

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate held on **25<sup>th</sup> March, 2023 at 10.00 a.m.** in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**PRESENT:**

1. Professor Renu Vig ... (in the Chair)  
Vice Chancellor
2. Professor Devinder Singh (online mode)
3. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
4. Dr. Gurmeet Singh
5. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
6. Dr. Jagtar Singh
7. Professor Jatinder Grover
8. Dr. Kirandeep Kaur
9. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk
10. Dr. Mukesh Arora
11. Dr. Parveen Goyal
12. Principal R.S. Jhanji
13. Shri Sandeep Singh
14. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
15. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra
16. Shri Varinder Singh
17. Professor Yajvender Pal Verma ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh and Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

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. I look forward to your valuable guidance for the growth of this historic University".

**Condolence Resolution**

The Vice Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the honorable members of this August House about the sad demise of –

- (i) Mother of Dr. Anil Kumar, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, on 18.02.2023;
- ii) Mother-in-Law of Prof. Meenakshi Malhotra, University Business School, on 27.02.2023; and
- iii) Professor Suryakant (Retd.), Department of Geography, on 19.03.2023.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of respected mother of Dr. Anil Kumar, mother-in-law of Professor Meenakshi Malhotra and Professor Suryakant and observed two minutes' silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

### **Vice-Chancellor's Statement**

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

1. Professor Amrik Singh Ahluwalia has been honored with 'Lifetime Achievement Award' for his outstanding contribution in the field of Botany by Society for Plant Research.
2. Panjab University won overall Rowing Championship in both men and women section during All India Inter University Rowing Championship held at Sukhna Lake, Chandigarh, from 01-03-2023 to 7-03-2023.
3. Panjab University Gymnastic Artistic men and women team become champion in All India Inter University Gymnastic Championship 2022-23 held at Gymnasium Hall, PU Chandigarh, from 10.03.2023 to 14.03.2023.
4. Panjab University won second and third positions in Sepak Takraw quad and team events held at Manipur from 6-3-2023 to 09-03-2023.
5. Dr. Jaskaran S. Waraich, Department of Defence (Project Director), Professor Simrit Kahlon, Department of Geography and Dr. Simran Kaur, Department of Evening Studies have been awarded a major research project by ICSSR of an amount of Rs.14,18,920/- (Rupees Fourteen lakh eighteen thousand nine hundred and twenty only) titled "*External Aggression and Infrastructure Development along India China Border: Issues and Challenges with special reference to Local Population*".

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that, first of all, he would like to congratulate all the sportspersons, who have contributed a lot. However, he wanted to point out that whenever the competitions are held in the University, the persons, who are appointed empires/referees, usually belonged to sports academies, and they in order to encourage their trainees, favoured them in the matches and discriminate against the players of University and its affiliated Colleges. He requested the Vice Chancellor to ensure that, in future, only qualified persons belonging to the University/affiliated Colleges should be appointed as referees/empires.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate is based on Panjab University Calendars, Volumes I, II & III. He drew the attention of the Registrar to page No.33 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022, Regulations 21 & 22 which say, "The minutes of the proceedings of each meeting shall be recorded by the Registrar, and submitted to the Chairman of the meeting for approval. The Registrar shall, within one month after the meeting, send to each member of the Senate, a copy of the minutes of the proceedings as approved by the Chairman. Any member of the Senate may write to the Registrar for the purpose of obtaining information on matter relating to the affairs of the University and the Registrar shall supply the required information within one month....." He pointed out that he has written to the University Authorities so many times in different forms, but no response has been received till date. Is it not his right to ask for information from any university office as a member of the Syndicate and Senate?

The Vice Chancellor said that they should first take up the agenda items and later on they would discuss such issues.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Parveen Goyal. He said that he did not know as to what information had been sought by Dr. Parveen Goyal,

but his only concern is that whenever any member of the Syndicate/Senate seeks information from the authorities, at least a reply must be given to him/her.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point made by Dr. Parveen Goyal would be taken care of.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that when no reply had been received from the authority relating to Construction Office, he sought the information under the RTI Act. The Construction Office is divided into five parts, i.e., (i) Construction, (ii) Horticulture, (iii) Maintenance, (iv) Architect and (v) Electrical. He received information only from three offices and the other two replies that such information is not available with them. In fact, he had sought information from them as to how many employees (Regular and Contractual) are working in their offices. How could they say that this information is not available with them? If the information relating to the employees, who are working in their offices, is not available, the Finance and Development Officer should tell whether the salary could be paid to the employees of the Construction Office. All the points made by him should be taken into consideration.

Continuing, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that had he not pointed out the shortcomings/mistakes in the project of Rs.28.90 crore relating to Shri R.K. Rai, the said project would have been got approved. Though he did not want to repeat, he is forced to repeat.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua intervened to say that as pointed out by Dr. Parveen Goyal, so many issues relating to affiliated Colleges and the University are pending for a long time. Either they should be allowed to raise those issues before taking up the agenda items or after the discussion on the agenda items is over.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that their only concern is that the issues raised during zero hour should also be given equal importance and not that the issues raised during zero hour should be ignored.

Majority of the members said that they fully agreed with the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Dinesh Kumar.

The Vice Chancellor said that she would like to make a request to the Hon'ble members that along with the problems, they should also suggest solutions to the problems and evolve a mechanism to resolve the issues, so that they should not leave the issues hanging in fire. Even to the issue raised by Dr. Parveen Goyal relating to supply of information, they have to contemplate as to what could be the mechanism for this.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is very unfortunate that the members of the Syndicate and Senate are forced to seek information under RTI Act.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that earlier, he had raised the issue of online file tracking system for which a sum of Rs.12.50 lac is being deducted annually. Though he had raised this issue in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate at several times, no action has been taken by the University till date. At the moment, online number is given only in the offices situated in Administrative Block and Vice Chancellor's Office.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee had already been constituted to look into this issue.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that what needed to be done is that only an e-mail. is required to be sent to all the departments for action as the software is available with all the University Offices. If they did not do even this, where would the general public go?

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. the felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to 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.
2. the information contained in Vice Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No. 2, 3, 4 and 5, be noted.

**2.** Item C-2 on the agenda was read out, viz. -

**2.** To appoint new Dean of Student Welfare (Women) w.e.f. 01.04.2023 in place of Professor Promila Pathak, Department of Botany, P.U., as she is going to retire on 31.03.2023 on attaining the age of superannuation, i.e., 60 years.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 2.2 at page 108 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2022 was reproduced as under:-

**2.2** The Senate may also, on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare (Women) for such period and on the same term and conditions as for the Dean of Student Welfare out of the Amalgamated Fund Account. The Dean of Student Welfare (Women) would also be the Chairperson of Grievance committee for the code of conduct and discipline for avoidance of Sexual harassment.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that he has a simple submission to make that in the meeting of the last Syndicate and the Senate also a policy decision was taken that the persons continuing beyond the age of 60 years be neither given administrative powers nor financial powers. Though the regulation has been quoted, the said policy decision has not been quoted. Why the said policy decision has not been mentioned? Secondly, Professor Promila Pathak had already got stay from the Court to not to retire her on attaining the age of 60 years. Thus, she is not retiring from the University service on 31.03.2023. He had also made a request in the previous meeting of the Syndicate that the persons, who are continuing in service beyond the age of 60 years with the stay granted by the Hon'ble Court, could not be treated as retired. If they wanted to bring such items, the decisions, which are being taken in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, should be reflected in the office note that owing to this particular decision, the item has been placed before the Syndicate/Senate. However, this is missing in the item under consideration.

It was informed that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Syndicate are yet to be confirmed by the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that the relevant paragraph referred to by him had already been approved by the Vice Chancellor and a circular on the issue had also been issued.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that Action Taken Report on the decisions taken in the previous meeting of the Syndicate should be placed before the Syndicate.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since it takes time to prepare the detailed minutes, it would be better if the resolved parts are prepared on priority and circulated to the members for confirmation so that there is no confusion as to what decisions were taken, before action is taken on them.

It was informed that though they had prepared the Action Taken Report on the decisions taken by the Syndicate in its previous meeting, the same could not be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Varinder Singh proposed the name of Dr. Simrit Kahlon for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women). If his colleagues wanted to discuss, they could do so.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he seconded the proposal made by Shri Varinder Singh. He further said that according to him, Shri Varinder Singh has made a good proposal as Dr. Simrit Kahlon was earlier a Warden and possessed the Administrative experience. They had witnessed that she had worked very efficiently. Only such a person should be assigned this responsibility who could deal with the students properly; otherwise, they had seen that injustice had been done to the students as they were not allotted hostel accommodation in spite of vacant seats. If a good administrator is appointed as Dean of Student Welfare (Women), she would be able to obtain work from the Wardens and lower staff. If the students are given hygienic food in the Hostels, only then they would be able to study properly. He reiterated that since Dr. Kahlon is a good Administrator, she should be appointed Dean of Student Welfare (Women). He thought that proposal made by Shri Varinder Singh for appointing Dr. Simrit Kahlon as Dean of Student Welfare (Women) would be acceptable to his colleagues.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that he had no objection if Dr. Simrit Kahlon is appointed as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that, according to him, it is not necessary that only a Professor is to be appointed as Dean of Student Welfare. Earlier, an Associate Professor was appointed as Dean of Student Welfare. If he is not wrong, Dr. Anirudh Joshi, who was a Reader in the Department of Sanskrit at that time, was appointed Dean of Student Welfare. If the authorities wanted, they could verify it from the record. If they could appoint a Reader/Associate Professor as Dean of Student Welfare, he would like to propose the name of Dr. Namita Gupta. If they could not appoint a Reader/Associate Professor as Dean of Student Welfare and could appoint only a Professor as Dean of Student Welfare, he would like to propose the name of Professor Vandana Arora as everybody including him wanted that the University should function properly. He clarified that his first proposal for Dean of Student Welfare (Women) is Dr. Namita Gupta, Associate Professor, and if somebody has objection to it, then his proposal is that Professor Vandana Arora should be appointed as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Shri Varinder Singh said that if it is not written that only Professor could be appointed as Dean of Student Welfare (Women), they had several names, and then they could appoint even the Assistant Professor.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that then the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to recommend the name of person to the Senate for appointing her as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to recommend the name of person to the Senate for appointing her as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Shri Varinder Singh said that he has no objection to giving authorization to the Vice Chancellor for recommending the name of a person to the Senate for appointing her as Dean of Student Welfare (Women), but the eligible names are only two – (i) Professor Simrit Kahlon and (ii) Professor Vandana Arora.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to recommend the name of anyone of these two persons (Professor Simrit Kahlon and Professor Vandana Arora) to the Senate for appointing her as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should remember that they all wanted to run the University in a smooth and efficient manner. He would like to bring to the kind notice of the members that Professor Vandana Arora was appointed Warden of an International Hostel in November 2015, but she was removed from the Wardenship in the year 2016 as she was not able to manage the funds of the Hostel. In fact, she had made purchases before getting the approval from the Purchase Committee. This matter had also gone to the Court. He requested the Vice Chancellor to appoint anyone from the above quoted two persons as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Dr. Dinesh Kumar observed that if they wanted to authorize the Vice Chancellor, then no restriction could be imposed.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they authorize the Vice Chancellor to recommend the name of any person to the Senate for appointing her as Dean of Student Welfare (Women), and there would not be any restriction on her.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that they should go by the Regulation 2.2 mentioned at page 108 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the process for appointment of Vice Chancellor on regular basis is underway and the last date for submission of applications is already over. It is expected that the entire process for selection of the Vice Chancellor would be completed within a month. He suggested that until a regular Vice Chancellor is appointed, they could appoint a Dean of Student Welfare (Women) on temporary basis.

A couple of members said that it would not be proper to appoint a Dean of Student Welfare (Women) on temporary basis.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that he was not speaking as the issue related to his office. His only request is that whosoever is appointed Dean of Student Welfare (Women), at least she should have the experience of Warden, because being the Warden, she is aware of the procedure as to how the hostel accommodation is allotted to the students as also how to deal with the students.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he did not want to object to the proposal made by Dr. Mukesh Arora as he is senior to him and he had a lot of respect for him. At the same time, it is also not correct that the proposal made by him is not appropriate. Respecting the sentiments of the members, the Vice Chancellor could request the members to raise their hands in respect of proposal made by him and Dr. Mukesh Arora separately and whosoever gets the majority, her name should be recommended to the Senate for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women). Continuing, he said that he has proposed the name of Professor Simrit Kahlon and Dr. Mukesh Arora has proposed the name of Professor

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Vandana Arora for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women). The Vice Chancellor could recommend anyone of these two persons to the Senate.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that they agreed to the proposal made by Shri Varinder Singh that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to recommend anyone of the two persons (Professor Simrit Kahlon and Professor Vandana Arora) to the Senate for appointment of Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that this issue was also raised in the previous meeting of the Senate. The Regulations are crystal clear that the Vice Chancellor would recommend the name of the person to be appointed as Dean of Student Welfare and then the Syndicate and Senate would consider the same. He request is that whenever such an item is placed before the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor must recommend a name on which they could deliberate. Had the Vice Chancellor recommended a name, perhaps, so much discussion might not have taken place?

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that one of the members had proposed a name and another member had proposed other two names. Thereafter, one of the members had objected to one of the names.

At this stage, a din prevailed as members indulged in heated duel arguments.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is no need to discuss the issue any more, and if need be, voting should be held by raising hands.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that they had authorized the Vice Chancellor to recommend anyone from the two persons (Professor Simrit Kahlon and Professor Vandana Arora) to the Senate for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Shri Varinder Singh endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Jagtar Singh. He said that now it is resolved that the Vice Chancellor be authorized to recommend anyone from the two persons (Professor Simrit Kahlon and Professor Vandana Arora) to the Senate for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women). He did not know whether the persons, who had been assigned the job of preparing the minutes, could not able to translate Punjabi into English. When the minutes came to them, they see opposite to what they had said in the meetings. He reiterated that it has been resolved that the Vice Chancellor be authorized to recommend anyone from the two persons (Professor Simrit Kahlon and Professor Vandana Arora) to the Senate for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that in this very House a decision was taken and a affidavit had been filed by their own Advocate that the appointment is not correct because the name was to be recommended by the Vice Chancellor and the decision was to be taken by the Syndicate. Now, in the similar case the members are recommending the name(s) and the Vice Chancellor is being authorized to take the decision.

It was said that now the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor that she would make her recommendation and the same would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the recommendation of the Vice Chancellor should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting and by that time a temporary Dean of Student Welfare (Women) should be appointed.

Shri Varinder Singh said that Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua is hundred per cent correct, but at the moment, the charge of office of Vice Chancellor has been given to Professor Renu Vig on temporary basis. It is correct that when Professor Emanuel Nahar was appointed

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dean of Student Welfare, his case had come to the Senate for reconsideration due to fact that his name was not recommended by the then Vice Chancellor. In that case, the shortcoming was that neither the name was recommended by the Vice Chancellor nor any of the members.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is still saying that the item should be kept pending for a month and the Vice Chancellor should place her recommendation before the Syndicate in its next meeting. To authorize the Vice Chancellor to recommend anyone name out of two (Professor Simrit Kahlon and Professor Vandana Arora) to the Senate for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women), would be wrong. If they wanted, anyone could be recommended for Dean of Student Welfare (Women) right now.

Shri Varinder Singh said, "No, No, they had authorized the Vice Chancellor to recommend anyone of the two persons (Professor Simrit Kahlon and Professor Vandana Arora) to the Senate for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

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

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that, according to him, the Vice Chancellor did not recommend the name because it seemed to him/her recommendation would not be approved by the Syndicate, and they might felt insulted.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that if the Vice Chancellor has no objection to the names proposed by the members, then the matter is sorted.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the Vice Chancellor could appoint any person as Dean of Student Welfare (Women) w.e.f. 1.04.2023 on temporary basis. In the meanwhile, the Vice Chancellor should make her recommendation for Dean of Student Welfare (Women) and placed the same before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is no need to appoint anyone as Dean of Student Welfare (Women) on temporary basis as they had authorized the Vice Chancellor to recommend anyone from the two persons (Professor Simrit Kahlon and Professor Vandana Arora) to the Senate for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women).

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that they authorized the Vice Chancellor to appoint any person as Dean of Student Welfare (Women) and there is no restriction on her.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that Dean of Student Welfare (Women) could only be appointed on regular basis and not on temporary basis.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they did not agree to the proposal made by Dr. Parveen Goyal. They had authorized the Vice Chancellor to recommend anyone from the two persons (Professor Simrit Kahlon and Professor Vandana Arora) to the Senate for appointment as Dean of Student Welfare (Women), and if they wished, voting could be held on this proposal.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice Chancellor, be authorized to recommend, on behalf of the Syndicate, any one of the two persons, i.e., either Dr. Vandana Arora, Department of Law or Dr. Simrit Kahlon, Department of Geography to the Senate for appointment as Dean of Students Welfare (Women) for the period of one year w.e.f. 01.04.2023.



**3.** Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 24.01.2023 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Training-cum-Placement Officer, UIAMS, be confirmed w.e.f. 30.05.2015. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

Initiating discussion, Professor Jatinder Grover said that, earlier, this item was cleared by the Senate and the relevant paragraph was circulated to him (Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha). Later on, a new notice was issued. When the Senate has cleared his confirmation, how could the office issue a revised notice? In fact, he (Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha) had been issued a letter regarding his confirmation w.e.f. 30.05.2015, and the copy of the said letter is with him. Why a new agenda item has been placed before the Syndicate?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired, had the letter about the confirmation of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha w.e.f. 30.05.2015 been withdrawn? If yes, the item could be placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor informed that the letter had been withdrawn and a Committee had been constituted by the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that after the decision of the Senate, the Committee could not be constituted. If they appoint a Committee on the decision of the Senate, the matter could only be placed before the Senate for reconsideration.

It was clarified that two other similar cases were discussed in the meeting of the Senate, and Dr. Jagwant Singh had suggested that both the cases should be dealt with simultaneously.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that, in fact, three cases were placed before the Senate namely, Professor Sukhwinder Singh, Professor Kirandeep Singh and Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha. Though the case of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha had been placed before the Syndicate, neither the case of Professor Sukhwinder Singh nor Professor Kirandeep Singh had been placed before the Syndicate. Why did they place the cases before the Syndicate in piecemeal? He had raised the issue of confirmation of Professor Kirandeep Singh in the meeting of the Senate held in February 2022, and a Committee had been constituted by the Vice Chancellor, but the recommendations of the Committee had neither yet been placed before the Syndicate nor before the Senate.

It was informed that the status of case of Professor Kirandeep Singh is not known, but so far as the case of Professor Sukhwinder Singh is concerned, the same is *sub judice*. Perhaps, a Committee is looking into the details of the case in chronological order.

Dr. Jagtar Singh suggested that all the cases should be placed before the Syndicate together.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that his only submission is that since the confirmation of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha had already been approved by the Senate, his case should be approved, and the cases of Professor Sukhwinder Singh and Professor Kirandeep Singh should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that they should not adopt the policy of pick and choose and bring all the cases together.

Professor Jatinder Grover reiterated that when the confirmation was approved by the Senate, why the same had again been placed before the Syndicate?

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to what they are approving? The item before them is recommendations of the Committee regarding confirmation of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha. It has been mentioned in the Appendix that the Committee was apprised of the legal opinion received from the Senior Law Officer, but document relating to legal opinion has not been appended. The document appended (page 3) is entirely different.

It was informed that the officials were directed to not to make this page a part of the appendix, but the officials forget to follow his orders.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua observed that the issue, which they wanted to be approved by the Syndicate, is not on the agenda.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the interesting part in it is – (i) the legal opinion has not been appended; and (ii) the minutes had not been approved by the Vice Chancellor, and the same had directly been placed before the Syndicate. The minutes should at least been approved by the Dean of University Instruction or the Vice Chancellor. It is not possible to skip that the minutes should be considered by the Syndicate without approval by the Vice Chancellor. Moreover, in the minutes it has been mentioned that “the final recommendation in case of Dr. Sukhwinder Singh will be made in the next meeting scheduled to be held on **06.02.2023**”. Although today is 25.03.2023, it seemed that no meeting of the Committee has been held. He suggested that in the case under consideration, even if all the documents have not been appended, at least references should have been given. As such, the item is incomplete as neither the related documents have been appended nor the minutes have been approved by the Vice Chancellor. Firstly, the minutes should be approved by the Vice Chancellor and then item placed before the Syndicate.

Professor Jatinder Grover pointed out that in the meeting of the Senate held on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2022, it was resolved that Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Training-cum-Placement Officer, University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, be confirmed on the post held by him at present w.e.f. 25.10.2015, i.e., the date on which the post held by him at Punjabi University, Patiala, was declared vacant. These were the orders issued by the Assistant Registrar, Establishment.

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

Shri Varinder Singh pointed out that the minutes are not prepared properly. It seemed that the sentiments of the members are not kept in view while drafting the minutes, and the version quoted in the minutes is entirely different than what they say in the meetings. Moreover, the authorities also misdirect the issues/files. He did not know whether they are doing this deliberately or not. What he meant to say that whatever is resolved here irrespective of whether the same is done in zero hour or while considering the items, why they did not record/approve the same as it is? So far as zero hour is concerned, the same is ignored on the plea that it was only general discussion and nothing could be resolved.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that it should be resolved that all the three cases should be brought to the Syndicate in its next meeting together.

It was pointed out that since the case of Professor Sukhwinder Singh is *sub judice*, how could the same be placed before the Syndicate?

Professor Jatinder Grover clarified that then it should be written that the case of Professor Sukhwinder Singh is *sub judice*, the same could not be placed before the Syndicate. However, the case of Professor Kirandeep Singh should be brought to the Syndicate along with the case of Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha.

Shri Varinder Singh said that now he should be listened carefully. When it was speaking in the previous meeting of the Senate, he was obstructed. In future, if the Registrar has to give some clarification in the meetings of the Syndicate or the Senate, he should speak with the permission of the Syndicate or Senate. In fact, when he was speaking in the previous meeting of the Senate, the Registrar was signaling him to stop, to which he felt insulted. In future, it should be taken care of.

**RESOLVED:** That consideration of **Item C-3 on the agenda**, be deferred. The cases (Dr. Amandeep Singh Marwaha, Professor Sukhwinder Singh and Professor Kirandeep Singh) be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting with all the relevant documents.

- 4.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 07.02.2023 (**Appendix-II**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that whenever the University makes appointment on compassionate grounds, they asked the dependent of the deceased employee to fill up the *pro forma* which comprised of a column 'post applied for' and the dependent of the deceased mention the name of the post. He had requested to the Vice Chancellor earlier also that the *pro forma* needed to be changed as it is for the University to decide as to which post is vacant and could be offered to the dependent of the deceased employee in accordance with his/her eligibility and not the person, who is seeking the job on compassionate grounds. He suggested that the *pro forma* should be changed or the column in question in the *pro forma* should be deleted and in future, the office should scrutinize the application of the person carefully and recommend to which vacant post the person is eligible and against which post they needed more persons. The dependents of deceased employees could seek jobs, but not of their choice. Nowhere, such a facility is available. Could they show him the Regulations/Rules of Government of Punjab, which they followed, where it is written that the dependents of deceased employees could seek job of their choice. Secondly, they have to take a policy decision to change the *pro forma*, so that it could be beneficial for the University, because the University would see as to on which post it required more persons. Thirdly, in the template (Annexure), they had written category belonged to. In this regard, his simple question is – at several places SC/ST category has been written. If any person belonging to SC/ST category is given the job on compassionate grounds, would he/she be counted under the said category in accordance with the roster?

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if they look into the 1<sup>st</sup> Item, the Committee has not made any recommendation. In fact, it has been written, "After obtaining the legal opinion, the case be placed in the next meeting". For what, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate? According to him, in future, only clear-cut recommendations, where the procedure has been completed, should be placed before the Syndicate. However, wherever anything is incomplete, the same should not be placed before the Syndicate. He, therefore, suggested that this item should be withdrawn. He reiterated that if a policy decision is taken that the dependents of the deceased employees have just to apply for job, but the post, on which the job is to be given on compassionate grounds, would be decided by the University. It would certainly prove to be beneficial for the University.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh pointed out that, at one point of time, he was also a member of this Committee, and knew a person of 45 years had applied for job on compassionate grounds, which is surprising because he/she might be serving somewhere and could not be without job. This could be considered under the policy to be framed. He, however, suggested that they should try to offer appointment on compassionate grounds within a stipulated time, so that the families of the deceased employees might not suffer. They should help the families of the deceased employees in a time bound manner as justice delayed is justice denied.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the objective of giving job on compassionate grounds is to grant financial assistance to the families of the deceased employees immediately, but not the job of choice.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that, perhaps, it is also there in the policy that job on compassionate grounds is to be given on one step lower post than the deceased employee. However, the dependent of the deceased employee could give his preference for a post, but the final decision would be of the office/Committee.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that sometimes, people stressed that they should be offered this and that post, owing to which the case remained pending for years. This is the major reason for delay in compassionate appointments. Secondly, the people, who are already on jobs, resigned their previous job and get appointed in the University on compassionate grounds.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh suggested that a Committee should be constituted to frame the policy.

**The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee would be formed to frame the policy for making appointments on compassionate grounds and change the *pro forma*.**

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is no need to appoint a Committee as only two issues needed to be resolved – (i) change in *pro forma* and (ii) whether job on compassionate grounds is to be given to the dependent of deceased employees continuing beyond the age of superannuation of 60 years. In fact, the University is changing its stance at every platform. Everything is processed through the office of the Registrar. In some cases, they treated the persons continuing beyond the 60 years as their employees and in certain cases they say that they cannot hold statutory positions and financial powers could also not be given to them. They have to take a cautious decision whether the persons continuing beyond the 60 years as their employees because the rights of these persons had been accepted even by the Court where the case is pending. He pointed out that under each recommendation a note has been given that as per the Punjab Government notifications and the decision of the Board of Finance dated 21.01.2021, the minimum pay of Clerk is Rs.19900/-(5910-20200+1900/-). They are seeking clarification in this regard from the Punjab Government since 2020. Though they are in 2023, the clarification from the Punjab Government has not yet been received. Would this continue for years? Even after receiving a clarification from Punjab Government, a Committee would be formed and by the time the issue would be got settled, new pay-scales would come. This is a prime example of complicating a simple issue.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh pointed out that the controversy whether the persons continuing beyond the age of 60 years to 65 years is only related to teaching staff, whereas this issue only related to non-teaching. Here the deceased employee was on extension. Whether the dependent of deceased employee, who was on extension, is to be considered for appointment on compassionate grounds is a separate issue.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if it is extension, then the dependents of deceased class 'C' employees continuing in service up to the age of 65 years needed to be given employment on compassionate grounds.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since there is no recommendation of the Committee on this issue, he did not deliberate on it. The day the recommendation of the Committee is placed before them, he would give his opinion on the issue. He, however, pointed out that the rules relating to re-employment /extension are crystal clear. As per one of the rules, the person concerned has to give physical fitness from the medical officer after attaining the age of 60 years, 62 years, and 64 years. It meant, the extension for five years is not in a one go;

rather, the extension is for two years, two years, and one year. Could they consider dependent of deceased employees who were on extension?

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that even if the deceased employee was on extension, his/her dependent could be given job on compassionate grounds. There was a notification of Punjab Government in this regard at one point of time, but the same was later on withdrawn by the Government. After some time, the Punjab Government again issued a notification stating that dependent of deceased employees, who were on extension, could also be given job on compassionate grounds, but later on, the same was also withdrawn.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the discussion held here should be placed before the Committee, so that all the aspects relating to this issue is taken into consideration by the Committee.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra suggested that the rules and regulations of Central Government on this issue should also be consulted and if they found clarity there, the University could follow the said rules.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the intent of compassionate appointment is that the family of the deceased employee could come out of the sudden shock and financial crisis. As per rules, the dependent of deceased employee could be given job on compassionate grounds on one step lower post. However, the discretion should not be given to the job seeker, but it should be with the University. As per Punjab Government rules, the dependent of the deceased employees have to apply for a job within a period of six months from the death and if someone applied after six months, his/her request is not considered. If they are framing a policy, they should make provision that the job on compassionate grounds is given within a stipulated time.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, referring to the information given by the Committee at the last page of the minutes, said that if any employee working on daily-wage/contract basis dies, his/her dependent could be given job on compassionate grounds on daily-wage/contract basis as the case may be by the office itself, but such cases should not be got rejected from the Committee in this manner as the same did not fall within the purview of the Committee. However, if a couple of members of the person, who is working in the University on daily-wage/contract basis, died due to one reason or the other, his/her services could not be regularized.

The Vice Chancellor said that now the University had stopped making appointments on the non-teaching side on daily-wage/contract basis.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the University wanted, it could itself offer job to the dependent of the deceased employee, who was working on daily-wage/contract basis, on daily-wage/contract basis, but not through the Committee. According to him, the office has shifted its responsibility to the Committee. If the appointment could not be given to these persons, their requests could have been straightaway rejected.

Dr. Mukesh Arora enquired, are the persons given extension in service up to the age of 65 years by the Syndicate or the University Authorities themselves. If somebody asked them, they tell that none is appointed/given extension after attaining the age of 60 years.

It was clarified that there is a provision in a Calendar that class 'C' employees could be given extension of 2 years + 2 years + 1 year up to the age of 65 years. Moreover, these employees are given all the benefits, including annual increment, etc., during their extension period. Since there was doubt in the minds of the Committee members, they had sought legal opinion on the issue.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 07.02.2023 at (Sr. Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10), as per **Appendix**, be approved.

- 5.** Considered minutes of the Admission Facilitation Committee (Item No.2, 3 and 4) dated 31.01.2023 (**Appendix-III**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to various admission related cases.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the minutes of the Admission Facilitation Committee have been appended with the item, but the minutes have not confirmed by the Chairperson of the Committee. Secondly, the proposal is of Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, to convert LL.M. 2-Year Course into LL.M. 1-Year Course, but the correspondence of P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, has not been provided to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that part 1 of the recommendation 3 of the Admission Facilitation Committee is that the seats for serving Defence persons for PG Diploma in Disaster Management and Security be increased from 14 seats to 25 seats.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua clarified that he is talking about P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana (recommendation 2), but the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor has reached to recommendation 3. He reiterated that the recommendation of P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, relating to conversion of LL.M. 2-Year Course into LL.M. 1-Year Course, on the basis of which the Admission Facilitation Committee has made its recommendation, has not been appended with the item. Approval of this would mean that they approved the item without looking into the relevant documents.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, in fact, recommendations 1 & 2 should not have been placed before the Syndicate and only recommendation 3 should have been placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that earlier the seats were 20+3 NRI+2 Foreign National+14 seats for serving Defence Persons. That meant, earlier there were 39 seats in total and now they are effecting an increase of more than 50%, i.e., 20 seats as core seats and 25 for serving Defence Persons. If they had the infrastructure to teach 40 students at a time, why could they not fix 40 seats in total?

The Vice Chancellor said that the general seats are for general category students and the 14 seats are reserved for serving defence persons.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this could not be done.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that, that is a different issue. On an information sought by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk, the Vice Chancellor said that all the 14 seats are always filled up.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that seats for serving Defence Persons are being increased because this course is relevant for them.

Dr. Mukesh Arora enquired, are the classes conducted in offline mode or online.

It was informed that regular classes are held.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if the seats could be increased on the basis of demand alone, then the seats of affiliated Colleges, where the applicants are much more than the number of seats, should also be increased.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk pointed out that all the 20 seats are not general seats because the seats included reserved seats also. Hence, there might be only 10 seats for general category and the remaining 29 seats are reserved, which is a clear violation of Supreme Court's Guidelines as they could not reserve more than 50% seats under any circumstances.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that 14/25 seats are basically for serving Defence Persons and these could not be treated as reserved seats.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that, on the one hand, they are allocating 20 seats for the candidates of all over Punjab, and on the other hand, giving 14 seats (now increased to 25 seats) to serving defence persons, which did look proper.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that it all depended on the demand. In this case, the demand of serving defence persons is more as the course is relevant to them.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there are three Departments (Department of Defence & National Security Studies, Department of Disaster Management and Department of Police Administration in the University), where serving defence persons came after taking study leave. Not more than 5 serving defence persons came to Departments of Police Administration and Disaster Management. Maximum serving defence persons opted for Department of Defence & National Security Studies. Owing to this, the seats for them are always more. Moreover, the admission criteria for serving defence persons are also different. Here also, the admission criteria for each category of seats are different. Now what should be their concern that whether the fee structure for the serving defence persons is the same or a different one. If the fee structure for the serving defence persons is the same, the same would not be proper.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that this logic is not acceptable that since they are taking more fees from certain categories of students, more seats have been earmarked for them.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra and Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the seats, which remained vacant, could be converted to other categories, where the applicants are more.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the scheme initiated by the former Vice Chancellor (Professor Raj Kumar) that every Department should generate more and more funds, is not acceptable to them.

Principal R.S. Jhanji enquired had the University sufficient infrastructure to accommodate 11 more students?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that a letter is there that they could not demand more staff.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that only 11 more students are to be accommodated in the existing class.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that then they should increase the general seats, which are presently 20 seats.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that those who are talking about generating more income, he would like to tell them that for generating more income, University Institute of Engineering & Technology was established, and the University Institute of Engineering & Technology has brought the University down. How could they increase the seats without any logic? When the Vice Chancellor said that she is not talking about generating income,

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that though the Vice Chancellor is not saying so, the other members are giving this as one of the reasons for increasing the seats. According to him, there are 20 core seats and as per Hon'ble Supreme Court of India's judgement, there could not be more than 50% reservation.

Dr. Parveen Goyal observed that this debate is going on owing to lack of information. Reply to the queries made by the members could only be given by those who have made this proposal. He suggested that at the moment, they should approve the item, and in case any problem arose about the reservation, the same would be taken care of by the House.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that it seemed Dr. Parveen Goyal is feeling that information about all the issues is available within him. He did not know where Dr. Goyal has stored the information, but he would like to tell him that the other members also possessed a little bit knowledge.

It was clarified that in the minutes of the JAAC, it has been written that at present, there are 14 seats for serving Defence Persons in Postgraduate Diploma in Disaster Management and Security and the applications received were 42 and 35 for PG Diploma in Homeland Security against 15 seats reserved for them. It seemed that since the demand for the courses much more and that is why, they had recommended increase in seats for serving Defence Persons from 14 seats and 15 seats to 25 seats for Postgraduate Diploma in Disaster Management and Security and PG Diploma in Homeland Security, respectively.

To this justification, Principal R.S. Jhanji and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the affiliated Colleges usually received 500 applications for a given course against 70 seats.

Dr. Mukesh Arora remarked that if the sanction of more seats for serving Defence Persons is going to help the country, the seats must be increased.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that according to him, there would not be any problem, if the general seats and seats for serving Defence Persons are earmarked separately and a teacher would continue to take the class.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that if the House is not in favour of increase of seats for serving Defence Persons, the seats should remain the same, but if the general, foreign national and NRI seats (out of 25) remained vacant, the same should be offered to serving Defence Persons.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that a policy decision should be taken that all the seats for Postgraduate Diploma in Disaster Management and Security and PG Diploma in Homeland Security are inter-changeable.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendation 4 of Admission Facilitation Committee that the proposed criteria for admission to LL.B. Course (applicable to Department of Laws/P.U. Regional Centres, Ludhiana, Muktsar and Hoshiarpur and for LL.M. (1-Year Course) (applicable to Department of Laws), as per **Appendix**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the seats – 20 + 3 NRI + 2 Foreign National + 14 for Serving Defence Persons and 10 + 3 NRI + 1 Foreign National + 15 for Serving Defence Persons meant for Postgraduate Diploma in Disaster Management and Security and PG Diploma in Homeland Security are inter-changeable.



**6.** Considered the following recommendations of the Admission Facilitation Committee dated 22.02.2023 (**Appendix-IV**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to various admissions related cases regarding:-

1. filling of the vacant/left over seats of B.Sc. (HS) in M.Sc. Chemistry on basis of CET (PG).
2. revised admission criteria and eligibility of various M.E./M.Tech. Courses of UIET.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the item related to recommendations of the Admission Facilitation Committee dated 22.02.2020, but the recommendations of the Committee are not available in the papers appended. In fact, the papers appended with the item related only to recommendations of JAAC of different meetings. He is pained to point out that it seems the agenda has come out from very raw hands as in several items the relevant documents have not appended.

The Vice Chancellor said that the minutes of the Admission Facilitation Committee have been made available to the members.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that, as pointed out by Dr. Dinesh Kumar, it should be informed as to how the Admission Facilitation Committee has been constituted. They would come to know from the Item, which would be taken up for consideration later, as to how the admission norms/conditions are to be diluted. He is sorry to point out that the persons from the concerned department are not included in the Committees as they do not want to dilute the eligibility criteria.

The Vice Chancellor said that she is the Chairperson of the Admission Facilitation Committee, and she could tell them that the Admission Facilitation Committee had observed that first preference for admission to M.E./M.Tech. Courses would be given to GATE qualified candidates, and if certain seats remained vacant, the same would be filled up on merit prepared on the basis of marks obtained in B.E. Since the Chairpersons of the concerned departments were invited to the meeting, they were requested to get the criteria recommended/approved from the JAAC of their respective department. The above-said criteria had been recommended by the JAAC of Engineering Departments and had come to the Syndicate for approval. Thus, it is not that the JAAC has been by passed.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is not saying that the JAAC has been by passed.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they have no objection to the revised criteria for admission to Engineering courses, but similar exemption should also be given to the affiliated Colleges in the courses, e.g., M.Sc. Biotechnology, where the number of applicants is less than the number of seats.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur pointed out that there are several PG courses in the affiliated Colleges, which have been included in the PG-CET, to which only few candidates applied for admissions. She pleaded that such exemption should also be given to the Colleges.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since the seats in the PG courses after making admission through PG-CET remained vacant, the Colleges have to make requests every year to the University to allow them to make admissions on the basis of merit.

Dr. Jagtar Singh pointed out that the permission is given by the University very late, by then the students are taken away by the private Universities.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Shri Varinder Singh said that every year, the students are decreasing in the Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that similar is the position in the University. Had the students not been decreasing in the University, why have they to change the criteria? He clarified that they are seeking approval from the Syndicate that they be allowed to make admission to M.E./M.Tech. courses on the basis of GATE score and if the seats remained vacant, the same should be allowed to be filled on merit on the basis of marks obtained in B.E.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that this facility should also be extended to the affiliated colleges.

Principal R.S. Jhanji and Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that since the University allowed them to make admission against the vacant seats very late, a number of seats remained vacant as by then the students take admission in other Universities. Moreover, the students have also to pay late fee as by then the normal dates of admission get over. This problem is faced by them every year and if this is allowed to continue, the Colleges would be closed down.

The Vice Chancellor said that there should be a system that first preference should be given to the candidates who have qualified the Entrance Test and if the seats remained vacant, the same should be filled on merit on the basis of marks obtained in the qualifying examination.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that a letter might have been received by the University in the year 2021 from the Punjab Government that now the admissions would be made by the Government through the joint portal, but the item relating to this has not yet been placed before the Syndicate. Clarifying the position, he said that the Punjab Government is saying that now the admissions in the colleges situated in the State of Punjab would be made by the Government itself.

The Vice Chancellor said that she had recently attended a meeting with the Education Minister, Punjab and Secretary Higher Education, Punjab (Mrs. Talwar), wherein it was told that now the admissions would be made through a portal and the purpose of this was just to collect and maintain data of students admitted to various courses in the Colleges situated in the State of Punjab.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that a meeting of Principals of Colleges affiliated to Guru Nanak Dev University was held on 22<sup>nd</sup>, which was attended only by the Principals of couple of Colleges. Majority of the Colleges boycotted the meeting. In fact, the Government is forcing the universities to ask the Colleges to get themselves registered on the portal. However, the managements of the Colleges neither wanted to register on the portal nor to give the data.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the agenda of the Government is quite clear that they wanted to promote the private Universities and to harass/close down the aided Universities and aided Colleges. It is evident from the way they are promoting/appointing the Chancellors/ Vice Chancellors of Private Universities as Member(s) of Parliament. Their purpose of getting the Colleges registered is not only collection of data, but to give the data to Private Universities to promote them, so that they could get maximum number of students. The portal would open on 15<sup>th</sup> May, and by 15<sup>th</sup> May, the Private University would have made all the admissions. The Federations of Management and Principals have opposed this decision of the Government tooth and nail. It is their agony that such issues are never come up for discussion here. By the time the University would start making admissions, the Private Universities would have filled their all seats and closed admissions. Hence, they are required to focus on the University and its affiliated colleges. He has brought the letters of the Punjab Government of 2021, 2022 and the recent letter issued by

the Government is dated 18.1.2023, which stated that the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University would make admissions in accordance with the dates mentioned in the letter.

The Vice Chancellor said that though the admissions are to be made in accordance with the dates given by the Government, the admissions are to be made by the Colleges themselves.

To this, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Government is saying that the Colleges have to get themselves registered on the portal and the admissions are to be made by the Government.

It was clarified that in the meeting they had denied this and in view of the apprehension of resistance from the Colleges, they said that the portal is only for collecting the data of students.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua invited the kind attention of the House to the letter of the Punjab Government which states that on the subject cited above, it is informed that the admissions to Undergraduate and Postgraduate Courses in Government, aided and un-aided colleges of the State for the session 2023-24, would be made in accordance with the following schedule through the Online Centralized Portal. This letter has been issued with the approval of the Secretary Higher Education, Punjab. He is sure that with this policy of the Government, the Government aided Universities and Colleges situated in the State of Punjab would definitely suffer.

Continuing, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that as they are allowing the University Departments/Institutes to fill the vacant seats on merit on the basis of marks obtained in the qualifying examination, the affiliated Colleges should also be allowed to do so. Secondly, it should also be resolved that the Syndicate does not accept the schedule and the process suggested by the Punjab Government and the University and its affiliated Colleges would follow their own procedure/process.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua. They had a live model that the Chandigarh Administration had started making centralized admissions in the Chandigarh Colleges, which was unfortunately accepted by the University. The number of applicants for admissions to various courses in the Colleges situated in Chandigarh is much more than the number of seats, but with the centralized admissions, which more often than now got delayed, the Colleges had about 100 students against 300 sanctioned seats. Due to delay in admissions, the private Universities and other neighbouring Universities took away the students. The private Universities and other neighbouring Universities already acquired the data, but the same is not available with Panjab University.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that the Entrance Test(s) should also be abolished.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that everything should be sorted out now; otherwise, later on, they would be in a soup.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that they are not ready to make admissions through the centralized portal.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the Entrance Tests are often conducted late due to which the Colleges have to seek permission from the University for making late admission with the permission of the Vice Chancellor. He suggested that the Colleges should be authorized to make admission on merit on the basis of qualifying examination, if the seats remained vacant.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that the centralized admission process started by the Chandigarh Administration should be abandoned, and the Colleges should be allowed to make admissions at their own level.

The Vice Chancellor said that she had already told this to the Higher Education Minister, Punjab, that owing to the private Universities, their Colleges are at the verge of closure. The private Universities make admissions early, but the admissions in aided Universities and Colleges got late due to the portal of the Government, and the Government said that they should make their admissions according to their own schedule.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had started with that the University should prepone its admission schedule a little bit. After +2 examination, the agents of private Universities have started visiting the homes of the students, whereas there is bar on them not to make any admission before 15<sup>th</sup> May. He pleaded that they should be given last date to finish the admissions, but the opening date should not be given.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that, this is what, they are demanding again and again.

Principal R.S. Jhanji reiterated that the starting date should not be given by the University and only the last date for making the admissions should be given.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the date the result of +2 examination is declared, the Colleges should be allowed to make admissions.

To this, Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the result of +2 examination would come in the month of May.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that, by then, the students would be taken away by the private Universities.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that they should be allowed to make admissions as is being demanded by them. But his only concern is that if the University started making admissions to M.E. and M.Tech. courses on the basis of GATE and if the seats remained vacant, the same would be filled on merit on the basis of marks secured in B.E., as said by Dr. Dinesh Kumar that the private Universities are awarding marks to the students between 95% and 97%, their students (students of Panjab University) should not be in loss. There is only one solution to this problem that **the Department concerned should conduct an Entrance Test at its own level; otherwise, the students of Panjab University would be in a loss.**

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the seats are not got filled on the basis of GATE, they have no alternative, but to make admission on the basis of merit determined on the basis of marks obtained in the qualifying examination.

Professor Jatinder Grover reiterated that since private Universities are awarding marks to their students between 95% and 97%, how the students of Panjab University would compete with them.

The Vice Chancellor said that the scenario in Engineering Institutes for Masters courses is that there is no students. PEC has discontinued Masters courses. Last year, they had admitted students on the basis of B.E. Entrance Test.

It was informed that an issue was also raised in the previous meeting of the Senate that since there is less number of admissions, the starting date for admissions should not be fixed and only the last date for admissions should be fixed, so that they could fill up their seats to the optimum. After the +2 examinations are over, the Colleges should be allowed to

enrol/register students provisionally. Before the last date of admission, the Colleges should make admissions on the basis of merit prepared of the candidates, who had got themselves enrolled/registered.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that no College wanted to admit student(s) having low merit. Every College prepared a merit list. Hence, the Colleges should be allowed to enrol/register the students provisionally. He reiterated that it should also be resolved that the Syndicate of Panjab University took a conscious decision that the Syndicate does not accept the schedule and the process of online admissions through portal suggested by the Punjab Government and the University and its affiliated Colleges would follow their own procedure/process.

It was pointed out that they have also to see the consequences of not following the instructions/guidelines of Punjab Government.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the admissions of Colleges are part of the University regulations and not of rules. Hence, the Punjab Government could not interfere.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that a letter should also be written to Chandigarh Administration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the problem arose because there were a large number of applicants for admission to B.Com. course, and the same were made through centralized process, both in the Colleges of Chandigarh and Punjab. The Colleges situated in Punjab stopped making admissions through centralized process as the number of applicants got reduced with the passage of time, and started making admissions on the basis of merit. He lamented that the Government has abolished the teacher's category in Chandigarh, i.e., the Government had abolished the designation of Assistant Professor and started recruiting Lecturer, guest faculty, resource person, etc., so that they could not get relief from the Court in any manner. Even in Chandigarh also, the prerogative of admissions is only and only of the Panjab University, and the Government could not intervene in it. He, therefore, suggested that a letter should be written to both the Directors, Higher Education, Punjab and U.T., Chandigarh.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he would like to bring to the kind notice of the House that the centralized counseling for the unaided courses, where the Government has nothing to do, is also being done by the Chandigarh Administration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that if the University authorities felt that they needed help for drafting the letter, a Committee could be formed, but otherwise the need is not there.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur proposed that if after PU-OCET candidates, the seats in Colleges remained vacant, the vacant seats should be allowed to be filled by the Colleges on merit on the basis of marks secured in the qualifying examination.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that the proposal made by Principal Kirandeep Kaur should be approved and the decision should be conveyed to the affiliated Colleges before the beginning of the session.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that now it is resolved that the admissions in the affiliated Colleges would be regulated by the University and not by the Punjab Government as conveyed by it through its letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> January 2023. Secondly, as suggested by Principal R.S. Jhanji and Principal Kirandeep Kaur, if after PU-OCET candidates, the seats in Colleges remained vacant, the vacant seats should be allowed to be filled by the Colleges on merit on the basis of marks secured in the qualifying examination. Letter relating to this should be sent to the affiliated Colleges before the start of the admissions.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that the decision is a permanent one and not for only the ensuing session, i.e., 2023-24.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that they are not following the Chandigarh Administration and Punjab Government for making admissions through centralized portal. However, if they received communications from Chandigarh Administration and Punjab Government that the admissions in Government Colleges would be made by the respective Government through online portal, what the University would do? According to him, the Punjab Government would never allow the University to make admission at its own level in the Government Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that irrespective of whether the admissions are to be made in the University or Government Colleges or aided Colleges or unaided Colleges, the prerogative of admission is of the Panjab University. The regulation with this respect is available in Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022. What has happened is that the newly Committee has come only on two issues, i.e., health and education, but the Government has done nothing in both spheres. The Government is showing to the people that they are doing a lot. If the strength of teachers in Government Colleges is only 10%, has the Government any right to make admissions there? What is needed to be looked into is whether they wanted to retain Government Colleges affiliated to Panjab University or not. 120 Teachers used to be in SCD Government College, Ludhiana, but now there are only 20 teachers.

Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that it has been written at page 26 of the Appendix that if 5 or less students took admission, the course would not be run. Suppose a few students took admissions in the month of July and after 3<sup>rd</sup> counseling, they are told that since only 5 or less students have taken admission, the course would not be run, where the students concerned would go? Hence, they needed to contemplate as to whether this condition is to be retained or not. He further said that if they make admissions late, the students are taken away by other Universities. It has been mentioned at page 27 that "Third and Final Counselling will be conducted as Spot Registration and Counselling in the first week of August".

The Vice Chancellor said that these are the minutes of JAAC.

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the admission process should be started a little bit earlier.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are not approving the minutes of the JAAC; rather, they are approving the item under consideration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it should be noted that they are not approving the minutes of JAAC, and instead they are approving the recommendations of Admission Facilitation Committee.

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the Third and Final Counselling should be conducted as Spot Registration and Counselling in the first week of July because they had approved the regulation at page 133 of the Appendix, wherein the duration of each semester has been increased from fourteen weeks to fifteen weeks. If the classes are started in the first of August, they would not be able to complete 15 weeks due to holidays/vacations during the even semester. Secondly, the expenditure of the registration fee of B.E., M.E. and M.Tech. students should be with the permission of the Registrar/Syndicate as is in the case of other Departments. He had also given this in writing, but no action has been taken on this issue so far. He pleaded that this should be made a resolved part.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay".

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Admission Facilitation Committee dated 22.02.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

1. from the ensuing session (2023-24), if after admitting PU-OCET qualified candidates, seats remained vacant in the affiliated Colleges, the vacant seats be filled by the Colleges on merit prepared on the basis of marks secured in the qualifying examination;
2. after the +2 examinations are over, the affiliated Colleges be allowed to enrol/register the students provisionally and thereafter make admissions in accordance with the merit list prepared of the enrolled/registered candidates by the date(s) stipulated by the University;
3. the schedule and the online process suggested by the Punjab Government is not approved and the University and its affiliated Colleges would follow their own procedure/process;
4. the registration fee of B.E., M.E. and M.Tech. students be spent with the permission of the Syndicate as is in the case of other Departments.

**7.** Considered if, another person, be appointed as Chairman of the UMC Standing Committee-I as Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi (Fellow) vide e-mail dated 17.02.2023 (**Appendix-V**) has refused to accept this position, due to other work commitments. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-V**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 04.02.2023 (Para 4) had constituted the following Standing Committees to deal with cases of Unfair Means:-

- I.** (i) Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, Fellow ... Chairman  
(ii) Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra, Fellow & Syndic  
(iii) Shri Jagdeep Kumar, Fellow
- II.** (i) Dr. Mukesh Arora, Fellow & Syndic... Chairman  
(ii) Principal Sandeep Kataria, Fellow  
(iii) Dr. Gurmit Singh, Fellow, Malwa Central College of Education, Ludhiana.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu proposed the name of Professor Rajat Sandhir, Fellow, for replacing Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, who has refused to accept the offer of appointment of Chairman of UMC Committee-I.

Professor Jatinder Grover seconded the proposal made by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar proposed the name of Principal N.R. Sharma, Fellow, for replacing Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, who has refused to accept the offer of appointment of Chairman of UMC Committee-I.

Dr. Parveen Goyal proposed the name of Professor Sonal Chawla, Fellow, for replacing Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, who has refused to accept the offer of appointment of Chairman of UMC Committee-I.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Shri Sandeep Singh proposed the name of Dr. Inder Pal Singh Sidhu Fellow, for replacing Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, who has refused to accept the offer of appointment of Chairman of UMC Committee-I.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh proposed the name of Dr. Jagdish Chander, Fellow, for replacing Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi, who has refused to accept the offer of appointment of Chairman of UMC Committee-I.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that as Syndicate, only a single name should be proposed, on whom the consensus is arrived at.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that one of the members of the Committee (UMC Committee-I) should be appointed as Chairman and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua should be appointed as member.

Shri Varinder Singh said that since Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Sandeep Singh could not attend the previous meeting of the Syndicate, they should be included in the Affiliation Committee.

Professor Jatinder Grover and Principal Kirandeep Kaur supported the proposal made by Shri Varinder Singh.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they should stick to the item under consideration. He pointed out that in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Committee, all the members are of the rank of Professor. Keeping in view this, he had proposed the name of Principal N.R. Sharma as Chairman of the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that a letter had been received from him saying that he does not want to become a member of UMC Committee. When Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired as to when he has declined the offer, the Vice Chancellor said that he had written that he should not be made a member of UMC Committee.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh suggested that Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra should be made Chairman of the UMC Committee-I in place of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and the Vice Chancellor be authorized to appoint a member.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that Dr. Inder Pal Singh Sidhu should be appointed as a member of the UMC Committee-I.

Professor Jatinder Grover and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that Professor Rajat Sandhir should be appointment Chairman of the UMC Committee-I in place of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since several names have been proposed, the Vice Chancellor be authorized to appointment Chairman/member of the UMC Committee-I.

Shri Varinder Singh reiterated that both Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Sandeep Singh should be appointed members of the Affiliation Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that he could not attend the first meeting of the Syndicate owing to personal reasons. Several Committees were formed in the first meeting of the Syndicate. Though he was not capable enough, he was still appointed member of the Revising Committee, but due to personal reasons, he would not like to serve on the said Committee. He, therefore, requested that his name should be deleted from the Revising



## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Committee. Secondly, he would like to know as to how many members have been nominated as members of the Boards of Studies.

It was informed that the exact number could not be told, but several Boards of Studies have been constituted.

When the Vice Chancellor said that they should stick to the agenda, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that though there are several discrepancies in the agenda provided to them, they ignored the same and discussed the agenda items.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would come to these things. Whatever the Hon'ble member is saying is not related to agenda Item 7.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this is a serious issue and he wanted that it should come on record.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should come on record but with a proper way.

Continuing, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that with God grace, he is sitting in the meeting of the Syndicate, but he was not in a position to come. At that time, certain persons thought that since the situation has deteriorated, it needed to be corrected, and they formed this Syndicate. If the Vice Chancellor does not mind, he could say that even she is sitting here owing to those reasons. Since 1882, it is for the first time in the history of this University that someone has to leave the University in such a disgraceful manner because he had formed a coterie. They are not in favour of nepotism. He had, therefore, suggested that they should appoint member/chairman of the UMC Committee-I based on consensus. He only wanted that a signal should not go that such a decision had a influence of such and such persons. There are 190 affiliated Colleges and there could be recommendations of Principals of affiliated Colleges as also the Chairpersons of University Teaching Departments. He had just sought as to how many nominations have been made on the Boards of Studies. He had till now not spoken a word about the working of the Committee. He had just asked as to roughly how many nominations have been made. He only wanted that the different shades of people in the society or the stakeholders of the University as well as affiliated Colleges should get representation in the Boards.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Boards had been constituted on the basis of recommendations of the Departments.

Shri Varinder Singh said that nobody has done anything wrong deliberately. In fact, distribution has been done amongst all the stakeholders.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that only the distribution is not to be done.

Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that Syndicate had appointed a 6- member Committee. The Committee had tried to accommodate all the persons recommended by the department concerned. Earlier, there use to be a Committee having several members, but this time they decided that they should not appoint more than five members in the Postgraduate Boards of Studies and six in Undergraduate Boards of Studies. They had tried to include Principals and teachers of affiliated Colleges as also Professors and Fellows of subject in the Board of Studies concerned.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the Vice Chancellor had informed that Principal N.R. Sharma had sent an e-mail stating that he should not be made member/Chairperson of UMC Committee-I, whereas he has just asked him on phone, but he (Principal Sharma) has told him that he has not sent any e-mail to the Vice Chancellor on the issue.

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

The Vice Chancellor said that the e-mail might have come from a wrong id.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the e-mail under question should be brought so that the same could be considered here.

Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to appoint member/Chairperson of the UMC Committee-I.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice Chancellor be authorized to appoint member/Chairperson of the UMC Committee-I in place of Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi.

- 8.** Considered if, the recovery of excess interest amount from entitled subscribers of PF/GPF (as per List attached) (**Appendix-VI**) who were retired from the University service, be waived off as per the policy instructions dated 28.08.2015 issued by Govt. of Punjab (**Appendix-VI**) duly adopted by the Panjab University. Information contained in detailed office note (**Appendix-VI**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.09.2022 (Para 3) (**Appendix-VI**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the Item C-3 on the agenda, be deferred till next meeting. In the meanwhile, the office note, be redrafted by incorporating each and every aspect related to the issue, including judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the latest circular of Punjab Government, efforts made to recover the amount, responses to the letters, etc.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Finance & Development Officer should have ensured that the relevant papers been appended with the item in chronological order. The appendix is beginning from page 57, which is the list of persons from whom the excess interest paid, is to be recovered. He did not know whether the item has been got approved from him (Finance & Development Officer) or not, but it certainly looked that the item has been got checked from him (Finance & Development Officer). List has been appended first, thereafter letter of Punjab Government regarding recovery of excess payment, Syndicate decision dated 27.09.2022, detailed facts of the case, letter written to Director, Higher Education, Punjab and reply thereto and lastly the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. It has been written, "However, we are of the view that recovery should be made in a reasonable instalments. We direct that recovery be made in equated monthly instalment spread over a period of two years". Had all these persons retired from the University service and no dues are pending from them? How much amount is due from these persons?

It was informed that an amount of Rs.24,53,067/- is due from these persons.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that it has been written, "To recover such amount, the office issue recovery notice to the concerned subscribers and a substantial amount of recovery, i.e., Rs.4,84,46,933/- was affected by way of adjustment through PF, in those cases where employees were continuing in service and by seeking refund from those who were retired and drawing pension. He enquired whether none of these persons is drawing pension?

It was clarified that there is some shuffling in the documents. The office note is available at pages 66 and 67 of the Appendix. The other documents should have been appended after the office note. In fact, before 2015-16, the University used to declare the interest on Provident Fund and General Provident Fund on the basis of interest earned by it. At times, the interest determined by the Government of higher, but since the University earned less interest, it used to declare interest at lower rate than the Government, and when they earned more interest, they used to declare interest on higher rate than the

Government. Then in the year 2015-16, on the basis of observations of CAO, a decision was taken that irrespective of interest earned by the University on the amount of subscribers to CPF and GPF, the University would declare the interest rate in commensurate with the interest rate of Government of India, but the said decision was implemented from retrospective effect, i.e., the decision was taken in 2015-16, but was implemented from 2013-14. Meaning thereby, they decided to pay the interest rate on CPF and GPF, which was declared by the Government of India from time to time. During the period of two years, i.e., 2013-14 and 2014-15, the interest rate of the University was on the higher side, and the recovery was to be effected, and the total amount of about Rs.4.8 crore. The recovery of about Rs.4.6 crore had already been made, i.e., from the in-service employees and pensioners. There were certain employees of the University, who had not opted for pension. The recovery from these persons is between Rs.84 and Rs.84,000/-. Earlier, there were instructions of Punjab Government on the Supreme Court that the institute could not make recovery from the retired employees. Thereafter, a new judgement had come from the Supreme Court that recovery could be made provided the institute had obtained an undertaking from the employee(s). However, in the case under consideration, undertakings could not be taken as the lower rate of interest was effected from retrospective effect. Hence, they had no alternative, but to waive off the excess payment made on the basis of higher rate of interest than the Government of India. They could not file suits for recovering a sum of Rs.10,000/- or more.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh pointed out that in certain cases, the recovery is Rs.20,000/- 32,000/-, 50,000/- 72,000/-, 84,000/-, Rs.1,26,000/- also. Hence, they should take a conscious decision.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk enquired, has the undertaking been not taken from any of these persons?

It was informed that occasion for taking the undertaking did not arise because the decision was taken in the year 2015-16, but was implemented from the year 2013-14. Moreover, there could be only 15-20 cases, where the recovery is more than Rs.50,000/-.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said, "Is the recommendation of the office that the amount should be waived off".

It was informed that there is no way out except to waive off the amount.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired, is there any person in this list, who wished to opt for the old pension scheme and giving representation for the purpose, but he/she/they are not refunding the excess amount paid to them.

It was informed that since the University has not taken any decision regarding reopening of options for old pension scheme, the list of persons, who are giving representations for reopening of old pension scheme, has not been prepared.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that there is no harm if the options for old pension scheme are reopened.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the old pension scheme could not be reopened in this manner.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that what he meant to say is, if these persons are not refunding the excess amount paid to them by the University, why their request for reopening of pension scheme could be considered favourably?

On an information sought by Dr. Gurmeet Singh, it was informed that all these persons have not opted for the old pension scheme.

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dr. Mukesh Kumar remarked that first these persons should be allowed to opt for the old pension scheme, and then the excess amount paid to them should be recovered.

It was suggested that they have to consider that in all these cases the employees are not at fault as the rate of interest was decreased by the Syndicate from retrospective effect, which was earlier decided by the Syndicate itself on the higher side. Now, even if the recovery suit is filed, both the judgements are against them – (i) that recovery could not be made; and (ii) recovery could only be made where an undertaking has been obtained.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh enquired, could they not file recovery suits in the cases where the recovery is of more than Rs.50,000/-? Could there be only single decision or they could take two different decisions? Could the persons in whose cases the recovery is of more than Rs.50,000/- challenge the decision of the Syndicate?

Dr. Mukesh Arora opined that the amount under consideration should be waived off as more than 5 years had already elapsed.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that either the amount under consideration should be waived off or the old pension scheme reopened.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur observed that since they had not obtained the undertakings, they would not be able to win the case, if filed.

A couple of members suggested that the amount under consideration should be waived off.

It was said that in terms of policy of Punjab Government, the recovery of the excess amount of Rs.24,53,067 paid to the CPF and GPF subscribers, could not be recovered.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh suggested that correct resolution should be got recorded by the Finance & Development Officer.

Dr. Mukesh Arora and Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that at least the meeting of the Pension Committee should be convened at the earliest, but to reopen or not to reopen the option for the persons is a separate issue.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk observed that as pointed out, they are waiving off the excess amount in view of the instructions of Punjab Government.

It was informed that it is not a case where the University is surrendering its right of recovery; rather, in view of the policy of Punjab Government framed in terms of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in these cases, the recovery could not be effected.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that, it meant, that it could not be taken as a precedent.

**RESOLVED:** That, in view of the policy of Punjab Government framed in terms of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in these cases the recovery of excess interest amount from the subscribers of CPF/GPF (**Appendix-VI**), who have retired from the University service, could not be effected and hence, the same be adjusted so that the account is settled.

**9.** Considered if, the proposed Guidelines (**Appendix-VII**) for admission to the reserved category of sports for the admission in UBS and all other Teaching Departments of P.U. and Regional Centres for the session 2023-2024, be approved.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar drew the kind attention of the House towards page 78 of the Appendix where it has written, "Second Round of Sports Trials will be conducted on the

request of particular department for the candidates, who could not appear in the First Round of Sports Trials due to any reason, if the seats remain vacant in the concerned Department". He said that 'any reason' should have been specified; otherwise, 'any reason' is a vague term.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Second Round of Sports Trials would be conducted if the seats remain vacant.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that even if the seats remained vacant conversion formula could be applied. His only concern is that the reason should be specified, maybe medical, etc.

The Vice Chancellor said that 'any reason' should be replaced with 'any valid reason'.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the Item should be approved, but the Committee should be asked to send the list of reasons to be considered under 'any reason'.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee would be asked to give 4-5 specific reasons.

Dr. Mukesh Arora remarked that how a lie to be proved a truth, would come as a reason. Ultimately, everything would be a lie.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that none of the sportspersons would have any genuine reason to miss the sports trial.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that they make admissions at P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, under sports category, but sports facilities are not available at Hoshiarpur, and the students usually request the University to transfer them to Chandigarh.

To this, Dr. Jagtar Singh remarked that they admit sportspersons of international level.

**RESOLVED:** That the Guidelines for admission to various courses offered in University Business School and all other Teaching Departments of P.U. and Regional Centres, for the session 2023-2024, under the reserved category of sports, as per (**Appendix-VII**), be approved, and in the meanwhile, the Committee be requested to give 4-5 specific reasons to substitute 'any reason'.

**10.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 27.09.2022 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to revision of booking charges of various Indoor and Outdoor Sports facilities/infrastructure available with Directorate of Sports, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that booking charges have been prescribed for Educational Institutions/PCA/HCA/Chandigarh Cricket Association (UTCA) and affiliated Colleges of Panjab University, Chandigarh (page 92 of the Appendix), but since the affiliated Colleges give sports fee (per student) to the University. Hence, the affiliated Colleges and their students should be given the waiver of payment of this fee as is being given to campus students. However, booking charges must be charged from the sports clubs, academies, etc. He, therefore, suggested that the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University and their students should be exempted from payment of this booking fee.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he is not able to understand as to what the existing charges are and what would be the difference after the approval of revised changes. Earlier, they were charging a fee of Rs.1500/- per day, but now the same has been made free. Secondly, in the second column the fee has been raised from Rs.5,000/- to Rs.8,000/- per day. It seemed as if the amount has been added.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that at certain places, the changes are in multiple folds. Citing an example, he pointed out that at page 94 of the Appendix, the fee has been revised from Rs.1,000/- per day to Rs.5,000/- per day, and similarly at another place a new fee of Rs.8,000/- per day has been prescribed. His only concern is that the fee should be increased proportionately.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that since the students of the affiliated Colleges are also their own students, they should not be discriminated and given the treatment, which is being given to campus students.

Continuing, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that where earlier no charges were prescribed, charges of Rs.25,000/- per day and Rs.50,000/- per day have been prescribed. Even if the charges of electricity, water, etc. are to be taken, the same should be charged from the outsiders. He added that the students are already running away from the sports and opted for drugs, mobiles, etc. He, therefore, suggested that the students should be attracted/encouraged to participate in sports activities, and they should charge only nominal fee from them, so that there is no load of payment on them. If they go with these prescribed charges of Rs.25,000/- per days and Rs.50,000/- per day, none would come and the sports infrastructure would remain unutilized. He requested the Vice Chancellor to get the charges reviewed from the concerned Committee, and free to at least the sportspersons of affiliated Colleges and teachers of the affiliated Colleges situated in Chandigarh, so that they could make use of sports infrastructure of Panjab University.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur suggested that the recommendations of the Committee should be got reviewed in accordance with the suggestions given by the members.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that since the Committee would not be aware of the sentiments of the House, Shri Lajwant Singh Virk and Dr. Jagtar Singh should be included in the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That the matter be referred back to the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor with regard to revision of booking charges of various Indoor and Outdoor Sports facilities/infrastructure available with Directorate of Sports, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for review, and Shri Lajwant Singh Virk and Dr. Jagtar Singh be included in the Committee.

- 11.** Considered that 20% of income from the sale of books, be credited to “Revolving Fund” of Publication Bureau subject to the maximum limit of the provision made in the Budget Estimate for financial year 2023-2024.

**NOTE:** A copy of letter dated 25.01.2023 of Honorary Director, Publication Bureau was enclosed (**Appendix-VIII**).

Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that instead of fixing 20% limit for income from the sale of books, no limit should be fixed, so that Publication Bureau could publish maximum number of books as envisaged in the new National Education Policy, 2020, and credit 20% or more income to the Revolving Fund.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Punjabi University, Patiala, was established much later than Panjab University, but they would be surprised to see the ‘Kitab Ghar’ of Punjabi University. In fact, the Kitab Ghar of Punjabi University, Patiala, is at conspicuous place. He suggested that to improve the functioning of the Publication Bureau of Panjab University and to shift it to a prime location, a small Committee should be formed. The books available with the Publication Bureau of Panjab University are rare books, but the University and the affiliated Colleges are not able to take much benefit of the books published by the

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Publication Bureau. Every College purchased books amounting to more than Rs.10,000/- per year, but out of those books, none is of Publication Bureau.

Principal R.S. Jhanji pointed out that a Committee was constituted when Professor Sudhir Kumar was in-charge of Publication Bureau. He was also a member of the Committee and the Committee had recommended that the list of books published by the Publication Bureau should be sent to all the affiliated Colleges, so that they could purchase books out of them. It has come to his notice that the Colleges have now started purchasing books published by the Publication Bureau. He informed that Punjabi University held book fairs in the affiliated Colleges where a number of books got sold on the spot, but so far as Panjab University is concerned, it did not hold any such book fair.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Principal R.S. Jhanji.

Continuing, Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since the Colleges received grant from the UGC for purchase of books, they could purchase the books published by the Publication Bureau, if publicized.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that the authors of the books published by the Publication Bureau of Panjab University are more recognizable/authentic and to keep their books in the Libraries is a kind of respect.

Principal R.S. Jhanji informed that a former student of Panjab University namely Dr. Surjit Singh is working in Kitab Ghar of Punjabi University, Patiala. On a request, Dr. Surjit Singh had sent a van to his College for exhibition of books and books amounting to more than Rs.25,000/- were sold on the spot.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that once Dr. Gurpal Singh was the Director of Publication Bureau and he was member of the Publication Bureau Committee at that time. Dr. Gurpal Singh had held exhibitions in several Colleges, including his College. In that year, the income of the University from sale of books had increased manifolds.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Kitab Ghar of Punjabi University is situated at the most prominent place of the University. The cost of books of Rs.50/- or Rs.100/- did not matter much to the students/public.

Dr. Parveen Goyal drew the kind attention of the House towards item under consideration, which says that 20% of the income from the sale of books, whereas the Publication Bureau has its own Budget Head in the University Budget, and about a sum of Rs.55,32,000/- has been allocated to it. Moreover, an observation has been made by the Finance & Development Officer at page 109 of the Appendix that “since considerable unutilized amount is available with Publication Bureau, therefore, there is no justification for further transfer of amount.....”. Hence, he is of the view that first the Publication Bureau should spend the unutilized amount available with it and only thereafter 20% of the income from the sale of books be allowed to be credited to the Revolving Fund of the Publication Bureau. ”.

Dr. Mukesh Arora clarified that the Bureau has in fact has sought transfer of 20% of income of the Bureau to the Revolving Fund and not 20% of the income from the sale of books. Secondly, as pointed out by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, they could renovate the Publication Bureau and its functioning only if more funds are made available to it. He suggested that a Committee should be formed to suggest relocation of Publication Bureau and improvements in its functioning.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur pointed out that the Bureau has sought that 20% of the income from the sale of books be credited to the Revolving Fund of the Bureau.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That 20% of income from the sale of books, be credited to “Revolving Fund” of Publication Bureau subject to the maximum limit of the provision made in the Budget Estimate for financial year 2023-2024.

- 12.** Considered recommendation (No.11) of the Committee dated 17.01.2023 (**Appendix-IX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the following eligibility criteria for admission to Post Graduate Diploma in Nutrition and Dietetics w.e.f. academic session 2023-24 be revised/approved:

Current Eligibility Criteria	Proposed Eligibility Criteria
<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> </ul>	<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. (Bachelor of Science) in any field</li> <li>• BHMS/BAMS/BDS/MBBS</li> </ul>

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

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that he has been connected with this issue since long. This Diploma (Post Graduate Diploma in Nutrition and Dietetics) was for the first time offered by S.C.D. Government College, Ludhiana in the year 2005. When they saw the decline in admissions, they started evolving their own mechanism. If they see the existing eligibility criteria, they would find that only the students of science background have been eligible as the successful students would get job in Hospitals. A resolution in this regard was proposed and the same was referred to a Committee constituted under the chairmanship of Professor Akhtar Mahmood, and he was Dean, Faculty of Science at that time. The then Vice Chancellor, Professor K.N. Pathak had included experts from PAU, Ludhiana, as well as from Himachal, in the Committee. The reason for putting these experts in the Committee was that they did not want to dilute the eligibility criteria from the basic sciences. Earlier, the B.Sc. in any field, BHMS/BAMS/BDS/MBBS was not part of the eligibility criteria. If Bachelor in any field is to be kept as eligibility criteria, then where is the need for mentioning other degrees? Moreover, a Bachelor Degree is also there in Computer Science. Since the candidate would get job in the Hospital, they could not put the lives of the patient in danger. Professor Raj Kumar, the former Vice Chancellor had



diluted the eligibility criteria to such an extent that anybody could get admission in any course. Had the General Branch officials not briefed the Committee during the meeting? The General Branch officials must have briefed the Committee. One of the justifications given for the proposed eligibility criteria is “cater to the demand of the course”. The reason should have been to cater to the demand of the society as the course is always run for the society. It seemed they wanted to admit the students without caring for the lives of the patients. The second reason is given, “developing the skill sets to generate employment”. They could not see it separate from the basic sciences irrespective of whether candidates seek admission to this course or not. He pointed out that certain Universities award B.Sc. Degree in Psychology also.

The Vice Chancellor said that according to latest framework of the UGC, there would be only a four year Bachelor Degree.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that this not a degree, but only a PG Diploma. Simply, the B.Sc. (Bachelor of Science) in any field and BHMS/BAMS/BDS/MBBS should be mentioned below the existing eligibility.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the coming years, a lot of flexibility would be given in the eligibility criteria.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that several nursing colleges had been opened, but nobody joins them. They could well imagine the position of the patient who would be injected by these students.

Professor Jatinder Grover remarked that the situation of Nursing Colleges is worse than Education Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that, as suggested by Dr. Dinesh Kumar, BHMS/BAMS/BDS/MBBS should be mentioned below the eligibility criteria and not B.Sc. (Bachelor of Science) in any field, and the information about this should be sent to the concerned quarters in advance with the direction that the eligibility criteria should be followed strictly and in case any wrong admission is made, the same would not be confirmed by the University.

**RESOLVED:** 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></ul>

• **BHMS/BAMS/BDS/MBBS**

**13.** Considered following recommendations (2, 4 and 5) of the Committee dated 17.01.2023 (**Appendix-X**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to recommend an appropriate mechanism as an interim arrangement, for smooth conduct of various academic activities of the University:-

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

4. that w.e.f. the academic session 2022-23, the following guidelines as applicable in case of appointment of examiners, be followed for appointment of thesis Guide and Co-Guides for MD/MS courses:-

“no person who is not an active post-graduate teacher in the subject be appointed for Guide and Co-Guide. However, in case of retired personnel, a teacher satisfies the conditions can be appointed up to one year after retirement”.

5. that in accordance with P.G. Regulations of MCI for appointment of Internal Examiners for the Course MD, Rule 1 at page 468, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, be amended as under and given effect from the session 2022-23:

<b>Existing Rule</b>	<b>Proposed amendment as per MCI Guidelines</b>
That no person shall be appointed as an examiner in any subject unless he has taken at least five years previously a Post-Graduate degree of a recognized University of an equivalent qualification in that particular subject as prescribed by the Medical Council of India and thereafter has had at least five years Postgraduate teaching experience in the subject concerned or in an allied subject in an affiliated college of a University or a recognized Postgraduate institution.	<p>No person shall be appointed as an internal examiner in any subject unless he/she has three years experience as recognized PG teacher in the concerned subject. For external examiners, he/she should have minimum six years of experience as recognized PG teacher in the concerned subject. Out of internal examiners, one examiner shall be a Professor and Head of the Department or Head of the Department.</p> <p>An examiner shall ordinarily be appointed for not more than two consecutive terms.</p> <p>The internal examiner in a subject shall not accept external examiner ship for a college from which external examiner is appointed in his subject.</p> <p>The Head of the Department of the institution concerned shall ordinarily be one of the internal examiner and second internal examiner shall rotate after every two year</p>

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that several such items have been placed before the Syndicate. Since the Academic Council, Faculties, and Boards of Studies had now been constituted, could such items technically be placed before the Syndicate directly? This has just been recommended by the College and they have directly placed the same before the

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Syndicate. This time, the items should be approved, but in future, such items should first be placed before the Faculties, Academic Council and then before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that, in fact, Boards of Studies in certain subjects are yet to be constituted as election of members of the Boards of Studies in certain subjects are to be held in the meetings of Faculties scheduled for tomorrow (26.03.2023). As such, the meetings of Boards would only be conducted in the end of April or in the beginning of May and by then the academic matters would be got delayed. However, in future, such matter would definitely come through the Faculties.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. Regulations/Rules for BHMS framed in accordance with Gazette Notification dated 06.12.2022 (**Appendix-X**), be approved and made effective from the academic session 2022-23;
2. w.e.f. the academic session 2022-23, the following guidelines as applicable in case of appointment of examiners, be followed for appointment of thesis Guide and Co-Guides for MD/MS courses:-
 

“no person who is not an active post-graduate teacher in the subject be appointed for Guide and Co-Guide. However, in case of retired personnel, a teacher satisfies the conditions can be appointed up to one year after retirement”.
3. in accordance with P.G. Regulations of MCI for appointment of Internal Examiners for the Course MD, Rule 1 at page 468, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, be amended as under and given effect from the session 2022-23:

<b>Existing Rule</b>	<b>Proposed amendment as per MCI Guidelines</b>
<p>That no person shall be appointed as an examiner in any subject unless he has taken at least five years previously a Post-Graduate degree of a recognized University of an equivalent qualification in that particular subject as prescribed by the Medical Council of India and thereafter has had at least five years Postgraduate teaching experience in the subject concerned or in an allied subject in an affiliated college of a University or a recognized Postgraduate institution.</p>	<p>No person shall be appointed as an internal examiner in any subject unless he/she has three years experience as recognized PG teacher in the concerned subject. For external examiners, he/she should have minimum six years of experience as recognized PG teacher in the concerned subject. Out of internal examiners, one examiner shall be a Professor and Head of the Department or Head of the Department.</p> <p>An examiner shall ordinarily be appointed for not more than two consecutive terms.</p> <p>The internal examiner in a subject shall not accept external examiner ship for a college from which external examiner is appointed in his subject.</p> <p>The Head of the Department of the institution concerned shall ordinarily be one of the internal examiner and second internal examiner shall rotate after every two year</p>

**14.**

Considered if:-

- (i) National Academic Depository (NAD)-Digilocker, be adopted in totality along with Degree Templates of UG and PG courses (**Appendix-XI**).
- (ii) Implementation of Academic Bank of Credits (ABC) under Digilocker frame work as per Communications received from UGC (**Appendix-XI**).
- (iii) the following recommendations of the Committee dated 11.08.2022 (**Appendix-XI**) 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 should be uploaded.
  2. The System Administrator must ensure that the data of only those UG/PG degrees is uploaded on NAD-Digilocker which already have been physically printed meaning thereby that whose fee is clear.

It was informed that the University has received several letters from the UGC for adoption of National Academic Depository (NAD) – Digilocker. Earlier, the data was to be preserved on NSTE, but now they have shifted to Digilocker. Now, since the NEP is coming, they are asking for shifting the data on Academic Bank of Credits (ABC). Although they have registered at the requisite forums, since the approval of the Governing Body had not been obtained, the same is being sought. The data is available with them and they have just shift the data of NAD from the year 2021 onwards. Similarly, they have to upload the detailed-marks-cards along with the credits of the students on the ABC. The credits of students studying in science stream could be correlated, but for other stream mechanism for correlation of credits is to be evolved as there are credits in all streams under the NEP. Thirdly, they were asking the University to upload the data on the Digilocker so that the students could download their self certified documents as is being done in the case of Aadhar Card, Driving License, etc. Since the templates of the degrees being awarded by the University were not matching, they had improvised the templates a little bit, and the same are placed before the Syndicate. If the Syndicate approved these templates, they would be able to upload the data on the Digilocker.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua enquired from which year the data would be uploaded. He further enquired whether the detailed-marks-cards of the students would be uploaded after qualifying the examination or before even if they had re-appears.

It was informed that the data of students would be uploaded from the year 2021 onwards. So far as detailed-marks-cards/degrees are concerned, the same would be uploaded only when they become eligible for award of degrees.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since the Colleges had also received similar communications from the UGC as well as from the Director, Higher Education, they have also made registrations on the ABC. As such, the data of existing students have already been uploaded by the Colleges. He did not know whether they have to get themselves again registered for the templates or not.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that although they had registered the students, since then University had not got itself registered, the credits earned by the students are not shown.

The Vice Chancellor enquired, are the schemes of the affiliated Colleges credit based.

It was informed that the ABC had given them two options – (i) the people of Digilocker wanted that the entire data should be uploaded at the earliest as was being done on NAD. They had uploaded the Ph.D. degrees awarded to the students from the year 2019 onwards. From this, the student concerned had to get himself/herself registered and he/she was given the user name and password, and then they could download the degrees digitally. This system has been scrapped and now they have asked the University to shift to the Digilocker. Though they had registered on the Digilocker, data is still to be shifted. Thirdly, there is Academic Bank of Credits for which there are two options – (i) the University could register all the students on it, where the Id of the students would get created, provided the students concerned gave their consent to use the data of their Aadhar Card. The mapping would automatically be done, but if there is some problem in the mapping, the students concerned would have to create his/her own Id and thereafter, activation would automatically be done. They could only upload the detailed-marks-cards. When they upload the data/DMCs of the Honours School students, the credits are automatically shown as the Honours School comprised of credits. The students could also generate their credits from the ABC. However, so far as other courses are concerned, they could only download the detailed-marks-cards. At the moment, they are just collating the data from all the universities, but how to utilize the data is yet to be decided. On a query made by a member, it was informed that this is mandatory for all the universities and their affiliated Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that what is going to happen is that the UGC has given 4-Year UG framework and they are saying that the students have to earn 40 credits from anywhere. He/she is not necessarily to be a student of Panjab University; rather, he/she could earn the requisite credits from any of the Universities/Institutes. The credits earned by the students would get collected in the ABC, and when he/she would earn 40 credits, he/she would be eligible for award of degree.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the data was sought from them by the Director, Higher Education, Punjab, and they provided the same to his office.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that with this, perhaps, the students would not be asked to submit Migration Certificate.

The Vice Chancellor said that under this scheme, the Migration Certificate would not be required.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired, how would the University meet its expenditure? Ultimately, they would face the problem in the generation of revenue for the University.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) National Academic Depository (NAD)-Digilocker, be adopted in totality along with Degree Templates of UG and PG courses (**Appendix-XI**);
- (ii) as per Communications received from UGC (**Appendix-XI**), Academic Bank of Credits (ABC), under Digilocker framework, be implemented; and
- (iii) the following recommendations of the Committee dated 11.08.2022 (**Appendix-XI**) 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.

**15.** Considered following recommendations of Regulations Committee dated 28.12.2022 (**Appendix-XII**):

**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 REGULAION</b>
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.	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>  <b>This Regulation shall be applicable for</b>

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

**ITEM 5**

That following eligibility conditions for Ph.D. course at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, be added at page 369 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 and given effect to from the session 2022-23:

**ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS FOR PH.D. COURSE AT UIAMS (W.E.F. 2022-23):**

1.3 Any candidate who has obtained Master's degree with not less than 55% (50% for SC/ST/BC/PWD category) marks in the aggregate, from Panjab University or from any other University (approved by the Academic Council) in any one of the following subjects:

(i) Commerce or Management.

OR

(ii) Economics, Mathematics, Statistics, Sociology, Psychology, Public Administration, Operations Research, Social Work, Engineering and Laws.

OR

(iii) Any subject other than those mentioned in (i) and (ii) above provided that the candidate has either not less than 5 years' work experience at the managerial (including administrative service) level or is a member **of the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce**, Panjab University with not less than 5 years' experience of teaching Postgraduate classes.

OR

(iv) Master of Finance and Control (MFC).

Provided further that candidates with qualification, mentioned in (ii) & (iii) above shall be eligible for enrolment only if the area of research relates to the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce.

(v) The following categories of candidates, who are graduates and have either a minimum 5 years' standing in the profession (practice or service) or 5 years' experience of teaching postgraduate classes, shall also be eligible:

(a) A member (Associate or Fellow) of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India.

(b) A member (Associate or Fellow) of the Institute of the Cost & Works Accountants of India.

(c) A member (Associate or Fellow) of the Institute of Company Secretaries of India.

**University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh will admit students to Ph.D. Programme once in a year only, i.e. in the beginning of the session of Ph.D. Programme, as University Institute of Applied Management Sciences has two-semester course-work.**



**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>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULAION</b>
<p>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.</p>	<p>1. No Change</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. 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></p>

**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>1. No Change</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:

- (i) Certificate course in Citizenship
  - (ii) Certificate course in Financial Management in Public Affairs
  - (iii) Certificate course in Leadership Skills
  - (iv) Certificate course in Campaign Management 2017-2018
  - (v) Certificate course in Practical Skills in Areas such as Media Skills, Public Speaking, Campaign Strategies, Handling Conflicts
  - (vi) Certificate course in Ethics in Public Policy
  - (vii) Human Resource Management
  - (viii) Political Parties and Electoral Process
- } 2018-2019

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the recommendation of the Regulations Committee contained in Item 1 needed to be withdrawn as Clause 14 of the revised Ph.D. Guidelines, 2023, framed in accordance with the UGC Minimum Standards and Procedures for Award of Ph.D. Degree Regulations, 2022, available at page 376 of the Appendix says, “Panjab University shall not offer the M.Phil. (Master of Philosophy) Programme”. Since they are abandoning M.Phil. Programme in this meeting itself, it would not be proper to approve the Regulations for M.Phil. (Clinical Psychology). He suggested that keeping in view this fact, Item 1 of the Regulations Committee should be withdrawn.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra pointed out that the Regulations for M.Phil. (Clinical Psychology) are being approved for the session 2022.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the admissions have already been made under these Regulations, the Vice Chancellor should have approved these Regulations in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate and the item should have been placed before the Syndicate for ratification.

The Vice Chancellor said that the students, who are admitted under these Regulations, would be governed by these Regulations.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that if the consideration of the item is deferred, the students, who are admitted under these Regulations, would be at loss.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that approval to all these Regulations is pending for the last 1-2 years.

When Principal R.S. Jhanji suggested that this item should be shifted to ratification/information, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that Regulations always come to the Syndicate and Senate for consideration.

**Referring to Sub-Item 3**, Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that it has been written in the proposed Regulation, "Each semester shall be at least of 15 weeks durations" instead of 14 weeks. Is the duration of semester not 18 weeks durations? In his department, the semester is of 18 weeks durations. Could they deviate? Earlier, the duration of semester in the Department of Laws was 13 weeks, but the same was enhanced to 18 weeks after the implementation of new Regulations of UGC.

**The Vice Chancellor said that the duration of semester - whether of 15 weeks or 18 weeks, would be got checked.**

**Referring to Sub-Item 4**, Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the item related to Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Hearing/Speech Impaired and Mentally Challenged Persons. So far as he knew, now-a-days they avoid to use these words. Had they not named the course opposite? Secondly, no justification has been provided for naming it as "Special Diploma in Fine Arts..." because usually they use the words "Advanced Diploma, Diploma and Certificate". If the justification is available with the Vice Chancellor, the same should be provided to them.

**Referring to Sub-Item 5**, Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the University Institute of Applied Management Sciences has recommended eligibility conditions for Ph.D. Course, but he could not understand the logic of making eligible the students having done Masters in Sociology, Psychology, Public Administration, Social Work, etc. If they talked about flexibility, the subject of Political Science, Gandhian Studies, etc., could also be included. The eligibility recommended under (iii) is more interesting. They had recommended the new criteria "that the candidate has either not less than 5 years' work experience at the managerial (including administrative service) level or is a member **of the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce**, Panjab University with not less than 5 years' experience of teaching Postgraduate classes". According to this, if he is a member of the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce, he could do Ph.D. at UIAMS even if he has done Masters in Hindi. How could he be eligible for do Ph.D. at UIAMS? Thirdly, they had made eligible members of Associates or Fellows of Institute of Chartered Accountants of India, Institute of Cost and Works Accountants of India and Institute of Company Secretaries of India. Though these persons related to Management, they qualify these

examinations after 12<sup>th</sup>/Graduation. Here they are removing the qualification of Masters Degree. He could not understand the logic.

Professor Jatinder Grover pointed out that it has nowhere been mentioned that the candidates have to qualify the Entrance Test conducted by the University or they should have qualified UGC NET, SLET, etc.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that Dr. Gurmeet Singh is absolutely right. Anyone could be a member of the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce and if they determine the eligibility according to this, the entire system of the University would be jeopardized, because it has been written in the eligibility condition of Ph.D. in the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce that the candidate should have Masters Degree in the subject concerned. The eligibility conditions of Ph.D. Programme to be run at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences should be the same as are for University Business School. Referring clause (ii) wherein the subject of Economics, Mathematics, Statistics, Sociology, Psychology, Public Administration, Operation Research, Social Work, Engineering and Laws, he said that it has been clearly mentioned in the revised UGC Guidelines that the candidate should have done Masters in the subject concerned.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh reiterated that even if they are talking about the flexibility under the NEP, they would look into it at the time of implementation of NEP. He, therefore, suggested that both the items 4 & 5 should be referred back.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that Sub-Item 4 could be approved with certain modifications. According to him, 'Specially Abled' words have been mentioned in the Act. Hence, Sub-Item 4 should be amended accordingly and approved. So far as Sub-Item 5 is concerned, it needed to be referred back, because the University Institute of Applied Management Sciences has picked up the Regulations of University Business School, which were framed 50 years ago. Moreover, the University Business School itself is not following these Regulations. Resultantly, the faculty members of Economics, Mathematics, Statistics, Sociology, Psychology, Public Administration, Operation Research, Social Work, Engineering and Laws, have become eligible to carry out research leading to Ph.D. at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences. He suggested that the item should be referred back and the Institute should be asked to reframe the eligibility conditions in accordance with the Ph.D. Guidelines to be approved in this very meeting. He pointed out that earlier there used to be Master of Finance and Control (MFC) Degree, but now no University is awarding this degree.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has already been decided that the item should be referred back.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that, as suggested by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, letter should immediately be written to the affiliated Colleges, so that the Colleges could make the admissions accordingly. Secondly, as suggested by Dr. Gurmeet Singh that if the seats of M.A. (Hindi) remained vacant, the students having done B.Com., B.Sc., etc., without studying Hindi, be allowed to be offered, if they applied. Earlier, a student having done BBA had been allowed to join M.A. (Hindi) and his result was also declared. The copy of the DMC of the candidate is available with him. This year, a student having done B.Com. was admitted to M.A. (Hindi) Course, but now he is being declared ineligible. If a student having done BBA could be eligible for M.A. (Hindi), why a student having done B.Com. could not be? He had made a request in this regard to the Controller of Examinations and the Controller of Examinations should look into this case.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the above quoted recommendations of Regulations Committee dated 28.12.2022 (Appendix), be approved except recommendation contained in Sub-Item 5, which be referred back; and
- (ii) the nomenclature of Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Divyang, be changed to that of **“Special Diploma in Fine Arts for Specially Abled”**.

**16.** Considered minutes of the Regulations Committee dated 15.02.2023 (**Appendix-XIII**) with regard to the following amendment in Regulation 17.3 and Regulation 7 under Chapter VI (A) and Chapter VIII (E) appearing at pages 133 and 173, respectively, and addition of Regulation 19 under Chapter VI (A) at page 134 of Panjab University, Calendar, Volume-I, 2022 in accordance with the Gazette Notification No. CG-DL-E-29032022-234639 dated 29.03.2022:

<b>Present Regulations</b>	<b>Proposed Regulations</b>
17.3 All whole-time members of the teaching staff, as defined in Regulation 1.1 of Chapter V(A), shall retire on attaining the age of 60 years and no extension in service shall be granted.	17.3 <b>All whole-time members of the teaching staff, as defined in Regulation 1.1 of Chapter V(A), shall retire at the age mentioned in the Regulations of the University Grants Commission/regulating body of HEIs.</b>
7. All whole-time teachers in Non-Govt. Colleges affiliated to the University, shall retire on attaining the age of 60 years and thereafter no extension in service shall be granted.	7. <b>All whole-time teachers in Non-Govt. Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University, shall retire at the age mentioned in the regulations of the University Grants Commission/regulating body of HEIs.</b>
	19. <b>Conditions of Service including the pay scales in respect of teaching faculty will be governed by the UGC/regulating body of HEIs, vide regulations as made by such bodies under any law for the time being in force as applicable, shall be such as specified in the said regulations. In case of any contradiction with any other regulations in the Calendar, the Regulation shall prevail.</b>

Initiating discussion, Professor Jatinder Grover said that the University had amended the Regulations in the year 2011 and sent the same to the Government of India for approval. He pleaded that the matter should be pursued with the Government of India and the afore-said regulations be got approved.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he did not know as to why the item has been placed before the Syndicate in this manner. He was also a member of the Regulations Committee and they had simply discussed that this item could not be placed before the Regulations Committee without following the laid down procedure. In fact, this item could only be placed before the Regulations Committee after following the laid down procedure. As per the laid down procedure, the Resolution is supposed to go to the Syndicate and then to the Senate and the Senate would refer the same to the Regulations Committee. Moreover, they had discussed the issue and found certain anomalies. If they go through page 145 of the

Appendix, they would find that the Regulations Committee has recommended that the proposed amendments along with following related document be placed before the Syndicate. In fact, the Resolution should come to the Syndicate as such and the documents could have been appended with it, and not in the form of recommendation of the Regulations Committee as it did not fall within the purview of the Regulations Committee. He reiterated that unless and until the Resolution is not placed before the Senate, it could not be referred to the Regulations Committee. He suggested that since he is also a signatory, a letter should be written to the proposers of the Resolution to incorporate explanation because as per provision of the Calendar for proposing a Resolution, explanation is must. They had discussed this issue in the meeting and it was suggested that explanation should be got attached with the Resolution. Hence, at the moment, the Resolution is incomplete. Moreover, if they approve the Resolution and amend the Regulations accordingly, the amendments, which were sent to the Government of India for approval in the year 2011, would become null and void. Resultantly, their 11 years' labour would come to zero. He reiterated that the University should write to the proposers of the Resolution and they would add the explanation, which is compulsory.

Professor Jatinder Grover suggested that the amendments made in the Regulations in the year 2011 should also be taken care of while recommending amendments in the Regulations, and after getting the amendment approved from the Senate, the same be sent to the Government of India for approval and the matter be pursued with the Ministry concerned.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that as far as his knowledge goes, whenever a Resolution is proposed by the Fellow(s), the same is referred to a Committee for consideration in the first instance. After getting the Resolution considered by a Committee, the same is placed before the Syndicate and then before the Senate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as per the provision of the Calendar, a decision is to be taken by the Vice Chancellor whether the Resolution is to be placed before the Syndicate or not. If the Vice Chancellor decided not to place the Resolution before the Syndicate, the reasons for the same have to be given to the proposers in writing. To simplify this, the Vice Chancellor used to refer the Resolution to the Committee because he/she has not time to give reasons to the proposers.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that problem is that there is a lot of difference between Resolution and Regulation. There is a set procedure for proposing a Resolution as also to deal with it. It is to be seen by the Vice Chancellor whether the Resolution is to be referred to a Committee to examine, if the Resolution is within the Regulations or a new thing is to be created. If something new is to be created, it has to be taken to a new direction. He did not know how the Resolution proposed by the Fellows had been refer to the Regulations Committee. The Resolution proposed by the Fellows should have been placed before the Syndicate in its original form. He, therefore, suggested that the Resolution proposed by the Fellows, along with the explanation, be placed before the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That the Resolution proposed by the Fellows, along with the explanation to be sought, be placed before the Syndicate.

- 17.** Considered if the following qualification, be added for the post of Nurse as per the eligibility and qualification under NHM Punjab June 2018 (**Appendix-XIV**):-

“Three years Diploma in Nursing approved/duly registered by Nursing Council of India OR Diploma in GNM from a recognized Institution, Registered with Punjab Nursing Registration Council OR B.Sc. Nursing from a recognized Institution Registered with Punjab Nursing Registration Council”.

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

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that it has been mentioned at page 159 that “As per the recruitment notification of various posts under NHM, Punjab of June 2018, available at Punjab Government website, the eligibility and qualification criteria of Nurse are as under”. The relevant section should be asked not to rely on the information obtained from the website, but should obtain the information, i.e., eligibility and qualification criteria of Nurse, from the Punjab Government. Moreover, when a document is to be procured from the Government or any other agency, a communication be sent and the new guidelines/qualifications/eligibility criteria should be procured. He reiterated that they could not rely on the information downloaded from the website and make the base of their advertisement as they did not know as to when the same was uploaded. They could say that they had sought the information, but response has been received or a person was deputed to get the information, and they had got this information.

**RESOLVED:** That a letter be written to Punjab Government requesting them to send the latest qualifications and eligibility criteria for the post of Nurse Staff.

- 18.** Considered following recommendation (No.1) of the Committee dated 18.01.2023 (**Appendix-XV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for amendment in the Rules for migration of the students from a Law College that addition of Rule 10 in Chapter XIV(g) of Migration of Students meant for LL.B. Three Year Course appearing at pages 299 and 301 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019 respectively, be made as under:

“the migration in Department of Laws, University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh, Regional Centres and Law Colleges for LL.B. Three-Year Course and 5 Year B.A./B.Com. LL.B. shall be on the basis of Entrance Test to be conducted by CET Cell in the month of July:

1. The fee for entrance test shall be Rs.5000/- or as decided by the Syndicate/Senate from time to time.
2. The Syllabus for the entrance test shall be based on the P.U. syllabus which the candidates have studied in their previous semesters.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar, while referring to page 163, stated that the recommendation of the Committee dated 16.06.2022 be reaffirmed and there under the decision of the Committee dated 16.06.2022 was recorded. At the end in the resolved part, some other issue was decided and it had no connection with the relevant agenda. Both the resolved parts should be recorded as point (i) and point (ii). He said that this should be approved, but his only concern is that instructions should be given to the Committee to amend the word ‘affirmed’ and replace it with ‘resolved’. He urged that conduct of entrance test for migration should be approved, as if the migration is allowed on the basis of merit, the students of Chandigarh University and Rayat Bahra College got migrated from their Universities to Panjab University as Private Universities award highest marks to their students, resultantly, the students of Regional Centres of Panjab University are deprived of the chance to migrate in Panjab University. On the directions of the High Court, the University conducted the entrance test for migration and the students of Regional Centres of P.U. were considered for migration. There is one thing which is required to be added is that, earlier the classes of Law students were conducted in morning and evening batches, it is mentioned in the Rules that difference of two papers, is allowed. If the student is admitted in morning batch, he/she used to clear the papers in the evening batch and if admitted in evening, he/she used to clear the same in morning batch parallelly, whereas presently the University is offering the course of Law in morning batch only. One more addition is required in the amendments of the said Rules is that, difference of papers should be made nil. The problem which is being faced in the Department of Law is, that four students had taken admission and cleared the final semester and thereafter, they represented to the University that their two papers are pending as they could not attend classes parallel and they requested to allow special chance to them. If the special chance was allowed, then the problem of shortage of attendance would come. If they would not be allowed to appear in papers, in that case their degree would be extended to 3.5 to 4 years. He, therefore, requested that rule regarding difference of papers should be included in the proposed amendments. He further stated that admission rules can be amended by the Syndicate, these Rules for admission are the part of the Handbook of Information.

To this, the Vice Chancellor stated that all the existing rules are same, the only amendment proposed in the Rules is that, instead of qualifying marks, the migration will be considered on the basis of entrance test. She further reiterated that rules regarding allowing the deficiency of two papers are the same as per existing norms.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that deficiency is allowed, but in the migration cases which were placed, it was requested that affidavits are required to be submitted. Being Dean of



University Instruction, it was ordered when the migration cases had come, a condition was laid down that an affidavit is required to be submitted that for two remaining papers, he/she would appear in the same after completing the degree of 3 years. At this stage, the Department and office of Vice Chancellor have to face pressure to allow them to appear in the deficient papers. He urged that if the same is allowed to be incorporated in the Rules that difference of papers should be treated as nil so that automatically the students are allowed to appear in all the papers.

Professor Jaintder Grover said that the students which are being considered for grant of permission to attend classes on medical grounds, should also be considered on the same pattern of migration on the basis of entrance test. Allowing of more than 60 students to attend classes on medical grounds, is totally wrong.

Dr. Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it is not considered as migration, it is only the permission to attend classes. He further said that as mentioned by Dr. Dinesh Kumar that for the students of Chandigarh University and Rayat Bahra College, only the title of syllabus is different, the contents of the syllabus are same. He observed that 80% of the syllabus is the same. Hence, it should be allowed that difference of papers to be treated as nil.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has the existing system in the Rules, if they want to make changes in the existing system, a mechanism should be evolved.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that while approving the item, a note should be sent to the Department that issue regarding deficient papers was raised and this issue should be addressed by referring the matter to the Committee to make recommendations regarding amendment in the rules of migrations with regard to deficient subjects on the basis of discussion.

Shri Varinder Singh pointed that fee which is proposed for conduct of entrance test is on the higher side.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that if the students cleared the entrance test, they are required to submit NOC from the previous institution. In the cases where the institution is not willing to issue NOC to the students, the condition to submit NOC should be waived off. Secondly, the proposed fee should be reduced to some extent as Rs.5000/- is on the higher side. He further stated that for checking the papers of entrance test of law students, the teachers of Regional Centres should also be involved/deputed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it depend on the part of the concerned Department, which conducted the entrance test to get the papers of the entrance test evaluated. Regarding reduction of fee for conduct of entrance, the issue had come earlier also. It is observed that the expenditure for conducting the entrance test is required to be met out of the amount of fee collected for test. In some cases, the candidates apply in least number and the expenditure for conduct of entrance test is not met with the least amount of fee. On medical grounds, the students are paying Rs.1,000,00/- per semester for granting permission to attend classes in Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies, as compared to it, the amount of Rs.5000/- is very less.

To this, Professor Jatinder Grover said that these students are from the privileged class. Moreover, they are submitting fake medical certificates in support of their requests.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that in that case the students have to suffer in all the situation, firstly he/she has to obtain NOC from the institution and even has to appear in entrance test for migration; hence, it should be considered that fee of Rs.5000/- should not be charged, rather it should be reduced to some extent.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that opportunity should be given to students of P.U.R.C., Ludhiana, who have been deprived of due to his/her low merit. The opportunity/chance of getting admission in P.U. should be allowed to those students who are placed in the merit on lower rank.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the purpose of the University is quite different, the students of P.U.R.C. Ludhiana are allowed to join the course in Panjab University. If the students with low merit of P.U.R.C. Ludhiana are allowed to migrate in University, in that case also, the seats at P.U.R.C. Ludhiana would be vacated.

The Vice Chancellor stated that this item is approved and the matter regarding charging of Rs.5000/- would be examined by verifying the facts relating to income and expenditure.

Shri Sandeep Singh enquired if the students applied more than the desired number, would they refund the fees charged from them?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar replied that the fees are not refunded, rather the same is deposited in the account for the purpose.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired, what is the purpose of conducting the entrance test?

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that entrance test would be conducted for students willing to migrate from Regional Centres to Department of Laws and University of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

To this, the Vice Chancellor stated that the matter regarding entrance fee would be got examined.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said while referring to Item 18, that in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, new Committee was constituted comprising of members of the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, the said Committee was constituted to grant permission to attend classes at P.U. Chandigarh, to students of P.U. Regional Centres on medical and sports ground.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that but the Committee so constituted, is also related with the migration of Law students. He pointed out that the Committee of Syndics was constituted at that time, whereas it has been brought to their notice after the receipt of the letter that without information, the non-syndics members were also included in it. The Committee for examining the cases of students to grant permission to attend classes to Law students, was constituted out of the members of the Syndicate. It should be made clear to them as to how members other than the Syndicate are added in it.

The Vice Chancellor said that letters were issued in accordance with the proceedings of the Syndicate.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk and Shri Varinder Singh said that they had sent a communication in response to the letter from the office of the Vice Chancellor regarding clarification for constitution of the Committee.

Principal R.S. Jhanji enquired as to how the proceedings are misinterpreted.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that before the approval of the proceedings, how can a Committee be constituted. Either it is done on the basis of resolved part or otherwise. The meeting of the Committee was held before the finalization/circulation of the proceedings of the Syndicate.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

It was informed that meeting was pre-scheduled as the students were pressing hard to grant them permission to attend classes on medical/sports grounds.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that when the previous Committee was made redundant, then how could they convene the meeting? If they consider by the proposition of the Vice Chancellor that the meeting was pre-scheduled, in that case also, then how could the new members which were proposed to be added, were invited to the meeting.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that Committee was constituted in accordance with the proceedings of the Syndicate.

Shri Varinder Singh said that in that case, it might be that the proceedings were wrongly recorded.

To this, the Vice Chancellor replied that after confirmation of minutes by the Vice Chancellor, the tentative minutes are circulated to the members to point out discrepancies in recording of minutes, if any, within a period of two weeks.

Shri Lajwant Singh said that as per the statement made by the Vice Chancellor, it is accepted that minutes are corrected/rectified after receiving the discrepancies by the members. How could they constitute and convene the meeting of the Committee before the finalization/confirmation of the proceedings.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could be checked whether the meeting was conducted before and after the finalization of the proceedings. But as per her knowledge, the Committee is constituted as per the proceedings of the meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that meeting of the Syndicate was held on 4<sup>th</sup> February, 2023 and the meeting of the Committee regarding grant of permission to attend classes to law students, on medical and sports grounds, was held on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2023. Till 17<sup>th</sup> of February, 2023, the proceedings were not circulated and even the resolved part also was not made available to them. On what basis, his name and name of Dr. Dinesh Kumar was added in the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor replied that it might be on the basis of paras approved on priority basis.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that there is contradiction in it, how could the matters which were not discussed in the House, were recorded in the proceedings.

The Vice Chancellor replied that they could check the proceedings.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk clarified that there is contradiction on two issues, firstly that the meeting of the Committee was fixed before the conduct of the Syndicate, in that case, his name, and the names of Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra, Dr. Dinesh Kumar would not be in the meeting of the Committee.

It was clarified that it might be that after considering the resolved part, the Committee was formed and meeting was convened.

The Vice Chancellor replied that some of the paras related to formation of Committees were approved on priority basis.

To this, Principal R.S. Jhanji said that some matters which were not discussed in the meeting, were recorded in the proceedings.

The Vice Chancellor replied that they could check the proceedings with the video recording as nothing is recorded beyond the issues discussed in the meeting.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that when the Committee was formed amongst the 15 members of the Syndicate, how any other member was included in the Committee, which was not discussed. He further said that no member other than the member of the Syndicate, would have to be included in the Committee.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that as per the statement made by Secretary to Vice Chancellor, the meeting was pre-scheduled before the meeting of the Syndicate, as per the second proposition drawn by the office of the Vice Chancellor, when the proceedings were confirmed, the Committee was formed. It is wrong statement made by the office of the Vice Chancellor, they have to check the record whether the meeting of the Committee was convened before the confirmation of the proceedings of the Syndicate or not.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the letter was sent by Shri Varinder Singh and in response to the said letter, she had sent the proceedings of the meeting of the Syndicate. If any discrepancy or error is found in the proceedings, they could check the same with the video recording.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the sense of the views expressed by them had been twisted and a non-Syndic has been included in the Committee.

To this, the Vice Chancellor replied that nobody is twisting the recording, everything is recorded by the officials present there.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he is not talking about the officials.

The Vice Chancellor stated that when everything is recorded, two or three persons may sit together and check the recording as per videography.

Shri Varinder Singh requested that he did not know on whose part the error has occurred. But as per his opinion, whatever the minutes are prepared, these are quite different from the viewpoints/statements made by them. If the officials are unable to understand, they should be replaced with new ones who could record the minutes.

To this, the Vice Chancellor replied that two or three persons amongst the members of the Syndicate may be deputed to check the minutes with the video recordings.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it become difficult for them to go through the minutes which are circulated through online mode. Hence, it is requested that hard copy should be provided to them. He suggested that if priority paras are approved before the finalization of the complete proceedings, these priority paras should be circulated to the members of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor reiterated that from now onwards, two or three persons amongst the members of the Syndicate, may be deputed to check the resolved part of the priority paras, whether these are in order or not.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that there is no problem in circulating 3-4 approved paras on priority amongst the members of the Syndicate.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the resolved part of the proceedings should be circulated to the members of the Syndicate as it is very lengthy process to go through the whole proceedings of more than 500 pages.

The Vice Chancellor agreed that the resolved parts of the proceedings of the Syndicate would be circulated to all the members of the Syndicate.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk reiterated that four members namely, Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra, Professor Devinder Singh, Dr. Dinesh Kumar and his name (Shri Lajwant Singh

Virk), were nominated by the Syndicate for the Committee to be constituted for the purpose of granting permission to attend classes to Law students, on medical or sports grounds. Whereas the other non-Syndic, was included in the Committee.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said, as per his opinion, it might be that as one Committee was already in existence, and in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, the above mentioned four persons were nominated for the purpose of constituting a new Committee. It might be possible that these four names were included in the previously constituted Committee.

To this, the Vice Chancellor replied that, no it was not done in this way, as she has not constituted the Committee, the same was constituted after following the proper procedure by the recommending authority.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it was decided to re-constitute a new Committee for the purpose. He further said till the matter is resolved, no meetings of this Committee should be fixed.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the resolved part of the proceedings of the Syndicate should be circulated to the members of the Syndicate, whereas the process of recording discussion should be continued as per the time schedule required for the purpose.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that fee for entrance should be reasonable.

The Vice Chancellor replied that they would follow the provisions of the P.U. Calendar while taking decision on the matter pertaining to charging of fees for entrance test.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that while increasing the fee they must ensure the rationality behind the hike.

Shri Varinder Singh enquired, could they give preference to the students of P.U. Regional/Rural Centres, while allowing migration to Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies, rather than allowing migration on the basis of entrance test.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they had been told that there is a court order on this issue.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the next meeting of the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor to consider requests of students for allowing them to attend classes at Chandigarh, should not be held until the Committee is re-constituted.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk suggested that either the recommendations of the Committee should be placed before the Syndicate or the same should be approved by the Vice Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, so that the cases of the students are not delayed. It did not matter, when the Committee had been constituted rightly or wrongly, but there is no fault of the students.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the previous meeting of the Committee, all the cases were cleared, and students had paid the requisite fee.

Shri Varinder Singh said that now what could be done when the students had paid fee for permission to attend classes at Department of Laws, P.U. Chandigarh.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should go through the proceedings of the Syndicate in the first instance as Committees are being constituted only as per the decision taken in the Syndicate.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that if he proved wrong, he would be ready to resign from the post of Syndic.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

The Vice Chancellor said that she could make themselves available the written statements recorded in the proceedings of the Syndicate.

Shri Varinder Singh said that what they are meant to say, is that for example, 11 members of the Syndicate had constituted a Committee and thereafter, from amongst them, one member proposed some other name to be added in the Committee.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it would be wrong, if the Committee has been constituted by proposing the name of one particular member, by one of the members of the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor agreed to the proposal made by one member.

The Vice Chancellor replied in negative and said that nothing like that had happened. This is wrong statement; they can check the video recording of the proceedings.

**RESOLVED:** That addition of Rule 10 in Chapter XIV (g) of Migration of Students meant for LL.B. Three Year Course appearing at pages 299 and 301 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019 respectively, be made as under:

“the migration in Department of Laws, University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh, Regional Centres and Law Colleges for LL.B. Three-Year Course and 5 Year B.A./B.Com. LL.B. shall be on the basis of Entrance Test to be conducted by CET Cell in the month of July:

1. The Syllabus for the entrance test shall be based on the P.U. syllabus which the candidates have studied in their previous semesters.
2. However, so far as the fee for entrance test is concerned, the matter be got examined by verifying the facts relating to income and expenditure.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

1. a note be sent to the Department that an issue regarding deficient papers was raised and the same be referred to the Committee (already constituted) to make recommendations regarding amendments in the rules of migrations with regard to deficient subjects on the basis of discussion; and
2. the resolved parts of the proceedings of the Syndicate meetings be prepared, approved and circulated to all the members of the Syndicate for confirmation, and before that no action be taken on the decisions taken by the Syndicate.

**19.** Considered minutes of the College Development Council dated 27.12.2022 **(Appendix-XVI)**.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar, referring to page 177 at the end of the column, chart (c), where the name of Colleges whose C.D.C. fee is pending, said that he would like to enquire why this is pending from the year 2019-20, 2020-21, and what action is proposed by the University for these defaulting Colleges. He enquired as to what action is to be taken against these six defaulting Colleges.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that these are not only six Colleges, there are more than six defaulting Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar asked, why these Colleges are not paying fee? Ultimately, from the fees so deposited by the Colleges, they have to make payment to the students for their scholarship. Some decision should be taken as to what action is required to be taken against these defaulting Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu asked if only these six Colleges are the defaulters or some other Colleges who had applied for extension of affiliation.

Dr. Kirandeep Kaur said that these six Colleges are from the Colleges, which had applied for extension in affiliation.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the recommendation of the College Development Council was that these Defaulting Colleges should be directed to pay the outstanding fee immediately and it was also recommended that the payment for conduct of seminars and workshops should not be released to these Colleges. Due to non-payment of outstanding fee on the part of the Colleges, the students have to suffer in getting the payment of scholarship.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the grant of Rs.22000/- approx. allowed to these Colleges is very meagre, but in that majority of Colleges had applied for same. He said that he would like to bring to knowledge of the House that the titles and topics of the seminars, which are being conducted on "New Education Policy – Issues, Challenges & Implications", are not of the required standard/quality. One topic is "New Education Policy – 2020", which is not a concrete topic. The other topics are "NEP-2020 – Issues & Challenges", Teacher Education & NEP-2020 and one more interesting topic "Diversity, Equity, Accessibility & Inclusion". The topics and titles of these seminars are not of desired quality, for which they get the sanctioned grant. Hence, there is need to evaluate these proposals. The Colleges, which are doing excellent work, should be given commendation and for those Colleges, who are lacking in the field of excellence, should be taken to task.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that equal amount is sanctioned either for one week seminar Programme or for one day Programme. Hence, it is requested that it should be differentiated.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that there is one another College, i.e., Sant Baba Bhag Singh Sukhanand College, who had not paid salaries to their teachers from the last six months, in spite of receiving number of representations in this regard, whereas the University is sanctioning grant to this College for conducting the seminars/workshops.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that this is very important issue that the college teachers are not being paid salaries. One representation from the College of Gurusar Sidhar has also been sent to the Vice Chancellor where the salaries of teachers from the last 15

months had not been paid. On the one hand, they were talking about quality education, and on the other hand, the teachers of these Colleges were deprived of their basic right to get salaries. They had to suffer a lot in meeting their day-to-day expenses. How could they maintain the quality of education? What action, University is taking in this regard? The University should take strict action in this matter. It is only the example of one College which had been brought before the House. There are similar other Colleges, in which the teachers are facing such type of problems.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he would like to add one more issue in that, the Selection Committees should be constituted itself either from the Senate or from the University teachers, whereas the University depute persons from one College to conduct inspection of another Colleges. How could it be treated as fair, if one person from one College is deputed to check/inspect another College? The Senate, being the supreme body, should have to include the members of the Senate in the panel of the Inspection Committees or the teachers from the University should be added while constituting the Inspection Committees, so that the current problems could be resolved. Whereas the University has the tradition of constituting the Committees pertaining to Colleges, is that the Assistant Professors of Colleges have been made as member of these Inspection Committees. The persons, who had superannuated even before more than four years, have been included in the Inspection/Affiliation Committees. He further requested that Committees already constituted by the previous Dean College Development Council, should be re-constituted by removing College teachers from there. After removing College teachers, add the names of the Senators or the teachers from the University. This step would be more helpful in improving the condition of the Colleges. The surprise visit, which was initiated by then Vice Chancellor, Professor Arun K. Grover, should be re-introduced so that these issues could be resolved to some extent. The team from amongst the members of the Syndicate and Senate should be made or secondly the Affiliation/Inspection Committees should be constituted amongst the members of the Senate or from the teachers of the University. The earlier Committees constituted by the previous Dean College Development Council, should be made redundant. How could one Principal check the College of other Principal?

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that problem lies in it, is that the two or more duties of Inspection should be allocated to one person at a time. If one person is deputed to inspect more than 10 Colleges, it would pose problems.

Shri Varinder Singh said that this issue had already been discussed in the meeting of the Senate that the same is needed to be addressed. If it requires more discussion on it, it should be done to improve the condition; otherwise it would not be possible to have improvement in this direction.

The Vice Chancellor replied that she already taken care of this aspect that one person should not be deputed to conduct Inspections at more than three places.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that it had already been mentioned in the Regulations of P.U. Calendar that one teacher shall not be allowed to visit more than two Colleges for Inspection. If they would like to allow 3 teachers for the same, they should take a consensus decision in the matter.

Shri Varinder Singh reiterated that the decision regarding conduct of surprise visits should be taken. The members amongst the Syndicate and Senate should be made the part of these surprise visits. They would not claim any T.A./D.A. for these visits from the Colleges, rather the University should make arrangement of vehicles for executing these surprise visits.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that previously this issue was highly pointed out in one of the meetings of the Senate, as the University has to bear a huge expenditure for sending the



members of the Senate to the Colleges for executing these surprise visits. Hence, it was decided at that time to curb the expenditure of T.A./D.A. on the Colleges, that Principals of nearby Aided Colleges should be made the part of surprise visit teams. Previously, when he was also the member of the Syndicate, it was decided that any Senate member would not be deputed to visit any College.

Shri Varinder Singh said that on this issue, such type of decision should be taken in such a way that for the Committees to be constituted for the ensuing session should be re-constituted and the old Committees already constituted should be made redundant/nullified.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it was anticipated that these issues would be discussed on the item pertaining to minutes of the C.D.C. During the Covid-19 pandemic time, all the inspections were cancelled and thereafter, without taking permission, these inspections were re-initiated. It was for the first time that the matters regarding fixation of rates were discussed. From the year 2020 to January, 2023, the list of persons deputed for conduct of Inspections for grant affiliation, should be provided to them before the next meeting of the Syndicate. This issue is not raised for the first time, it had already been raised. They all are aware of the fact, that the chair of the previous Vice Chancellor was gone because of these reasons but nothing has been done to take action against those persons, who were involved with him (the then Vice Chancellor). It is not the matter how many persons whether two or three should be added in the constitution of the Inspection/Affiliation Committees, the rationality should be maintained. He registered his protest on the statement made by the Vice Chancellor that "nobody is honest". She should not have made such type of statement. He can say that he is honest. He did not wish to speak on this item, but on hearing the statement from the chair of the Vice Chancellor that "nobody is honest", he made his mind to speak. He said that corruption was done in these years; if the corruption was not there, then the Vice Chancellor would not have gone in such a way. He did not utter a single word that "he was not involved in any type of corruption", before the members of the Senate during the meeting of the House, continued for more than 3.5 hours. What action was proposed to be taken against the persons involved in the corruption at that time? Without placing the list of persons involved in the cases of corruption before the next meeting of the Syndicate, the agenda would not be considered. It seemed very painful to know that such type of corruption had taken place in the University. It was never happened that Professors would had been involved in the corruption. This Syndicate was constituted on the basis of zero tolerance for corruption, to examine the previous corruption cases, if they would not become a part to examine then who would do this? Secondly, a Committee should be constituted to examine those Affiliation Committees who rejected the affiliations of the Colleges. Previously, there was a Pocha Committee which used to collate the data. There were several Affiliation Committees, which rejected the grant of extension of Affiliation of various Colleges. The data related to the Committees which approved the grant of affiliation of certain Colleges, whose extension in affiliations were rejected by the Committees, should be got prepared. These two things should be placed before the forthcoming meeting of the Syndicate, in the month of April.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the said data is to be prepared by the Dean College Development Council.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that corruption cases should not be viewed with closed eyes.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that these issues should be placed in the meeting of the next month under the item Action taken report.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the working of the College Development Council is such that in the cases which have been got cleared from the Colleges, and grant has been

allocated, and it has been written that teachers approved by the Panjab University for presenting paper in allied related disciplines, keeping in view the status of the organizing body. The word “approved teachers” is objectionable, if the non-approved teacher receives the grant, then what would be done.

Shri Varinder Singh endorsed the statement made by Dr. Harpreet Singh and enquired that if he required the data since the joining of Dr. Raj Kumar as Vice Chancellor or for a period of six months or one year, should be clarified.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the year 2019, during the time of Covid-19 pandemic, the Syndicate had decided that there was no need to conduct the Inspections as the Colleges had been closed. The data from the year 2019 till the Inspections were re-started, should be provided.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the data since the joining of Dr. Raj Kumar as Vice Chancellor, should be placed before the House. They should examine the things from the initial stage, so that more clarity could be made. He said that it would take time to prepare this data, but it should be made available.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the compendium relating to the previous Affiliation Committee is ready till date, which could be made available by the Dean College Development Council, only the data mentioned above for a period of three year, should have to be prepared and attached.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he fully agreed with Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, since the year 2021, the corruption cases were raised, but no action has been taken. If they would like to take action against the corruption, they should find and dig out these cases. He said that it is not a long process for the University to collate the data of four years since the joining of Dr. Raj Kumar as Vice Chancellor. The data relating to working of the Inspection/Affiliation and Selection Committees for the last four years, should be placed before the House.

Shri Varinder Singh requested that the names of Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Sandeep Singh should be added in the constitution of the Affiliation/Inspection Committees.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the compendium of data is available with Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, he would provide the same to the office of Dean College Development Council.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said this item should be approved with only one suggestion that those teachers whose payments had been reimbursed for foreign visits for attending the international seminars etc., their approval number should be mentioned with the sanction letter. Till the mentioning of the approval number, their payments should not be released.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu asked the Dean College Development Council as to what action has been taken for the College of Guruser Sadhar?

Shri Sandeep Singh said that all the members are associated with the education system, the names of the Colleges which are not making payment of salaries have been identified and fine has been imposed on them. He enquired as to what action is proposed to be taken against these Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the provisions are existed to take action against the defaulting Colleges, in the University Calendar. There is one College of Ludhiana, where in spite of efforts by the University, the teachers of the said College are not re-instated. The teachers of Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur Cantt., have submitted their representation that they were appointed on salary of Rs.52,000/-, which was reduced to Rs.32,000/- and from

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Rs.32,000/-, the same was reduced to Rs.26,000/-. Now, they were given orders if they were interested to work on the salary of Rs.26,000/-, they could work otherwise they had no option except to leave the job.

The Vice Chancellor said that there might be some reason for reducing the salaries of these teachers.

Principal R.S. Jhanji replied that there is no reason behind reducing the salaries of these College teachers. The said College has the strength of 3000 students and they are reducing their staff strength day by day. In the Punjabi Department of the said College, they had 10 posts, which had been reduced.

The Vice Chancellor asked, why action has not been taken against the College?

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it is mentioned in the conditions of granting affiliation to the College that till the payment of salaries and other benefits to the teachers, the College could not be granted extension in affiliation.

Dr. Mukesh Arora replied that only three Colleges have been granted extension in affiliation and the extension in affiliation of the remaining Colleges have been kept pending.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it was for the first time that Colleges have been sent letters that organization of events etc., would be reduced if they failed to recruit staff and make payment of salaries to the teachers. About 15 Principals were also called and message was given to the Managements of the Colleges that some of the courses would be closed from the next academic session. Without giving any one chance to explain his/her position, they could not punish. The Principals were called in the presence of the Dean College Development Council and they were asked to complete the shortcomings pointed out by the Committees, if they failed to clear the discrepancies/shortcomings, their particular class would be closed and their units of sections would be reduced. They were directed to pay full salaries to the existing staff. For running the four-four units of classes/sections, there was a requirement of 32 teachers, whereas the Colleges had the strength of six teachers, who were also not getting salaries. The Committee instead of imposing the condition of recruitment of 32 teachers; recommended that out of four units of one class, they could reduce to one unit. Only two meetings of the Affiliation Committees could be conducted for granting the extension in affiliation for the session 2022-23. If at this stage, they would not allow extension in affiliation, more than 2.5 lac students would be affected.

The Vice Chancellor said that there should be set procedure for disbursement of salaries. Salaries should be transferred to the accounts of the teachers and submit the bank statements in support of the disbursements.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that proper mechanism, which is to be evolved, is that the mandatory *pro forma* should be got filled by the Affiliation Committee before 31<sup>st</sup>October, and thereafter the documents pertaining to Form-16, salary statements of the faculty, service book record, provident fund record, etc. The inspection should be got done on receipt of the duly filled mandatory *pro forma* with all the supporting documents. By following the set procedure, it is not that they could achieve 100% results; at least they could get 60% results. These defaulting Colleges should be issued warning letters stating therein that if they will not fulfil the requisite conditions, the University would not send Inspection teams for granting them affiliation. They should be directed to reduce the units of courses and full disbursement of salaries to teachers, so that the Inspection teams could be sent to Colleges for granting extension in affiliation. There are two ways, one is to shut down the course with least strength of students and the second is to give them the opportunity to run the courses, as at this stage in the mid of the session, they could not affect the education of more than 2.5 lac students. The action which was recommended was

that for grant of forthcoming affiliations for the session 2023-24, the warning letters may be issued by the office of Dean College Development Council. The previous Syndicate on the directions of the Senate had issued disapproval letters to the four Colleges under section 13.1. Even 13 Government Colleges, had been issued letters of disaffiliation for the first time, with its endorsement to Director, Higher Education and Director, Higher Education said that they are running new courses without recruitment of staff. These four notorious Colleges of Punjab, had moved to High Court and got the stay orders of *status-quo*. The Colleges had not sufficient legal expertise with them and owing to this very reason; they failed to plead their cases in the courts. He requested that the stay from the High Court should be got vacated.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu requested that stay of the High Court should be got vacated at the earliest.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that as stated by Principal R.S. Jhanji, at Colleges where officiating Principals are not posted, the examination and evaluation centres should not be created at these Colleges.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the College Development Council dated 27.12.2022, as per Appendix, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

1. the list of persons deputed for conduct of Inspections for grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation from June 2018 to January, 2023, and the data relating to the Committees which approved the grant of affiliation of certain Colleges, whose extension in affiliations were rejected by the Committees, be got prepared by the Dean, College Development Council and placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting;
2. in future, Action Taken Report on the decisions taken by the Syndicate be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting; and
3. The teachers whose payments had been reimbursed for foreign visits for attending the international seminars etc., their approval number be mentioned with the sanction letter, and till the approval number is not provided, their payments be not released.

**20.** Considered recommendation (Item No.9) of the Committee dated 22.02.2023 (**Appendix-XVII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to recommend an appropriate mechanism as an interim arrangement, for smooth conduct of various academic activities of the University, and

**RESOLVED:** 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>
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.	“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)
Candidates who have studied computer	

<p>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>**5% Concession is admissible in eligibility requirement to SC/ST/ BC/ PwD candidates.</p>	<p>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> <p>**5% Concession is admissible in eligibility requirement to SC/ST/ BC/PwD candidates.</p>
--	---

- 21.** Considered the following proposal submitted by Professor Supinder Kaur, President, Panjab University Teacher’s Association (PUTA) vide e-mail dated 27.02.2023 (**Appendix-XVIII**) as decided in the General Body Meeting (GBM) of PUTA dated 17.01.2023 that:-

“the contribution to Panjab University Teacher’s Association Welfare Scheme be enhanced from existing amount of Rs.600/- to amount equivalent to half-day gross salary of each member, on the relevant month in which the deduction is to be made.”

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 24) (**Appendix-XVIII**) had considered the Resolution passed by the GBM of PUTA dated 16.09.2016 and enhanced the subscription to PUTA Welfare scheme from Rs.300/- to Rs.600/-.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the representation received from the President, PUTA in the form of resolution is placed for consideration. Firstly, that Panjab University Teachers’ Association works in accordance with the constitution. Under Article 4 of the constitution, it is clearly mentioned that for the members of the teaching staff of the Panjab University, including the teaching staff of the University Regional Centres, whereas, no staff member of Regional Centre is included in it. Firstly, it should be resolved that PUTA should be consisted of teachers of Regional Centres of Hoshiarpur, Kauni, Muktsar and Ludhiana. Under the teacher welfare scheme, half day salaries of teachers are deducted to meet the exigencies of mishaps. This item has been placed after passing from the G.B.M. of PUTA, whereas teachers of Regional Centres of P.U. were not included. They should include the teachers of Regional Centres of P.U. into the PUTA in the first instance, and thereafter, this item should be placed for consideration, because the teachers of P.U. Regional Centres are the part and parcel of PUTA, as the uniform pattern either of selection process, scheme syllabi, salaries or academic and CAS promotions is followed in accordance with the teachers of Panjab University departments. He humbly submitted that they should be included in the PUTA.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the agenda item related to PUTA is for enhancement in contribution of Rs.600/- to half day salary for welfare of teachers. Firstly they should agree on it and thereafter consider additional agenda for the same. Secondly, the teachers of PU Regional Centres should be made the part of the PUTA Welfare Scheme.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra while endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Professor Jatinder Grover, said that teachers of P.U. Regional Centres should be the members of the PUTA. Their share of contribution should also be incorporated in PUTA Welfare Scheme.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it is the separate issue whether the teachers of P.U. Regional Centres should be made the part of PUTA or not.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it is not under the provisions of the P.U. Calendar to include teachers of P.U. Regional Centres to PUTA.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter related to inclusion of members of P.U. Regional Centres to PUTA is a separate issue.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the item should be approved and the suggestions of the members should be included in the resolved part. When the members of P.U. Regional Centres would be made the part of the PUTA, then they would automatically become the part of the PUTA Welfare Scheme.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it should be approved in the item that members of P.U. Regional Centres would be included in the PUTA.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is not disagreeing with the fact that members of P.U. Regional Centres should be made the part of the PUTA. But the recommendation regarding inclusion of members of P.U. Regional Centres in PUTA should be forwarded through the GBM of the PUTA.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that the contribution of Rs.600/- towards PUTA Welfare Scheme, should be enhanced to half day salary. The proposal/resolution are two separate things. Resolution can be moved by any Fellow for the consideration of Senate and Syndicate. The proposal letter is signed by both President PUTA and Secretary PUTA. He said that he is not against the letter, but a proposal should be made in the form of proposal. This was only the request of the PUTA and not the proposal. The proposal is only to be moved by the Fellow and not by Dr. Amarjeet Singh Naura as Secretary, PUTA. Professor Supinder Kaur, President, PUTA, could move the proposal as Fellow and could attach the related documents in support of her request as documentary evidences. But herein, only the letter from PUTA is enclosed. Secondly, it would be astonished to know that the said amount is deducted from the P.F. and if they propose to name it as Panjab University Teacher Welfare Scheme, there would be no problem in it if teachers of P.U. Regional Centres wish to opt for the scheme. When the contribution is to be made in the Finance Department of the University, why not it should be named as Panjab University Teacher Welfare Scheme. There is no problem if they would deduct one-day salary for the purpose, who opt for the same and resultantly the problem of P.U. Regional Centres would be solved. It is wrong that on the plea that teachers of P.U. Regional Centres are not the members of PUTA, they would not be considered to be part of the Welfare Scheme. Either the scheme is to be proposed by PUTA or from the Panjab University, the teachers should be benefitted. It should be taken care of that on one e-mail received under the signatures of two persons, they considered it as proposal. Under the Regulations of P.U. Calendar, the proposal can only be submitted by the member of the Senate. The suggestion that the teachers of P.U. Regional Centres should be included and the other suggestion made by him that Panjab University Teachers' Welfare Scheme, should be initiated, should be taken into consideration if the amount is being deducted by the Panjab University. For the purpose, a Committee of University teachers should be constituted to examine and make proposal for the same. It is right that earlier also Syndicate had enhanced the subscription from Rs.300/- to Rs.600/- he is not saying that this work cannot be done by the Syndicate, hence it should be examined.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, the way the papers have been placed on table, is not technically correct. The proposal cannot be moved in this way. Under the Regulations of P.U. Calendar, there are several points mentioned in it for moving the proposal by any Fellow. The teachers of the University would have to opt for subscription of half day salary; otherwise, their subscription would not be deducted. If the option is to be given by the University teachers, in that case, the Panjab University Teachers Welfare Scheme should be implemented, as also stated by Dr. Gurmeet Singh. The teachers, who would opt for the subscription, would automatically get the benefit of the scheme. Last year, due to Covid-19, their colleague from P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur had died and no one pleaded for appointment on the basis of compassionate. Dr. Parveen Goyal made several requests through the G.B.M. but PUTA did not respond to his requests. Their main concern is only if the University implements the Panjab University Teachers' Scheme, it would be implemented for all the teachers including teachers of P.U. Regional Centres. All the teachers should have the right to get option. As also stated by Dr. Gurmeet Singh, can this proposal be adopted in this way. Previously it was adopted by the Syndicate. But on the request of the PUTA, the Finance Office could not deduct the salaries only on the basis of the request of PUTA. The salaries of the teachers can only be deducted if the same is approved by the Governing body. After the decision of the Governing body, the teachers would have to opt for the scheme, it would not be made mandatory.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are talking about what mechanism is to be evolved for taking decision in the matter.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh and Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that this scheme should be implemented by Panjab University rather on the basis of request made by President, PUTA as some teachers are not the members of PUTA. If they opt for the Scheme irrespective of the fact, whether they are the members of PUTA or not, they would automatically become the member of Panjab University Teachers' Welfare Scheme.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if he opts for the Scheme by giving his consent, and after 10 years if he opted out of from the membership of PUTA, he would only be the member of the scheme.

Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that if the teachers of P.U. Regional Centre wish to become member of this scheme, they should be allowed to do so. If they would not allow them to be the member of the Scheme, then a separate constituency would be constituted out of them for representing their case.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said as intimated by Dr. Parveen Goyal, in the meeting of the GBM of PUTA, as per the constitution of PUTA, the teachers of P.U. Regional Centres can send their representative for the meeting. But the information regarding meetings was never sent to them. If after inviting them and obtaining their signatures, it would become a collective request. Now, it seems that it is only for the teachers of Panjab University. Hence, being their colleagues, they should also be made the members of the Scheme.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that all the teachers of P.U. Regional Centres should become the part of the Panjab University Teachers' Welfare Scheme on the basis of their consent by exercising the option to subscribe.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that all University teachers including teachers of P.U. Regional Centres can opt for this scheme and they had no objection for subscription of half day salary for the same.

Dr. Harpeet Singh Dua said that he had no problem if the teachers of P.U. Regional Centres would become the member of Welfare Scheme. The concern is that the proposal of including the teachers of P.U. Regional Centres should be forwarded through PUTA as this

item had been placed by PUTA. This item should be placed through PUTA by including the teachers of P.U. Regional Centres as it has its separate entity

The Vice Chancellor said that irrespective of the fact that item is placed on the request of the PUTA, but basically it is desired that Panjab University Teachers' Welfare Scheme should be implemented by the Panjab University and all the teachers including teachers of P.U. Regional Centres should also be made the part of the scheme. She stated that this item is approved in principle and in the matter, F.D.O. would examine.

**RESOLVED:** That Panjab University Teachers' Scheme for the welfare of all the teachers, including P.U. Regional/Rural Centres, be approved, in principle, but the modalities of the Scheme be evolved by the Finance & Development Officer.

**22.**

Considered if:

- (i) the result of the test for the post of Stenographers (English) to be filled through competitive test in Stenography of internal Steno-typists held on 03.03.2023, be approved.
- (ii) the ranking list of following successful candidate as at Sr. No.1 to 5 according to merit of Stenography test, be approved for filling up 50% competitive posts of Stenographers for present vacancies:

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name	Number of Mistakes	Marks out of 500 i.e. 500 minus number of mistakes
1.	02	Ms. Preeti Deptt. of Computer Science & Application	11	489
2.	05	Sh. Rishi Sablok, O/o the P.R.O.	15	485
3.	04	Ms. Parvesh Kumari Deptt. of Biotechnology	16	484
4.	03	Ms. Arti Sharma Accounts Branch	16	484
5.	01	Sh. Sanjeev Kumar Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital	19	481

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

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the result of the test for the post of Stenographers (English) to be filled through competitive test in Stenography of internal Steno-typists held on 03.03.2023, be approved; and
- (ii) the ranking list of following successful candidates as at Sr. No.1 to 5 according to merit of Stenography test, be approved for filling up 50% competitive posts of Stenographers for present vacancies:

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name	Number of Mistakes	Marks out of 500 i.e. 500 minus number
---------	----------	------	--------------------	--



				<b>of mistakes</b>
1.	02	Ms. Preeti Deptt. of Computer Science & Application	11	489
2.	05	Sh. Rishi Sablok, O/o the P.R.O.	15	485
3.	04	Ms. Parvesh Kumari Deptt. of Biotechnology	16	484
4.	03	Ms. Arti Sharma Accounts Branch	16	484
5.	01	Sh. Sanjeev Kumar Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital	19	481

**23.** Considered report dated 08.09.2020 submitted by the Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University, Chandigarh in respect of the complaint made by Chairman, C.G.M. College, Mohlan and Chairman, Management Committee and Governing Body, National Degree College, Chowarian Wali (Fazilka) against Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib and Senator, P.U. for having taken bribe.

**NOTE:** An office note was enclosed.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the after going through the report, it has been observed that it is full of flaws. The C.V.O. had not recommended any action on the affidavit submitted by the complainant. In one of case of RTI, wherein forensic report had been sought for matching the signatures, whereas in this case no report from the forensic expert has been sought for matching the signatures of the complainant. Interestingly, if they go through the report of the C.V.O., they would notice the signatures of the complainant can easily be matched. In his opinion, they cannot accept this report, as the report itself is full of flaws. Referring to page No.210 and 211, he stated that the signatures of Mr. Gurpreet Singh at the pages mentioned above are the same which are appended on the complaint. They are not forensic experts yet they can find out that the signatures appended at both the places are of the same person. At pages 210, 211, 212 and 213, the signatures of Mr. Gurpreet Singh are matched with the signatures made on the complaint. For matching these signatures, there is no need of even any forensic expert as these can be matched by them also. If this report is accepted as such, it would be give a signal that nothing is being done to curb corruption in the University. In some cases, the University is going to the extent of seeking of report of forensic experts, whereas in other cases, no action is proposed on the complaints made by annexing affidavits. He is of the firm opinion that this report should be accepted as such.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that if C.V.O. had submitted the report, he might have submitted the same on the basis of some evidences. After going through the report, it has been observed that he had submitted the report as no concrete and substantial evidences were submitted by the complainant of both the Colleges. Only affidavit was submitted by the Chairman, C.G.M College, Mohlan. Therefore, in the absence of insufficient evidence, no action could be recommended by the Standing Committee wherein the remarks of the previous S.V.C. were also recorded. There were number of corruption cases which are also pending against the previous Vice Chancellor. They could not enquire anything from the previous Vice Chancellor, hence this report should be accepted due to lack of sufficient evidences.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if they have to accept all the reports of the Chief Vigilance Officer, then it would not be correct.

To this, Professor Jatinder Grover said that they are not talking about accepting all the reports of the Chief Vigilance Officer.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that enquiry should be got conducted through the retired judge.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the period of six years had expired and he had not paid any visit to these Colleges.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu had been retired and even the management of the College had been changed. This report should be accepted without taking into account the note of the Secretary to Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that this could not be done in this manner. If they had obtained the affidavit from the complainant, they should take action on the complaint. The penalty should be imposed on the College and College itself would explain the reality of the matter.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that cash payment of Rs.9 lacs had been disbursed by making entries on the day-book. This can be done by any College. He (Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu) himself entered the amount in the day-book.

Shri Varinder Singh said that they should not move in the direction that one had paid the money to other or not. As of now both the officials had been retired and management had been changed, both the parties are not interested to fight in the matter and the University is moving in the direction to take action.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if this report is accepted as such, they should not say in the meetings that investigation against corruption cases at the time of the then Vice Chancellor should be initiated.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that in this case on 12<sup>th</sup> August, 2017, three members had gone from the University for inspection/surprise visit, and thereafter, whatever give and take, was conducted or not. On 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2018, the complaint was made by Chairman, National College for Girls and C.G.M. College, Mohlan. After the complaint, the verification was made and thereafter, in September, 2020, the C.V.O., had submitted the report that the record of Rs.9 lacs was found entered in the day-book, but no concrete and substantial evidence was found. Hence, action was recommended. Thereafter, the S.V.C. had remarked that "It may be ascertained as if College had made any such complaint made if any. On receipt of reply the matter may be considered to be reported to Syndicate and (i) closure of the case and (ii) appropriate legal action against this College for complaint, if found fake and false and benefit of any merit". There are two things that the reputation of the Panjab University has been tarnished not only from the Faculty, but also from the Principal and in this matter, they should take action against the College. The surprise visit was conducted on 12<sup>th</sup> August, 2017, whatever dealing of give and take was held, and the matter was reported to the Syndicate, after the same was placed before the Affiliation Committee. The matter was approved in the Syndicate, when it was placed before the Senate and there, some observation was made and thereafter, complaint was made on 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2018. After that, the complainant had moved to Court, this case might have been pending in the Court.

To this, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that this case was not pending in the Court.

Dr. Parveen Goyal replied that this case was not pending in the Court, the decision related to grant of affiliation might be pending in the Court. He had filed a case in the Court regarding non-grant of affiliation, as the affiliation had been approved in the Syndicate and in the meeting of the Senate, some member had made observations, resultantly, the affiliation was kept pending. If they felt that in this case, the report of Panjab University is badly affected, they should take strict action against the College who had posed action against the faculty of the University.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that after going through the details of the matter, it has come to his notice that as all the transactions were held in cash, and all are aware of the fact that bribe is always taken in cash. This could not be the base that no record of cash transactions was available. Hence, no action can be taken for accepting bribe. There is one other aspect that anybody could enter the record in the day-book. In the previous line, it had been mentioned that payment was made and entry was done in the day-book, whereas in the next line, it had been recorded that no concrete or substantial proof was found. If it was right or wrong entry has been made, but it was considered as evidence. If the report was made against the College and it had tarnished the image of the College, in that case, they should take action. If the view point of the delinquent official is right, then there should be no matter of raising objection that College had made the complaint, later on which was withdrawn. They all are aware that his (Dr. Sandhu) reputation has already been tarnished; hence, he requested that action should be taken against the College.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that action should be taken against the College for filing a false complaint. If a false complaint is filed against any one, he/she would file a cross complaint against it. It is never happened that cross complaint is not filed. After going through the report, it came to their notice that first time 10 members visited the College and later 3 members visited the College as a surprise visit. Why no allegation was filed on any other member of the Committee.

Shri Varinder Singh said that both the parties are not interested to fight. The College is also not interested to pursue the complaint case and moreover, the official had also been retired. This case can be lingered on for 15 years or more. Their main motive is to close this case as six years had already been gone. They should not play politics on the matter that one party or the second party should be punished, as both the parties are not interested to pursue their case.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they all should think before using words for a person as the enquiry report as well as of the police, had already been annexed. If the police had proved him innocent, then what would be the situation and the words used by them.

To this, Principal R.S. Jhanji and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the enquiry up to the level of I.G. of Police had been conducted.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the issues raised by the members that entry of cash transaction was made in the day-book, are correct. Had they gone through the report of the Committees which visited the College? They should talk about the merits and demerits of the case and should be examined the same in briefly whether any concrete statement is available in it. Referring to page 294 where report of S.S.P. Faridkot was sent to S.S.P. Fazilka stating therein that they are to inform that from the office of respected Inspector General of Police, Faridkot and respected Director, Bureau of Investigation, Punjab (Chandigarh), requests were sent to examine. After investigation, the documents indicating therein that in the complaints, no truth had been revealed, so these were sent back to Director, Bureau of Investigation, Chandigarh. He urged that after going through the communication between S.S.P. Faridkot and S.S.P., Fazilka, it has been found that no truth was revealed.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Shri Varinder Singh said that after going through the report of S.S.P., it has been observed that the same had been sent to I.G. of Police. The whole contents of the report had not been mentioned, rather some extract was given in it. He urged that the report of Chief Vigilance Officer should be accepted and the case which was lingering on from the last six years should be closed.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that both the reports either of the Chief Vigilance Office or of the Inspector General of Police, are matched. He agreed with the statement that report of the Inspection Committees, should be placed before the House and action should be taken to meet the irregularities of the College, e.g., appointment of teachers, funds and so on. There should not have any doubt when the contents of the report of the C.V.O. and Inspector General of Police are completely matched. If the report of the C.V.O. was not matched with the report of the Inspector General of Police, then they could say that report of the C.V.O. is not upto the mark and should not be accepted.

To this, Shri Varinder Singh said that office of C.V.O. of the University has no required infrastructure to conduct the enquiries, and they are not much capable as they have limited resources.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it would be wrong to consider that Vigilance team has not required resources and forensic experts, then nothing could be done in the matter.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that S.S.P. was also of the opinion that action was to be taken against the person who has been termed as accused. But in the meantime, he was transferred from the station and the application was forwarded to I.G. of Police and further it was enquired by the Director, Bureau of Investigation. The report from him has come in favour in this or that way, but now at this stage, the report of the C.V.O., based on the investigation done by the Director, Bureau of Investigation. But in the initial enquiry, it could not be ascertained that no such incident had occurred. Whereas, the C.V.O. report says that insufficient documents were annexed. Insufficient documents meant, sometimes it happens in the Court that the benefit of doubt is being given to the accused. So, it is a kind of case where benefit of doubt had been given. They cannot come and say that it is the hon'ble acquittal. It is not such type of case where they would close the file on the ground that it is the honorable acquittal. He suggested that as the accused is no more in the Senate, and even the Management Committee has already been changed, it would be a futile exercise if they further linger on this case. Besides above, rest is in the hands of the House, whatever they want to decide on the matter.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they would like to close this case, they should not talk about corruption free. Hence, it would be much matter if all the cases with the C.V.O. should be recommended to be closed.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that they all are saying that report of the C.V.O. should be accepted but action against the complainant should not be initiated. If the action would be initiated against the complainant, this matter would linger on and it would not be considered as closed for Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there are two things, firstly that as they were no longer as members, hence they should be acquitted.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that he meant that as the management Committee had also been changed, in both ways, it can be closed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in corruption cases, they cannot give signal like this, he further pointed out while referring to page 202 where C.V.O. had submitted the report and further at page 296, C.V.O. had written a letter to S.S.P. Fazilka, where he could not

understand as what was the role of C.V.O. in writing a letter to S.S.P. whereas C.V.O. was conducting an independent enquiry. Why C.V.O. was interested to know whether the police complaint was registered or not. These offices either of Police or the University has their own independent working. In most of the cases, the University receives the direction from the Police that it is their internal matter, hence it could be got examined internally at the level of the University. If anything was required to be sent to Police, it had to be written by the Registrar, how C.V.O. could write. Being an independent officer, C.V.O. should have no interest in knowing the judgement of the Police. He was not sure whether the report of the C.V.O. was attached with the letter sent to Police.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that recently, the matter was discussed that report of the C.V.O. of the University was made on the basis of report of the S.S.P. The C.V.O. had submitted its report much before the report of the S.S.P.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that when the report was submitted by C.V.O., the matter was also reported to S.S.P., Fazilka. Later on the matter was forwarded to S.S.P., Faridkot.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that report of the C.V.O. was submitted independently in the year 2018. In the meantime, the complainant had contacted the Police and no final outcome was received from the Police. Whereas, the C.V.O. had reassured that accused had not involved in any financial fraud. If they question, why the C.V.O. had written letter to Police, it should be sent through the Registrar, there he would like to make it clear, in most of the cases, where even MoUs which were required to be signed by the Registrar, were signed by the Chairpersons of the department concerned. For example, if they authorize Dean College Development Council to take decisions with regard to Colleges, if some matter would come from the Court, it would be addressed to the Registrar rather than Dean College Development Council. The C.V.O. had submitted his independent report and the Police also had submitted their independent report, both these reports were not interlinked. C.V.O. had only written a letter to the Police, it is very simple case, it is up to them if they want to linger on. The fact that S.S.P. had been transferred could not be established as he did not find any supporting document pertaining to it.

To this, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it should be resolved in the proceedings of today's meeting that FIR may be lodged against the College for providing the wrong affidavit.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that reports of the Affiliation Committees should be sought from the College as per provisions of P.U. Calendar. The action may be proposed to be taken as per the provisions of P.U. Calendar. The police had not made University as a party of the complaint lodged against Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu. He had independently handled the complaint, defamation had been faced by him and not by the University. The allegations levelled against the University would be examined under the provisions contained under section 11.1. and 11.2 of P.U. Calendar.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it is the later decision to take as to what action would be recommended to be taken for filing a false complaint.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the reports submitted by C.V.O. and Police should be considered.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if reports are to be considered then action should also be taken against the College which had submitted wrong affidavit.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that action would be recommended on the basis of documents.

Shri Varinder Singh replied that documents are also available with them.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that nothing could be evolved from this, in spite of long debate and discussion on it.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the document stating that S.S.P. was transferred, should be placed before the House.

Shri Varinder Singh said that when both mutually agreed, what action could be taken by the University. Could the action to disaffiliate the College be taken on the ground that the College had made false complaint?

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the matter to grant affiliation for co-education status to the College was placed before the House, and the same was not accepted on the basis of this false complaint. Ultimately, the matter was sent to the High Court and the High Court had passed stay orders. There is a lot of arguments for the College as well because they had already got the stay orders against their cancellation of affiliation and the stay orders are still continuing. It meant that there were certain things which are in their favour. The issue is - when both the parties did not want to go against each other, as of now, it may be settled once for all. If it would be lingering on, as suggested by some of the members that action should be initiated against the College, then action would be taken also against the officials of the University. The complaint was against one particular person and not even against the Committee has not signed the order of cancellation of affiliation. He further said that all the documents are not annexed with the case.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they should accept the report but not on the ground that complaint has been withdrawn by the complainant. But it is wrong to say that the enquiring bodies, either of the University or of the Police had submitted wrong reports.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that at page 235, an affidavit is placed, which meant that they would enter in the domain of law, in that condition the provisions of the Calendar would not prevail. If wrong affidavit is filed by him, the provisions of the Calendar would not prevail; rather, Sections of I.P.C. would apply. It was clear cut mentioned in I.P.C. that for filing wrong affidavit, criminal complaint would be filed, due to this very reason, the affidavits are sought in the legal matters in the Court. The logic behind seeking the affidavit is only to initiate criminal proceedings against the incumbent who had provided wrong information in the affidavit. Hence, a criminal report should be filed against the College for filing the wrong affidavit, otherwise it has no merit in obtaining affidavits in other matters of the University also.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that if the wrong affidavit had been filed, as per the suggestion of learned friend, action should be taken. In the same way, if the complaint has been filed in the Police Station and at the later stage, the complaint is found false and fabricated, the accused has the remedy to file an application under section 182. In this case, police complaint has been registered and Director of Investigation Bureau has granted the benefit of doubt and acquitted him. Was the application moved under Section 182? The police had not taken any action on it, he, therefore, suggested that when a Government organization did not bother to take action, why should the University?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that why University is bearing this burden from the last six years? Why the C.V.O. had been deputed from the year 2020 to conduct the enquiry?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the Police had submitted its report in the year 2022, what University would do in the matter?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that why C.V.O. has been deputed for the enquiry?

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

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

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that this matter is pertaining Panjab University and being the Public University, this matter should be sent to Police.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the matter of corruption belonging to persons with their personal contacts has surfaced, then they recommend that case should be closed. When the allegations were levelled against the previous Vice Chancellor, it was recommended that inquiry by the CBI may be conducted. The members of SFS also represented and submitted their memorandum that action should be taken against the accused.

The Vice Chancellor said that on the report of the C.V.O., the comments of Secretary to Vice Chancellor are very much clear that "this case may be closed and appropriate legal action against the College for complaint, if found fake, has to be taken. Hence they would take the decision accordingly and as per the report of the C.V.O., the case be stands closed but for taking the action against the College, a Committee would be constituted which will examine the matter.

Shri Varinder Singh stated that action cannot be taken as per the comments of the Secretary to Vice Chancellor. If this is so, then a fresh enquiry of the whole case should be re-conducted.

To this, the Vice Chancellor replied that affidavit has been annexed with the complaint of the College.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the University did not get any evidence in support of the complaint.

Shri Varinder Singh said that if this decision is to be taken, in that case, complete report should be deferred and enquiry may be conducted again. The reason is that this report is lacking complete documents in support of which the accused has been acquitted. He urged that complete documents should be placed before the House for taking action.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that it would be better if complete documents related to the enquiry are placed before the House.

Shri Varinder Singh said that this report should not be accepted. If this report would be accepted, he would not be in its favour that report with half of the contents is accepted.

The Vice Chancellor said that consideration of item is deferred and the same will be placed in the House with complete documents on the basis of which the accused has been acquitted.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the documents on the basis of which the accused has been acquitted are available in the file, which has been seen by all the members. They should be asked as to what document, they are seeking.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he would like to speak on this, but he is compelled to speak that persons from the University had supported the allegations in their statements. The complete enquiry should be placed before the House, as to on what ground, the accused has been acquitted.

**RESOLVED:** That consideration of item 23 on the agenda, be deferred and the same be again placed before the Syndicate with all the relevant documents on the basis of which Dr. Iqbal Singh Sandhu has been acquitted.

- 24.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 16.02.2023 (**Appendix-XX**) constituted by the Dean Student Welfare to look into the request of Ambedkar Students' Association (ASA) to add respectable title "Mata" before Savitribai Phule Hall (Girls Hostel No.5), P.U. Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** 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".

- 25.** Considered if, the Intellectual Property Right Policy, 2022 (**Appendix-XXI**) of Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP) of the Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he could not understand, who had framed the Policy related Intellectual Property Right Policy, 2022 and on what basis the Policy has framed.

It was informed that this Policy has been framed by the Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP).

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that were these documents prepared by the University or has been obtained from some other sources as the names printed on the annexure are not legible.

The Vice Chancellor replied that this policy has been framed by the Faculty of the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, while referring to page 314, at point 1(d), said that "having experience in technology, commercialization or industry expert and one legal adviser with experience in IPR, may be constituted by the Vice Chancellor". Some designation should be specifically defined under the term "industry expert". Point 1(d) defines that "if there is a dispute in ownership, a minimum of four members Committee be constituted for two or more faculty members, alumni of institute, having experience in technology, commercialization or industry expert". The designation and level of the person to be deputed as industry expert should be specifically defined in appropriate terms.

It was informed that crux of the case is that industry person, who has expertise in I.P.R., used to become as member of the Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the relevant field of the industry person should be mentioned in the I.P.R. Policy. In similar cases, a case had come before the Syndicate of the year 2019, where a Post-doctoral degree was to be awarded to the Principal of Architecture College, the Committee so formed at that time, had no relevance with the subject/field.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar replied that, at that time, this matter was rejected by the Committee in which he was also the member, because the subject expert from the field of nanotechnology was included in the Committee instead of person having the expertise from the architectural background.

The Vice Chancellor said that it had been clearly mentioned that a person with the experience of having IPR, may be included in the Committee to be constituted by Vice Chancellor on the recommendation of Director, CIIPP.



Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as per the suggestion of Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, the referred clause may be replaced as “Industry expert of the relevant area” or “relevant industry expert”.

**The Vice Chancellor agreed to it.**

Dr. Parveen Goyal, while referring point 1(c), said that it is mentioned that “if a product or IPR is developed by the innovators not using any institute facility outside office hours (staff and faculty) or not as a part of the curriculum of the student, then IPR will be entirely owned by Inventors.” It cannot be considered that a person is the owner of a particular patent which is developed by him after office hours with the available infrastructure with him, and he is only one who can commercialize it. It is not to be done in that way. Point 1 (c) refers in this way, how it is possible to define it. If any faculty, who is associated with Panjab University, develops any patent, in that case, P.U. would be the only assignee/owner of the product and the liability of the same would be accrued to P.U. Point No.4 (c) reads that “financial assistance for protection of I.P.R. against.....”

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua interrupted and said that firstly point 1(c) should be considered.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that point referred by Dr. Parveen Goyal pertaining to point (c) for any project allotted to any person who is associated as faculty of the University, which a person got because of the name of the Panjab University, is for the Panjab University.

It was clarified that it has been written in it only because if any one after collaboration with industry, prepares a common product, in that case, industry also wishes its own benefit. The spirit behind it is that, this product has become more productive by making interaction with the faculty.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he fully agreed with Secretary to Vice Chancellor, for tie-up collaborations with Industries, MoUs are to be signed, the said clause could be added in the MoU, but it should not be added in the I.P.R. Policy, if at the stage when the honorarium of the product, would be credited, in that case, the CIIPP could not charge any amount.

It was informed that it was clearly mentioned in the I.P.R. policy that if some product is developed in collaboration with industry, industry does not wish to give amount of profit to any other, hence if extra benefit is to be given to the University, industry would not be motivated to work with the University.

**The Vice Chancellor said that the issue on point 1(c) may be referred to Committee for re-examining.**

Dr. Parveen Goyal, while referring to point 2(b), said that it has been written that IPR Committee would comprise of “at least four faculty members of Panjab University from Sciences, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Engineering and Law domains. He suggested that “Social Sciences” should be added in the clause at point 2(b).

To this, several members pointed out that “Social Sciences” could not be included in it.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that departments should be given some scope, if there is discontentment for some particular product, they should have easy approach for the same. The committee recommended for providing support, is also to be constituted by CIIPP, the clause relating to resolving of grievances by the Vice Chancellor or by the

Syndicate, should be incorporated. He urged that a provision for redressal of grievances should be made.

The Vice Chancellor said that this policy has been passed through several stages, the I.P.R. policy and the start-up policy has been introduced by Ministry of Industries at national level and on its basis, the I.P.R. policy of the University has been framed. Firstly, the draft was put up before this Committee and thereafter the same was placed before the MoU Committee and later on the draft of this policy was sent to the senior Professors of the University for vetting. It has gone through several steps.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is agreed that the draft has been passed through several stages and now it has been placed before the House for giving input. He suggested that other institutions did not have any scope for placing the draft before their Governing bodies, but the University has the provision to do so. While referring to point (h) at page 316, which says that "Director, CIIPP can allow funding up to Rs.25,000/- per teacher for this earning against application for a teacher of the University". The word 'per teacher' should be replaced with 'per project' as some teacher can have one or more projects.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that as per the clause mentioned at point (h) of page 316, the CIIPP wishes that ceiling of Rs.25,000/- may be allowed to Director, CIIPP and Rs.25,0000/- to the Committee.

**The Vice Chancellor said that consideration of this item is referred back to the Committee.**

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that at page 316 under the heading "Legal Jurisdiction", the Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh should be replaced with "Chandigarh jurisdiction" only as Punjab and Haryana High Court would be meant that case could be filed in Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh. This should be replaced as "jurisdiction of Chandigarh only".

**RESOLVED:** That, in view of the above discussion taken place, the matter, be referred back to the Committee for re-consideration.

- 26.** Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 21.02.2023 (**Appendix-XXII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that show-cause notice issued to Dr. Vijayta Dani Chadha, Centre for Nuclear Medicines, be withdrawn, as the Committee does not find any insubordination on the part of Dr. Vijayata Dani Chadha and is satisfied with the reasons and the reply given by her to the show-cause notice. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXII**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 13.08.2022 Para 27 (**Appendix-XXII**) considered the matter regarding casual and irresponsible approach/attitude on the part of the concerned Chairperson of Centre for Nuclear Medicine had:-

**RESOLVED:** That a show cause notice be issued to Dr. Vijayta Dani Chadha, Assistant Professor, Centre for Nuclear Medicine and explanation be sought within a period of 7 days.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a High Powered Committee be constituted to enquire into the matter.

Initiating discussion, Professor Jatinder Grover stated that, on this issue, a Committee was constituted and two works were assigned to the Committee, first one was to examine the reply received from Dr. Vijayta Dani Chadha, Assistant Professor, Centre for Nuclear Medicine, and second was to examine the reply received from Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Harish Kumar and Professor Sanjeev Gautam in response to show cause notice served to them by the Syndicate. The Committee resolved "the Committee desired the office to put up rest of the cases, giving details about show-cause notice issued to the faculty members and the reply submitted by each and every faculty member for consideration of Committee for examining the same, one by one, in the next meeting to be held on 1<sup>st</sup> March, 2023 at 4:00 p.m. From the 1<sup>st</sup> March till 25<sup>th</sup> of March, no recommendations of the Committee were placed before the House. Secondly, the earlier decision taken by the Syndicate, reads that "Panjab University Syndicate in its meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> August, 2022 resolved for item 28 that show cause notice be issued to Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Harish Kumar and Dr. Sanjeev Gautam, citing insubordination/violations etc., on their parts specially when the University had informed them before leaving India that the approval to visit U.S.A. is withheld due to administrative reasons, they be asked to give reply within seven days and reply so received be placed before the competent authority". Who is the competent authority? Is that Committee, the competent authority? Accordingly, a show cause was issued to all these three faculty members by the University to which they had replied on 26.08.2022.

Continuing, Professor Jatinder Grover stated that the Vice Chancellor had formed some Committee, which is contrary to the Syndicate decision. Hence, the 14 members of the present Syndicate in its meeting held on March 25, 2023 resolved that show cause notice issued to Professor Navdeep Goyal, Department of Physics, Professor Harish Kumar, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Dr. Sanjeev Gautam of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, is withdrawn and it is resolved that complete salary for the month of August, 2022 be released to Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Harish Kumar and Dr. Sanjeev Gautam. This salary was withheld by the University without any reason and without any approval from the Syndicate. Further the Duty/Ex-India leave of Professor Navdeep Goyal is also approved at par with the already approved Duty/Ex-India leave of Professor Harish Kumar and Dr. Sanjeev Gautam. The resolution signed by 14 members of the Syndicate, is submitted to the Vice Chancellor. With these words, he handed over the Resolution signed by 14 members to the Registrar on the floor of the House.

**RESOLVED:** That, as recommended by the Committee in its meeting dated 21.02.2023, the show-cause notice issued to Dr. Vijayta Dani Chadha, Centre for Nuclear Medicines, be withdrawn.

**27.** Considered if:

- (i) Mr. Sachin Sharma, Research Scholar, Department of Music, be granted extension of six months and in continuation of that further extension of six months in submission of synopsis with the condition to pay the prescribed fee.
- (ii) He be also allowed to submit his synopsis within 15 days of issuing of the decision of the Syndicate, as a special case, being a blind student and not to be taken as precedent in future.

**NOTE:** 1. Request letter dated 02.02.2023 of Mr. Sachin Sharma was enclosed (**Appendix-XXIII**).

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

Initiating discussion, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that this item should be approved. There are similar other cases whose 8 years period had been expired, one is Mr. Rajeev Bhatia who was enrolled for Ph.D. on 03.11.2014 under Dr. Gulshan Kumar vide enrolment No.14/245, he was not accorded the chance allowed during Covid-19 pandemic, hence he should be allowed extra chance for extension in submission of thesis.

The Vice Chancellor said that such cases may be submitted to the concerned quarters for approval.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) Mr. Sachin Sharma, Research Scholar, Department of Music, be granted extension of six months and in continuation of that further extension of six months in submission of synopsis with the condition to pay the prescribed fee.
- (ii) He be also allowed to submit his synopsis within 15 days of issuing of the decision of the Syndicate, as a special case, being a blind student and not to be taken as precedent in future.

**28.** Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 03.03.2023 (**Appendix-XXIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, and

**RESOLVED:** That the following Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs) (**Appendix-XXIV**), be executed between:

1. Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Panacea Biotech Limited.
2. Panjab University, Chandigarh and CSIR-IMTECH, Chandigarh.

**29.** Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 15.03.2023 and 16.03.2023 (**Appendix-XXV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the Panjab University Ph.D. guidelines (**Appendix-XXV**) formulated in accordance with U.G.C. Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of Ph.D. degree Regulations 2022, be approved.

Initiating discussion, Professor Jatinder Grover said that there are two items, first is relating to admission criteria which is mentioned as 70% for academic performance and 30% for performance in interview. He suggested that this criterion should uniformly be followed in all the departments. Secondly, he asked if there are minimum pass marks from interview else than this academic performance. He pointed out that there are no clear cut rules pertaining to it in the Department of Education. As in their department interview is for 40 marks and out of which minimum 60% are required to be scored in interview. If it should be framed on uniformity basis, the criterion should be made common. He further said that for paying the continuation fees, some criteria should be framed to pay the continuation fee every year, so that students may not face difficulty in paying the same in lump sum. The admissions are conducted in January, July and September, he suggested that admission should be conducted twice a year and for the same advertisements should be published two times in a year for making the Ph.D. admissions. He would also like to share problem being faced by him as Dean of Student Welfare, that JRF students whose guide is from outside the University, could not get the hostel facility. In the guidelines, it has been recommended that some cluster of approved research centres is to be made; hence, the clusters should be formed before the start of admissions in July, so that JRF could get facility of hostel in their own cluster and not in the University.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that all the teachers of Regional Centres are guiding the Ph.D. research scholars as per U.G.C. norms. For extending the facility of hostel accommodation to the students of Regional Centres, being the extension centre of Panjab University, preference should be given to research scholars of Regional Centres so that they can carry the research work.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that this issue is concerned with students, he is of the view that priority should be given to research scholars of Regional Centres, for allotment of hostel accommodation of hostel in P.U. campus. For the remaining research scholars, a policy should be framed as these students are pursuing Ph.D. on part-time basis, hence they require hostel only for doing course work. They should be allowed hostel facility for doing Ph.D. course work and secondly for doing research work in summer and winter break, they could be allotted hostel accommodation in University campus.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the research scholars of P.U. Regional Centres should be allowed hostel facility in P.U. Campus on the condition that their requests may be considered on the recommendation of the Supervisor.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that as the recommendations of new Pay Commission were made effective from the 01.01.2016, wherein it is clearly mentioned that no increment would be granted for attaining higher education. But on 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2018, new guidelines were issued in which it has been made clear that Ph.D. increments would be allowed as per the existing procedure. In the revised pay scales, increments for attaining higher education were not granted. The application with regard to same was also submitted by him, which should be looked into by constituting a Committee. Referring to Ph.D. guidelines under the heading "procedure for admission", the admission is to be made on the basis of national eligibility test and entrance test of Panjab University and thirdly that regular faculty is exempted from the entrance test. If it is possible, the contractual faculty, served for more than 10 years, should also be exempted for appearing in Ph.D. entrance test. As stated by Professor Jatinder Grover also, the admissions should be conducted twice in a year instead of three times in a year.

Professor Jatinder Grover reiterated that admissions of Ph.D. should be conducted twice a year instead of three times in a year.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dr. Mukesh Arora endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Shiv Kumar Dogra that students of research centres of Colleges should also be allowed hostel facility in P.U. Campus on priority basis. The Ph.D. increments which were withdrawn from the year 2016 to 2018, should be released.

It was informed that as per the pay notification of the Punjab Government, the Ph.D. increments have been continued from 01.01.2016. In place of the said increments, the payment of allowance has been recommended as on completing the Ph.D. the employees are being granted accelerated promotion. Hence the Ph.D. increments from 01.01.2016 were discontinued.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that two notifications were issued from the U.G.C., one was regarding pay revision and second one was regarding minimum qualifications. The anomaly has come that for the pay revision, the U.G.C. had made it clear, what Finance & Development Officer had informed. The notification with regard to minimum qualifications issued by U.G.C. contained the previous clause of 3 and 5 years. When the case was forwarded to the Audit Branch, it was made clear by them that the financial benefit(s) would be allowed on the basis of pay revision of Punjab Government and not on the basis of notification issued by the U.G.C. for minimum qualifications. Under this notification, Audit Branch would not allow any enhancement or reduction in pay. The anomaly is due to these two notifications as in one notification, one clause pertaining to payment is existed and in the other, the same is lacking. In this connection, clarification from the U.G.C. is required to be obtained, if the same is approved in the House, it would prove to be a futile exercise, as it would not be approved by the Audit Branch. The other issue pertaining to allowing of hostel facility is due to the reason that for admission to any particular course, seats are limited, but for Ph.D. the seats are unlimited as of now the seats are allocated to Colleges also. Hence it is difficult for the University to allow hostel accommodation to all the research scholars of the Colleges. Some mechanism on the basis of merit should be evolved and number of seats should be fixed for enrolment in Ph.D. in every department. If they allow hostel accommodation to all the research scholars who applied for the same, it would be difficult for the University to allocate to allow hostel facility to U.G. and P.G. students.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that part-time students enrolled for Ph.D. are allowed hostel facility rather than the research scholars pursuing Ph.D. on regular basis.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there are two or three crucial points in the revised Ph.D. Guidelines, at page 358 under point 4.2 for seeking any extension for submission of thesis, there is no reference of permission of the Dean of the Faculty concerned. It is mentioned that the Chairperson and Guide of the department would recommend for extension in submission of thesis and it would be approved only by Dean of University Instruction. It should be made clear whether Dean of the Faculty concerned should become part of it or not. The women candidates and specially disabled persons would not be charged fee for the extension of two years beyond six years and for further extension after expiry of 8 years, they would be charged fee of Rs.35,000/- per year. As per his opinion, why fee of Rs.35,000/- be not charged for extension in submission of thesis after expiry of six years. Under point No.4.3, it is mentioned that 'women candidates and persons with disability (more than 40% disability) may be allowed a relaxation of two years for Ph.D. in the maximum duration of eight years. However, they will be charged a fee of Rs.35,000/- per year for this extension (beyond 8 years). He observed that as per his opinion, there should be no relaxation of charging of fee from women candidates.

The Vice Chancellor said that extension of 2 years' time is recommended to be allowed to women candidates in submission of Ph.D. thesis.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that University would have to bear a huge financial loss, if they would exempt women candidates from this fees, as in the University, maximum of

women candidates is enrolled for Ph.D. Out of 600 Ph.D. research scholars, 500 research scholars are women. Hence, the charging of fees from women candidates, should not be exempted.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 15.03.2023 and 16.03.2023 (**Appendix-XXV**) relating to Ph.D. Guidelines (**Appendix-XXV**) 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).**

**30.**

Considered if, the following amendment, be made in General Rules 1.1(i) Chapter XXXII “(a) Appointment of Paper Setters and Examiners” at page 446 of Panjab University, Calendar, Volume-III, 2019:

<b>Existing</b>		<b>Proposed</b>	
(i)	In the case of Paper Setters, end of July of the year previous of the year of examination; and	(i)	In the case of Paper Setters, end of May of the year previous of the year of examination; and
(ii)	xxx xxx xxx	(ii)	No change

It was informed that information with regard to paper setters is received at the end of July of the year which was applicable from the time when the annual system of examinations was in existence and now it is proposed that this rule is to be amended that the said information pertaining to Paper setters shall be received at the end of May of the year for conducting the examination on semester system. Hence, it is requested that the said Rule may be amended so that the schedule of paper setters and syllabus shall reach their office by the end of May of the year.

Several members said that it should be approved.

**RESOLVED:** That General Rules 1.1 (i) Chapter XXXII “(a) Appointment of Paper Setters and Examiners” at page 446 of Panjab University, Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, be amended as under:

<b>Existing</b>		<b>Proposed</b>	
(iii)	In the case of Paper Setters, end of July of the year previous of the year of examination; and	(iii)	In the case of Paper Setters, end of May of the year previous of the year of examination; and
(iv)	xxx xxx xxx	(iv)	No change

**31.**

Considered –

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 (**Appendix-XXVI**).
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 (**Appendix-XXVI**).
3. Template for Direct recruitment for private aided colleges in U.T. Chandigarh as per UGC Regulations 2018.
4. Template of CAS promotions for colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh, located in Chandigarh as per UGC Regulations, 2018.
5. Template for CAS promotions in affiliated colleges located in Punjab as per UGC Regulations, 2018.

**NOTE:** 1. No reply had been received from DHE, Chandigarh and DHE, Punjab regarding points at Sr. No.3, 4 and 5.

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

Initiating discussion, Dr. Gurmeet Singh referring to page 399 said that templates have been prepared, he felt that there is a need to form a Committee.

Shri Varinder Singh said that templates prepared as per U.G.C. Regulations 2018 have been approved by the Syndicate/Senate. But with respect to non-aided Colleges where process of recruitment was going on and the screening of applications were in the process, these Colleges should be given exemption to re-advertise the posts as huge amount is spent on publication of advertisements. Hence these non-aided Colleges may be allowed to call those candidates who had applied earlier in response to the pre-published advertisements.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that template has been annexed at page 395 where the requisite qualification has been specified as NET+Ph.D.+JRF.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that at page 385, it is mentioned that .....

To this, Shri Varinder Singh interrupted him and asked why template is to be implemented on non-aided Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua replied that it has been mentioned in the Regulations that template is also applicable to non-aided Colleges.

Shri Varinder Singh said that as the candidates had already applied for the posts on the basis of advertisements published earlier.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua replied that there is difference of procedure as per the template to apply for the posts. For example, in the Committee constituted under the chairmanship of Dr. Jaspal Singh Sandhu, they had referred to the process as per the



norms of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. The shortlisting of applications received in every College would have to be carried out in the office of College Development Council.

Shri Varinder Singh said that for the purpose, letters should be sent to the Colleges for following the procedure of appointment as per revised template.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said, while referring to point (3) at page 383 that the shortlisting Committee will be constituted by the University/Government which will be having the following members: Dean College Development Council of the respective University (Chairman), Principal of the concerned College, Senior most teacher of the concerned college. In most of the Colleges, where there is only one teacher and for others the process of recruitment is in pipeline, in such Colleges, what would be nominated in short-listing Committee? In the next point, Dean of Faculty of the concerned University/Senior most teacher of the University of the concerned subject, the same problem would be posed while constituting the Short-listing Committee. At page 385 at point (3), which reads that, "for each first vacancy, 8 candidates will be called for interview and assessment of Domain knowledge according to merit and 4 candidates for every additional vacancy. In case the required number of applications is not received then the minimum number of applicants to be invited for interview shall be decided by the University/Government". A mandate should also be prepared as to how many number of applicants are to be invited for 8 posts or for 6 posts. Previously, it was decided by the Government that if a single application is received, then no appointment could be made, later on this condition was waived off and decided that if single candidate had applied, it may be considered. There are several points in the templates which are required to be considered. The score card of marks is even clashing with one another. Even, a Committee is also required for making corrections/modifications in the templates, so prepared.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that whenever the template is prepared, a column of languages known, should always be inserted as it is very much related to competency.

The Vice Chancellor replied that templates have already been prepared.

Dr. Mukesh Arora requested that on the one side they are directing the Principals of the College to fill the vacant positions and on the other side, if they consider for insertion of clause "languages known", it would be delayed as three departments English, Hindi and Punjabi are involved in it.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that, just now the Vice Chancellor was saying that for one post, 200 applications were received, whereas in the Colleges, for one post, sometime only one application is received and sometime four applications are received. When the template would be sent to D.P.I., it would not be approved as it would be pointed out that for one post 8, applicants could be invited for interview, by the Government, but what would be the criteria of the University? For the purpose, a format is required to be made as to how many candidates are required to be called for interview for how many posts.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that he should thoroughly read the guidelines pertaining to it.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that it is correctly mentioned and everything would be set right as per the guidelines.

Dr. Mukesh Arora and Principal R.S. Jhanji asked the Vice Chancellor whether they could make changes in the templates or not.

It was informed that this template is framed for the government aided Colleges of Punjab, the template for non-aided Colleges are not available; hence, the Syndicate has to

decide that template for aided Colleges of Punjab be implemented non-aided Colleges also. Moreover, they did not receive any template for Government Colleges situated in Chandigarh. The decision has to be taken whether the same template framed for government aided Colleges of Punjab would be implemented in non-aided Colleges or for Colleges situated at Chandigarh. The template for CAS promotions has also not been received, hence it should be decided as to what would be done to deal with CAS promotions. As the issue raised by one of the members that for the Colleges where advertisements have been published, it should be decided as to what would be done where the validity of advertisements has been expired. It has been mentioned in the Regulations that online applications are to be invited for filling up the vacant positions, whereas University had never called for online applications. If applications are invited online, then posts are to be re-advertised. Hence, these issues should be resolved one by one.

The Vice Chancellor said that for taking decisions on the issues raised above, a Committee is to be constituted.

It was requested that, to avoid delay in implementing its decision, the Committee so constituted should take decision, in anticipation approval of the Syndicate.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that a Committee out of the members of the Syndicate should be constituted. He requested that the Vice Chancellor may be authorized to constitute a Committee for the purpose.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that till date the template for CAS promotions has not been prepared. Resultantly, the promotions under CAS from the year 2018 are still pending.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that as the Committee would be constituted under the chairmanship of Dean College Development Council as he is well aware as to what matters are to be placed before the Committee for consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that template notified by U.G.C. should be followed.

Dr. Shaminder Singh said that preparation of template is the prerogative of the University and not of the Punjab Government. The Committee for preparation of template, which was constituted in the year 2016, he was also the member, at that time no nominee of U.G.C. or of any Government was the member of the Committee. Presently, the template for CAS promotions is also to be prepared by the University. Hence, he requested that a Committee should be constituted and the template so prepared may be placed before the Syndicate or the Vice Chancellor may be authorized to take decision, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee so constituted would work out the modalities for framing of template.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the Vice Chancellor be authorized to approve the template on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that as the officers of Punjab Government are not participating in framing of the template(s), the University should take action to frame the template(s). The template(s) so prepared for CAS promotions, should be sent to Chandigarh Administration with the request to make direct recruitment as well as for doing CAS promotions in accordance with the procedure laid down in the template(s).

The Vice Chancellor said that all this work should be done in a time bound manner.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that two major issues – (i) pertaining to CAS promotions; and (ii) relating to framing of template, are needed to be redressed. The Director, Higher Education (Punjab) made the CAS promotions in accordance with their own template. Previously, the templates for aided and non-aided were formed separately. They can revise the templates for the non-aided Colleges but for aided Colleges, they could not make amendments in the templates and if they made amendments in the templates for aided Colleges, the Director, Higher Education would not give approval to the appointments of teachers.

The Vice Chancellor enquired whether the Punjab Government has given the template or not?

It was informed that template for recruitment of teachers has been provided, but the template for CAS promotions is still awaited.

Principal R.S. Jhanji informed that the template for CAS promotions is under process and the office of D.C.D.C. should get in touch with the Punjab Government for the purpose. He further informed that there are two Regulations, the Punjab Government followed the Regulations of 2016, whereas the University followed the Regulations of 2018; hence, there is no parity. Unless and until, both the University and the Punjab Government are on the same platform, problem would definitely arise. Citing an example, he said that their two cases for giving approval were returned owing to the reason of parity of Regulations of 2016 and 2018. Hence, it is requested that there should not be any variation in the template(s) of the Punjab Government. They even did not accept that advertisement for recruitment of teachers which is published in other than three national daily newspapers. Hence, wherever, there are anomalies, they should contact the Punjab Government before finalizing the templates.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that some modalities are required to be framed. It has been written that if the required number of applications are not received, the modalities are to be finalized by the University. Hence, these modalities should be worked out.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it has the clear understanding that for one post, at least four applicants could be considered, but they should list these things in black and white as for re-advertisement, a huge amount of Rs.1 Lac is to be spent. They should define that for one post, more than applicant should be there.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the case of appointments of Principal, the Government itself has waived off the condition. They also make the appointment of Principal, on the basis of single application.

Principal R.S. Jhanji clarified that this is not a new rule, earlier they used to call six applicants for interview, now they desired that eight applicants may be called for interview.

Majority of members urged that it should be resolved in the House itself that 8 applicants would be called for interview for one post.

The Vice Chancellor intimated that on the basis of information provided by D.C.D.C. that there are several other issues which needed to be resolved, a Committee is to be formed.

It was requested that those applicants, who had already applied in the Colleges for the posts, either they should be considered for appointment on the old system through offline mode or otherwise.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Shri Varinder Singh said that those candidates, who had already applied in the Colleges, may be directed to apply again through online mode rather than re-advertising the posts.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that advertisement for grant-in-aid Colleges should be published as it has the validity of only six months and after the expiry of validity of advertisement, the Government would not accord approval for recruitment of those teachers.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that earlier there were two applicants for the post of Principal, but presently, only single candidate applies for the post. It has been mentioned by the Government that University should work out its own modalities in the Colleges where senior-most teacher of the concerned subject is not available.

The Vice Chancellor said that a meeting of Short-listing Committee may be convened within a week by including the senior-most Principals of the Colleges.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that these points should be examined by the Committee consisting of Principal R.S. Jhanji and Principal Kirandeep Kaur.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that where the subject expert teacher is not available, the teacher from the allied subject should be included in the Committee.

Dr. Mukesh Arora and Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua may be included in the Committee.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu, Principal R.S. Jhanji and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua should be included in the Committee.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the name of Dr. Jagtar Singh may also be included in the Committee.

### **RESOLVED:** 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, as per **Appendix-XXVI**, 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, as per **Appendix-XXVI**, be approved;
3. Template for Direct recruitment for private aided colleges in U.T. Chandigarh as per UGC Regulations 2018, as per **Appendix-XXVI**, be approved;
4. Template of CAS promotions for colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh, located in Chandigarh as per UGC Regulations, 2018, as per **Appendix-XXVI**, be approved; and
5. Template for CAS promotions in affiliated colleges located in Punjab as per UGC Regulations, 2018, as per **Appendix-XXVI**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the following Committee of Syndics be constituted to look into the suggestions made by the members and recommend changes in the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) and other modalities. The Vice Chancellor be authorised to take decision on the recommendations of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate:

1. Dean, College Development Council (Chairman)
2. Principal R.S. Jhanji
3. Principal Kirandeep Kaur
4. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua
5. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
6. Dr. Jagtar Singh

**32.** Considered minutes of the Student Aid Fund Administrative Committee dated 09.03.2023 (**Appendix-XXVII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to the applications of eligible students of teaching departments/VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur and U.S.O.L. for financial assistance out of Students Aid Fund, for the session 2022-2023.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Student Aid Fund Administrative Committee dated 09.03.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

**33.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 13.03.2023 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) 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 (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

**RESOLVED:** 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, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

**34.** Considered minutes of the Committee meeting dated 27.02.2023 (**Appendix-XXIX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the issue regarding release of Enhanced Salary in pursuance of CAS promotions under 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment of UGC Regulation 2010.

**Discussion shifted from Ratification Items**

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that point 5 of the proposed undertaking says, "I undertake that in case the above clarification (as and when received) is against me, the University will have the right to make recovery as per this undertaking". They are talking about the recovery of monetary benefits only. Suppose someone is promoted as Professor in accordance with the UGC Regulations, 2016, the person concerned has not only got financial benefit, but designation also. Hence, such persons would have to apply again for their promotion in accordance with new UGC Regulations and their screening, interview, etc., would be done again. He, therefore, suggested that in the last paragraph (Point 5), it should be added, "...and I will re-apply for the academic level as per UGC Regulations, 2018 and the University shall do the screening afresh as per UGC Regulations, 2018".

It was pointed out that the last line of point 5, i.e., the University will have right to make recovery as per this undertaking, needed to be replaced with "I will refund the excess payment", in case he failed to refund, then the University will have right to make recovery. Secondly, it has also to be mentioned in the undertaking that the payment is being received provisionally. This undertaking is to be given by the teacher concerned.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the proposed undertaking should be changed in accordance with the above discussion.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendations of the Committee dated 27.02.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the undertaking as recommended by the Committee, as per **Appendix**, be obtained from the teachers, whose promotions are pending owing to interpretation of UGC Regulations, 2018 (Clause 6.3).

- 35.** Considered if, 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. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXX**) was also taken into consideration.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Dr. Bhupinder Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi, should be promoted as Associate Professor (Stage 4) w.e.f. 17.09.2014 and the letter of promotion should be issued to him, in anticipation of approval of the Senate as he has to apply for Professorship, the interview for which would be conducted shortly.

Professor Jatinder Grover suggested 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.

**RESOLVED:** 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.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** 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.

- 36.** Considered request dated 24.02.2023 (**Appendix-XXXI**) of the Principal, Master Tara Singh Memorial College for Women that Innovative Programme MBACIT, be excluded from Common Entrance Test PU-CET (P.G.)-2023. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXXI**) was also taken into consideration.

After some discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Innovative Programme MBACIT offered in Master Tara Singh Memorial College for Women, be excluded from PU-CET (P.G.) from the ensuing session 2023-24.

- 37.** Considered recommendation (No.1 and 2) of the Shops Committee dated 19.10.2022 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the request of change in name of lessees of 02 shops as per the request of Mr. Surinder Mohan Anand occupant of Shop No.35, Sector-14, P.U. Campus to his son i.e. Niraj Anand and request of Capt. Rajnish Talwar occupant of shop No.06, Sector-14, Student Centre, P.U. Campus, to his daughter i.e. Ms. Shweta Ashwini Arya, be allowed to change their lessee as per policy decision already approved for change of tenancy of the premises to the legal heirs of the occupant dated 28.01.2020. Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that since the shop is of the University and the same has just been leased out to the lessees, it is not the right of the legal heirs of the lessees. Moreover, the lease deeds are always signed between the lessees and the owners. If the requests of the above said persons are acceded to, it would mean that once the property is leased out to a person, the same would have to be leased out only to his/her legal heirs.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that they should examine the lease deeds, which were executed between the aforesaid persons and the University for the first time.

A couple of members suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred.

It was informed that whenever the lease deeds are to be executed between the lessees and the University, the same would be executed in accordance with the new rates of rent. Moreover, the proposed rent would be calculated on the basis of new rates and area of the shop and the lessees could not contest that earlier the rate of rent was calculated on less area.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since they had least interest in this item, they had not gone through all the relevant documents appended with the item. He, therefore, suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. Dinesh Kumar.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of Item C-37 on the agenda, be deferred.

**38.** Considered the following Resolutions proposed by Dr. Jagwant Singh, Fellow, Panjab University:-

- (i) Resolved that all decisions which are *ultra virus* the Section 27(2)(C) and Regulation 4.3, Chapter VIII A, Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

**Explanation:** It is an establish principle of law that the Regulations are derived from the Act and not the vice-versa. In case of conflict between the two, it the Act which prevails. Section-27 of the PU Act has not been followed in the recent past leading to a situation where the provisions of Section-27 have not been complied with. This is due to Regulation 4.9 of Chapter-7, PU Calendar, Vol.-III, 2019, page 226. The matter was discussed in one of the meeting of the Senate where the point was conceded. The practice needs to be changed.

- (ii) Resolved that position of D.U.I., Director (Research) be filled on the basis of seniority, subject to the condition that the person is not accused under any section of I.P.C. or serious misconduct in the discharge of duties.

**Explanation:** Principle of seniority has generally worked well across the organizations. Any departure from the same creates controversies and raise some questions which are not good in taste.

- (iii) Resolved that all allegations of corruption be examined in a time bound fashion and in those cases where there is prime facie evidence and/or is supported by an affidavit, necessary approval for investigation/prosecution be granted expeditiously to create corruption free administrative eco system.

**Explanation:** There has been lot of discussion regarding corruption in the University in recent time. This has dented the image of the University. University needs to take such actions which should assure the stakeholders that none of the issues has been pushed under the carpet and sincere efforts are being made to establish a corruption free eco-administrative system.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that since it is a serious matter, consideration of this item should be deferred.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that they should be told as to what the first Resolution is.

Shri Varinder Singh said that since it is a Resolution proposed by a Fellow, it should be forwarded to the Senate for consideration.

Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that let first the members of the Syndicate be allowed to apply their minds. Since the item has been included in the supplementary agenda, they had not gone through all the related documents and could not apply their minds.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Resolution would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting as a proper agenda item.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that a Committee should be constituted to look into the Resolutions proposed by Dr. Jagwant Singh, Fellow.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the above said Resolution proposed by Dr. Jagwant Singh, a Fellow, be referred to a Committee to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor for consideration in the first instance.

**39. Information contained in Items R-1 to R-11 was read out, viz. –**

**R-1.** 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, 2007, 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



**R-2.** 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 term and conditions, under Regulation 5 at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

**R-3.** 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.

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

**R-4.** 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, Distt. Ferozpur w.e.f. 01.03.2023, under Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Cal. Volume-III, 2019.

**NOTE:** 1. Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, reads as under:

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

2. Request letter of Mr. Pawan Kumar dated 01.02.2023 was enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

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

**R-5.** 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.

**R-6.** 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.

**R-7.** 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.

**R-8.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the request of Shri Ravi Inder Pal Singh, Assistant Section Officer, Department of Sports, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 30.04.2023 (A.N.), from University service and sanctioned the following retirement benefits :-

1. Gratuity, as admissible under Regulations 15.1 and 17.8 at page 131 & 133 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
2. Encashment of Earned Leave, as may be admissible, under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of PU Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, but not exceeding 300 days.

**R-9.** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation (current agenda) of the Committee dated 22.02.2023 and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the additional seats of BE/ME/M.Tech. courses at UIET and

UICET be in force till further amendment w.e.f. the session 2023-24 (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

- R-10.** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Affiliation Committee dated 14.09.2022 and subject to 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.
- R-11.** 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.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that relevant documents have not been appended with any of the item included in the items for ratification. Items for ratification did not mean that relevant documents would not be provided to the members. Documents relating to only a few of the items have been appended, but they did not know by the documents relating to other items have not been appended. If certain matter had been referred to a Committee and the Vice Chancellor had also been authorized to take decision on the recommendation of the Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate. They could understand if such an item is placed before the Syndicate without relevant documents.

Shri Varinder Singh said that since the persons re-appointed afresh under Sub-Item R-1 are working for the last six years, their appointments should be ratified.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they could not ratify the appointment without any input. He observed that before ratifying anything, they must know as to what they are ratifying.

It was clarified that since these are only routine matters, they did not think it proper to append relevant papers.

When Shri Varinder Singh said that certain persons are continuing since 2006, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the College referred to in Sub-Item R-1 is functioning since 1990, but that did not mean that they should ratify the decision of the Vice Chancellor without relevant document.

**Referring to Sub-Item R-4**, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that had they started paying revised remuneration, i.e., Rs.1500/- per lecture and maximum Rs.50,000/- per month to the guest faculty.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the decision of the Syndicate revised remuneration to the guest faculty would be got implemented after the approval of the Board of Finance.

**Referring to Sub-Item R-10**, Shri Varinder Singh pointed out that the College is demanding temporary extension of affiliation for B.Sc. I (Non-Medical) 2<sup>nd</sup> Unit, but the relevant documents have not been appended with the item. He, therefore, suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred and the item should be placed before the Syndicate again with all the relevant documents.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the College has sought affiliation for the session 2022-23, which is almost over.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out that the issue of grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation to various Colleges for the session 2022-23 is still under consideration of the Affiliation Committee.

**Some portion of discussion held here shifted to item 34**

**Referring to Sub-Item R-11**, Shri Varinder Singh said that Shri Rajan Sharma, Assistant Registrar (Retd.), has been given re-employment. Is there any policy for giving re-employment to non-teaching employees?

The Vice Chancellor said that policy did exist.

Shri Varinder Singh said that then the policy should have been appended with the item, so that they could have known as to how the re-employment has been given to Shri Rajan Sharma.

The Vice Chancellor said that the re-employment to Shri Rajan Sharma has been given in terms of decision of the Board of Finance dated 21.02.2012 and Syndicate and Senate dated 29.02.2012 and 31.03.2012, respectively.

Shri Varinder Singh said that could anybody be re-appointed under this policy.

The Vice Chancellor said that normally they did not re-employ anyone, but since Shri Rajan Sharma had been handling the work relating to promotions under CAS for the last so many years, he has been given re-employment for a period of six months. In the meanwhile, they would get somebody else trained to handle the work of promotions under CAS as also new appointments of teachers.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he would like to point out that Shri S.C. Tewari has been working as Deputy Registrar for the last about 18 years. His humble submission is that he should be designated as Joint Controller of Examinations/Joint Registrar. Earlier, an item relating to this had been placed before the Syndicate during the tenure of Professor Raj Kumar, Former Vice Chancellor, but the same was withdrawn at the last moment. He pleaded that either the said item be placed again before the Syndicate or discussion held right now. He added that everybody needed promotion. Moreover, the performance of Shri S.C. Tewari as Deputy Registrar is excellent. If Shri S.C. Tewari is designated as Joint Registrar, it would be a great help to the Registrar as he would take care of a lot of work being presently taken care of by the Registrar.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he had been making phone calls to Shri S.C. Tewari continuously for the last 3 days, but he is not picking up the phone.

Shri Varinder Singh reiterated that Shri S.C. Tewari has been working as Deputy Registrar for the last about 18 years, and everybody wanted promotion during his career. Moreover, Shri S.C. Tewari is capable and intelligent person who has performed well as Deputy Registrar. Since additional charge of the post of Registrar has been given to Professor Y.P. Verma, he has to take care of his teaching, academic and research work in

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

addition to Administrative work. If Shri S.C. Tewari is designated as Joint Registrar, it would certainly lessen the work of the Registrar.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that Shri S.C. Tewari had been appointed as Assistant Registrar through selection. When certain persons had opposed to his selection in the meeting of the Senate, the then Vice Chancellor (Professor K.N. Pathak) had said that this person speaks in English and had a good command over the language. Though he (Dr. Mukesh) had opposed to his selection, Shri S.C. Tewari still gives him a lot of respect.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. information contained in **Item 39 - R-1 to R-9 and R-11**, be ratified; and
2. so far as **Sub-Item R-10** is concerned, the same be placed before the Syndicate again in its next meeting with all the relevant documents.

**40.** Information contained in **Items I-1 to I-15** was read out and noted, i.e. –

**I-1.** The Vice-Chancellor has given the additional charge of the Dean, College Development Council, Panjab University, to Professor Sanjay Kaushik, Chairperson, University Business School, P.U. with immediate effect, in addition to his own duties, till further orders.

**I-2.** 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:-

Sr. No.	Name of Faculty member	Department	Date of Superannuation (i.e. 60 years)	w.e.f. the date he/she continue in service, as per interim orders
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

**I-3.** 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 have been allowed to continue in service in view of the similarly placed cases as under:-

Sr. No.	Name of Faculty members	Department	Date of superannuation	w.e.f. the date he continue in service as per interim orders
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.

**I-4.** 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. P.S. Dhingra, Professor, Panjab University Regional Centre, District Sri Muktsar Sahib (who had attained the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 28.02.2018 and allow to continue working in the Panjab University service upto the age of 65 years i.e. 24.02.2023), subject to the final decision of Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 1505 of 2016 and other connected cases:-

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulations 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 184 & 187 of P.U. Calenda, Vol.-I, 2022.
- (ii) Encashment of Earned leave as may be due to him but not exceeding 300 days, as admissible as per the decision of the Syndicate dated 01.09.2022 (Para 1).

**I-5.** 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. Asha Maudgil, Professor, Dept. of Philosophy, P.U Chandigarh (who had attained the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 28.02.2018 and was continuing working in the Panjab University service upto the age of 65 years i.e. 12.02.2023) subject to outcome of Special Leave to Appeal (c) No. (s) 17457-17491/2022 dated 10.10.2022:-

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulations 15.1 and 15.2 at pages 131-132 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2007.
- (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).

**I-6.** 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 Mrs. Renu

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Gandhi, Assistant Professor, Department of Life Long Learning & Extension, P.U. (who attained the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 28.02.2018 and continuing working in the Panjab University service upto the age of 65 years i.e. 22.02.2023) subject to the final decision of Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 1505 of 2016 and other connected cases:-

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulations 15.1 and 15.2 at pages 132 & 133 of P.U. Cal. 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).

**I-7.** 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. Meena Dutta, Professor of Defence & Strategic Studies, USOL, P.U. (who attained the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 28.02.2018 and was continuing working in the Panjab University service upto the age of 65 years i.e. 20.02.2023) subject to outcome of Special Leave to Appeal (c) No. (s) 17457-17491/2022:-

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulations 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 184 & 187 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).

**I-8.** The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following retiral benefits to Professor Praveen Rishi, Department of Microbiology, upto the age of 60 years i.e. 28.02.2018) who was continuing working in the Panjab University service upto the age of 65 years i.e. upto 07.02.2023, subject to outcome of LPA No. 1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & others) and other connected cases:-

- (i) Pension/Gratuity as admissible under Regulations 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 184 & 187 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).

**I-9.** In term 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. Vikas Bist, Associate Professor (subject to outcome of Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. (s) 17457-17491/2022), Department of Mathematics, who attained the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 31.07.2021 and was continuing working in the Panjab University service upto the age of 65 years, however, he withdraw his name from the array of the CWP No.11343 of 2021:-

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulations 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 184 & 187 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2022.

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

- (ii) Encashment of Earned leave as may be due to him but not exceeding 300 days, as admissible as per the decision of the Syndicate dated 01.09.2022 (Para 1).

**I-10.** 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.

**I-11.** To note the following recommendation of the Committee dated 25.01.2023 (**Appendix-XXXV**), 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”.

**I-12.** To note the following recommendation (No.12) of the Committee dated 17.01.2023 (**Appendix-XXXVI**), 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)”.

**I-13.** The Vice-Chancellor has accepted the resignation of Ms. Anita Rawat, Junior Assistant, University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh w.e.f. 09.02.2023 instead of 17.04.2023, with the condition that she has to deposit two months and eight days salary in lieu of short of three months prior notice, under Regulation 6 at page 119-120 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022 and ordered that her monetary benefits viz. Provident Fund etc. be paid to her accordingly.

**I-14.** The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University non-teaching staff:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Mrs. Poonam Chopra Deputy Registrar Establishment Branch, P.U.	17.11.1978	30.04.2023	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.



Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
2.	Mrs. Ranbir Kaur Mann Assistant Registrar USOL, P.U.	14.01.1985	31.03.2023	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
3.	Sh. Umesh Johar Assistant Registrar Accounts Branch, P.U.	30.11.1983	30.04.2023	
4.	Sh. Jagmohan Singh Nagra Superintendent General Branch, P.U.	16.07.1991	31.03.2023	
5.	Mrs. Shashi Bala Superintendent Examination Br.-IV, P.U.	07.12.1983	31.03.2023	
6.	Mrs. Harbans Kaur A.S.O. (Stenography) Department of Community Education & Disability Studies, P.U.	04.04.1989	31.03.2023	
7.	Sh. Jaspal Singh Senior Assistant Examination Br. P.U.	05.11.2004	30.04.2023	
8.	Dr. Anil Kumar Sharma Senior Technician (G-II) Tabla Instructor Department of Music	07.02.1997	31.03.2023	
9.	Sh. Harmesh Singh Chargeman Grade-I (Work- Inspector) Construction Office, P.U.	23.04.1993	31.03.2023	
10.	Sh. Tilak Raj Library Restorer Department of Anthropology, P.U.	11.11.1987	31.03.2023	
11.	Sh. Budhi Singh Thakur Daftri General Branch, P.U.	15.06.1978	31.03.2023	
12.	Sh. Sushil Kumar Sharma Daftri R&S Branch, P.U.	06.06.1980	31.03.2023	
13.	Sh. Raj Mal Record Lifter Department of Laws, P.U.	07.11.1989	30.04.2023	
14.	Sh. Panna Lal Beldar Construction Office, P.U.	02.04.1993	30.04.2023	

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

**General Discussion**

1. Shri Sandeep Singh said that the University imposed a late fee of Rs.5000/- on the students for submitting Migration Certificate late. In fact, the students faced a lot of problem in getting Migration Certificate from other universities. He urged the Vice Chancellor to reduce the late fee for submitting Migration Certificate late to Rs.2500/-, which earlier used to be charged. He remarked that they get the late fee for submitting application form appearing in examination waived off from the Controller of Examinations.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk pointed out that they had also raised a similar issue in the previous meeting of the Syndicate. He enquired as to what action has been taken by the University authority on the same.

It was informed that the cases, which had been recommended by the Head of the Department, have already been resolved.

2. Shri Sandeep Singh said that they had discussed the issue relating to students covered under Post-Matric Scholarship Scheme several times. This time also the result of students, who are covered under the Post-Matric Scholarship Scheme, had not been declared. Earlier, a Committee was formed and he had brought the problems faced by the students to the knowledge of the Committee. If the students had paid a fee of Rs.2500/-, a fine of Rs.2500/- had been imposed by the University for paying the fee late. The students had to approach the Controller of Examinations for waiving off the late fee. He urged that the fine imposed on the students covered under the Post-Matric Scholarship Scheme should be waived off in one go, so that they do not have to go to the Controller of Examinations again and again. This would definitely reduce the work of the office and harassment of the students.

Professor Jatinder Grover suggested that the request made by Shri Sandeep Singh should be acceded to.

Continuing, Shri Sandeep Singh said that the officials have also now stopped to disclose the results of the students covered under the Post-Matric Scholarship Scheme. They request him to ask the students to deposit the fee. If the result of the students, who are placed under compartment, is not disclosed, how could they apply for re-evaluation or re-examination within the stipulated dates?

It was informed that the list of students, who are fee defaulters, is provided by the Fee-Checking Section and the result of these students is neither declared nor disclosed to them. Sometime the dates for submission of application for re-evaluation/re-examination got elapsed. Hence, the result of at least those students, who are placed under compartment/re-appears, should be allowed to be disclosed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that instead of mentioning marks against the name of the students, pass or re-appear should be mentioned.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that earlier they used to retain the marks sheets and degrees of the students covered under the Post-Matric Scholarship Scheme, but their result was declared. Now, they have stopped declaring the result even. He could even say that such students should be declined admissions for non-deposit of fee, but once they are admitted, they should not be harassed. Instead of visiting the University again and again for getting their cases resolved, they preferred to pay the fees.

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

3. Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out that he had requested in the previous meeting of the Syndicate to grant a golden chance to those students, who could not clear their compartments under the Annual System of examination. He requested that the golden chance should be given.

Majority of the members said that golden chance to those students, who could not clear their compartments under the Annual System of examination, should be given.

4. Shri Sandeep Singh said that in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, he had enquired as to how much expenditure had been incurred on the renovation of Examination Branch and where the old furniture had gone, but no information had been provided to him.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that an inquiry should be conducted to know as to where the old furniture had gone.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that they would not make any compromise on corruption.

It was informed that the entire furniture had been brought back and only the chairs, which require re-canning, are kept in the basement.

5. Shri Varinder Singh said that the issue of enhancement of remuneration to guest faculty from Rs.1000/- per lecture and maximum Rs.25,000/- per month to Rs.1500/- per lecture and maximum Rs.50,000/- per month as per UGC notification should be placed before the Board of Finance so that the revised honorarium could be paid to the guest faculty working in the University, Panjab University Constituent Colleges as well as affiliated Colleges. The recommendations of the Board of Finance on the issue should not be placed before the Syndicate; rather, the same should be approved by the Vice Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and implemented.

6. Shri Varinder Singh said that tenure of members of Panjab University Staff Association is from 1<sup>st</sup> January to 31<sup>st</sup> December. He did not know why the election of PUSA has not been got conducted. In fact, the election of PUSA is very important as one of the members is to come to the Senate. Since three months of the year had already lapsed, would the term of the next person only for 9 months. As the election had not been conducted, the person is not eligible for becoming Fellow.

The Vice Chancellor said that the election of PUSA would be got conducted in the month of April.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that such an argument could be given in the case of PUTA as there is no role of the University in the conduct of PUTA election, whereas election of PUSA is got conducted by the University.

7. Shri Varinder Singh said that the Government of Punjab had nominated two Members of Legislative Assembly (MLA) on the University Senate about five months before. Why those MLAs have not been got notified? He enquired as to what steps the University authorities had taken to get their notification issued from the Hon'ble Chancellor.

It was informed that several reminders had been issued in this regard.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Shri Varinder Singh enquired that has any fault/shortcoming in the process been pointed out by the office of the Chancellor.

It was informed that there is no response from the Chancellor's office.

8. Shri Varinder Singh said that certain Library Assistants had got promoted and promotion of some of the Library Assistants is being declined. The affected persons staged dharnas and gave representations also. He requested the Vice Chancellor to constitute a Committee to resolve the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee is already there, but the problem is that the Regulations/Rules of the UGC had got changed. When Shri Varinder Singh said that those Regulations are not applicable to them as they are appointed before the implementation of the revised UGC Regulations, the Vice Chancellor said that the revised Regulations are effective from 2018 and are applicable to them as they became eligible in the year 2021-22.

9. Shri Varinder Singh said that they had discussed the issue of grant of approval to Dr. S.S. Sangha as Principal. The issue had also been discussed with the Registrar, who had told them that the matter be placed before the Syndicate as an agenda item, but the same has not been placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter has been resolved.

10. Shri Varinder Singh said that the admissions to MBA Programme in the DAV College are made through CAT. He pleaded that if the seats remained vacant, the College should be allowed to make admission on the basis of merit.

The Vice Chancellor said that the matter would be looked into by the Dean, College Development Council.

It was informed that the admission to MBA Programme is made through CAT.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that the matter should be got examined and if possible, the college should be allowed to make admission on the basis of merit, so that no seat remain vacant.

11. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they had raised the issue of implementation of revised pay-scales in the previous meeting and had requested the University to issue a letter to the colleges to pay gratuity to the retired teachers in accordance with the revised pay-scales. He requested that the said letter should be issued at the earliest.

12. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that presentations were held in the Department of Music for enrolment to Ph.D. He pointed out that the enrolments of 4-5 students have been rejected. The students had given representations, but the same have not been considered favourably. He requested that, if need be, the presentation of the said students should be got conducted again in the presence of Dean of the concerned Faculty. If the students found to be competent, they should be enrolled; otherwise, not. He pointed out that the student, who had topped in the University Entrance Test, had been rejected.

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

13. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the Committee to be constituted for Gurusar Sadhar College should be constituted at the earliest, so that it could visit the College.]
14. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that a letter should be issued to all the affiliated Colleges asking them whether they are paying updated salary to their teachers. According to him, most of the Colleges did not pay updated salary to their teachers and are several months behind. He suggested that this data should be obtained and placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.
15. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that earlier also, the Dean, College Development Council, had issued letters to the affiliated Colleges for grant of terminal benefits. According to him, the majority of the Colleges did not respond. They should evolve such a mechanism so that the Colleges must respond. If the College did not respond, they must take some action.
16. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the issue of CMJ University was there for the last so many years. Earlier, a teacher was placed under suspension by a College, but he was reinstated by the University. He pleaded that they should not adopt the policy of pick and choose and ensure that all the teachers, who are placed under suspension, should be got reinstated or none. He said that either approval not be given to any of the teachers or given to all. It is wrong that they have given approval to the appointment of teacher, who is close to a Senator. There is a teachers namely Shri Punardeep Singh in A.S. College, Khanna, whose approval is pending in the University, whereas he is teaching there for the last 10-12 years.
- Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that similar case is in her College as teacher had obtained degree from CMJ University, and the teacher is teaching the subject of English. His approval is also pending with the University.
17. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the issue of pay enhancement of temporary teachers should also be taken care of.
18. Professor Jatinder Grover said that earlier the guest charges from the students, who were allotted Hostels on guest basis, were Rs.80/-, but the same were enhanced to Rs.100/- by the Syndicate in its meeting held in the month of December 2022. Since the charges are never enhanced in between (between the session), the enhancement should be allowed to be effected from July 2023 and till then old charges should be allow to be charged.
- RESOLVED:** That the revised guest charges, which are charged from the students who are allotted Hostel Accommodation on guest basis, be implemented from July 2023 and till then old charges be charged.
19. Professor Jatinder Grover said that only MTS has been provided in two Girls' Hostels and it has come to his notice that the contract of MTS would be over on 31.03.2023. If possible, either they should e allowed to continue with the services of MTS or the Dean of Student Welfare should be allowed to appoint persons on daily-wage/contract basis on DC rates, as per rules of the University; otherwise, they would face problem in two Girls' Hostels.
- The Vice Chancellor said that she is seized with the matter and taking necessary steps in this regard.
20. Professor Jatinder Grover pointed out that whenever the University enhanced the fees, the students launch agitation and also sat on dharna. His humble

submission is that they should try to enhance income of the University through its own sources and at the same time curtail their expenses. He has certain suggestions for curtailing the expenses – (i) to get the Manpower Audit done.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had already got the Manpower Audit done.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that they had wasted the funds (Rs.13 lac.) of the University by getting the Manpower Audit done from Mahatma Gandhi Institute. There are about 25-30 teachers in the University, who are engaged by other Universities/Institutes getting their Manpower Audit done. The Manpower Audit could have been got done by the University from its own teachers without incurring any expenditure. They have to look into the model adopted by neighbouring universities, which had appointed non-teaching staff on the basis of ratio between the teachers and students. If they also adopted that model and appoint non-teaching staff on the basis of teachers and students ratio, they would certainly be able to reduce the expenditure.

The Vice Chancellor said that she had requested Professor Jatinder Grover to tell her as to how much staff is required in the Hostels.

21. Professor Jatinder Grover said that Dr. Devinder Dhawan, who has attained the age of 65 years, should be given extension/appointed at the University Health Centre as per previous practice as there is a shortage of doctors in the University Health Centre. Moreover, they had already given extension/appointed certain doctors after the age of 65 years. He pleaded that rules /guidelines should be followed in all similar cases and the policy of pick and choose should not be adopted. When Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Dr. Devinder Dhawan should not be given extension or appointed on contract after attaining the age of 65 years, Professor Jatinder Grover and Shri Varinder Singh said that either the services of all the doctors, who have been appointed on contract basis after the age of 65 years, should be discontinued or Dr. Devinder Dhawan should also be appointed on contract basis as per existing practice.
22. Professor Jatinder Grover pointed out that he had raised a point in the previous meeting of the Syndicate that the posts, which have been advertised, should be got reviewed. If the posts have been reviewed, the status should be told to them.
23. Professor Jatinder Grover suggested that the revised remuneration to be paid to the guest faculty appointed in the University, Panjab University Regional Centres and affiliated Colleges should be got approved from the Board of Finance and implemented at the earliest.

Shri Varinder Singh said that he had also raised certain issues in the previous meeting of the Syndicate. The same should also be got implemented.
24. Dr. Mukesh Arora, referring to the issue raised by Professor Jatinder Grover regarding the contract of MTS, said that earlier the MTS was used to be appointed by the Registrar Office. He did not know why they had decided to appoint MTS through contractor.
25. Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that there is confusion amongst the affiliated Colleges. Perhaps, a seminar was conducted on 15<sup>th</sup> during which instructions/guidelines for filling up examination forms on the University portal were given. An issue had got created as the fee for Environment Paper is not showing on the portal. However, when it was verified by the clerks from the University, they were told that the said fees included in the examination fee of semester 1, but the

colleges send the same separately. They were also told that if the colleges paid the fee in the next semester also, the University ignored it. Due to this confusion, the colleges are continuously paying the Environment fees of the students every year. She urged that a clarification in this regard should be sent to all the affiliated Colleges. Would the University refund the fee to the Colleges, which are paying the Environment Fee every year, for the last so many years? It seemed that the fee would not be refunded by the University, but they should correct the system for future. She reiterated that a letter should be issued to all the affiliated Colleges clarifying that the Environment Fee is included in the examination fee of 1<sup>st</sup> year. The Colleges are suffering a financial loss as the examination fee of Environment Paper is Rs.675/- per student.

26. Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that her second point was related to admissions, and the same had already been discussed in detailed in the morning. In the Academic Calendar, it should at least be mentioned that the affiliated Colleges could make provisional enrolment because the Colleges started admissions only after getting a green signal from the University.
27. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that firstly, he would like to thank the Vice Chancellor, Secretary to the Vice Chancellor and the Registrar for starting the process of promotions of teachers under the CAS and clarifying the Clauses 6.3 and 6.4.
28. Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the issue of grant of increments for M.Tech. and Ph.D., for which a letter had also been issued, should be got resolved by appointing a Committee.
29. Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that there is an option form for giving promotional benefits from the date of next increment in the revised pay-scales. In fact, the teachers are given annual increment in the month of July, but as per revised pay-scales, there are two options – (i) to get annual increment either in the month of January or (ii) in July. He pleaded that this provision should be adopted and implemented.
30. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that there is a Computer Science Department at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, where there are four teachers working on regular basis. Earlier, their in-charge used from the Department of Computer Science, but from sometime, their in-charge has been made from the Department of English. It needed to be looked into as to how a teacher of Department of English could become in-charge of Department of Computer Science.
31. Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that a letter had come in the name of Vice Chancellor from the Vice-President of India and it was written in the said that, if possible, a special meeting of the Senate should be held for discussing academic issues. He pleaded that a special meeting of the Senate should be held for discussing academic issues.
32. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that an F.I.R. should be lodged on the basis of the report relating to Committee(s) in the case of Mr. Lovish, Junior Engineer.
33. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he had sought status of complaint against the Construction Office. The same should be provided to him at the earliest.

It was informed that already reminders had been sent to the concerned quarters.

34. Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that Surjit Singh Sodhi Company and Engineers had filed a case against the Panjab University in September 2017, in which the Registrar and Executive Engineer of Panjab University had been made party. In violation of the material supplied, they had given a bill of Rs.42.55 lacs. In fact, the said company had approached the Arbitrator of sector 17. The Arbitrator approved the bill of the company, but when the payment was not made, the Company approached the Punjab and Haryana High Court. The Court had asked the University to give a bank guarantee of Rs.42.55 lacs. However, if Shri R.K. Rai, the Executive Engineer, retires, the liability of this amount would be of the University.
35. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that first of all, he would like to thank the University authority for initiating the process of promotion of teachers under CAS. He would like to raise two serious issues. There is a teacher namely Dr. D.K. Singh at Panjab University Regional Centre, Muktsar, who had attained the age of 60 years and is a habitual complainant. When Professor R.C. Sobti was the Vice Chancellor of this University, he had given instruction to the Establishment Branch that his complaints should not be entertained. He always flouted the University Regulations/Rules and makes false complaints against his fellow colleagues and sent the copy of the complaint Vice President of India, Chief Minister, etc. Recently, he had filed complaints against 2-3 teachers. Whenever, he filed complaint, a process unnecessarily got started. He requested that keeping in view his past record, fresh instructions should be issued that his complaints should not be entertained. In fact, there is a provision in the Calendar that no employee of the University could meet/approach any Minister, Higher Authorities, etc., without the permission of the University, but this person always flouted this rule again and again, still no action has been taken against him. Dr. D.K. Singh has attained the age of more than 62 years and he is harassing the regular teachers of the Centre by filing false complaints against them. His request is that the matter should be enquired into and necessary direction should be issued to the Establishment Branch that the complaints filed by him should not be entertained.
36. Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that a complaint had come to the Vice Chancellor from P.U.S.S.G Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur. In fact, the behaviour of a teacher working at this Centre had become very absurd due to family circumstances and the teachers concerned humiliate the teachers in front of the students and staff. Several teachers, including Dr. Ravinder Pal, had come and met the Vice Chancellor and requested her to take action against the concerned teacher. The Vice Chancellor had referred the complaint to the Standing Committee, but the Standing Committee has forwarded the same to the Director, P.U.S.S.G Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur. Had the Director, P.U.S.S.G Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, been empowered to take action against the teacher, the complaint might not have come to the Vice Chancellor. His humble submission in this regard is that the complaint should be taken seriously because the teachers had apprehension that the person concerned might crush the teachers under his vehicle. The faculty members are saying that if he is not medically fit, he should be given medical leave until he is medically fit. In fact, he speaks a lot during the admission counselling that the students and their parents left the counselling and the seats remained vacant. He, therefore, reiterated that the complaint should be taken seriously.
37. Dr. Jagtar Singh pointed out that there is no Stenographer in the Department of Sports. Earlier, Mrs. Jai Devi, was working there as Stenographer, but now she has been posted in the office of the Finance & Development Officer as Personal Assistant. The work of the Department is suffering in the absence of Stenographer. Six-seven inter-University tournaments had already been conducted and the entire



work is being done by the teachers themselves. He urged that Mrs. Jai Devi should again be posted in the Department of Sports.

38. Dr. Jagtar Singh pleaded that a policy for regularization of services of persons working in the University on temporary/daily-wage/contract basis should be framed.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that since these persons had already attained the age of more than 35 years, a policy must be framed for the regularization of their services.

39. Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that the retirees are demanding that the option for old pension scheme should be reopened. They in the Committee in January had said that the meeting of the Committee would again be held after a period of 15 days. Although 2-3 months had elapsed, the meeting of the Committee has not been convened. In fact, 15-20 retirees, who were demanding reopening of option for old pension scheme had already died during this period. The retirees are saying are they waiting for their demise. Today, some of them met him and said their request should be decided in either way.

It was informed that the data is being prepared, which is very bulky. When the data would be presented to the members, they would be astonished as to how the office has prepared the same within this period. Moreover, they had been asked to calculate the financial implications and the data is of about 20-30 years. The meeting would be convened as and when the data is prepared.

40. Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that he has also said in an earlier meeting of the Syndicate that a transfer policy should be prepared for the persons willing to Panjab University Campus from P.U. Regional Centres and vice versa. On his plea, a Committee has been formed. He requested that the meeting of the Committee should be convened at the earliest.

41. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that earlier, when he was teaching in SCD Government College, Ludhiana, the blind candidates used to study the subjects like Music. However, from the last few years, the opportunity from the blind candidates for studying has been snatched. He requested that since there are only about 10-12 blind candidates per year, they should be allowed to study; otherwise, the seats remained vacant.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that earlier, blind candidates used to be given admission in M.A. (Music).

A couple of members, including Shri Sandeep Singh said that such candidates should be allowed to take admission.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra suggested that a policy should be framed and the same should be implemented as there is a direction from the Government as well as UGC. As per the direction of the Government, even special labs. are to be set up for blind students. Similarly, special seating provision is to be made in the Libraries.

42. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the age of superannuation of teachers working in Government Colleges in Chandigarh had been enhanced to 65 years. Now, the managements of the private Colleges are saying that since they are ready to allow their teachers to continue in service up to the age of 65 years, they should also be allowed to do so. If allowed, they would bear the financial burden at their own.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that if such permission is granted, the same should also be given to the colleges covered under grant-in-aid Scheme of the Government.

43. Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that an employee namely Shri Rajesh Yadav has been given the additional charge of Panjab University Guest House. He suggested that if he is performing well, he should be posted at Panjab University Guest House permanently.

The Vice Chancellor said that Shri Rajesh Yadav had already been posted at Panjab University Guest House on permanent basis.

44. Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that a Committee should be constituted to resolve the problem being faced by the teachers of Gurusar Sadhar College, Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur, and Abohar College. In fact, these teachers have not received salary for the last 14-15 months and they continued to stage protest outside the College.

45. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the posting of employees come under the purview of the Syndicate, he could also give two-three names for posting them at different places. So far as he knew, the posting of employees is under the purview of the Registrar, how could they interfere in it?

46. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the agenda about the issues relating to affiliated Colleges did not get included in the agenda. He had certain issues relating to the Colleges, which he wanted to raise now. He said that certain students missed the examination due to medical reasons. The students concerned submitted their requested in their respective Colleges within the stipulate time, but sometimes the Colleges could not forward/recommend the same to the University within time, and the students had to suffer due to the mistake of the College. If any fine or penalty is to be imposed, the same should be imposed on the College and the student(s) should be allowed to appear in the examination and they should not be deprived of this opportunity under any circumstances.

It was informed that as per Regulation appearing at page 35 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, the application from the students recommended by the Principal of the concerned College, who missed the examination due to medical reason, for appearing in the examination again, should reach the University (Controller of Examinations) within 10 days. If the applicant remained pending with the Principal, the regulation restricted them and they could not go beyond that. Sometimes, they received genuine cases, in which the students had got broken their hand, leg, etc., but their applications remained pending with their respective Principal.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the students submit the application in their Colleges, but the Colleges did not recommend/forward the same to the University. Where is the fault of the students?

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the loss is of the students.

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the students could send/submit an advance copy of his request along with proofs in the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if it is rule, they (Syndicate) could amend/give relaxation in it. In genuine cases, they could allow the students to appear in the examination.

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that if the student is admitted in the Hospital, even the period of 10 days is less.

Dr. Jagtar Singh suggested that the Controller of Examinations should be authorized to allow the student to appear in the examination, if the medical reasons advanced by the student for missing the examination are found to be genuine.

It was suggested that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to allow the student to appear in the examination, if the medical reasons advanced by the student for missing the examination are found to be genuine.

The Vice Chancellor said that she would allow the students, who miss the examination owing to medical reasons, to appear in the examination on case to case basis.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the Vice Chancellor is authorized, it would make the system lengthy. He, therefore, suggested that instead of Vice Chancellor, the Controller of Examinations should be authorized to allow the student to appear in the examination, if the medical reasons advanced by him/her for missing the examination are found to be genuine.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Dr. Jagtar Singh supported the proposal made by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua.

On a query, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the Controller of Examinations is also authorised to deal with the pending cases according to the above authority provided that the request of the students has been received in the College within the stipulated 10 days.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that they as Principal could also recommend the application of such students through e-mail.

47. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that everybody including the University authorities knew that the results of BBA and B.Com. are very glaring. He is raising this issue here because the issue is connected with the society. If they had the reason for these glaring results, they could inform the same to the Syndicate, so that a policy decision could be taken.

It was informed that the complaints, which are received, are placed before the JAAC of the concerned department, but the JAAC did not recommend that the students should be given grace marks, and they are facing problem in those cases. The pass percentage of BBA 1<sup>st</sup> Semester is 37.8%, which was immediately withdrawn from the website of the University to get the same reviewed from a Committee. It had come to their notice that about 30 marks question paper was out of syllabus.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the University should take an appropriate decision regarding grant of grace marks to the students of B.B.A. and B.Com. where the question papers were set out of syllabus and the Syndicate would be behind them.

It was clarified that the decision in such cases is always taken on the recommendation of Board of Studies/JAAC.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that wherever there is a problem, the University authorities, i.e., Controller of Examinations or the Vice Chancellor could take appropriate decision, which would be ratified by the Syndicate. He remarked that if

## Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

a question paper of 30 marks out of 100 is set out of syllabus, what would be the fate of the student.

It was said that if they go beyond the recommendation of Board of Studies/JAAC and recommend grace marks, a wrong signal would go, and in future, the same would be quoted precedence in a number of cases.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua remarked that it had been said that if the admissions are made on the basis on merit, the students of Private Universities, which awarded more than 90% marks would get admissions but the students of Panjab University where they awarded marks strictly would not be able to get admission. Now, when the question paper of 30 marks out of 100 is set out of syllabus, where would the students stand? He, therefore, suggested that the representation(s) of the students should be considered favourably.

48. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is a deterrent (Regulation 11.1) for the Colleges, which did not work properly. Under Regulation 11.2, if after an enquiry, it is found that an affiliated College under Private Management is not being properly administered, the Syndicate may authorize the Vice Chancellor to appoint representative(s) of the University on the managing body of the College. Earlier, the representatives of the Syndicate (Principal R.S. Jhanji and he himself) were appointed on the Managing Committee of two Colleges of Ludhiana. They had written to the former Vice Chancellor about the deficiencies of the Colleges, but the Vice Chancellor did not pay any heed and the Vice Chancellor waived off the penalties without any reason. He pleaded that those cases should again be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting, so that they could know whether there is any improvement; otherwise, they should be taken to task.

49. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the affiliated Colleges had started a new practice. In fact, they made appointment of teachers on ad hoc basis, that too, for few months only. Citing an example, he said that the teachers are appointed on ad hoc basis in the month of August and relieved in November/December and again appointed in the month of February and relieved in May/June. However, such teachers are deputed for examination duties. He suggested that a circular should be issued by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) to all the affiliated Colleges stating that the ad hoc/contract appointments of teachers be made for the full academic session, i.e., from July to May/June.

50. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he would like to know as to who is the Principal of G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector-32, Chandigarh. Secondly, who is the Principal of DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh?

The Vice Chancellor said that, as per record of the University, there is no Principal in DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that about 45-46 nominations for Board of Studies were rejected by the University. Who was at mistake?

It was informed that the mistake was of the Management of the College.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the mistake was not of the College, but of the University. He pointed out that the procedure for election of members of Board of Studies has clearly been mentioned in P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. It has been written under Regulation 2.8 at page 56 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 that "The procedure for election shall be as laid down in the Regulations relating election of

Ordinary Fellows”, and there is no requirement of recommendation of Principal in the election of Ordinary Fellows. The University had rejected the nomination forms of 56 persons. Irrespective of whether the mistake is on the part of the Management or the University, it is clear that the mistake is not on the part of the teacher. The Syndicate should take a conscious decision and postpone the election of Boards of Studies, which are scheduled for tomorrow. The nomination forms of all such teachers should be accepted and then election conducted. If the University did not do this, they have no alternative what to approach the Chancellor. Since DAV College is in the vicinity of the University, everybody knew as to what is happening there. Why are they so much helpless?

It was pointed out that a communication was received from the DAV College stating that six persons are officiating as Principal. What could the University do?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the matter should have been placed before the Syndicate for adjudication and the Syndicate would have imposed penalty on the College under Regulation 11.1.

Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the Examination Centres allotted to DAV College should be cancelled.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if any of the Colleges did not follow the Guidelines/norms of the University, the same should be disaffiliated. He pleaded that the election of Boards of Studies, which are scheduled for tomorrow, should be postponed.

When the Vice Chancellor requested Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra to express his viewpoints, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the meeting should not be conducted in this manner. If they did not pay any heed to the repeated requests of Syndicate members, what would be they doing to ordinary persons.

At this stage, din prevailed as some of the members (Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, Shri Varinder Singh, Shri Sandeep Singh and Dr. Mukesh Arora) started speaking together.

51. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra pointed out that the surrounding States and the Universities are moving towards old pension scheme. He would like to make a request to the Finance & Development Officer to tell them as to how the University could move towards old pension scheme. He pleaded that a Committee should be formed to look into this issue.

52. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra pointed out that they had raised several issues during the zero hour, but when they saw the proceedings they were shocked to see that their viewpoints were mentioned totally opposite than what they had said in the meeting. Citing an example, he said that they had resolved that the appointment of Principal S.S. Sangha should be approved, but the decision was mentioned differently. He suggested that the discussion held and decisions taken during the zero hour should be recorded properly and action also taken on them.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that a Committee of 4-5 Syndicate members should be formed to ensure that the proceedings of the Syndicate are recorded in accordance with the sense the members expressed their viewpoints.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that they found variation in the recording of proceedings as they expressed their viewpoints with different set of mindset, but in the minutes the same are recorded differently. Perhaps, the persons, who prepare

the draft minutes, might not be able to understand the intension/sense in which they expressed their viewpoints.

53. Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that first of all he would like to thank the Vice Chancellor for starting the process of promotions of teachers under CAS. In fact, it had created a sense of happiness amongst the teaching fraternity, which was otherwise, feeling a discarded a lot. He pointed out that the screening of the case of Dr. Bhupinder Singh for promotion from retrospective effect had been done just a few days before and the same had been placed before the Syndicate in this meeting itself by the Vice Chancellor. Earlier, the teachers were reluctant to fill up the forms for promotion, but now they are filling up their forms quickly. He expected that the Vice Chancellor would process their applications for promotion under the CAS as quickly as has been done in the case of Dr. Bhupinder Singh. If she did this, she would certainly get a lot of blessing.
54. Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that he did not speak on item C-15 has discussion on the same held quite long. Referring the issue of enhancement of age of superannuation of teachers from 60 years to 65 years, he said that a letter of Smt. Kirron Kher has been appended, which she had written to Union Home Minister. The Home Minister had written a letter to the U.T. Administration and the U.T. Administration wrote a letter to the Registrar, Panjab University, on 6.07.2022 asking him to take necessary action. They usually start saying that they had already amended the relevant Regulation in 2011 and sent the same to Government of India for approval. He remarked that sometime a person proved to be a lucky one as she has in the case of promotions under the CAS. He requested that a well drafted letter may be sent from the office of the Vice Chancellor under her signatures, to Governor, Education Minister and Home Minister mentioning therein that CSR is applicable to Higher Educational Institutions which are governed by University Grants Commission. There is no need to tell that University is located in Chandigarh. The same request has been sent through the communication sent by Smt. Kirron Kher and PUTA. The letter under the signatures of the Vice Chancellor should be written to the Chancellor of the University, it does not matter, whether the issue would be considered or not, at least a communication should be sent.
55. Dr. Gurmeet Singh said that this matter was also raised in the meeting of the Senate, he had earlier suggested also that code of conduct for the members of the Senate should be made. The web-casting of the Senate meeting should be done, at least one screen should be fixed outside the Senate hall. By doing so, there is no need to frame code of conduct. The webcasting of the meeting of the Senate should be done by placing the screens in the Auditorium. In today's time, the proceedings of Vidhan Sabha, Lok Sabha are live. It is not that University is lacking with the resources to do so. He had been observing from the last 15 years that statements made during the meetings of the Senate are manipulated and the Vice Chancellor is blamed for the statements which he/she had never made.
- Dr. Parveen Goyal endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Gurmeet Singh regarding web-casting of proceedings of the Senate.
56. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he endorsed the statement made by Dr. Gurmeet Singh regarding sending of communication from the Vice Chancellor regarding implementation of CSR rules. He would like to suggest that one more thing should be added that from the year 1998 the University teachers are filing writ petitions in the High Court regarding enhancement of retirement age from 60 to 65 years. A huge amount of money has been spent in meeting with expenses of legal cases by both teaching as well as the University, hence it may be requested to the Ministry of Home Affairs to expedite the amendment proposed in the year 2011, at the earliest

so that the decision of the Central Government regarding implementation of CSR rules to the HEIs governing under University Grants Commission, could be taken.

57. Dr. Gurmeet Singh said it should also be mentioned in the letter to be sent, that disparity has been created amongst the Colleges which have been granted affiliation by the Panjab University, located in Chandigarh, are covered under the CSR rules of Centre Government whereas the University is lagging behind in it.
58. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that in some of the department of the University, 5-6 guest faculty teachers are appointed. The University is doing nothing except spoiling the careers of these guest faculty teachers. Their work load is not completed and until their work load is completed, they could not be issued experience certificates. In spite of working for 3-4 years, they could not get the benefit of teaching experience of this period. He requested that either the guest faculty should be reduced to 2-3 instead of 5-6 or their work load should be completed. If their workload is completed, they could get the certificate of experience issued and apply for the jobs outside the University.
59. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that he was informed that in Dental Institute, contractual teachers are appointed for B.D.S. course, just like same, they can also appoint teachers on contractual basis in the University departments.
- The Vice Chancellor replied that after 2012, no appointments have been made on contractual basis.
- Shri Lajwant Singh reiterated that if it is not possible to appoint teachers on contractual basis, in that case, the guest teachers can be appointed but their work load may be properly defined so that they could get certificates of experience issued after serving for two or three years.
60. Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since they are at the fag end of the academic session and they have to get their prospectus for the ensuing academic session (2023-24) printed, if the fees and funds to be charged by the affiliated Colleges as well as the academic calendar finalized, the same should be provided to them at the earliest.
61. Principal R.S. Jhanji pointed out that some of colleagues had already raised the issue of below par result of B.B.A. Similar is the problem in the case of B.Com. 1<sup>st</sup> semester as about 30% of the question paper has been found to be out of syllabus. Resultantly, the pass percentage of B.Com. Semester 1 is very low. Had the pass percentage of B.Com. 1<sup>st</sup> Semester been low only of a particular area, they could have understood the position? But since the result is low of the Colleges situated in both Chandigarh and the state of Punjab, they could say that there is definitely something wrong? He requested the Vice Chancellor to look into the matter.
62. Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they had received representation from certain categories of employees (attendants, cooks, etc.) working the University Guest Houses stating that although they are working for the last so many years, they did not get promotion. He pointed out that since they are working against ex-cadre posts, there are no promotional avenues for them. He requested that a Committee should be formed to look into their grievances and see whether certain promotional avenues could be provided to them.

Proceedings of Syndicate Meeting dated 25.03.2023

It was informed that several ex-cadre posts existed in the University.

Dr. Parveen Goyal asked, whether the Committee for the purpose has been constituted?

It was informed that the Committee has not yet been formed.

Y.P. Verma  
Registrar

Confirmed

Renu Vig  
VICE CHANCELLOR