 years ago. If precedence needed to be checked, the same should be checked from Chandigarh Administration or Punjab Government, but the promotion must be given to him, which is due since long. He (Mr. Anil Thakur) should be promoted as Executive Engineer instead of raising queries on his qualification after 20 years.

52. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he fully agreed with Shri Naresh Gaur on the statement made by him regarding one Advocate who is speaking in the Court without obtaining affidavits that the decisions are being reverted. The decisions, which were taken by the Vice Chancellor, on behalf of the Syndicate and Senate, could not be reverted. This should be looked into by the Vice Chancellor. They are taking back the court case filed by them.

53. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that just like Education Colleges, Law Colleges without proper teaching faculty are being opened in Punjab, which should be taken care of.

54. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that as also laid down in the provisions during the tenure of Professor Arun K. Grover as Vice Chancellor, that at that time the Registrar in consultation with Controller of Examinations and DCDC, after the next day of meeting used to make resolved parts of the decisions taken during the meeting. He requested that the said old tradition should be continued as it would be proved as better option.

55. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the issue of commercialization of education which had also been raised by one of the members is also needed to be addressed as now Colleges have become shops instead of educational institutions.

56. Professor Jagat Bhushan, Controller of Examinations, said that the promotion policy of DACP which had already been approved from the Syndicate and Senate had not been implemented so far. He met Registrar along with the faculty of Dental Institute, it was assured by him that this policy would be sent for further processing. He would like just to remind for the same.
57. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he fully agreed with the view point expressed by Professor Jagat Bhushan.
58. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he would like to talk about his observations on Regulation Committee, first is that in P.U. Calendar, there is a provision of 10% deduction of P.F. whereas in majority of Colleges, the P.F. is deducted @ Rs.1800/- which is being accepted. It should be made clear whether they are deducting the P.F. rightly or not. If not, then some clarity or legal opinion should be obtained on it.
59. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that a court case of the teachers regarding D.A. with the management is continuing since 2014, but till date, no output has come. Keeping in view the fact that this case is in the Court, several Managements had frozen the payment of D.A. for College teachers. He requested that the legal team should be directed to get the stay vacated as teachers are suffering badly.
60. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that as per the provisions of the U.G.C. and just like University, the five day working should be implemented in the Colleges as well.
61. Principal N.R. Sharma said that earlier, there was a policy that employees who had completed 10 years of service were used to regularized, hence he requested that this policy should be renewed and the services of employees, after completion of 10 years, may be regularized as they are getting only Rs.20,000/-

Y.P. Verma  
Registrar

CONFIRMED

RENU VIG)  
VICE-CHANCELLOR