

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate held on **26th August, 2023 at 11.00 a.m.** in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Renu Vig ... (in the Chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Professor Devinder Singh
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 (online)
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 welcome all the Members of Syndicate and wish a very Good Morning to all".

Condolence Resolution

The Vice Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the honorable members about the sad demise of Dr. R.K. Mahajan, former Fellow, on 24.08.2023.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Dr. R.K. Mahajan and observed two minutes' silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- i) With the concerted efforts of PU fraternity, the Panjab University secured the **A++ Grade** from **National Assessment And Accreditation Council (NAAC)**. This marks the university's first-

- ever attainment of the highest grade, with a cumulative score of 3.68 out of 4.
- ii) While clearing all the backlog, a total 175 CAS promotion cases [Professor (Academic Level 14): 34, Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A): 46, Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11 to Selection Grade/Academic Level 12): 63, Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10 to Senior Scale/Academic Level 11): 32] have been cleared from March 2023 to August 2023.
 - iii) Department of Laws, University Institute of Legal Studies & Punjab University Regional Centres – Sri Muktsar Sahib, Ludhiana & Hoshiarpur conducted **5th Law Convocation 2023** on 12.08.2023. Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Kant, Judge, Supreme Court of India addressed and presided over as the Chief Guest. A total number of 1378 Degrees of Law (B.A. LLB/LLB/LLM) awarded to the students. This time the Law Convocation has been organized by the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
 - iv) Professor Ashok Kumar, Department of Hindi, Panjab University, has been awarded the '**Vishwa Hindi Gaurav Samman**' by **Hindi ki Goonj International** e-magazine for his continuous services to Hindi Literature.
 - v) Dr. O.N. Bhargava (Honorary Professor, Department of Geology, Panjab University, Chandigarh) has been awarded **Life Time Achievement National Geoscience Award in 2022-23** by **Ministry of Mines** and **INSA SENIOR SCIENTIST position for a period of 3 years**.
 - vi) Professor R.C. Sobti, former Vice Chancellor Panjab University has been offered **INSA Honorary Scientist Position** by the Indian National Science Academy, New Delhi, for a period of 3 years".

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that all are well aware about the A++ NAAC grade, attained by the University, which is the highest one as earlier A++ was not to the credit of the University, for which, he would like to congratulate the Vice Chancellor and her team and all other persons, who were associated with this achievement. He had discussed the issue on 15th August that there should be arrangement of launching pad in the University for covering the events like Chandrayan. Now, the Vice Chancellor should have trust like all Indians that it is not difficult for the Panjab University to attain the A++ grade than to safely land on the south pole of the lunar. As published in the newspapers, he observed that the very first point of the observation made by the NAAC team is related to governance structure of Panjab University, has been proved as a strength of the University, which is an eye-opener for all of them, which should also be more strengthened for the years to come. He also stated earlier that two-way respect should be there, if the authorities desired that members of the Syndicate should behave properly, there is expectation from the authorities too. Citing an example, he stated that in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, it was not decided that recommendations of the item pertaining to webcasting of Senate proceedings, would be placed in the meeting of the Senate. It might be decided afterwards that the webcasting of proceedings of the Senate would have to be placed before the Senate. In his opinion, it is not necessary to seek the approval of the Senate on that item. When the minutes were circulated, he had sent the e-mail that it was not decided to place the item pertaining to webcasting of proceedings of the Senate, before the

Senate. But he did not receive reply to the e-mail. He again sent e-mail in the corrected minutes to correct the resolved part, but it was not done. He is not saying that placing that item before the Senate is wrong, at least he should be given information in writing that due to procedure, it was decided to place the item pertaining to webcasting of proceedings of the Senate, before the Senate. He could quote similar type of examples also. They hoped that the Vice Chancellor would mention about promotions under CAS in her lecture on the occasion of Independence Day, but due to her noble gesture, it was not cited that a huge backlog was cleared by her. It was the good decision, as per his personal opinion, the decision of promotions under CAS, is more commendable than attaining A++ NAAC grade. The process of conducting interviews was initiated by the Vice Chancellor even before her appointment as Vice Chancellor on regular basis. No Vice Chancellor, on officiating post, would decide for initiating the process of conducting the interviews, till he/she has the instinct that she would be considered for the post of Vice Chancellor on regular basis. While concluding, he said that wherever the marker has been used to highlight some particular thing or topic, a black print has emerged, which is difficult to read. It is presumed that someone has intentionally marked the portion in black or there might be problem in the photocopying machine. He requested that this should be looked into for future.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that he, on his own behalf and on behalf of the faculty, would like to congratulate the Vice Chancellor for making promotions, under the CAS. Secondly, he stated that he would like to discuss something before considering item 2 pertaining to the Minutes of the Selection-cum-Evaluation Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that firstly, they should talk on the Vice Chancellor's statement.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that firstly, he would like to congratulate the Vice Chancellor for A++ NAAC grade and endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Professor Gurmeet Singh in dealing with the promotions under CAS. He requested that the remaining 50-60 cases of promotions of teachers should also be considered before December. He also pointed out that the office should mark the highlighted portion by putting brackets outside the statements.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that first of all he would like to congratulate the Vice Chancellor for attaining A++ grade by moving with a collective wisdom of the stakeholders. The preparations pertaining to NAAC visit were done in a very speedy manner; resultantly, the University attained a good ranking and came on the track. A number of pointers have been pointed out by the NAAC team, and they had the enough time to work on the pointers, so that the status of grade should be maintained in future. He once again congratulated the Vice Chancellor and her team for attaining the high ranking.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra stated that it is really a matter of pride for them, being the family of Panjab University that A++ grade has been attained. Most of the problems especially of USOL would be solved with this attainment of A++ grading by NAAC. He once again congratulated the Vice Chancellor, being the head of the family. Secondly, he appreciated and congratulated the Vice Chancellor for making the promotions under CAS for more than 200 teachers in a very short period. He also congratulated the Vice Chancellor and the Department of Laws for conducting the Law Convocation, after Covid-19. As also stated, a positive wave has started in the University, which according to him, would be continued in future also.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this achievement of A++ NAAC grade has been seen after so many years. This positive moment has come after several years. He remembered the day of the meeting of the Senate of 30th December, 2022, where Professor Renu Vig, the present Vice Chancellor was sitting with them as member, and when she joined the University as Vice Chancellor. At that time, they could not comprehend as to how these things would be sorted out. The Vice Chancellor put her strenuous efforts in a very cool way and attained such a high ranking. They would agree that she had not only collected the data, but also presented the same in an attractive manner. The teams of the former Vice Chancellor had critical approach for providing the data. The way the Vice Chancellor apprehended and walked in a right way to curb the trepidations is a matter of pride for them. A++ grade of the University would certainly benefit University School of Open Learning. He was of the opinion that to maintain this A++ grade, the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor would get enhanced. He again, on his own behalf and on behalf of the House, thanked the Vice Chancellor for achieving this highest score.

Dr. Mukesh Arora congratulated the Vice Chancellor and the whole team who worked either in positive or negative terms. It had appeared in the newspapers that certain faculty members tried to tarnish the image of the University and provided wrong information to the NAAC team, he still wanted to congratulate them. He also congratulated the Law faculty for organizing the Law Convocation as well as the Awardees on being awarded the Law Degrees.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur congratulated the Vice Chancellor on behalf of the affiliated Colleges of Punjab. The attainment of A++ NAAC grade is a matter of happiness especially when this has been obtained under the leadership of woman. She is sure that they would walk with visionary approach in future. At one point of time, the University was at the downfall; however, under the leadership of Vice Chancellor, the University has regained its top position. She assured the Vice Chancellor that they would extend their full support to the Vice Chancellor and would continue to work for the betterment of the University.

Dr. Jagtar Singh congratulated the Vice Chancellor for attaining a huge score in NAAC with only 50% faculty in the departments.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu congratulated the Vice Chancellor and all the stakeholders of the University for this great achievement, which has been possible only due to dedicated efforts put forth by them within the last 4-5 months and could improve the score. He felt that with this great achievement, their responsibility has got enhanced and hoped that they would be able to fulfil this enhanced responsibility. There are majority of issues related to Colleges, where the services of number of College teachers have been terminated. Even the services of teachers working against grant-in-aid posts are not regularized, which would be discussed later. He requested that such issues should be taken up on priority and desired that a special meeting of the Syndicate for discussing issues related to Colleges, should be convened

Professor Jatinder Grover said, first of all, he would like to congratulate whole University and the Vice Chancellor for achieving the A++ NAAC grade. He would like to share that it was only due to the positive environment with the Vice Chancellor and her team including D.U.I. at the time of NAAC team visit. The Vice Chancellor had not lost her coolness, which brought positive vibes in attaining A++ NAAC grade.

Shri Sandeep Singh congratulated the Vice Chancellor and especially Class IV employees, who worked at the ground level, day and night.

Professor Devinder Singh congratulated the Vice Chancellor and her whole team for attaining A++ grade from NAAC. He suggested that University should celebrate and award those workers, who worked day and night, even on gazetted holidays for the maintenance and upkeep/cleanliness of the premises. If not possible at University level, the celebration could be done separately at the Department level by inviting them over a cup of tea.

Professor Jatinder Grover, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and Shri Sandeep Singh endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Devinder Singh.

Dr. Parveen Goyal congratulated the Vice Chancellor for the achievement of attaining A++ grade from NAAC.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that three teams from Sri Guru Gobind Singh College had performed during the NAAC visit, for which an appreciation letter should be sent to the College as the teams had prepared the performance items in just two days, which was also appreciated by NAAC team.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was the work of the huge team comprising of teachers, non-teachers, technical staff of the Administrative Block and teaching Departments, employees of Horticulture Department and everyone put hard work in the maintenance and upkeep of the University. Before NAAC visit, heavy rainfall occurred, in spite of that, the Construction department put strenuous efforts in coping up with the work, so that everything would be in order and in presentable form. They did not introduce Department of Music, but the team said that they would visit the department, the University was ready well before for such things. Their main purpose was to make themselves ready as team could visit any of the departments and hostels with the involvement of the efforts of all. With regard to awarding of score, she felt that the University could attain much better score than that. Their work was better than the score awarded to them. The data of the University was under presented as compared to the actual work. Citing an example, she said that the University has more than 10000 publications in their credit, but the publications which were presented, were 8500. Similarly, a lot of events and seminars are organized by the departments they failed to maintain the data pertaining to it. The University could not provide complete data as per the parameters of the NAAC, hence they could not get more score, but otherwise they do much more than this. She is very sure that in the times to come the score of the University would be better next time. Now, they are planning to do this exercise regularly that the annual assurance data should be submitted timely, and all the data should be properly presented so that next time the performance of the Panjab University would be better than this. Actually, now it is better than the past, but because of lack of data, the score is less.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Professor Ashok Kumar, Department of Hindi, Panjab University, on having been awarded the 'Vishwa Hindi Gaurav Samman' by *Hindi ki Goonj International e-magazine*;

- (ii) Dr. O.N. Bhargava (Honorary Professor, Department of Geology, Panjab University, Chandigarh), on having been awarded Life Time Achievement National Geoscience Award in 2022-23 by Ministry of Mines and INSA SENIOR SCIENTIST Position; and
 - (iii) Professor R.C. Sobti, former Vice Chancellor Panjab University, on having been offered INSA Honorary Scientist Position by the Indian National Science Academy, New Delhi.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No.1, 2 & 3, be noted.
 3. the Action Taken Report in respect of the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 27.5.2023 (**Appendix-I**), be noted.

At this stage, Professor Jatinder Grover said that before starting item 2, he would like to say that as there are so many promotion cases of Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor and these things have to be kept confidential. The proceedings of the Selection Committee were sent by the office in a closed cover. A member of the Syndicate has sent all these proceedings to the persons who are being promoted. Was it a good thing, had it been allowed? If it is not allowed, then how that person has send the proceedings of the Selection Committee to all those teachers, who are being promoted? He has the evidence with himself in support of this statement.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it should not be happened that secrecy is not maintained.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it is very serious matter as to from which mobile the information was leaked. It could also be got checked from their mobiles as to who is the person who has done this? In similar other cases, minutes of the meetings are circulated through mobile phone

Professor Jatinder Grover said that he had the evidence in the form of screenshots with him. The members of the Syndicate should be responsible if they are in the Governing body and should be a matured one. One should act as a mature person and not as an immature person who sends all the data to the person whose selections are to be approved and congratulated them in advance.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that in that case, item C-2 should be deferred with the direction to place it in the next meeting of the House.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that what is the fault of others who are not involved in this episode?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested that this concern should not be for one particular item. Unfortunately, in the last meeting of the Syndicate where Committee was formed and the members of the Committee resolved and without the signatures of two members, the documents were submitted before the Court even without the approval of the Vice Chancellor. How this matter would be dealt with? The Judge of the High Court questioned and the document had to be withdrawn; otherwise, the office would have been summoned. Though the members are accountable only up to December 2023, the accountability of the

Chair is continuous. He remarked that the chair is accountable even for the decisions taken during the tenure of previous Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that each one of them has to be realized that it is their responsibility. Some of the minutes of the meetings reached the media; hence, they should restrain themselves in doing so.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested that a Committee should be formed to frame code of conduct as this issue had been raised in the House several times. The confidentiality should be maintained. Every Government Office has its code of conduct; hence, the code of conduct should be framed for the University also.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is actually a matter of moral code of conduct.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that interestingly it came to his notice that a Committee regarding framing of code of conduct has already been constituted.

Shri Sandeep Singh asked, what would be done by the Committee of the code of conduct?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the minutes of the Committee for the code of conduct would never be placed before the House.

Professor Devinder Singh said that if the University has the code of conduct then it would be aware as that what level the violation is done and what code has been violated, which could be openly debated and discussed. If the code of ethics for the Fellows is defined, it could be better to discuss the violation. The code of conduct for the House should be made necessary. The meeting of the Committee for the code of conduct should be convened. If Committee is not formed, then it should be constituted.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that even the minutes of the meeting already constituted, which are approved by the Vice Chancellor are never placed before the House. A meeting, which was held under the chairmanship of Dr. Dinesh Kumar, its minutes had not been placed so far. He would like to bring it on record that Advocates of the University speaks against the University, which could be checked from the legal proceedings of the Court cases. Instead of defending the University in the court, the University is blamed by its advocates.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that those persons, who are responsible for not maintaining the secrecy of the House, should be imposed with the punishment that he must not hold any position or designation in the University. He said that while endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Mukesh Arora, the person who is representing the University and representing the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor of this University, should not go beyond the instructions and the guidelines of this University. He has been informed that the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor here has been even questioned in the High Court not by anybody else but by the Counsel himself, who is representing the University, this could also be taken into consideration in a very serious manner and this kind of misconduct should not be ignored.

Professor Devinder Singh said that this is also a reason to constitute a Committee for ethics that they should also be aware as to what is the good conduct.

Continuing, Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that if the Committee has already been formed then it is alright, if not, a Committee should be constituted so that the members of the Syndicate and Senate must be aware that these are the code of conduct which should not be violated. These codes should be categorically defined that for such violation, this kind of penal action would be taken.

Professor Devinder Singh said that there is need to define about the good conduct and misconduct which is expected from the Fellows.

2(i). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level-13A) to Professor (Academic Level-14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Navneet Kaur be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic Level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 02.06.2023**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level-13A) to Professor (Academic Level-14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Amarjit Kaur be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic Level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) in the Department of Chemistry Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 12.10.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level-13A) to Professor (Academic Level-14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Neetu Goel be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic Level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) in the Department of Chemistry Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement

Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 23.12.2020**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level-13A), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ramesh Kataria be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic level 12**) to Associate Professor (**Academic level 13A**) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 14.06.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(v). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor in Chemistry Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rohit Kumar Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic level 12**), in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 27.09.2020**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor in Chemistry (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor in Chemistry (Senior Scale/Academic Level-11), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Nishima be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Academic level 10**) to Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic level 11**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 12.03.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor in Chemistry (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor in Chemistry (Selection Grade/Academic Level-12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Prasanta Kumar Nanda be promoted from Assistant Professor in Chemistry (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor in Chemistry (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 06.05.2022**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor in Chemistry (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor in Chemistry (Selection Grade/Academic Level-12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Renu Thapar be promoted from Assistant Professor in Chemistry (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor in Chemistry (**Selection Grade/Academic Level-12**), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 04.03.2022**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-X**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor in Chemistry (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor in Chemistry (Selection Grade/Academic Level-12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Anil Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor in Chemistry (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor in Chemistry (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**), at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 01.03.2022**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(x). Considered minutes dated 07.08.2023 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010)(4th Amendment dated 11.07.2016) in the Department of Botany, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Anand Narain Singh be promoted from from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**), in the Department of Botany, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) (4th Amendment dated 11.07.2016) **w.e.f. 23.12.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of

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

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to 4th amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level-13A) to Professor (Academic Level-14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Samarjit Sihotra be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic Level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic Level 14**), in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 02.07.2022**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xii). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Physics, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Lokesh Kumar be promoted from from Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) to Associate Professor (**Academic Level 13A**), in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 18.07.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400 -2,17,100, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xiii). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor in Physics (Academic Level 13A) to Professor in Physics (Academic Level 14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Shuchi Gupta be promoted from Associate Professor in Physics (**Academic Level 13A**) to Professor in Physics (**Academic Level 14**), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 17.07.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xiv). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sakshi Gautam be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**), in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 15.10.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xv). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at Centre for Medical Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vivek Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic level 12**), at Centre for Medical Physics, Panjab University Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 01.07.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed

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

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xvi). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor in Physics (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gulsheen Ahuja be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 18.07.2023**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xvii). Considered minutes dated 26.08.2023 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Maninder Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 28.02.2022**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xviii). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2010 (2nd Amendment, 2013) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Tanzeer Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2010 (2nd Amendment, 2013) **w.e.f. 11.08.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15,600-39,100/- + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

2(xix). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2010 in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Avneet Saini be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2010, **w.e.f. 01.10.2011**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15,600-39,100/- + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

2(xx). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (4th Amendment, 2016) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Naveen Kaushal be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2010 (4th Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 25.06.2018**, in the pay-scale of

Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the (4th amendment, 2016) of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxi). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Simran Preet be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 20.03.2022**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxii). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sarvnrinder Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4th Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 05.03.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the 4th amendment 2016 of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxiii). Considered minutes dated 08.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) (4th Amendment, 2016) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Pavitra Ranawat be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Biophysics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4th amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 20.03.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the (4th amendment 2016) of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxiv). Considered minutes dated 09.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A) to Professor (Academic Level 14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2018 (18.07.2018) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Suman Mor be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 30.08.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxv). Considered minutes dated 09.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) (4th Amendment dated 11.07.2016) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Madhuri Rishi nee Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage 3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage 4**) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4th Amendment, 11.07.2016), **w.e.f. 07.09.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the (4th Amendment) of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxvi). Considered minutes dated 09.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2018 (18.07.2018) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rajeev Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 08.11.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxvii). Considered minutes dated 09.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A) to Professor (Academic Level 14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Dipti Sareen be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 14.11.2020**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxviii). Considered minutes dated 09.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Nirmal Prabhakar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 01.09.2020**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxix). Considered minutes dated 09.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at Institute of Forensic Science and Criminology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vishal Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**), at Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 07.12.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxx). Considered minutes dated 09.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXXI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic

Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at Institute of Forensic Science and Criminology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Shweta Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at Institute of Forensic Science and Criminology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 03.12.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxxii). Considered minutes dated 09.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXXII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at Institute of Forensic Science and Criminology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Jagdish Rai be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at Institute of Forensic Science and Criminology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 15.09.2020**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxxiii). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A) to Professor (Academic Level 14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department cum National Centre for Human Genome Studies and Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ramandeep Kaur be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) in the Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies and Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 25.02.2019**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200, at a

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

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxxiii). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) in the Department cum National Centre for Human Genome Studies and Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ranvir Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage 3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage 4**) in the Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies and Research, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) (4th Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 10.04.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 4th Amendment, 2016 of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xxxiv). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXXV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A) to Professor (Academic Level 14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Deepak Kumar Rahi be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) in the Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 14.10.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxxv). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) in the Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Naveen Gupta be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage 3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage 4**) in the Department of Microbiology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010), **w.e.f. 04.05.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/ + AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

2(xxxvi). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A) to Professor (Academic Level 14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Microbial Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Rohit Sharma be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) in the Department of Microbial Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 24.07.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xxxvii). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Fashion Technology and Vocational Development, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Prabhdeep Brar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) to Associate Professor (**Academic Level 13A**), at University Institute of Fashion Technology and Vocational Development, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 22.12.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400 - 2,17,100, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(XXXVIII). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Fashion Technology and Vocational Development, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Anu H. Gupta be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at University Institute of Fashion Technology and Vocational Development, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 22.12.2020**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(XXXIX). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XL**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A) to Professor (Academic Level 14), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Geology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gurmeet Kaur be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) in the Department of Geology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 11.11.2022**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xl). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XLI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) (2nd Amendment, 2013) in the Department of Geology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Birendra Pratap Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage 1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage 2**) in the Department of Geology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2010 – (2nd Amendment, 2013), **w.e.f. 28.04.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100/- + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the 2nd Amendment, 2013 of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xli). Considered minutes dated 10.08.2023 (**Appendix-XLII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Geology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Debabrata Das be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Academic Level 10**) to Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) in the Department of Geology, Panjab University Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 23.11.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xlii). Considered minutes dated 11.08.2023 (**Appendix-XLIII**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Academic Level 13 A) to Professor (Academic Level 14) under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at Human Resource Development Centre (HRDC).

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that he had sent an e-mail to the University authorities on this issue, to which a reply was given to him late in the evening. Some of the documents had been provided to him and some not. His only

submission is that this Centre (HRDC) is not under the University, and all the financial powers of this Centre rested with the UGC. A clarification was sought from the UGC when Dr. Jayanti Dutta was promoted as Associate Professor. His question is only that now when they are giving promotion to her from Associate Professor to Professor, why they are not seeking permission from the UGC. When it was pointed out that she is being promoted in accordance with the UGC guidelines, he said that guidelines are a different thing. He also pointed out that though the HRDC is being headed by the Director, her application for promotion as Professor, under the CAS, has been countersigned by the head of one of the University Teaching Department. If the UGC is saying that she should be promoted, her application should have been routed through Director, HRDC. He could not understand how the Chairperson of another department could verify her credentials, including as to how many classes she had taken, because she had filled category one and two also. Even if they thought that she deserved promotion under the CAS of UGC, her application should have come through Director, HRDC. Since the funds are to be given by the UGC, permission of the UGC should be sought. Tomorrow, the UGC could say that since the University had not obtained permission from it before promoting her as Professor, it would not give the funds. Then the University would be in trouble. He, therefore, suggested that before giving permission to the promotion of Dr. Jayanti Dutta as Professor, permission from the UGC should be obtained. He also pointed out that the post of Director, HRDC, is equivalent to the post of Professor. Interestingly, the Syndicate at the time of granting promotion to Dr. Jayanti Dutta as Associate Professor had decided that she would not stake claim for the Directorship of HRDC via CAS of the UGC. Legal luminaries are present in the meeting and they would vouch that the Syndicate could not impose such a condition. The Syndicate could only say that she could be promoted as Professor but would not be appointed as Director of HRDC. The University could not decide who could claim what and what not. As such, these decisions of the University are not legally tenable. He, therefore, reiterated that the permission from the UGC should be obtained before promoting Dr. Jayanti Dutta as Professor.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is written in the letter that the financial liabilities on the promotion of Dr. Jayanti Dutta as Professor will be borne by the UGC. Moreover, the UGC nominee is saying that she is entitled for promotion under CAS as per UGC norms for University Departments.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that the applications of teachers of the departments for promotion under CAS came through the office of the Dean of University Instruction.

On a point of order, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the Syndicate has no power to change the decision of the Senate. Clarifying, he said that the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 20.08.2017 relating to the promotion of Dr. Jayanti Dutta as Associate Professor has already been approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 10.09.2017/24.09.2017. The issue had earlier also been raised in the Syndicate in one of its previous meeting. In fact, he would like to thank the Vice Chancellor for bringing the promotion case of Dr. Jayanti Dutta from Associate Professor to Professor in such a short span of time. Otherwise, she was waiting for the promotion since long. Several Vice Chancellors came and gone, but none of the Vice Chancellors tried to place her case before the Selection Committee and Syndicate and Senate. He, therefore, thanked the Vice Chancellor and congratulated Dr. Jayanti Dutta for getting promoted as Professor. Moreover, it had already been recommended by the Syndicate and approved by the Senate that if the scheme of HRDC is discontinued by the UGC, she would be adjusted at

an equivalent position in the Centre for Public Health. Otherwise also, they absorb everybody after the service of five years.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the UGC had written a letter to the University for absorbing, but the University has not hitherto absorbed anyone. Moreover, the case of Dr. Jayanti Dutta has also not been placed before the Board of Finance.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that Dr. Jayanti Dutta deserved promotion, for which she was waiting since long.

The Vice Chancellor said that the financial liability in this case is to be borne by the UGC. They would send the information about the promotion of Dr. Jayanti Dutta to the UGC.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the benefit for research paper should be given from the date the same is accepted for publication because publication took a lot of time.

The Vice Chancellor said that the benefit of research paper is given in accordance with the UGC guidelines.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the teachers are supposed to apply for promotion under the CAS of UGC three months before the date of eligibility. He suggested that a mechanism should be evolved and instructions should be issued to the Departments by the office of the Dean of University Instruction asking the teachers to apply for promotion three months before the actual date of their eligibility. Otherwise, the teachers got promotions after a period of 2-3 years. Now-a-days, they are approving the cases of promotions of teachers, who are eligible for promotion from 2018. When their pay fixation would be done?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that for this, they have to frame a rule.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Jayanti Dutta be promoted from Associate Professor (**Academic level 13A**) to Professor (**Academic level 14**) at Human Resource Development Centre, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 08.05.2023**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her. Since this position is in UGC funded Centre (HRDC), the financial liability of this promotion shall be borne by the UGC.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xliii). Considered minutes dated 11.08.2023 (**Appendix-XLIV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor in Mathematics (Stage-3) to Associate Professor in Mathematics (Stage-4), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2nd Amendment, 2013) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Saurabh Bhatia be promoted from Assistant Professor in Mathematics (**Stage 3**) to Associate Professor in Mathematics (**Stage 4**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (2nd Amendment, 2013), **w.e.f. 29.01.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 2nd Amendment, 2013 of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xliv). Considered minutes dated 11.08.2023 (**Appendix-XLV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2010 (4th Amendment, 2016) in the Department of Mathematics.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Manisha Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage 2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage 3**) in the Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010 – 4th Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 28.08.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the 4th Amendment, 2016 of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(xlv). Considered minutes dated 11.08.2023 (**Appendix-XLVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) at Centre for Nanoscience & Nanotechnology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Jadab Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Academic level 10**) to Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic level 11**) at Centre for Nanoscience & Nanotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 27.08.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xlvi). Considered minutes dated 11.08.2023 (**Appendix-XLVII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 2010 at Centre for Nuclear Medicine.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vijayta D. Chadha be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Centre for Nuclear Medicine, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 07.11.2011**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15,600-39,100 + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

2(xlvii). Considered minutes dated 11.08.2023 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Statistics.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Anju Goyal be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) in the Department of Statistics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 02.05.2022**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her..

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xlviii). Considered minutes dated 11.08.2023 (**Appendix-XLIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme 18.07.2018 at Centre for System Biology and Bioinformatics.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Tammanna Ravee Sahrawat be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at Centre for System Biology and Bioinformatics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 11.03.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(xlix). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-L**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) (4th Amendment, 2016) in the Department of Zoology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Yogesh Kumar Rawal be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 – (4th Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 13.09.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to the 4th amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(l). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2018 (18.07.2018) in the Department of Zoology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Indu Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Academic Level-10**) to Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level-11**) in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career

Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 01.09.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(i). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2018 (18.07.2018) in the Department of Zoology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Archana Chauhan be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Academic Level-10**) to Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level-11**) in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 29.10.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (2010) in the Department of Zoology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ravneet Kaur be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010, **w.e.f. 27.08.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15,600-39,100 + AGP Rs.7000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

2(liii). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4th Amendment, 2016) in the Department of Zoology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Mani Chopra be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4th Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 11.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900–2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the 4th Amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(liv). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4th Amendment, 2016) in the Department of Zoology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vijay Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, 2010 (4th Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 17.02.2017**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900–2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the 4th Amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

2(lv). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Academic Level 10) to Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018) in the Department of Zoology.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ravinder Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Academic Level 10**) to Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) in the Department of Zoology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the

UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 27.08.2018**, in the pay-scale of Rs.68,900-2,05,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(lvi). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LVII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sangeeta Pilkhwal Sah be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 14.09.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(lvii). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vandita Kakkar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 11.09.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(lviii). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Jai Malik be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 11.09.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(lix). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Amita Sarwal be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 12.09.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(lx). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LXI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12),

under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ashwani Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 11.09.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(lxi). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LXII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Anurag be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 10.09.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

2(lxii). Considered minutes dated 12.08.2023 (**Appendix-LXIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Senior Scale/Academic Level 11) to Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12), under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, (18.07.2018) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Neelima Dhingra be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Senior Scale/Academic Level 11**) to Assistant Professor (**Selection Grade/Academic Level 12**) at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (18.07.2018), **w.e.f. 11.09.2021**, in the pay-scale of Rs.79,800-2,11,500/-, at a

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

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. The Committee felt that the grade/score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the promotion has been made in compliance to the UGC Regulations, 2018.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letter of promotions to the persons promoted under **Item C-2(i) to C-2(lxii)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

At this stage, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the meetings of the Selection Committees were held for promotion of (175 + 1) teachers, under CAS from 26 March, 2023 to 12th August, 2023 under the guidance of the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor for which he would like to convey his heartiest congratulations. He would also like to congratulate the teacher for getting promoted, whose promotion was withheld by the Chairperson of his/her department from the year 2018. The Vice Chancellor had immediately contacted the incumbent and initiated the process of his/her promotion. At that time, tears had come in his/her eyes. His/her promotion was expedited by the senior most Professor of the University, i.e., the Dean of University Instruction. He conveyed his thanks to the Dean of University Instruction. The promotion was stopped only due to the reason that on the forwarding letter the date was wrongly mentioned as 8th April instead of 8th June. He added that the Professor of IGNOU (Dr. Bhaskar) reached the University in evening for attending the Selection Committee at the University.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that it is wrong to comment on the experts.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested that the promotion of the teacher, who has not been promoted, should be expedited.

The Vice Chancellor assured that that case would be considered in due course of time.

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

3. To appoint Returning Officer, for the Election of Ordinary Fellows - 2024, under Regulation 10.1 at page 65 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

NOTE:

1. Regulation 10.1 at page 65 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2022, reads as under:

10.1. "For elections other than those by the Faculties, the Registrar or the Deputy Registrar, as the Syndicate may decide shall be the Returning Officer."

2. The Syndicate has to decide the appointment of the Registrar or the Deputy Registrar as “Returning Officer” for the Election of Ordinary Fellows from the following constituencies:
 - (i) Registered Graduates.
 - (ii) Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University.
 - (iii) Associate Professors and Assistant Professors on the staff of the Teaching Departments of the University.
 - (iv) Principals of the Technical and Professional Colleges.
 - (v) Members of the Staff of the Technical and Professional Colleges.
 - (vi) Heads of the Affiliated Arts Colleges.
 - (vii) Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors of the Affiliated Arts Colleges.
3. In the previous election of 2020 the Syndicate appointed the Registrar as Returning Officer for the Election of Ordinary Fellows for the above constituencies.
4. An office note was enclosed (**Appendix-LXIV**).

RESOLVED: That the Registrar be appointed Returning Officer for the Election of Ordinary Fellows - 2024, under Regulation 10.1 at page 65 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

4. Considered minutes of the Advisory Committee of Panjab University Extension Library, Ludhiana, dated 28.12.2022 (**Appendix-LXV**).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that these are minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Committee of P.U. Extension Library, held in the month of December, 2022, which have been placed here after 8 months. The minutes of the meetings which were held in the University during the month of July have been placed before the House in the month of August. He requested that minutes of the Advisory Committees should be placed before the Syndicate at the earliest. He said that Vice Chancellor should visit the auditorium of the P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana to see that the auditorium is in the dilapidated condition. The building should be re-constructed after demolishing or some provision of lift should be made there. He had requested earlier also to get the work of repair and maintenance of the building done in several meetings of the Syndicate. He further

requested that the accommodation allotted to the Director of P.U. Extension Library, is also vacant from the last several years, he suggested that if possible, the said accommodation should be allotted to some other faculty or the provision of Guest House/Centre for spot evaluation, should be made.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar seconded the suggestion put forth by Dr. Mukesh Arora to use the accommodation of the Director as Guest House.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that papers concerning table agenda are received where 2-3 points have been withdrawn.

It was informed that these points were withdrawn as it is not in the purview of the Syndicate to take decision on them.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it is the matter only for getting the permission for opening of Centre for the Colleges around 60 kilometers from the Library, where students come for getting the information. For the purpose, he suggested that the Centre/Information Counter should be opened to provide information related to admission and results. It could prove more beneficial for the students. More than 500 students visit daily for getting the information related to forms, admission and results. Secondly, he said that the structure of the Auditorium is in such a bad shape that there is space crunch in it. Moreover, the strength of the institute is also increasing. He felt that this is one of the best Regional Centre, which has also got appreciation by the NAAC. Hence, this space should be properly utilized, by providing reading space to the students. The Committee had recommended that work of the repair and maintenance of the building should be carried out. In that fund, more than Rs.2.5 crore is lying, that money could be utilized for construction of Auditorium and Multi-capacity hall/reading room for organizing the functions and other academic activities. The parking space at the ground floor can also be created. The University will not have financial burden for the construction and maintenance of this building. As the institute is in the hub of the city and it is a very attractive campus, its library has its own history with collection of rare books. One item which has also been removed for consideration is pertaining to writing off the old newspapers and reading material. This should also be got done. He also suggested that the residential accommodation of Director should also be converted into Guest House so that the same could be used for visiting persons from University and other guests. If possible, they can meet the Vice Chancellor with complete papers or some meeting could be convened to accord permission and finalize it. The funds available with the Institute should be collectively and properly used to become more attractive campus, so that the same could be emerged as model regional centre.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the item the proper documents are not attached as he remembered that meeting was called by Dr. Raj Kumar, the then Vice Chancellor, where he and Shri Naresh Gaur had sent the e-mails, which was not made the part of the Agenda. He had written in the e-mails that Vice Chancellor should himself visit and see the condition of the building. The persons have emotional attachment with that place. Referring to sub-item 5 at page 23, how merciless things were taken? There was one item pertaining to digitization of the rare books, where the Librarian (Dr. Balbir Kaur) of Guru Nanak Khalsa College for Women expressed that the Punjab Digital Library provides digitization services to the library. The Punjab Digital Library, the institution of the Chandigarh, provide digitization services to the library, free of cost. Similarly, in Ludhiana, the Punjabi Bhawan had digitalized the lacs of Punjabi books, which

serves as N.G.O. with some foreign collaboration. The said N.G.O. has no legal right on the books. They only offered the services of digitization of rare books, at free of cost. The reply which was received on the suggestion of the Librarian for the purpose, an amount of Rs.25 lacs is required. From where, this figure of Rs.25 lacs has come? Was the scrutiny got done from any Company or any tenders were invited? It was informed that an additional amount of Rs.15 lacs should be added to the submitted proposal. In the end, it was resolved that a total (Rs.25 lac + 15 lac) i.e., Rs.40 lacs is approved for the proper digitization work of the library. The N.G.O., who is offering to digitize the books at free of cost, should be contacted. It should also be got checked whether the organization could complete the work as per the requirements of the University and is suitable for the University. Then they should go for other procedure either by calling tender or otherwise. But here, no process is initiated. Only one person is submitting the proposal of Rs.25 lacs and on it the second person commented that Rs. 25 lacs are less; it should be Rs.40 lacs. The profile of the persons working in the N.G.O. should be provided to the Registrar or the Vice Chancellor and the work of digitization could be done, free of cost, then they should be contacted so that Rs. 40 lacs of the University could be saved. Till then, approval to sub-item relating to sanction of Rs.40 lacs should be withheld.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that he fully agreed with Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua that if the work of digitization could be done free of cost, he would have no objection. It might be possible as Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua was not in the meeting. There was some problem in interpreting the issue. It is a huge Committee comprising of Principals of all the Colleges, wherein the permission was sought from the Committee that an amount of Rs.40 lacs should be allocated. It might be that out of this amount, only Rs.5 lacs would be spent for the purpose. He submitted that, as the meeting was held after a very long time and its minutes have also been placed after 8 months, allocation of budget should be approved, but the expenditure would only be done after following the proper procedure. He is of the view that if the item has come, it should be approved, rest of the procedure should be followed.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that these points/recommendations of the Committee have not been written by him. If the proposal has been placed by someone that digitalization work could be done free of cost, could anyone tried to work out this? They preferred to allocate Rs.40 lacs instead of working out the modalities on the proposal for doing the digitalization work at free of cost.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that during the tenure of Professor Arun K. Grover as Vice Chancellor, a Committee was formed. A meeting was held at the P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, wherein it was brought to the notice that Rs.1 crore was lying in their account at that time. He felt surprised to know at present Rs.2.5 crores is available in their account. The Youth Festival was conducted at the Seminar Hall at the ground floor of the building at that time, where numbers of Air Conditioners were not in working order and even the Generator Set was not in working condition. At that time the condition was of the Seminar Hall as well the Reading Hall was in dilapidated condition. A well drafted proposal indicating therein, the places where Air Conditioners were to be installed, shifting of parking place, construction of reading hall, was made. After the University, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, is considered as the most popular place, where majority of industrialists, old teachers and other persons are enrolled as members. The membership has also been renewed every year by them, rather Colleges deposit their contribution of students, so collected from them on annual basis. No developmental work has been done at the P.U. Regional Centre,

Ludhiana, from the last several years. The matter regarding installation of lift was also raised earlier; the officials from the University also visited the Regional Centre. He observed that this item should be approved, but the draft so prepared should be got scrutinized, and it should also be got checked whether the allocation has rightly been made. Sometimes in one budget head, more expenditure is incurred and in some other account less expenditure is incurred.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra asked that the budget allocation (under this item) should be approved in principle.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the matters regarding purchase of equipment and procurement of software are dealt with promptly, but no heed is paid to work, which is to be got done, free of cost. It is proposed that these 1000 rare books should be digitalized and Rs.40 lacs have been sanctioned without even calling tenders and quotations.

The Vice Chancellor said that this amount would only be approved with a condition that the proposal to conduct the digitization work, free of cost, should be got examined in the first instance.

It was informed that after this, most of the things have been updated. The meetings of the Budget Estimates Committees are being convened, where proposals for the Extension Library are being placed and positively considered for the purpose of development of the Extension Library. In the light of those decisions, proposals for development of Extension Library have also been sent to the University.

On a point of order, Principal R.S. Jhanji said that this amount of Rs.2.5 crore is of the Colleges.

It was submitted that gone are the days, when the fund was created and they started spending. There are strict compliances of Income Tax, GST for spending a huge amount. Who would comply with the conditions of deducting the TDS and GST? Who would file the returns of the TDS and GST? Were they got the GST number of the P.U. Extension Library? Is, P.U. Extension Library registered as separate entity? Were they got their separate PAN/TAN numbers? They could not spend money without complying the statutory provisions, so that was why, this decision was taken.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that P.U. Extension Library is not the Regional Centre, its structure, entity and relevance in the society is quite different. In other Universities, Extension Libraries are promoted instead of Regional Centres. The purpose of the Regional Centre and Extension Library is quite different. In the year 2004, an MLA Mr. Lajpat Rai, was the member of the Senate, had granted Rs. 2 crore from his discretionary fund, for the creation of the Law Centre. It was specifically decided that the entity of P.U. Extension Library would not be challenged, which could also be got checked from the proceedings of the meetings. Now, keeping aside the Director of P.U. Extension Library, the Director of P.U. Regional Centre has been appointed. The Director, P.U. Regional Centre, whosoever is appointed do not understand the sentimental approach of P.U. Extension Library. This problem is being faced several times by them. They have no problem in the growth of Regional Centre; rather, the problem is that the separate entity of P.U. Extension Library should not be ignored.

It was stated that how they could pay the salaries of P.U. Extension Library, if the same is treated as separate entity.

To this, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked whether the P.U. Extension Library came into existence after the P.U. Regional Centre or otherwise.

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

The Vice Chancellor said that they should consider item-wise recommendations of the Committee. As there is no problem in this item; hence, recommendation 1 should be approved. Recommendation 2 is pertaining to purchase of hardware/software, may be approved. Recommendation 3 is related to sanction of Rs.30 lacs for purchase of e-books, may be approved. She further read that recommendation 4 is for setting up Skill Development Centre at Extension Library.

To this, it was submitted by F.D.O. that amount to be allocated for this purpose would be allocated through Budget Estimates Committee. The proposals have come to the Budget Estimates Committee, if any proposal is left, the same should be sent so that the same could be placed before the Budget Estimates Committee for final approval of the Board of Finance.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the Colleges wanted to incur the expenditure out of the Development fund. She said that for example in item No.1, the issue only related to charging the amount from the fund.

It was informed that University could charge the amount from the development fund but could not make payment from the fund.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that item No.1 of the Committee is approved and for item No.2, the same has to come through the Budget Estimates Committee. Item No.3 again should also have to come through the Budget Estimates Committee. Item No.5 is for digitization for which the same may be routed through Budget Estimates Committee, with the condition that the N.G.O. which offered free of cost digitization of rare books, should be contacted to work out their proposal. Item No. 6 is to set up well-equipped University Information Counter.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Ministry of Culture usually sanctioned grants for the digitization of rare books. He suggested that University should utilize these grants which have been allocated to the Archival Cell, for the purpose.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he is not doubting the NGO, which has offered to digitize the rare books free of cost. Since the NGO is digitizing their record free of cost, the credibility of the agency needed to be got examined.

The Vice Chancellor said that in A.C. Joshi Library, the work of digitization has already been completed; they could help the P.U. Extension Library in getting the said work completed.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk suggested that the work of digitization of rare books of P.U. Extension Library could also be got done from the same vendor which had done in A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that at present SOUL-2 is running in P.U. Extension Library, whereas the Punjab Government had completed the digitization work through their portal. Moreover, the Punjab Government had also advised the Colleges to use COHA software, which is offered free of cost for the digitization work.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever software is being used in the A.C. Joshi Library for the work related to digitization of rare books, could also be used for the work of digitization of rare books in the P.U. Extension Library. The model of the University could be followed in this work. Wherever, there is need for allocation of funds, the same would be made available through the Budget Estimates Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the proposal with regard to setting up of Information Counter has been moved. As stated by Dr. Shiv Kumar Dogra, a minimum of 500 students visited daily for getting one or other information. On pointing out by the Vice Chancellor, he clarified that he is talking about the setting up of Information Counter, where a person fully equipped with latest digital equipment needed to be deputed, so that he/she could meet the requirements of the students.

At this stage, several members started speaking with each other and din got prevailed.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that funds have been collected out of the amount deposited by the students who deposited the security amount in the Library and did not claim its refund.

The Vice Chancellor asked whether the money is not required from the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that no money is required from the University as the Information Counter is already running.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that this item should be approved without taking care of the budget allocation.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he would like to bring to their knowledge, the recommendations made vide sub item No.11 pertaining to C-4 wherein it is mentioned that except five Colleges, the remaining Colleges are not contributing to the development fund of the library which is Rs.100/- per student per year. Some modalities should be framed to take action against the Defaulting Colleges, who failed to contribute to the development fund.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that these Colleges should be informed telephonically regarding contribution towards the development fund of the Library.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it was earlier decided that the students, who are located at the outskirts of Ludhiana and are not using the facility of Library, are exempted from contributing Rs.100/.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that it should be made compulsory for the students to contribute for using the library facility.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra clarified that just like sports fee and cultural funds are collected by the Colleges, the fee of Library should be charged from the Colleges situated within the radius of 60 kilometers from Ludhiana, in accordance with the strength of these Colleges.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that if a College had a strength of 2000 students, the College had to deposit a sum of Rs.2 lac @ of Rs.100/- per student, whereas several students did not make payment to the College for this purpose. Hence, it was later on decided that those students who visit the library and are the members of the library, should be charged with security amount.

The Vice Chancellor said that those students who are the members of the library should contribute for the library fee along with the security amount.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is a provision in the P.U. Calendar that any student, who studies in any of the College around 60 kilometers of Ludhiana, should contribute Rs.100/- per student. If they exempt students from contributing library fee, no student will pay the contribution.

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

RESOLVED: That:

1. recommendations **1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 9** of the Advisory Committee of Panjab University Extension Library, Ludhiana, be approved;
 2. the setting up of Skill Development Centre at Extension Library (**recommendation 4**), be approved.
 3. the digitization of rare books (**recommendation 5**) be approved, in principle, but for funds, the matter be routed through Budget Estimates Committee. However, in the first instance, the **N.G.O.** which offered free of cost digitization (pointed out by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua) be contacted for the digitization of rare books, but credibility of the **N.G.O.** be got ensured;
 4. the imprest money of P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana (**recommendation 7**) be enhanced from Rs.6200/- to Rs.1,10,000/- (Rs.25000/- for meeting day to day expenditure and Rs.85,000/- for monthly electricity bill).
- 5.** Considered minutes dated 21.06.2023 (**Appendix-LXVI**) of the Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee.

Initiating discussion, Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out that there is some correction under item C-5, where the name of the College of Dr. Inder Pal Singh Sidhu has wrongly been mentioned as S.G.G.S. College for Women instead of S.G.G.S. College, Sector 26, Chandigarh. He requested that necessary correction should be made.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, while referring point 1, said that the Colleges are not depositing the youth welfare fees. He could not comprehend, why the charges are not being deposited in the University account by the Colleges, whereas the University is distributing funds to the Colleges.

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

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that how the system would work if the Colleges would not pay Library fee and Youth welfare fees. The defaulting Colleges which have not paid these fees, the list of these Colleges should be annexed with the item. Moreover, it is required that those defaulting Colleges should be debarred from participating in the Youth Welfare Festival.

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

Professor Jatinder Grover said that these Colleges have been served with notice thrice, but only 2-3 Colleges have deposited the Youth Welfare Fees, whereas the others not. He pointed out that in the meeting of one of the Committees, it was decided that the defaulting Colleges should be debarred from participation in the Youth Welfare Festival.

It was informed that DCDC has already asked to take appropriate action against the defaulting Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that basically, the important point is as to how to extract the amount of fee from the defaulting Colleges. His submission is that the Colleges may be given 10–15 days' time to deposit the fees, failing which they would be debarred from participating in the Youth Welfare festival.

Dr. Mukesh Arora requested that if the Library fee is being charged for P.U. Extension Library, the fee of Youth Welfare should also be charged from the Colleges.

To this, Principal R.S. Jhanji and Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that only the Youth Welfare fee is being charged from the students, who have the membership for the same.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of Panjab University Youth Welfare Committee dated 21.06.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Dean, College Development Council be directed to write a letter to the affiliated Colleges, which did not deposit the youth welfare fee and student holiday home fee for the previous years, to pay these fees within 15 days, failing which the students of the Colleges concerned, be debarred from the participation in the Youth Welfare Festival.

The Vice Chancellor said that the following item C-6 on the agenda may be treated as withdrawn:

- 6.** To consider if, the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. Arun Kumar Grover, Ex-Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh in the Department of Physics. Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that he would like to know as to why the Item is being withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said that Item is being withdrawn owing to certain administrative reasons.

RESOLVED: That Item C-6 on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn.

- 7.** Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 04.07.2023 (**Appendix-LXVII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the following names for (1) Dr. Ambedkar Chair and (2) Sri Aurobindo Chair, be approved for a period of one year:-

Dr. Ambedkar Chair	Professor Badri Narayan Tiwari Director and Professor G.B. Pant Social Science Institute Jhusi, Allahabad
Sri Aurobindo Chair	Professor Sachidananda Mohanty Professor of English P102, Intellex Imperia Aruha Post Gobindpur, Via Pipili District Puri, Odisha 752104

NOTE: A copy of Curriculum Vitae of Professor Badri Narayan Tiwari and Professor Sachidananda Mohanty was enclosed (**Appendix-LXVII**).

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that out of these two proposed names, one is better known to him as he has a very good curriculum-vitae. In fact, both the persons are prominent personalities. He suggested that when both the persons joined, instead of organizing functions at the department level, the same should be organized at the level of the University. It is better that the payment of honorarium should be paid on the basis of per visit instead of per lecture so that it might not create any confusion in future. He reiterated that the payment should be made on the per visit basis as sometime the persons visited the University for 2-3 days, in that situation, it would be difficult to meet the confusing situation that how the payment would be made so that the visitors may also get clear-cut information.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar asked, what are the terms and conditions of appointing them on these Chairs?

The Vice Chancellor replied that terms and conditions of the Chairs have already been formed as various Chairs are existed in the University.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he would like to intimate that as these are the prestigious Chairs where they are getting the fare, residential accommodation and honorarium on the basis of per visit.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that for all the vacant Chairs also, they should try to fill the positions as these the persons of prominent profiles.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that earlier it had been the precedent of the University that former Vice Chancellors were sitting on these Chairs with so many increments. After going through the curriculum vitae of these personalities, he is of the view that the honorarium which should be paid to these persons should be uniform. The parameters should be decided on the basis of uniformity for the persons who will hold these Chairs in the University so that clear picture may be emerged and it would not vary from one Committee to another. These persons should know before visiting the University about their honorarium and other facilities.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that it is the automatically covered in the term when it would be used that payment of honorarium would be made on the basis of per visit rather than on the basis of per lecture in spite of his/her stay in the University for 3-4 days. He reiterated that these personalities should be honoured at the functions organized at the University level. He has no problem if they decide to pay honorarium on the basis of per lecture, he only submitted that there should not be confusion on it.

Several members said that Vice Chancellor should be authorized to take decision about it. It was further suggested by them that the maximum limit of Rs.10, 000/-.

RESOLVED: That the following names be approved for a period of one year for: (1) Dr. Ambedkar Chair; and (2) Sri Aurobindo Chair:-

Dr. Ambedkar Chair	Professor Badri Narayan Tiwari Director and Professor G.B. Pant Social Science Institute Jhusi, Allahabad
Sri Aurobindo Chair	Professor Sachidananda Mohanty Professor of English P102, Intellex Imperia Aruha Post Gobindpur, Via Pipili District Puri, Odisha 752104

RESOLVED FURTHER: That so far as payment of honorarium to the persons appointed on these Chairs is concerned, the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take a decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

8. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 15.06.2023 (**Appendix-LXVIII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor as per Syndicate Para 16 dated 07.11.2022, to determine the fee to be charged from each candidate for the application form for teaching posts to be advertised by the Panjab University.

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that as all are aware that recently the University has got 4 marks out of 4 under the heading institutional values in NAAC grading. The University is proposing that an amount of Rs.2000/- will be charged from the candidate, who applies for the post of

Assistant Professor. He was surprised to know as there were several members in the Committee, who usually were against the hike in the fees. He stated that there are Universities, which have made it a business for collection of money from the candidates to apply for the posts every year, the Panjab University should not be amongst them. He suggested that no fee should be charged from the candidate who applies for the post of Assistant Professor as huge amount is spent in filling up the form, whereas the fees has been proposed as Rs.2000/- . The University should charge Rs.5000/- from the incumbents who apply for the posts of Associate Professors and Professors as he has been serving on regular basis since 10 years. A candidate who applies for the post of Assistant Professor has to fill the form at various places. The fee should not be enhanced for the incumbents who apply for the posts of Assistant Professors. If they would like to enhance, it should be enhanced from Rs.375/- to Rs.500/-. He suggested that for the post of Registrar, the fee of Rs.10,000/- should be charged. Is this the institutional value that they are not charging fee from the employed persons?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said while endorsing the view point expressed by Professor Gurmeet Singh that it is not suitable for the Panjab University to charge Rs.2000/- as fee for applying for the post of Assistant Professor. This projection is very wrong that they are going beyond the commercial line. They should not compare Panjab University with neighboring Universities at this level. If this is approved, they should also propose to enhance the Ph.D. fee up to Rs.5 lacs as the neighboring Universities are charging Rs.5 lacs for enrolment in Ph.D. course. The cost of documents, which are annexed with application form would itself reached to Rs.2000/-.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the University is charging Rs.2400/- from the students for admission, whereas they are raising to charge fee of Rs. 2000/- from the incumbents who are applying for job in the University. For admission in B.Ed. course, Rs.3000/- is being charged from the students belonging to General category and Rs.1500/- from S.C. category students. If they are not agreed to enhance the fee to be remitted along with application form for applying for the post, they should also reduce the fee to be charged from the students as well.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that comparison of the students who apply for admission in some particular course with the incumbents who apply for jobs is not justified. For any particular course, the students remit fee as they are aware that their course would be completed, but here the candidate has no knowledge whether he/she would be selected or not.

The Vice Chancellor asked, are they aware as to what fee is being charged by the other Universities?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar replied that other Universities are charging fee of Rs.2000/-.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the comparative chart of fees being charged by other Universities was placed before the Committee. As per the comparative chart, a fee of Rs.2200/- is being charged by Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Rs.1700/- by Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, and Rs.1900/- by Punjabi University, Patiala.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as the University is paying Rs.1500/- to the guest faculty for one lecture, how could it be impossible for the candidate to pay a fee of Rs.2000/- to apply for job on regular basis. They should tell the details about a single candidate who entered the University as Associate Professor after having experience of 10 years of serving in Colleges. There is need to have clarification in the concluding line of the recommendations of the Committee that similar fee of Rs. 2000/- may be charged from the persons applied for the posts of Registrar, C.O.E. etc. A minimum of Rs.5000/- should be charged from them.

The Vice Chancellor said that from the last 30 years, the fee of Rs.350/- is continuing. When she applied for the post in the University, the fee was Rs.350/-.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the existing fee is Rs.375/- (for General Category) for applying for the post of Assistant Professor and Rs. 150/- for SC/ST candidates and Rs. 185/- for PWD candidates; hence, the proposed fee should be as Rs.2000/- for General category and Rs.1500/- for SC/ST candidates on the existing pattern.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that more than 100 applications are received for a single post. If they wish to enhance the fee, it should be linked with the payment of Income tax.

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

The Vice Chancellor said that this item is approved, they should move to next item.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it does not look nice in giving dissent on every item.

The Vice Chancellor stated that when she applied for the post, the fee was Rs.375/- she was being paid the salary of Rs.1500/-, whereas now they are getting much more than that.

RESOLVED: That recommendations of the Committee dated 15.06.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

- 9.** Considered recommendation (Current Agenda Item No.1) of the Admission Facilitation Committee dated 27.07.2023 (**Appendix-LXIX**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that one seat for Transgender students, be reserved in Panjab University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that for this item, they have to create an additional seat instead of reserving the seat just like the seat of single girl child, cancer patients. The course for transgender students should be identified where additional seat is needed to be created.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that for taking a decision in the matter, a Committee should be formed.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that similarly the University could also consider to create additional seat for the wards of faculty serving in the University on

compassionate grounds. The University should think over it by constituting a Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that this would be looked into later, presently, this item is approved.

Dr. Harpreet Singh said that there is no doubt in it, they all agreed that policy decision should be taken on this item, but in the letter received from Director Social Welfare, Chandigarh, it is mentioned that suitable action is required to be taken with regard to admission in a particular department. They did not ask to create additional seat for transgender students rather they asked to take suitable action in the matter. If the proposal is received, they should write that proposal from the person concerned is to be considered, but in the item no document with regard to proposal has been annexed.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is okay, but otherwise, there was a representation from Transgender's Association.

To this, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that in the minutes of the Committee, it has been written that the representation has been received from the Punjab Feminist Union of Students along with the letter from Director, Social Welfare, Women & Child Development, Chandigarh, regarding reservation of one seat for Transgender student.

Dr. Harpreet Singh said that one is the proposal and other is that it should not be a mandatory decision to reserve one seat for transgender students.

The Vice Chancellor apprised that the same has been recommended by the Admission Facilitation Committee at page 92 under the heading Current Agenda. The Admission Committee has not recommended giving additional seat to transgender student rather the Committee took decision to refer the item to Syndicate for consideration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Agenda item which is prepared is quite different from the recommendations of the Admission Facilitation Committee. Only the forwarding letter attached with the representation of the transgender students has been enclosed. They should have to annex the copy of the representation along with the agenda to take necessary action accordingly. The University has to allow such type of students on the basis of their representation.

It was informed that the agenda is to consider the recommendations of the Admission Facilitation Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if it is approved on individual case basis, it would become precedent. It should be decided that for transgender students, in every department, one additional seat may be created.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should identify the departments, where there is need to create additional seat for transgender students.

It was informed that this should be approved, in principle. For other departments, modalities should be worked out through a Committee as to in which department, the provision is to be made and which not.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the University should have worked out the modalities before placing the item before the Syndicate for its final approval.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested that this additional seat should not be converted to general seat at the later stage.

Professor Devinder Singh said that the Admission Facilitation Committee had recommended that “this item be referred to Syndicate for consideration”. Since the Committee had not applied its mind, a Committee should be constituted to consider the issue and make recommendations.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the Vice Chancellor has the power to create additional seat for any course for which there is no need of any policy decision.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the additional seat could be created by the Vice Chancellor, the additional seat would have been proposed to be created from the office of the Vice Chancellor. As there was no provision pertaining to it, the item has been placed before the Syndicate to take decision.

It was informed that this item should be approved, in principle, and a Committee should be constituted to work out the modalities and place the same before the House.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that there is a provision of creation of maximum of 4 seats for the students belonging to cancer and thalassemia ailments, sports background and for participation in youth welfare functions.

The Vice Chancellor stated that this item is approved in principle and its modalities would be worked out by constituting a Committee.

RESOLVED: That an additional seat be created for Mx. Ayesha, a transgender, who has sought admission to M.Sc. (Stem Cell & Tissue Engineering). However, so far as the issue of creation of an additional seat for transgender in all the courses being offered by the University is concerned, a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to consider the issue and make recommendations.

- 10.** Considered minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 09.06.2023 (**Appendix-LXX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the cases of those students who could not carry out their Ph.D. after the stipulated period.

NOTE: In the meeting of the Syndicate dated 04.02.2023 during General Discussion, Shri Varinder Singh pointed out that certain students could not carry out their research and complete their Ph.D. during the Covid-19 pandemic. He had suggested that a Committee should be formed to examine the cases of such students.

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he has no problem in the recommendation of the Committee, but the agenda item so prepared, is quite different from the recommendations of the Committee.

The term of reference of the Committee is to decide for the students who could not carry out their Ph.D. after the stipulated period, whereas the Committee had recommended on different terms.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the recommendations of the Committee should be approved.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the recommendations of the Committee are different from the note annexed with the item on the basis of issue raised by Shri Varinder Singh during general discussion. His concern was for completion of Ph.D. course after the stipulated period.

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

The Vice Chancellor clarified that issue raised by Shri Varinder Singh during the general discussion is related to examine the cases of those students, who could not carry out their Ph.D. within the stipulated period. Whereas the recommendations of the Committee are on separate issue for the students, who left the Ph.D. course midway without any intimation resultantly the Supervisor could not enrol another candidate until the enrolment of the candidate who has left the programme, is declared cancelled. The Committee recommended to charge Rs. 5000/- as security amount.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that there is no dispute over it, the Syndicate should decide either to approve the recommendations of the Committee or this item should be replaced or bring it in the next meeting.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the copies of the thesis are being sent to two experts and thereafter being sent for review. Sometimes only one expert gives report and the other expert could not timely submit its report, resultantly, the report remained pending for 3-4 months. He submitted that in that case, it should be considered to send the thesis to other experts without waiting for the submission of report by the earlier one.

Professor Devinder Singh said that in at least two cases when the report was not submitted, he had written to inform about the death of the Supervisor. He suggested that a time period should be decided for the evaluation of theses and the submission of the report.

Certain members including Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu and Professor Devinder Singh suggested that 4 months' time should be sufficient for the evaluation of thesis and submission of its report.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he had received 5-6 theses through online mode. He requested them to provide hard copies of the theses but they refused to do so and in some of the Universities, they sent the theses with spiral bindings. The University is only seeking two copies of the thesis.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the Controller of Examinations should comment and verify the statement on this issue.

It was informed that the copies of the thesis were sent to the Experts after obtaining their consent, but even after, the compliance from the side of examiners is not received. The office has to communicate those experts again telephonically or through e-mail, ultimately, most of the experts did not return the thesis and

recently a couple of experts had returned the copy of the thesis. Since the University did not have spare copies of thesis, they could only provide the soft copy of the thesis.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the soft copy of thesis is sought to upload the thesis on Shodhganga repository.

Certain members suggested that the University should initiate to get the soft copy of thesis from the students.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that seeking a soft copy of the thesis, is a good solution, but problem is that some of the teachers are not ready to read the thesis on soft copy.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that as theses are being sent to the examiners after obtaining the consent. He suggested that whenever the consent is obtained, it should also be asked whether a soft copy or the hard copy is required for the purpose of evaluation.

It was desired that the House might fix the timeline of 3 months for the evaluation of thesis.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that as what is resolved in this item?

It was informed that no provision existed in the Rules/Regulations that the examiners have to evaluate the thesis and submit the report to the University within a period of 3 months or so. If a timeline of three months is fixed, the same would be communicated to the Examiners in the very first letter, while sending the thesis for evaluation.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it should also be got examined that allowing of golden chance for submission of thesis is legally tenable or not as in accordance with the guidelines of U.G.C., the Ph.D. degree should have been completed in 3 years whereas in the University, the Ph.D. degree is allowed to be completed in 5 years. His concern is only that this should also be got examined by constituting a Committee and now the purpose of golden chance has completely been removed.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this issue has been deliberated at length earlier and the decision had already been taken in the matter. Instead of stopping this facility of golden chance to Ph.D. scholars by forming a Committee, they should examine the papers concerning the items pertaining to grant of golden chance in the first instance. If the problem persists in future, it would be sorted out.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that earlier it was mentioned that the research scholars are pursuing Ph.D. under XII Plan Guidelines or XV, XVII Guidelines, the same has been discontinued to mention in the letters of enrolment/registration. The Chandigarh Administration has raised objections and instructed the students to get it written under which plan/guidelines they have pursued Ph.D. degree.

RESOLVED: That, to tide over the problem faced by the Supervisors of Ph.D. students in paying an amount of Rs.5000/- for getting the Ph.D. registration of his student cancelled, an amount of Rs.5000/- be charged from the Ph.D. students as security, which could be adjusted at the time of submission of thesis.

RESOLVED FURTHER : That if the Ph.D. students did not pay annual charges by March every year, a notice be issued by the respective department to the concerned students with the direction to pay the requisite fee within a period of one month; otherwise his/her registration would be treated as cancelled.

- 11.** Considered recommendation of the UMC Standing Committee-II dated 27.07.2021 (**Appendix-LXXI**), to scrutinize the gist of cases of unfair means and misconduct that Ms. Nancy Aggarwal, student of LL.B. 3rd Sem. be disqualified from appearing in any university examination for two years including that in which she was found guilty i.e. Dec, 2020 (held in Feb./March 2021) to May 2022 (four Exams), under Regulation 7 at page 11 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007.

NOTE: A copy of minutes of the UMC Standing Committee-I dated 26.07.2023 was enclosed (**Appendix-LXXI**).

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the major issue is that the minutes of the second UMC Committee are not annexed with the item, only the minutes of the first and third Committee have been annexed. It is the question as the first Committee had similar recommendations as that of the last Committee that both the students to be debarred for two years. This case was decided in the year 2021, and year 2023 is going on. Now the question arises that according to the decision of the last Committee, which had changed the decision of the previous Committee, the students have appeared in the examinations and most likely results might have also been declared and the students could have got the mark sheets. This should be told whether these students have been awarded the degrees or not. As per his knowledge, there were two students against whom UMC cases were registered, but only one case has been placed before the House. These are two-three things which have to be decided.

Professor Devinder Singh said that it was decided in the previous meeting of the Syndicate which was held 5-6 months ago, that the results of both the students be withheld. On receipt of the decision, he wrote to Controller of Examinations to withhold the issuance of degrees to these students. The Department is complying the orders of the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar asked whether the results of the semester examinations of these students have been declared or not.

It was informed that the results of these students have been declared and the DMCs have been sent to the department but the degrees have been withheld.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that it is correct that the degrees of these students have been put on hold. Now, one of the options which they had, is that after clearing the examinations after two years, the degrees could be awarded to them. It might be possible that the student may approach the Court that they have appeared in the examinations as per the decision of second Committee taken in the year 2021. These points should be taken into consideration. He had only placed his apprehensions before the House.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar asked, it should be made clear whether Degrees have been awarded to the students or not, to which he was replied that no degree was issued to these students.

Professor Devinder Singh said that as informed by Controller of Examinations, only DMCs have been sent to the departments, but the Degrees of these students were withheld.

The Vice Chancellor said that two years' period has already been finished.

Professor Devinder Singh said that these students should be communicated that as per the decision, they have to appear again in the examinations.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that results are needed to be revised, earlier the results under which they were declared as pass should be revised and they would have to declare fail so that they could re-appear in the papers.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the second Committee had also declared them fail, but these students had cleared the papers after appearing in the examination again, which was not considered as their right. That result should be cancelled and after two years, they should reappear in the papers.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra asked, when did these students appear in the papers?

It was replied that they again appeared in the examination of those papers after two years.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the item for consideration is placed only for one student.

The Vice Chancellor said that only one student had applied to review her case and the second student had agreed that he has been debarred for two years.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it should not be so, the recommendations of the UMC Committee have been placed before the House for approval. If the second candidate has agreed, still the findings of the UMC Committee should have been placed in the Syndicate.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the meeting of the UMC Committee was held on 27th July, 2021, wherein as per Regulation 7 at page 11 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, the candidate was disqualified from appearing in any University examination for two years. Later on, the result was declared on 4th August, 2021 and both the students Nancy Aggarwal and Mansi Jain had appealed within 30 days. As per Rule 32.2 at Page 14 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 the case would have to be sent to the same Committee, but the case was marked to second Committee.

On a point of order, Shri Sandeep Singh asked as to who had marked the case to second Committee?

Dr. Parveen Goyal replied that papers were held in March, 2021 and results were declared in August, 2021 and after the declaration of the result, the case was sent to the office of the Vice Chancellor and Secretary to Vice Chancellor marked the file to Committee-I. The Committee-I decided to debar the students from appearing in one paper. They had appeared in these two papers and after declaration of results, their DMCs were sent to the department. When the matter was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 4th February, 2023, it was decided to review their case and after reviewing, the Committee comprising of Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu, Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra and Professor Gurmeet

Singh has recommended that as per Rule appearing at page 14, P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, the decision of the first Committee be retained. He humbly submitted that decisions taken by the first and third Committee should be implemented and the students may be informed accordingly.

Professor Devinder Singh said that results of both the students should be cancelled in the first instance.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that it is only the mistake of the office of the Registrar that only the case of Nancy Aggarwal was placed for consideration and the case of Ms. Mansi Jain was not placed whereas the files of both the cases were sent by the UMC.

Shri Sandeep Singh requested that there is no fault of the students in this case, one Committee recommended one thing and the second and third Committees recommended something else. Hence, whatever decision is to be taken, the same should be done in favour of the students. If the first Committee had recommended to punish the students for debarring them for two years, the duration of two years has been finished. The punishment was imposed in the year 2021 and now in 2023, two years have been completed. When the students had appeared in the examinations after the decision of the first Committee, in that case, how the students are at fault? The action should be taken against the first Committee and not on the students.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that, if possible, the declaration of results can be delayed for two years.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that who would take action against those persons, who got the case marked/referred to another Committee, which changed the decision of the first Committee? Hence, the fault lay with the Officers/Officials of the University and not with the students.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that two things emerged after observing the record that first Committee had given its recommendations, later on the appeals were sent to the 2nd Committee for review, but as per the provisions of the P.U. Calendar, the appeals should have been sent to the same Committee. As per practice, the appeals were sent to the same Committee. This practice is going on from several years, but no legality/question was raised till then. When the legality was raised, the norms/provisions of P.U. Calendar should be followed. Moreover, the third Committee was not competent to take decision in the matter.

On a point of order, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that it is not written anywhere in the provisions of the P.U. Calendar, old practice was being followed till any legality is pointed out. He fully agreed with the viewpoint expressed by Shri Sandeep Singh that students are not at fault, the fault lay with the system.

The Vice Chancellor said that the resolved part of the item should be that as the two years' period has expired and the DMCs of the students should be released.

Shri Sandeep Singh requested that if the students after reappearing in the examinations got cleared the exams, then their DMCs should be released.

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

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that why the recommendations of the UMC Committee have been obtained on the decision of the Syndicate in its meeting

dated 4th February, 2023. He asked the Controller of Examinations to intimate the further course of action as per the provisions of the Panjab University Calendars.

Dr. Mukesh Arora, being the Chairman of the UMC Committee, said that when the punishment was imposed for disqualification for a period of two years and after 4-5 days, the students filed an appeal to reconsider their cases, could it be possible for the Committee to change the decision after 5 days. It would be better to send the appeals to the second Committee rather than sending to the first Committee.

Dr. Parveen Goyal, while endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Mukesh Arora, said that there is a reason behind it that suppose he had given the decision and the Vice Chancellor could check if there are true facts in it or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that decision should be taken under the provisions of the P.U. Calendars.

It was informed that there is some ambiguity in the provisions of P.U. Calendar that the decision has to be sent back to the Committee, but there is mention of only one Committee. At the time of formation of P.U. Calendar, there was no provision for appointing two Committees. If there was one Committee, the appeal would have to be sent to the one Committee. When two Committees are formed, it becomes the discretion of the Vice Chancellor/Syndicate to take decision in the matter, whether the said cases are needed to be cross-reviewed or not. A policy decision whether the appeal should be sent to the same Committee or not, should be taken, so that there is no ambiguity in future.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that if new facts are revealed by the students, then the case should have been sent to another Committee.

It was informed that in this matter, these students have been debarred for appearing in examination for six months after review. After six months, the students have re-appeared and cleared some of the examinations. If the current decision is to be implemented, they have to cancel the results of the papers in which they re-appeared. After that, the students have appeared in all the remaining three semesters.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that students were not aware about the provisions of the P.U. Calendars; they appeared in the examinations as per the schedule.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that fault of the students was only that they had done cheating in the examinations.

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

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the students had appeared in the examinations as per the decision of the Second Committee after reviewing the case, those examinations should also be cancelled. The UMC case for review should have been sent to the same Committee as also in the Court case, where review is only being sent to the same Judge. If the case is decided by the Second Committee on different terms, the candidate would definitely get relief from the Court. Hence, these students who have re-appeared in the examinations after expiry of 6 months' period, should be considered and be allowed otherwise the ambiguity would be increased.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that this case should be considered as an exceptional case and for future a policy should be framed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there is need to take re-examinations of those 3 papers where the UMC was made and there is no need to conduct the re-examinations of paper of other semesters. The Committees in Panjab University are political, but it should not be such that one or other Committee of any particular group is clashing.

The Vice Chancellor said that re-examinations should be conducted only in the papers wherein the students have been found guilty in cheating.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the students had re-appeared in the examinations as per the decision of the Committee after review. This should be made clear and it should be decided as policy decision that whenever there is need to send the recommendations of the Committee for review, the same should be sent to the same Committee.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that from the date it has been pointed out, the matter is being referred back to the same Committee. When pointed out by Professor Gurmeet Singh that it has not become a policy, he said that it has not become a policy, because it has been presented in a different manner. However, if an enquiry is conducted, several persons would be got indicted.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Dr. Parveen Goyal should clearly say as to who would be got indicted; otherwise, he is casting aspersion on all of them.

Dr. Parveen Goyal reiterated that it was decided in the meeting of the Syndicate held on 4th February, 2023 that the matter be referred to the Committee and the decision of the Committee would be followed. Now the decision of the Committee has come that both the students be debarred for two years, and the same should be approved.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the meaning of debar, is not that within that two years' the candidate could appear in the examination, get the result declared and received the DMCs; rather, the candidate should obtain degree after the period for which the student is debarred. If it is to be done, the decision taken by the Syndicate on 4th February, 2023 has no value.

The Vice Chancellor said that the career of both the students is at stake, issue of the year 2020 is being discussed in the year 2023. As per practice, in UMC cases, the decision is to be taken within two months whereas in the present case 3 years has passed and no conclusive decision has been taken.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that his dissent on this item should be noted as the recommendations of the Committee are not being accepted.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the recommendations of the Committee are acceptable. The University is holding examinations every month through golden chance, the students should be asked to appear in three papers and receive their DMCs. Some date should be fixed from where the imposition of punishment is to be made.

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

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that for all intents and purposes of this, the penal action is that they have to debar the students for two years.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the future of the students should not be put on stake. When the students have appeared in the papers where they were found guilty, why they appeared in those papers again?

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

It was informed that the UMC case was made for the 3rd semester of these students. The examination of 3rd semester was cancelled and the students were debarred for next six months. The students appeared in the papers of 3rd semester along with the 5th semester in physical mode.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as per the statement made by Controller of Examinations, it is very strange that when the students are debarred from appearing in the examination, how could they get admission in 5th semester? When the punishment of debarring from appearing in the examination is imposed, the gap of 6 months would come.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that taking into the legal aspect when the student had re-appeared in the papers, could the University withhold the result?

Professor Devinder Singh said that as pointed out by the Controller of Examinations that there is ambiguity in the provision of P.U. Calendar. Hence the policy decision should be taken that review of the appeal of the defaulting candidate would be done by the same Committee.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

1. in future, if the student found guilty of misconduct during the examination brings to light new facts within 30 days of the decision of the Committee, the matter be referred to the same Committee for review, which had earlier considered the case; and
2. since Ms. Nancy Aggarwal, a student of LL.B. 3rd Semester had appeared in the examination for the first time in December 2020, and the UMC Standing Committee-I in its meeting dated 07.09.2021 had recommended that Ms. Nancy Aggarwal be debarred from passing the papers; Labour Law (4726), IT & RTI Act (4727), and Interpretation of Statutes (4730), as a disciplinary measure, under Regulation 30 at page 14 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007. Ms. Nancy Aggarwal has taken these examinations second time. In the interest of student, her result be declared as a one time exception, not to be quoted as precedent.

Dr. Parveen Goyal has given dissent on the item.

Items C-12 and C-13 on the agenda were taken up for consideration together.

12. Considered minutes of the sixth meeting of the Affiliation Committee dated 16.06.2023 (**Appendix-LXXII**), constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 04.02.2023.

13. Considered recommendation (No. IV) of the seventh meeting of the Affiliation Committee dated 14.07.2023 (**Appendix-LXXII**), constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 04.02.2023, with regard to grant of temporary affiliation in the course(s)/subject(s) to the Colleges situated in the Punjab State and Chandigarh for the session 2023-2024.

It was informed that this item is not for consideration, it is for information.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that this item should be considered under consideration items and not for information.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, referring to page 106 at S.No. 6, said that in Sadhbhavna College of Education for Women, where out of total faculty of 28, 2 teachers are on permanent basis and 26 teachers are on *ad hoc* basis for 200 seats of B.Ed. course (4 units), which is unjustified. This College of Education (Sadhbhavna College of Education for Women), as all are aware, is the famous College of Punjab for irregularities. The Syndicate of University had disaffiliated the College 4-5 years ago where one teacher was the regular student of the Department and two teachers were working as Government employees in other institutions. The Punjab Government had terminated both these employees. For 100 students, 16 teachers are required as per University norms and for 200 students, 32 regular teachers are mandatory to be recruited, whereas in the said College, only two regular teachers are there.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that as all are aware, 31st October is the last date for admission with the permission of the Vice Chancellor. The Affiliation Committees have not visited the Colleges but they have allowed for admission with condition. Now, next month all the cases would be sent to the University, could they withhold admission of the students? Earlier, the teachers who have cleared NET, obtained stay orders from the Court, after the vacation of stay, they were not to be counted. The Affiliation Committee had given time to the Colleges to appoint teachers within a stipulated period but the University has not given panels to the Colleges. The Colleges were asked to provide an affidavit from the Management of the College, that next year the permission for admission would only be granted if they appoint regular teachers. The DCDC has the record of affidavits of all the 60 Colleges. Earlier, the teachers were appointed without clearing NET, now the stay orders had been vacated and that is the reason that only two regular teachers are there in the College. Earlier there were 18-20 teachers, which could also be got checked from the official record. When the Committee imposed the conditions on the teachers, and were also directed to deduct the provident fund, prepare service books then the affidavit should also be obtained from the Colleges that teachers would get salaries as per regular grade. He further said that there is no College where panels have been given from the last one year.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when any member of the Affiliation Committee pointed out some discrepancies, the problems are started arising amongst the members. During the visit of the Committees, 15-16 teachers were shown on the rolls of the Colleges whereas actually there are only two permanent teachers. There are only 5-6 Colleges of Education where there is need to send the

team on surprise visit with reports of the Affiliation Committee of previous five years. How could it be possible that 15 regular teachers left the job? Something had happened in that College. If something has come in the knowledge, for that corrective measures should be taken.

Professor Jatinder Grover while endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there are problems in Colleges of Education. The College was disaffiliated on the basis of the discrepancies pointed out by the Affiliation Committee as stated by Dr. Mukesh Arora. In these Education Colleges, dummy teachers, students and Principals are there.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that as suggested by Fellow, the surprise visit of these Colleges should be conducted.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this affiliation is not for the session 2022-23, it is for the session 2023-24.

Certain members pointed out that these recommendations of the Affiliation Committee are for the session 2022-23.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the University should reduce the seats of the Colleges where there is no permanent faculty.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they received the mandatory *pro forma* for signatures on the day of meeting, when the Government had decided the dates for the conduct of counselling. He pointed out how could he sign the mandatory *pro forma* for the session 2023-24 as the Inspection have not been conducted, even Inspections for the session 2022-23 had not been conducted. If they refused to sign on the mandatory *pro forma*, all the Education Colleges would be debarred from admission portal, which were intimated to them from the office of Dean College Development Council. The Principals of the Colleges were called before the Affiliation Committee in 2022-23 and also tried to call the Managements of the Colleges for giving them warning that their seats would be reduced in the session 2023-24. The warning letters for the session 2022-23 were sent to the Colleges that their seats would be reduced if they did not appoint requisite faculty for the students as per P.U. norms. When the matter regarding grant of affiliation for the session 2023-24 was placed, they had the apprehension that permission should not be granted, but the Affiliation Committee granted affiliation to these Colleges. It does not mean if they have signed the mandatory *pro forma* that they could not impose any condition/check on it. The mechanism of the University is very slow in it. If before the commencement of the session or before the deadline i.e., 31st of October, they complete the process till July, only in that case, the whole system could be streamlined. The Colleges did not conduct Inspections within six months, sometime panels are not given and sometimes the Colleges shirked to conduct the Inspections. Now the session 2023-24 has been commenced, students have been admitted, if they visit the Colleges now what would they recommend. How could they recommend to debar the College for running the course at this point of time? If this is recommended at the stage when the students have been admitted, later on the matter would be placed before the House that keeping in view the interest of the students, the affiliation for the session 2023-24 should be granted to the College. He requested that he has been pleaded from several years that before the last date i.e., 31st October to apply for provisional affiliation, every College should be informed about whether the affiliation is to be granted to the College or not.

It was informed that all the concerns which are raised in the House were due to the reason that last year was the peculiar because Selection Committees could not be sent to the Colleges as the template was not ready. How could it be possible to make selection without template? As pointed out by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua that two teachers are on regular basis and rest are on *ad hoc* basis, permanent appointment would only be made when they have the template with them. Due to the process of finalization of template, there is a delay in sending the panels to the Colleges. The members of the Affiliation Committee, sitting there, had taken the decision was right.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that what has been done, should be considered as past. From the commencement of the session 2024-25, they should be very strict that letters should be sent on time and process to be initiated in a time bound manner. The letters for the session 2023-24 have been sent and the University has no other alternative except as the matter has become legal now. Such a mechanism should be evolved for the session 2024-25 that the whole process would be completed before July.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that usually before July is also late, actually the whole process should be completed before May.

It was stated that recently the matter regarding surprise meetings was discussed. In that matter, he would like to submit that complete files of the periodic inspections have been prepared, the periodic Inspections through Syndicate would be conducted very soon.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that when they visit the Colleges, there is one *pro forma* where it has been written from the last 12 months, how many teachers were relieved. They have to deal with these Colleges not by choice but by default. For this particular College, could the Affiliation Committee not considered the report of the previous year? Only two years had come for the teachers where passing of NET was mandatory.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu stated that Colleges are exploiting the teachers in every respect and befooling the University. Even the Colleges are not replying to the letters of the University. The University is not in a position take strict action on these Colleges. When the Registration returns of the Colleges are to be submitted, firstly they should obtain NOC from the Colleges Branch that all the conditions regarding payment of salaries/increments to the teachers on regular grade, have been met. The NOC should be issued from the Colleges Branch regarding fulfilment of conditions by the Colleges before accepting the Registration Returns in the University. Till then, the Registration Returns should not be accepted. If there is any objection pertaining to fulfilment of conditions on the Colleges, the Registration Returns should not be accepted. After the last date of receipt of Registration Returns, the Colleges should be charged fine on daily basis. This system should be followed strictly. There are certain measures on which they have to work. He suggested that either a special meeting of the Syndicate should be convened or a Sub-Committee should be formed dealing with such type of issues by framing Rules, obtaining Affidavits so that the whole system could be streamlined at the grass root level.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the power to constitute the Affiliation Committee lies with the Syndicate and the Syndicate delegated the power to the Vice Chancellor to form the Committee. In several places, the Fellows have been assigned the task of Nominee of the Vice Chancellor and the Colleges have been

informed about it. Later on it has come to their notice that the V.C. nominee has been changed without intimating the Fellow.

The Vice Chancellor asked, how the Fellows knew about the same before receipt of information in writing?

To this, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that Dr. Amit Joshi, after receiving the letter to be appointed as V.C. Nominee to visit Dasmesh Girls College, Chak Alla Baksh, Mukerian, denied later on for visiting the said College.

It was clarified that this information is correct but he could not comprehend as to how this letter regarding denying him was sent as the file was with him

To this, the Vice Chancellor asked Dean College Development Council to ask his Deputy Registrar about it.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that in the case of A.S. College for Women, Khanna, the Senior Law Officer had requested the Affiliation Committee to recommend action against the College in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 11.1 at page 161 of Panjab University, Calendar, Volume-I, 2022. The Affiliation Committee has no power to disaffiliate any College, rather it is the power of the Syndicate to take action. The Senior Law Officer should be directed to not to send such type of comments to the members of the Affiliation Committee.

Professor Devinder Singh said that it was written in the resolved part that after deliberation, it was decided that clarification be sought from Director, Higher Education.

To this, Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that it is the separate case, he should read the resolved part of the item.

Professor Devinder Singh said that in the resolved part it is mentioned that Affiliation Committee has no power to take action in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 11.1. He asked then who has the power to take the action?

Dr. Mukesh Arora and Principal Kirandeep Kaur replied that power to take action to disaffiliate the College lies with the Syndicate.

Professor Devinder Singh said that it is the power of the Syndicate to take action to disaffiliate the College, but the Affiliation Committee should have given the specific recommendations whether the services of the teachers are to be dispensed with or not.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the leniency of the University is the major reason that services of majority of teachers who have been appointed on grant-in-aid posts have been retrenched by the Colleges.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that in Colleges of Education, huge number of students had been admitted but still the Management of the Colleges are removing the teachers from the service.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean College Development Council to call the Managements of the Colleges against whom the complaints have been received.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that action should be taken in accordance with the provisions of the Regulation 11.2 against the defaulting Colleges.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that there were certain Colleges where services of teachers were terminated and they moved the Court and obtained the stay orders but till date the services of these teachers are not re-instated.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the meeting of the Syndicate in the year 2007, he was also the member of the Syndicate, when this was happened, at that time the team was formed in different context. They were not given time for 7-8 months and technical flaws were created intentionally. There are proper statutes in the P.U. Calendars, whenever these provisions were properly quoted and implemented, none of the Management had got the relief. Referring to page 123 and jointly taking up both the items 12 and 13 for consideration, where affiliation case regarding R.S.D. College, Ferozepur is listed for the session 2023-24, where the Committee visited on behalf of the Syndicate. Referring to time table of B.A. B.Ed. of R.S.D College, Ferozepur (with the signatures of the Principal), he said that while the affiliation has been granted for the academic session 2023-24, they had allocated one lecture in the same room at the same time both for B.A. and B.Ed. course but the syllabus is different. The same lecture can only be taken where the contents of the syllabus are the same. The College listed at S.No.9 listed for the affiliation of the College for the session 2023-24, here this decision should be taken that how could they accept the recommendations of the Committee in that situation?

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

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that firstly decision should be taken on the issue why they constitute the Affiliation Committee for a particular College where problems are going on and they knew about the issue.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that 5 teachers and 2 teachers were terminated in Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur and Bondli College respectively. Similarly, there are 6-7 Colleges where the teachers have been terminated by the College authorities arbitrarily. This issue was also raised by him in one of the meetings of the Syndicate that in Gurusar sadhar College, teachers were not being paid salaries since 14 months. The Committee so constituted by the Syndicate, tried to convince the teachers of the said College, for which the complaint was made by the teachers.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he was the member of that Committee and the interim report of the Committee was submitted to the office of the Dean College Development Council wherein it has been clearly mentioned that they should not say that salaries were not paid from the last 14 months rather they should write that the salary of 14 months from the service of previous year was not paid so that the format of the complaint should be uniform. They should see whether the statutes of the P.U. Calendar are ignored by the Committee. It was also asked to produce the data in support of their complaint, but they failed to do so.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that what action was taken by the Committee?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua replied that interim report has been submitted to the office of DCDC, but the same is not produced before the House.

The Vice Chancellor said that time and again, she has been saying that the Committees either the Selection or Inspection should seek the data and convene the meeting through online mode with the Colleges and inform the concerned Colleges about their visit so that the Colleges could ready the information and provide the same. If the Principal assured that the information sought by the Committee is ready, then the Committee should execute their visit to the College.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are not talking about the Principals of the Colleges. The issue is that complainant should have made his/her complaint with the data in support of the complaint.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that when the management of the Colleges wishes to terminate any teacher of the College, they discontinue to teach a particular course. The Management of the R.S.D. College, Ferozepur, is taking decisions an arbitrary manner. The strength of the students is not much reduced but the Management intentionally treat it a reason for termination of teachers. In Bondli College, the subject of Computer Science was not offered to the students of B.A. and B.Sc. 1st year, instead the College discontinued the subject before the commencement of the classes of B.A/B.Sc. 1st year. For example, in A.S. College for Women, Khanna, the subject of Home Science is not being offered. The Colleges should seek permission of the University before discontinuing any particular subject, but no such procedure is being followed. He requested that strict action should be taken against the R.S.D. College, Ferozepur.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that this item should be withheld and it should be discussed with table agenda C-22.

Several members suggested that discussion of C-22 item should also be made with this item.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that there are several problems also in Dashmesh Khalsa College, Muktsar, where one teacher Mr. Lakhbir Singh of Department of Punjabi has been terminated by the College without any intimation. The letter was also got issued by the University to the College but action has not been taken by the College so far.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Colleges were issued the letters to re-instate the teachers but the Colleges are not taking any action regarding their reinstatement. A decision should be taken in principle that the Registration Returns of these Colleges should not be accepted. Such decision had already been taken earlier against the defaulting Colleges.

RESOLVED: That the following recommendations of the Affiliation Committee dated 16.06.2023 (**Item C-12**), be noted:

1. that the Dean, College Development Council be authorised to sign the mandatory *pro forma* of 60 Colleges of Education (**Appendix-LXXII**); and

2. that an affidavit (**Appendix-LXXII**) duly countersigned by the President/Secretary and Principal of the concerned College, be obtained with regard to meeting the compliance as per NCTE/Panjab University Regulations required for extension of affiliation to the Colleges of Education.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

1. the recommendation 1 of the Committee dated 14.07.2023 (**Item C-13**), as per **Appendix**, be approved;
2. a notice be issued to 14 Colleges (**Appendix-LXXII**), under Regulation 11.1 at page 161 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2022, to deposit balance Endowment Fund within 30 days time from the issuance of the notice failing which the registration returns of the students for the session 2023-24 would not be accepted; and
3. recommendation 3 of the Committee dated 14.07.2023 (**Appendix-LXXII**), be approved except that R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City, be not granted extension of affiliation for B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. (2nd Unit – 50 seats) for the session 2023-24.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That A.S. College for Women, Khanna, be written to reinstate Dr. Sushma Singla, Associate Professor in Home Science, with immediate effect, failing which -

- (i) the registration returns of the students be not accepted; and
- (ii) the papers for grants to the College be not forwarded to the State Government/University Grants Commission.

14. Considered the following recommendations (1 & 2) of the Medical Board of BGJ Institute of Health dated 16.06.2023 (**Appendix-LXXIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to decide the superannuated cases that:-

1. point no-5 and 6 of Medical Assistance Reimbursement Form, be modified as under:-

Existing	Modification
5. Income of my wife/other dependent from all sources is less than Rs.1000 p.m.	5. I have not claimed reimbursement of the above bills previously.
6. I am suffering from _____ which is a chronic disease.	6. I do not have any bills pending with me for claim prior to the period of the bills claimed above.

2. for all the cases where surgery is performed in Government Hospitals, the reimbursement rates of the implant for IOL, TKR and Hip replacement, be allowed as per the revised rates of Punjab Govt. Circulars nos.12/69/2009-____/518, dated 30/05/2023 and 12/5/2011-____/505, dated 30/05/2023, respectively.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he is happy to note that now medical reimbursement (page 126) has been allowed to Dr. B.D. Budhiraja, former Dean, College Development Council.

RESOLVED: That the above recommendations of Medical Board of Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, dated 16.06.2023, be approved.

15. Considered the following recommendations (No.VI & VII (b)) of the House Allotment Committee-I & II dated 25.04.2023 (**Appendix-LXXIV**) constituted by the Syndicate with regard to various issues as enumerated in Agenda that:-

- VI.** (1). if a person residing outside the University gets allotment of house and surrenders the same before expiry of six months of the date of allotment of house then market rent be charged from him/her and after the expiry of this period, normal rent be charged as the same may not be intentional.
- (2) if an employee is already residing in the University accommodation and gets allotment of higher category of houses and surrenders the higher type before/after expiry of stipulated period of three months, he/she shall have to pay the market rent of higher category type of house and whichever house is surrendered by him/her.
- VII (b).** Allotment of house on priority basis should be given only one time on a particular ground and no such request for allotment of house on priority basis be entertained.

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

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh referring to page 135 (under sub item 6) wherein the lines were written in bold font, the meaning of these lines are being conveyed that if any person is residing outside P.U. Campus and surrenders within 6 months, he/she would have to pay market rate of rent, if he surrenders after 6 months, the allottee would have to bear the normal rate of rent. In that case, who would surrender the house before the period of 6 months? There is some problem in it,

Dr. Dinesh Kumar clarified that as he being the member of House Allotment Committee, as there is a problem in it with regard to allotment of houses for non-teaching staff, that sometimes certain non-teaching employees intentionally get the houses allotted in his/her name and surrenders the house whenever the turn of his near and dear one matures for allotment. This is done because the waiting list of non-teaching employees started after the person who got house allotted in the previous counselling, whereas in every counselling, the waiting list of teaching started from the beginning. To curb this menace, a representation had been received from the non-teaching side. After deliberating on the issue, the decision was taken as a penalty measure.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he understood the concept of this decision by the House Allotment Committee, but it is not mentioned in the decision that it is only applicable to the non-teaching employees. For example, a

teacher is residing outside P.U. Campus and a residential accommodation is allotted, but the repair and maintenance work is not completed in time, in that case, thereafter the teacher surrenders the house allotted, the market rent is also levied on him. In that case, why he will surrender before 6 months, he would prefer to surrender after 9 months because at that time he would have to pay normal rate of rent. He requested to make changes in the sentence formation of the decision as there is ambiguity in it.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that citing an example of the Vice Chancellor, a residential accommodation had been allotted to her in the month of March, 2022 and rent was started deducting from the salary from the day one of allotment. On the other hand, the faculty who is residing in Campus is being given 3 months' time period to shift to another category of house allotted, he requested that 3 months' time should also be allowed to the teachers residing outside P.U. Campus. The construction office should verify that the repair and maintenance work has been done according to them, if need be, the other maintenance work should be got done by the faculty themselves. This should also be got examined that the repair and maintenance work of the houses should not be done on the basis of favoritism.

It was clarified that it should be modified as "it appears to be intentionality in holding the house for another person on the waiting list, hence this decision was taken. When he/she surrenders the house after six months' it should be mentioned as there appears to be intentionality, the market rent would be charged and for a person who retains the house after a period of six months due to non-completion of maintenance work, normal rate of rent would be charged as there is no malice intention of the employee in it.

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

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that it should be made clear that market rent would be charged from the employee either he surrenders the house within 2 months or more than 6 months. The issue related to mal-a-fide intention is not only for non-teachers, even the teachers also do such type of things. He asked, how this intention would be identified? One person says that he surrenders, because he was harassed in contacting the XEN office for getting the repair work done, whereas another person deliberately retains a house.

The Vice Chancellor said that according to her, it should be decided that if a person residing outside the University Campus gets a house allotted and surrenders the same within a period of six months from the date of allotment of house, market rent would be charged so that the person wishes to get the house allotted, get the same wisely.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the item should be referred back to the House Allotment Committee for reconsideration, so that the Committee could take an appropriate decision in the light of the observation made by the members of the Syndicate.

He was supported by Professor Gurmeet Singh.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that when the house is listed for counselling, XEN office offers the house as "ready to shift", whereas the house is not in habitable condition.

RESOLVED: That the following recommendations of the House Allotment Committee-I & II dated 25.04.2023 (**Appendix-LXXIV**) constituted by the Syndicate, be approved:-

- (1). if a person residing outside the University gets a house allotted at the Campus and surrenders the same before expiry of six months from the date of allotment, market rent be charged from him/her as a deterrent, so that one could not deliberately get the same house allotted to his/her near and dear ones. However, after the expiry of the period of six months, normal rent be charged as the same may not be intentional.
- (2) if an employee is already residing in the University accommodation and gets a house of higher category allotted and surrenders the higher type before/after expiry of stipulated period of three months, he/she shall have to pay the market rent of higher category type of house and whichever house is surrendered by him/her.
- (3) House on priority basis on any ground, be allotted only once, and thereafter no request for allotment of house on priority basis again, be entertained.

16. Considered request of Ms. Navdeep Sharma, Ex-Programme Coordinator, NSS with regard to release of her Earned Leave emoluments for the period i.e. 01.07.2016 to 30.06.2020, having worked as Programme Coordinator (NSS). Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that after going through the agenda item, it is clear in the resolved part that the contractual employee is not entitled for payment of earned leave, which has been conveyed by the office of the Vice Chancellor to the incumbent. He is not referring to this particular case, rather it is the trend being followed in the University that if some representation or request is not covered under the rules the same is placed before the Syndicate. Wherever the Regulations/Rules are clear, the University should own the responsibility and convey the decision to the candidate. When their own office note is saying that the encashment of earned leave cannot be made to the contractual employee as per P.U. Rules, then how it could be considered.

It was informed that it has been written in the appointment letter issued to her that her pay of Rs.53820/- per month will be fixed in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+G.P. Rs.9000+ allowances admissible under the University Rules i.e., in the pay band-4 equal to whatever she is getting in her present position of Associate Professor at A.S. College, Khanna. It had also been mentioned in the appointment letter, "Leave: your appointment will be governed by the University's Regulations and Rules for leave to its employees as incorporated in P.U. Calendars Volume-I and III and other Rules and Instructions framed thereunder from time to time shall be applicable".

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that it is absolutely correct, but it has not been specifically recommended by the Registrar. Her appointment was on contractual basis and it was a tenure post. The other allowances are meant only for D.A. and mobile allowance etc.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that allowances are associated with the post whether the post is contractual or regular. He requested that if this particular case is allowed, they would have also to consider the 100 temporary faculties who are serving for 10-12 years. He further clarified that the office could check any appointment letter of temporary faculty wherein the payment of pay plus allowances has been mentioned. Allowances did not mean that the employees are entitled for encashment of earned leave.

It was informed that it is mentioned in the appointment letter issued to her that her term of appointment is extendable for further one year on the terms & conditions mentioned in the appointment letter as her appointment was subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, to CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

Certain members including Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that these conditions are only applicable for permanent posts.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that she has been allowed all the benefits which a regular teacher has.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if the audit would have objection on it, the case would be returned back with the comments. When the legal opinion and the resolved part of the Committee is clear, why it is in their minds that Audit would raise objection.

The Vice Chancellor said that does it mean that it is as per the Rules that there is no provision for encashment of earned leave.

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

The Vice Chancellor stated that as per Rules, it is not permissible.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Professor Gurmeet Singh that the cases which are not covered under the Rules, are being placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this item should be deferred and after making specific recommendations, the same could be placed again before the Syndicate for consideration.

Professor Gurmeet Singh also endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and stated that this should be deferred.

RESOLVED: That in the light of the observations made by the members, the consideration of item, be deferred.

- 17.** Considered if, M.Ed. Course at Guru Gobind Singh College of Education, Giddarbaha, Sri Muktsar Sahib, be discontinued, from the academic session 2023-2024 in a phased manner as per Regulation 13.2, 13.3, 13.4 & 13.5 at page 162 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-LXXV**) was also taken into consideration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said though this case is clear, he enquired whether there is retrenchment of any teacher of M.Ed. Course at Guru Gobind Singh College of Education, Giddarbaha, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that there is no retrenchment of teachers.

RESOLVED: That, as per Regulations 13.2, 13.3, 13.4 & 13.5 at page 162 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, M.Ed. Course at Guru Gobind Singh College of Education, Giddarbaha, Sri Muktsar Sahib, be discontinued from the academic session 2023-2024, in a phased manner.

- 18.** Considered minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 12.07.2023 (**Appendix-LXXVI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the template/parameters to be prepared for the evaluation/ assessment/performance of temporary/guest/part-time faculty when granting them extension beyond one semester.

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that after going through, the first thought, he had in his mind, is pertaining to imposition of strict conditions on temporary/guest/part-time faculty. While framing the template, it is being written that since the University Grants Commission has increased the honorarium of Guest faculty up to a maximum limit of Rs.50,000/- allowing Rs.1500/- per lecture..... leaving the statement in mid of it, he said that that he would not read the contents of the discussion completely. The rules are already existed that the Chairperson of the department where guest faculty is teaching, would give the recommendation after every six months, whether the guest faculty has satisfactory performance or not. According to him, there is no need of framing such type of parameters, it would only result into harassment. Instead of concentrating on teaching, the guest faculty would be involved in collecting the papers, which would cause lot of harassment to them. Citing an example, when the interviews under CAS promotions were being held, there posed a problem in some PPTs, letter was issued from the office of Dean of University Instruction, before appearing the Screening Committee, the candidate should check his/her PPTs, later on the issue was made against the issue of this letter and lately, the said letter would have been withdrawn, whereas no objectionable contents were mentioned in the letter. The Committee was constituted to frame the template for temporary/guest/part-time faculty. The said Committee at point No.11 recommended that "the Committee members who have signed below will also serve as a Review Committee, which will meet twice every year to discuss only problematic cases, where performance evaluation parameters or JAAC reports are ambiguous and referred by the DUI/Vice Chancellor to the Review Committee". It should be informed to him as to how the existing Committee forms another Committee with the same members for reviewing the cases. His first submission is that this matter should be got re-examined, if she agrees, the recommendations of the Committee could be considered for approval. There is a procedure laid down for the Guest faculty, which should be continued or one or two things should be added rather than imposing a long list of 10 conditions. For any complaints or issues, a separate Committee could be formed or standing orders could be issued that all such matters/complaints would be looked into by this Committee. The

method of writing in such a way that persons who are signing below, will act as members of the Review Committee, to examine the cases pertaining to complaints, is not justifiable.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it should not be such that these are the recommendations of the Committee and it would only be reviewed by them.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that this recommendation was made due to the reason that if they face problems in fulfilling these recommendations, in that case the same Committee review and thereafter proper guidelines would be prepared within one year.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that implement these guidelines/conditions for regular teachers and see the results.

The Vice Chancellor said that these conditions are not for guest faculty. In fact, University had 300 guest faculty, more than 100 temporary faculty, but University is not involving them in any research, research projects, to supervise Ph.D. students. Meaning thereby, they are allowing these 300 persons just give lecture and go. The University wanted that they should sit in the department and they should be involved in the practical work or research project either they are Ph.D. or not. They might not be the Supervisor of the Ph.D. students, but they could do practical work with them, so that they have publications to their credit. At what place these temporary faculty and guest faculty would stand at the time of interviews/shortlisting, which would be conducted for selections, whether they are going to be called for interview or not. Why that would happen? It is only because they have not been involved in anything other than teaching. They have not done any research or have publications in their credit, they would not get marks for the same and would not be shortlisted for the interviews. In Colleges, the regular faculty is drawing less salary than the guest faculty in the University, but the regular faculty of the Colleges, is involved in the research projects and supervising Ph.D. students. The marks of the regular faculty of the Colleges would be more than the guest faculty of the University.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he fully agreed with the statement made by the Vice Chancellor, but in the minutes some other feelings are getting reflected. The statement made by the Vice Chancellor should have been made in the meeting of the Chairpersons. The information sought by the University on 9 different parameters is quite different. There are majority of Chairpersons who might be encouraging the guest faculty. The selection of temporary faculty has been made after following the laid down procedure. A system is already in place for it. A Committee could be formed. After reading these recommendations, he apprehended that such type of conditions on guest faculty would be troublesome.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that no extra document is sought from the guest faculty under these conditions. Referring to page 177, only 5 documents have been sought (under points a to e), these could be provided by the teachers by summarizing in merely 2 pages. The University has no concrete documents pertaining to guest faculty instead of merely the document consisting of satisfactory performance. The University could not remove any guest faculty even on receipt of complaint. In the Department of Laws, it become difficult for the Chairperson to get it approve from the JAAC of the department that guest faculty would work from 9 to 4 in the department for looking after the other research related activities. Out of these five points, half of them would be certified by the Chairperson of the concerned department, rather the work of the Chairperson or

the office is increased. In point 1, the workload is to be given for the guest faculty, which is to be given by the office. His only request is that point listed at 11 should be little modified.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that after 3-4 meetings of the Committee and lengthy deliberations, these conditions were framed. The reason behind formation of this Committee was that there are two teachers in the University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management, who refused to work and as a protest, the Chairperson of the department resigned. The same problem had also been faced in some other departments. The guest faculty were not doing any work and there was no laid down condition to remove them. Only the remarks of the Chairpersons of the department regarding the satisfactory performance of the teacher have been recorded. In that particular case, even the Police was called. This criteria or template was prepared to fix some accountability on them.

Several members were of the view and suggested that the condition mentioned at number 11 should be removed.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that for research, time should be spared instead of wasting time in completing the formalities and providing information listed in these 9 conditions. He reiterated that this thing should be considered in terms of encouragement rather than harassment, for them. He suggested that on the basis of exceptions, rules are not framed. Secondly, the logic being discussed in the meeting of the Committee that as the guest faculty is being paid Rs.50,000/-, is painful for him. There is no one in support of guest faculty, if they face some problem, there would be no one with them to raise their voice whereas with the regular faculty, the support of PUTA is with them.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if they provide the supporting documents for evaluation of answer books, submission of assessment, details of research projects, participation in conferences and seminars, only then the appeals would be checked whether the JAAC has taken the decision rightly or not.

It was clarified that when the teachers show their PPTs a glitch used to come, the letter was issued keeping in mind that they should check whether their PPT is functioning properly or not.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar clarified that at point No.1 in second line, it was written that "Attendance Register is to be produced". He suggested that instead of this, it should be written in the circular to be issued that the certificate issued by the Chairperson of the department regarding attendance would serve the purpose. Otherwise, they would get the attendance register xeroxed.

It was informed that the point pertaining to UIHTM has rightly been explained by Professor Jatinder Grover. Most of the guest faculty has been working for more than 10 years in most of the departments. What is happening is that the guest faculty took it for granted that they would be re-appointed the next day. The rider, the University has imposed that the work should be satisfactory and the conduct should be good, which should be seconded by the JAAC of the department. The JAAC has to meet for reconsidering the performance and conduct of the guest faculty; however, in many cases the performance and conduct of guest faculty is not good. In Department of French, two guest faculty members are insisting and coming to meet her even when the Chairperson does not want them to come back, because they have been working very poorly and misbehaving,

yet these persons are insisting as to why they are not being given extension. Therefore, it was urgently felt that there has to be some kind of appraisal.

The Vice Chancellor while supporting the viewpoint expressed by DUI, said that it would be better to impose such conditions on the guest faculty, so that they should actively participate in research and other academic activities.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that it has been mentioned at page 176 of the Appendix, "Since the University Grants Commission has increased the honorarium of guest faculty up to a maximum limit of Rs.50,000/- allowing Rs.1,500/- per lecture (whereas earlier maximum limit was Rs.25,000/- with Rs.1,000/- per lecture). It is suggested that they should contribute more in the working of department, attend to research work and participate in Department activities, such as in the organization of seminars, evaluation of answer books, mentorship of students etc." The justification given for seeking more contribution of guest faculty in the academic activities of the department is not academic.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that this line has been inserted because it had been specified in the UGC circular, through which the remuneration of guest faculty was enhanced to maximum of Rs.50,000/- (Rs.1500/- per lecture) from maximum of Rs.25,000/- (Rs.1000/- per lecture) about the norms for composition of Selection Committee, workload, etc. The UGC has written that the guest faculty is supposed to work as the regular faculty worked.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that instead of mentioning this line, the copy of the norms laid down by the UGC should have been appended with the recommendations of the Committee. The intention conveyed here in the meeting is different, but the message which goes out is entirely different. He, therefore, suggested that the copy of the norms laid down by the UGC should be appended and the line quoted above should be deleted.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that why the remuneration of guest faculty working in the Constituent Colleges has not been increased from maximum of Rs.25,000/- (Rs.1000/- per lecture) to maximum of Rs.50,000/- (Rs.1500/- per lecture)?

The Vice Chancellor said that it is because of the circular issued by the Government of Punjab.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that since the faculty members of the Constituent Colleges are employees of the University, the service conditions and Regulations and Rules of the University are applicable on them, which has also been mentioned in the MoU executed between the University and Government of Punjab.

Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that a circular should be issued to all the affiliated Colleges to pay a revised remuneration of maximum of Rs.50,000/- per month (Rs.1500/- per lecture). He further said that earlier same remuneration/honorarium was paid to the guest faculty working in the University, Constituent Colleges and affiliated Colleges, but now the Punjab Government had approved different remuneration/honorarium to the guest faculty working in the Constituent and affiliated Colleges as the Punjab Government wanted to have control on these Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that earlier, the University had issued a letter to the affiliated Colleges to pay a minimum salary of Rs.25,800/- per month

to the faculty working on *ad hoc*/temporary basis. Now, the salary of the faculty working on *ad hoc*/temporary basis should also be revised to Rs.50,000/- per month and a circular should be issued.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the first sentence of paragraph 5 written at page 176 should be deleted, but the remaining portion, "It is suggested that they should contribute more in the working of department, attend to research work and participate in Department activities, such as in the organization of seminars, evaluation of answer books, mentorship of students etc.", should remain as such, because the UGC has said that the selection of guest faculty should be the same as for regular faculty.

It was said by the Dean of University Instruction that she believed that it is good that the guest faculty should do research, but should not think that it is contradictory to the basic ideology. In fact, difficult times called for difficult measures.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that they could do this, but their major efforts should be to encourage the guest faculty.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he believed that they had incorporated these clauses in accordance with the UGC document – irrespective of whether it is related to appointment or taking work from them. He submitted that 3rd Amendment had come in the UGC Regulations, 2010, under which the workload of practicals of 2 hours was equal to 1 hour. The said amendment had come been there only for 2 months because the trade unions had agitated and the same was amended by the UGC and 1 hour practical was made equal to 1 hour. Now, they are expecting everything, including that the guest faculty should be innovative, should have research publications, research projects, etc., but at the same time, they are giving them unjustified treatment by counting the practical of 2 hours equal to 1 hour. As per the UGC Regulations/Rules, the practical of 2 hours should be equal to 2 hours; otherwise, it would be violation of UGC Regulations/Rules.

It was informed by the Dean of University Instruction that according to NEP, 2 hours practical is equivalent to 1 hour.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out that it has been written in the minutes of the Committee that at the end of the Academic Session, a report regarding the work and conduct of the guest faculty will be given by the Chairperson to the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department, which may recommend his/her name as guest faculty to teach in the Department in the next academic session. However, there are Departments where there is only a single teacher, who is the Administrative Committee as also the Academic Committee.

It was informed that in such Department, teachers from allied Departments are made members of the Academic and Administrative Committees.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu, Citing an example, said that there is only one teacher in the Department of Music and he/she is doing everything.

It was informed that teachers from the faculty of Design and Fine Arts have been made members of the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department of Music.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out the topper of Entrance Test had not been registered for Ph.D. by the Department of Music, and said issue was raised by them a couple of times.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the issue raised by Dr. Mukesh Arora and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu should be taken seriously and it should be ensured that the guest faculty working in the Constituent and affiliated Colleges should get maximum of Rs.50,000/- p.m. and Rs.1,500/- per lecture as per UGC norms.

Dr. Jagtar Singh suggested that the office of Dean, College Development Council should issue a letter to the affiliated Colleges to pay maximum of Rs.50,000/- p.m. and Rs.1,500/- per lecture to the guest faculty working there.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the system of payment of salaries to the guest faculty should be simplified, because they have to go from pillar to post for getting the salary.

Professor Devinder Singh stated that they are used to the guest faculty. There are 9 regular teachers in his Department and 30 are guest faculty/part-time teachers. When the maximum honorarium of Rs.25,000/- or Rs.1,000/- per lecture was paid to them, they were stressing that they should stay in the Department and do some work. Now, they had incorporated certain points for their encouragement. So far as workload is concerned, it could be verified as the same always came to the office of the Dean of University Instruction. Another point is that the guest faculty should adopt innovative teaching practices, and the guest faculty could convince the Academic and Administrative Committees about this. So far as participation/presentation of papers in the Conferences/Seminars is concerned, it would be difficult for them because classes are not held on the days of Conferences/Seminars, whereas the guest faculty is paid remuneration/honorarium on lecture basis. However, they are paid additional money for the examination. As per the terms and conditions of the appointment of guest faculty, their term of appointment comes to an end on the last working day of the third month. Since the guest faculty is appointed only for two terms during the academic session, i.e., 80 days + 80 days, they are paid only for 160 days in a year. Certain departments are totally dependent on the guest faculty. A misconception is there amongst certain members of the guest faculty that they could only be replaced with the appointment of faculty or regular basis. Since certain departments are dependent on guest faculty, their term should be extended up to the last day of examination instead of last working day of the teaching.

Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that the day the guest faculty participate/present papers in the Conferences/Seminars/ Workshops, they should be treated on duty and paid honorarium.

Professor Devinder Singh said that even if they allowed honorarium to the guest faculty for participating and presenting papers in the Conferences/Seminars/Workshops, the audit might raise objection, because the guest faculty is paid on the basis of attendance.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the problem of Department of Laws could not be compared with other departments as the Department of Laws has more examination than others. In fact, the Department of Laws conducted

examinations throughout the year. Moreover, Conferences/Seminars/Workshops are usually held at the weekends, i.e., Saturdays and Sundays. Even if the guest faculty is allowed honorarium for participating and presenting papers in the Conferences/Seminars/Workshops, there would not be much difference and they would only be able to get maximum of Rs.3,000/- to Rs.4,500/- more, but not more than Rs.50,000/-.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the recommendations of the Committee dated 12.07.2023, except recommendation 11, as per **Appendix**, be approved;
2. that the following portion of the discussion mentioned at page 176 of the Appendix, be expunged:

“Since the University Grants Commission has increased the honorarium of guest faculty up to a maximum limit of Rs.50,000/- allowing Rs.1,500/- per lecture (whereas earlier maximum limit was Rs.25,000/- with Rs.1,000/- per lecture)”.

3. honorarium/remuneration be paid to the guest faculty for participating or presenting papers in the Conferences/Seminars/Workshops.

19. Considered legal opinion dated 30.06.2023 of Shri Akshaya Kumar Goel that Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer-II, Construction Office, P.U., be dismissed from the University services w.e.f. 16.08.2022, i.e., the date on which the Hon'ble CBI Court, Chandigarh pronounced him guilty.

NOTE: An office note containing full facts of the matter was enclosed (**Appendix-LXXVII**).

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the matter is sub-judice as the case is pending in the Punjab and Haryana High Court, where no decision has been taken on the issue so far. Secondly, the University has taken legal opinion from three advocates out of which two are in favour of the delinquent and one against him.

It was clarified that after the conviction of Shri Satish Kumar Padam, Executive Engineer, his case was put up for subsistence allowance and the Assistant Comptroller (Local Audit) (ACLA) had *inter alia* observed, 'despite conviction on criminal charges by the CBI, Shri Satish Kumar Padam has not been dismissed from the University service, ignoring the instruction of Punjab Government. No justifiable ground for this has been given. Non-dismissal from the service, despite being convicted, entail into heavy expenditure on account of subsistence allowance'. Thereafter, it was observed that in view of the sentence having been stayed by the Court, what action is required to be taken by the University. That is why, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate to consider along with the observation of the ACLA that after his (Shri Satish Kumar Padam) conviction, he should be dismissed from the service, as to what action is to be taken.

Professor Gurmeet Singh stated that since it a clear case and the matter is also *sub-judice*, there is no need to deliberate much on it. Anyhow, according to him, there is no base for suspension after the conviction and the same has also

been vouched by the Advocate in his legal opinion. Suspension is always done, pending inquiry or the inquiry is underway. Now, the Syndicate could decide whether he (Shri Satish Kumar Padam) is to be dismissed or removed from the University service. He added that another accused in the case namely Shri Nand Lal Kaushal, who had retired, had been denied even pension, which is a severe punishment. However, in the case of Shri Satish Kumar Padam, suspension is being suggested. That was why, he was suggesting that minimum to minimum discussion should be held on this item. In the end, he said that after his conviction, they had no choice, but to remove/dismiss him from the service. Had he been acquitted, all the benefits would have been given to him? He, therefore, suggested that proceedings for removing him from the University service should be initiated.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that Shri Satish Kumar Padam was appointed as Junior Engineer and reached the position of Executive Engineer. However, till date, neither any complaint was filed against him nor any charges were leveled nor any inquiry conducted. He remarked that sometime certain persons adopt such measures to implicate the officials. It is quite possible that somebody might have implicated him. Now, he has been convicted. There was no need to seek legal opinion after his conviction as the Syndicate has the power to take appropriate action against him. As suggested by Professor Gurmeet Singh, he is also in favour of removing him from the University service, if consensus arrived on it.

Professor Devinder Singh said that without discussing the merits of legal opinion and his past service, he would like to say that after conviction, pending appeal, the University could take appropriate action against him. However, the quantum of punishment is to be decided by the competent authority. Since the power to decide quantum of punishment lay with them, they should decide it and pass speaking orders. At the moment, the University has not passed speaking orders relating to quantum of punishment to be awarded to him after his conviction. In nutshell, he said that the competent authority is required to pass speaking orders about the punishment to be awarded to him, i.e., dismissal or removal from University service.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he has not seen during his entire life that a person is placed under suspension after his/her conviction.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra suggested that a Committee comprising members of the Syndicate, Senate and from administrative side should be constituted to recommend quantum of punishment to be awarded to Shri Satish Kumar Padam.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that he could not understand how the proceedings have been conducted, because after the conviction, they had issued show cause notice saying that why the disciplinary proceedings be not initiated against you under University rules on account of your conviction by the Hon'ble CBI Court, Chandigarh. In fact, disciplinary proceedings against him should have been initiated, the day an FIR was lodged. After conviction, removal or dismissal could be done. However, the criminal and disciplinary proceedings are entirely different. They could have continued with the disciplinary proceedings even during the pendency of the trial, which they did not do, and instead placed him under suspension and given his subsistence allowance.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that Shri Satish Kumar Padam had remained suspended from 2010 to 2014 and was paid subsistence allowance during that period. Thereafter, he was reinstated. From 2014 to 2022, he was in the active service of the University. Now, after conviction, they could not place him under suspension and should either remove or dismiss him from the University service. If he (Shri Satish Kumar Padam) is acquitted by the High Court at a later stage, he would automatically get all the benefits.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that, in fact, neither the disciplinary proceedings in this case have been initiated nor the regular inquiry conducted. If they took any action against him, somebody could point out in the Court that neither the disciplinary proceedings have been initiated nor the regular inquiry conducted in this case, which might go against the University. Now, they could pass speaking orders regarding the punishment to be given to the convict without waiting for the orders of the Court on his appeal, which is pending in the High Court. It had been rightly pointed out by his colleagues that there was no need to seek legal opinion in this case. He agreed with the suggestion given by the other members that since Shri Satish Kumar Padam has worked in this University for a number of years, the penalty of removal of service should be imposed on him, so that he could get the benefits.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that Shri Satish Kumar Padam has an unblemished record of service except this case.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that somewhere a decision had been taken that an inquiry officer be appointed to conduct the inquiry in the case of Shri Satish Kumar Padam, but the inquiry officer was not appointed.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk and Professor Gurmeet Singh said that only the sentence has been stayed by the High Court and not the conviction. Had the conviction been stayed, it would have meant that the Court had another view.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, as said by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk, both the criminal case and service matters are different ones. A show cause notice had been issued to Shri Padam stating that they would start disciplinary proceeding against him. They could decide the punishment to be awarded to him on the basis of punishment decided by the Court, but they could not decide the punishment till the report did not come to the University, which clearly declared him guilty. They could not give punishment on the basis of opinion alone. So far as legal opinions of advocates or Committees are concerned, they are just opinions. As such, opinions could not become base of any punishment. Therefore, to meet the technicalities and legal formalities, they have to conduct regular inquiry in this case, and thereafter, decide the punishment to be awarded to him on the basis of the inquiry report. However, if they awarded punishment now, they have to give reason as to why punishment of removal from service has been awarded and why not the punishment of dismissal from service has been awarded and those reasons are to be given by the Syndicate. There is no need to appoint inquiry officer from outside and incur a huge expenditure on the inquiry. Inquiry Officer could be appointed from within the University. Ultimately, they would decide the quantum of punishment to be awarded on the basis of the inquiry report.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that now, they had the option for conducting the regular inquiry.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that when Shri Satish Kumar Padam was in service, the University did not take any action. He was placed only under suspension because he was arrested. His suspension was done under clause of arrest for 24 hours, because it has been mentioned in the University Calendar that if an employee remained arrested for 24 hours or more, he/she has to be placed under suspension.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the legal opinions, which the University had taken, are part of the agenda. The legal opinion had received on 30.06.2023 by the University, but they are saying that it would not be accepted. The suggestion (ii) given by the office in its note dated 06.07.2023 strengthened the legal opinion which has been given by Shri Indresh Goel, Advocate. In fact, Shri Indresh Goel has opined, "Though the conviction and sentence as on date has been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court, the fact remains that Shri Satish Kumar has been charged and convicted for offences of corruption and moral turpitude. The University has placed him under suspension and the future course of action shall be decided upon the final outcome of his appeal before the Hon'ble High Court. Till then, the University should pay him subsistence allowance as per rules and regulations....". In accordance with legal opinions given by the two advocates, he is entitled for subsistence allowance Hence, as per legal opinion, subsistence allowance could be given to Shri Satish Kumar Padam. If they did not allow him subsistence allowance, would he not get the same through the Court? What he meant to say is, that they should not take any contrary decision. In the pendency of his appeal in the High Court, they should not take any decision in the case, because they are not paying him subsistence allowance. They should wait instead of taking a decision a step ahead.

Professor Gurmeet Singh pointed out that the Audit had given its observation that subsistence allowance could not be paid after conviction and the Audit had quoted the Regulations/Rules. According to him, they could proceed for issuing show cause notice after the conviction. So far as legal opinions are concerned, they are not accepting them and recommending removal from service. He and Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the legal opinions are not binding on them.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that after the conviction, they have just to fulfil the procedural formalities.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the law, there is no double jeopardy; otherwise, there could not be two punishments for the same offence. As laymen they could think that two punishments have been awarded - (i) one by the Court; and (ii) another by the University for forfeiting his benefits. However, a set code existed in administrative and service matters that they could not be counted in double jeopardy. That is why, despite the work done by the Court, the University is required to do its job, for which they have to follow all the steps, including conduct of regular inquiry.

On a point of order, Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that if they remove/dismiss him from the University service as punishing authority, it could be challenged in the Court, but could not be termed as illegal. It is not necessary that they have to remove/dismiss him from the service after his conviction; rather, they might not remove/dismiss him from the service.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that even if report acquitted him, the University could take action against him on the basis of the inquiry conducted by the University itself, because they have to see as to what wrong he has done in the University system.

When it was pointed that show cause notice had already been issued to Shri Satish Kumar Padam and he had given the reply, Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that even after the receipt of reply, regular inquiry could be conducted.

Dr. Parveen Goyal enquired, has the University laid down any criteria as to from which lawyer the legal opinion is to be sought. When it was informed by one of the members that a panel of lawyers is there for obtaining the legal opinion, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he did not know on what basis the advocates gave their opinion. It seemed that the advocates gave legal opinion as per their "whims and fancies". One of the lawyers, while giving the legal opinion, made the base of conviction given by the Court and opined that he should be dismissed from the University service, whereas the another lawyer made the base of the stay granted by the Court and opined that he should be paid subsistence allowance during the period of suspension till the date of his retirement. Meaning thereby, every lawyer made base on the basis of which he wanted to give his opinion. Why the second lawyer did not made the base of conviction and opined for removal/dismissal from the service.

To this, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that every advocate gave opinion according to his knowledge and understanding. That is why, it is an explicit principle in law that the legal opinions are not binding. This is the reason, the advocates easily gave their opinions knowing full well that it is for the concerned party to accept or reject their opinion.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that it meant that different legal opinions could come from different lawyers. Two different cases had come in the meetings held on 27.5.2023 and 08.07.2023 respectively. The job, which they could not perform, should not be performed by them and should be referred to the competent person/body. Since contradictory legal opinions have come, the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that now it is being suggested that decision on the issue should be deferred, whereas the Standing Legal Committee constituted to enquire into this case had made two different recommendations that subsistence allowance be paid to Shri Satish Kumar Padam and pension of Shri Nand Lal Kaushal be stopped. That was why, he was saying that if they discuss the issue in detail, certain lacunae might come to fore and suggesting that on the basis of the conviction, the process of removal from the service should be initiated, pending final decision of the Court. If he is acquitted by the Court, he would automatically get all the benefits. If need be, regular inquiry should be conducted on the basis of which the quantum of punishment should be decided.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since he was a member of the Committee, which had recommended penalty of stoppage of pension to Shri Nand Lal Kaushal, he would like to inform them that pension to Shri Nand Lal Kaushal was stopped in accordance with Regulations/Rules of the University, because he had already retired from the University service and the Syndicate/Senate had nothing to do with him at that point of time. Though he was a member of the Committee, which met to consider the case of Shri Satish Kumar Padam, he could not attend the meeting, and that is why, he did not know as to how the payment of subsistence

allowance was recommended. Had he been present in the meeting, he would have definitely suggested that procedure should be followed for dismissal/removal from the service. They could follow the laid down procedure even within the period of 15 days and award the punishment.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that Damocles' Sword is not hanging on their head to take a decision on the issue right now. He, therefore, suggested that the consideration of the Item should be deferred and brought again in the next meeting of the Syndicate. In the meantime, an Inquiry Committee should be appointed to enquire into the matter.

At this stage, several members started speaking together, which resulted into a bedlam

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the plea of Professor Gurmeet Singh that on the basis of conviction, Shri Satish Kumar Padam should be removed from the University service, is accepted, so that he could get the benefits, then how could they stop the pension to Shri Nand Lal Kaushal? If they did not follow the procedure, they would be in trouble. That is why, he is stressing that procedure should be followed. However, instead of appointing an Inquiry Committee, an Inquiry Officer should be appointed.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that an Inquiry Committee should be appointed and the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to take decision on the Inquiry Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that only Inquiry Officer is required to be appointed and not an Inquiry Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that whatever the fault maybe, as per natural justice, hearing has to be given to the accused.

Professor Devinder Singh said that irrespective of whether Inquiry Committee is to be appointed or an Inquiry Officer, the main purpose to advance the reasons under the service law is to give punishment to Shri Satish Kumar Padam. So far conviction by the Court is concerned, the Judge has decided the case as per criminal law.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to evaluate quantum of punishment for Shri Satish Kumar Padam, former Executive Engineer, P.U. Construction Office.

- 20.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 13.07.2023 (**Appendix-LXXVIII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to decide the modalities for recruiting faculty on regular basis along with posts of Controller of Examinations, Director Sports, Librarian, Director Youth Welfare, Registrar, Dean College Development Council, Director Public Relations and 2 posts of dispensary.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that the item placed before the Syndicate for consideration is different, whereas the recommendations of the Committee dated 13.07.2023 are entirely different. The Committee has in fact recommended as to how many candidates are to be called for interview for the post of Assistant Professors.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that the term of reference of the Committee was “to decide the modalities for recruitment of faculty on regular basis”.

It was clarified that, in fact, permission to advertise the posts of Controller of Examinations, Registrar, Director (Sports), Director, Youth Welfare, Librarian, Dean, College Development Council, Director Public Relations and two posts of Doctors at Panjab University Health Centre has been sought.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee has recommended criteria that if a single post is advertised, 20 candidates are to be called for the interview, and the other criteria would be, as per the table recommended by the Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the item should be reframed in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, in fact, the posts had already been advertised and the concerned departments are asking as to how the scrutiny is to be done. That was why, the criteria has been got laid down through a Committee.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk enquired, do they pay additional honorarium to the persons, who have been given the additional charge of the administrative posts, e.g., Registrar, Controller of Examinations, Dean of Student Welfare, etc.

It was informed that additional honorarium is paid to the persons, who have been given additional charge of the administrative posts.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that different honorarium is being paid to the persons, who have been given additional charge of the administrative posts.

To this, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that equal honorarium should be paid to all.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur suggested that equal honorarium should be paid to all.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that since the meetings of the Budget Estimates Committee are underway, the issue of equal honorarium to all the persons, who have been given additional charge of the administrative posts, should be placed before it, so that the same should be placed before the Board of Finance. In this way, uniformity would be maintained.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he had also said in the meeting of Board of Finance that until the financial position of the University is improved, all the persons, who have been given additional charge of the administrative posts, should voluntarily surrender the honorarium.

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

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that University Grants Commission has prescribed minimum criteria, but the University could always prescribe higher criteria. He, therefore, suggested that they could fix the parameters for short-listing the candidates as well as calling them for interview. If they fix the parameters, the number of candidates to be invited for the interview might vary.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that certain Universities called 25 candidates for the interview of a post.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they might be remembering that they had pointed out the discrepancies when the template for the posts of Assistant Professors and Principals in the affiliated Colleges was approved. In the case of affiliated Colleges, they had followed the UGC Guidelines for calling the candidates for interview, whereas for Assistant Professor in the University, they had fixed their own criteria. The recommendations of the Committee are not as per the UGC Guidelines. Why they are adopting two different yardsticks? Despite their repeated pleas, the University decided to adopt the criteria as prescribed by the UGC. In the case of Assistant Professors in affiliated Colleges, they had decided that 8 candidates be called for interviews for a post.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that recording of interviews is being done by certain Universities.

The Vice Chancellor said that nowhere the UGC has said that 8 candidates be called for the interview for a post. When Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked, the Vice Chancellor said that those were the guidelines of Punjab Government. However, at the same time, the UGC says that the Universities could evolve their own criteria.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that they have fixed the maximum number of candidates to be called for the interview, but not the minimum. He suggested that minimum number of candidates to be called for the interview should also be fixed.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has been written in the UGC Gazette notification, "Number of candidates to be called for interview shall be decided by the concerned Universities".

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua enquired, had they written this to Punjab Government after the deliberations taken place in the Syndicate?

The Vice Chancellor said that they had accepted the notification of Punjab Government. If they wished to deviate from Punjab Government, they could have written to them that they wanted to call 10/15/20 candidates for the interview instead of 8. If they even decide today, they could write to Punjab Government that they would like to call 20 candidates for the interview for a post of Assistant Professor in the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that what he meant to say is that if they decided to call 20 candidates for the interview for a post of Assistant Professor in the University, the University should write to Punjab Government as well as affiliated Colleges that they are allowed to call 20 candidates for the interview for a post of Assistant Professor.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is a standard rule that minimum of 3 candidates are required to be called for the interview.

Dr. Jagtar Singh and Dr. Mukesh Arora stressed that same criteria as of the University should be prescribed for calling the candidates for the interview for the post of Assistant Professor in the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that Punjab Government everywhere says that Punjabi would be compulsory up to 10th standard. Would they make Punjabi compulsory up to the 10th standard while making appointments in the University?

The Vice Chancellor said that the University makes appointments as per the guidelines/rules/regulations of the UGC.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that when they are accepting each and every rule of Punjab Government, why could not they accept this rule of Punjab Government?

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that they are not accepting the rule of Punjab Government for appointment the teachers on probation for a period of 3 years; rather, they are appointment them on a probation of 1 year.

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

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out that the appointments in Punjab are being made in accordance with the Punjab Government rules/regulations and not in accordance with the Central Government rules/regulations.

Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that the 3 posts of Principals of P.U. Constituent Colleges are lying vacant, the same should also be advertised.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that if they follow the rules of Punjab Government, with effect from 01.04.2023, the Punjab Government has reduced the age of superannuation from 60 years to 58 years.

It was informed that at the moment, the University has not adopted the said notification of Punjab Government. At the time of acquiring the Constituent Colleges, the University has made it amply clear to the Punjab Government that the service conditions, which are applicable to the University faculty/employees, would be applicable to the faculty/employees of these Constituent Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it should be noted/recorded that for appointments, Punjabi up to 10th standard should be made mandatory.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 13.07.2023, as per Appendix, be approved, with the modification that instead of 20, 25 candidates be called for the interview of a post of Assistant Professor in the University as well as in the affiliated Colleges, and if need be, the Punjab Government be written to for the purpose.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the posts of Controller of Examinations, Registrar, Director (Sports), Director, Youth Welfare, Librarian, Dean, College Development Council, Director Public Relations and two posts of Doctors at Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, be advertised/re-advertised.

21. Considered if, the following Faculties opted by S. Ranbir Singh Bhullar, MLA & Fellow, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be assigned to him –

1. Science
2. Medical Science
3. Education
4. Business Management & Commerce.

RESOLVED: That S. Ranbir Singh Bhullar, MLA, Punjab & Fellow, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be assigned to the following Faculties –

1. Science
2. Medical Science
3. Education
4. Business Management & Commerce.

22. Considered Report of the Committee dated 10.08.2023, 17.08.2023, 19.08.2023 and 22.08.2023 (**Appendix-LXXIX**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance to the letter dated 10.08.2023, to look into the issue of termination of the following teachers of the R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City, Punjab:-

1. Shri Lakshmindra Bhorawal, Assistant Professor in History
2. Mrs. Manjeet Kaur, Assistant Professor in Punjabi
3. Shri Kuldip Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu stated that though it is an issue of a particular College, i.e., R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City, everybody is aware of the situation prevailing in the majority of the affiliated Colleges and how they are exploiting the teachers. Certain teachers have served in the Colleges for 20-25 years and some of them have been working as Head of the Department, but they have been removed from the service. After their appointments, the Colleges had filled up certain teaching positions covered under the grant-in-aid scheme of the Government of India. All the teachers are respectable for them. The Colleges are pleading that the strength of the students is depleting year by year, but when he was looking into the report, though there is a sufficient workload for the teachers, still the teacher(s) had been removed from the service. This is not the situation of a single College, but of majority of the Colleges. As such, they have to consider this issue seriously and take a well thought of decision. If 15000 students are studying at the Campus, 2,50,000 students are studying in the Colleges. The University, being the custodian of the Colleges, should take care of the Colleges. He has been a member of the Syndicate and Senate for the last about 7 years, there was no meeting of the Syndicate and Senate where the issues relating to Colleges had not been raised. The situation in the Colleges is that a person appointed as Assistant Professor, retired as Assistant Professor as promotion is not granted to the teachers by the Colleges. As per Regulations of the University 10% Provident Fund on the total salary minus HRA is to be deducted, but the Colleges deduct 10% Provident Fund on the basic pay. Meaning thereby, the teachers are being harassed in every way. In fact, the Colleges are adopting the policy of might is right as none of the Colleges is following Regulations/ Rules/Norms of the University. Though they are stressing for carrying out Periodic Inspections, the same are not being conducted. Certain Colleges are not paying salaries to the teachers for the last 14 months. How the teachers concerned would be able to meet the expenses of their families in the absence of

salaries? They had received several complaints from the teachers, but unfortunately, they would not be able to take any action. He felt that they should immediately take appropriate action. If the management(s) is/are not able to run the College, provision(s) of Regulation 11.1 at page 161 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022, should immediately be imposed on the Colleges, which are not giving the salaries to the teachers. Resultantly, two representatives of the University would be on the governing bodies of the Colleges concerned and the report of every meeting of the governing body would come to the University. The Colleges, which are totally defaulter, e.g., R.S.D. College, Ferozepur, Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur, Dashmesh Khalsa College, Muktsar, Malwa College, Bondli, Samarala, Ramgarhia College, Ludhiana, as they had not sent the resolution to the Government enabling them to get full salary even though the teachers are working there for the last more than 7 years. If the Colleges send the resolution to the Government, the teachers concerned would be covered under the grant-in-aid scheme and the Colleges would be supposed to share 25% of the salary. As per Government, it has to be checked by the University. Therefore, they should check this and do planning and evolve proper mechanism. He reiterated that wherever violation is taking place, provision of Regulation 11.2 should be imposed. So far as R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City, is concerned, provisions of Regulation 11.1 should be imposed.

The Vice Chancellor enquired, should provisions of Regulation 11.1 be imposed on this College?

To this, a few members said that provisions of Regulation 11.1 should be imposed on R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that more discussion is required on the issue.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the Syndicate and Senate always made best efforts to solve the problems of the affiliated Colleges. The Committees of the University also visited the Colleges. Unfortunately, the management of the Colleges did not bother to care for the Regulations/Rules/Norms of the University. The Committee headed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua tried to convince the College Management but the management did not pay any heed to their advice. They have to take a strict decision and implement the same, and if the College(s) approached the Court, they have to defend it while engaging a competent lawyer; otherwise, no fruitful purpose would be served. He had suggested about three months back that a Committee should be sent to Dev Samaj College, Sector 45, Chandigarh. Though the Committee has been constituted by the Vice Chancellor, the Committee did not visit the College. If the Committee is not ready to visit the College, the same should be replaced.

The Vice Chancellor remarked that none of the member is ready to go.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the members did not want to go as it is a thankless job.

It was informed that sometimes, the members refused to go at the eleventh hour.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out that in certain cases, they had called the managements of the Colleges to the University. He suggested that if the members are not ready to go to the Colleges, the managements of the Colleges concerned should be called to the Campus with full record.

Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that a Grievance Cell under a Professor should be created to resolve the grievances of the College teachers.

Dr. Jagtar Singh pointed out that Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur, has removed five teachers from the service, but the University has neither appointed a Committee nor taken any action against the College.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that he would like to sincerely appreciate the guidance and efforts made by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Principal Kirandeep Kaur during their visit to the College. The way the matter was handled by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua was really appreciable as he initiated the proceedings in the College politely, whereas he (Shri Virk) was of the opinion that they would take a penal action against the College. The teachers were told that their workload is complete and they are not required to submit any document about this. Thereafter, the teachers talked with their management, but the management did not give time to them. He is sorry to point out that despite such sincere efforts by the Committee, the management behaved arrogantly as it did not give time to the Director and Principal of the College. They were of the opinion that perhaps they had been misguided by the College authorities. They communicated with the Secretary of the management and personally met him and spent about 1½ hour with him. Perhaps, that was the worst experience of his life. They might now think that they would not make such sincere efforts in future. The Secretary was of the view that the teachers do not have full workload, whereas they were of the opinion that the workload of the teachers is full. They asked the person concerned to open the laptop and get the same verified from them, but the behaviour of the person was so arrogant that he did not ever bother to open the laptop. As per the workload demonstrated to the management, the workload of teachers was not only full, but more teachers were required to be appointed. The Principal of the College signed on the papers provided by the teachers, which reflected the workload of the teachers, still the management of the College did not agree. He asked the management that even if their arguments are accepted, could they remove senior teachers from the service? They told that they could remove the senior teacher from the service, and when he asked as to what is the principle of natural justice, they said, "what is the Principle of natural justice". Since it is their college, they would act according to their discretion. Meaning thereby, they damn care for the Regulations/Rules/Norms of the University.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that the Committee members made strenuous efforts to resolve the problem. In fact, they spent entire day in the Colleges and left the College at 9.00 p.m. and reached home around 10.30 p.m. They checked all the documents during the visit and continuously talked to them.

Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that no new course should be given to such Colleges. In further suggested that no Inspection Committee should be sent to such Colleges for grant of extension of affiliation for new course(s). This decision should be taken by the University.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the issue of R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City, should be taken seriously.

Shri Sandeep Singh remarked that majority of the students with the College are non-attending students and they come to the College only for appearing in the examinations.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the teachers with the family members, including females, are sitting outside the College for the last 22 days.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that 4 year ago, a Committee had been constituted to visit a College of Ludhiana under the chairmanship of Principal R.S. Jhanji. The Chairman of the Managing Committee had requested them to come to his home, but they took a conscious decision that the members of the Syndicate and Senate of Panjab University would not go to anybody's home. The said case could not be resolved. Had they gone to the home of the Chairman of the Managing Committee, the case would perhaps have been resolved? After four years, the same situation has arisen. From the report submitted by the Committee, they could gauge that they had received all the documents through the Principal, which had also been certified by him/her. None of the document had been received by them directly. When the Vice Chancellor enquired, Dr. Dua said that the strength of the students has not decreased; rather, it is same which was during the previous year. The strength of the students as well as the workload of the teachers has been appended with the item in the form of annexures.

The Vice Chancellor enquired as to how many teachers are required to teach the batches of students of 40 each.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that for B.A. courses, the batch did not comprise of 40 students; rather the strength of batch vary between 60 students to 80 students. What is happening is that the students comprising the batch of 80-90 students plus the batch of 40 students of B.A.B.Ed. are being taught in a single classroom by a teacher despite the fact that the syllabi of two classes are entirely different. He further said that they could themselves see from page 13 of the appendix that they had mentioned the workload of M.A.-II; however, the College has discontinued M.A.-I and deleted the same from its prospectus without the permission of the University. Even after discontinuing M.A.-I, the College had a workload of 72 hours plus 18 hours for B.A.B.Ed. Even after retaining the existing teachers, one more teacher is required to be appointed. Similar is the position in the case of Punjabi. Even after discontinuing the course, which the College has discontinued, two more teachers are required to be appointed. He is talking after commuting all the classes, which the College has commuted. However, if they segregated all these classes, many more teachers are required to be appointed by the College. The College had the strength of students but as told by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk, the College has finished the issue in one sentence that it is their College and they could do whatever they want. In the light of this, they should deal with such Colleges. If need be, the management of such Colleges should be called to the University along with the relevant records. They should take a conscious decision in the case of all the Colleges, which have removed teachers from the service and defer the decision for imposing provision of Regulation 11.2. Until the Colleges concerned did not follow the decision of the University, the returns of the students of such Colleges should not be accepted. If the returns of the students of the Colleges would not be accepted, they would automatically accept the directions of the University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that after taking the decision, the same is to be conveyed to the Colleges concerned, Colleges Branch, and R&S Branch for necessary action.

Dr. Jagtar Singh and Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that this decision, if taken, should be implemented uniformly.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they had another option of recommending to the Government to appoint administrator on all the defaulter Colleges or the University should appoint its two representatives on the managements of such Colleges.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that under the Regulation 11.1, the College could be disaffiliated.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the College concerned has to be issued a show cause notice for disaffiliation.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the University could send a notice for disaffiliation to the College and for that the College could not go to the Court because the Court might say that the College has still a remedy to file its reply to the show cause notice. He, therefore, suggested that they should decide to send a show cause notice to the college for disaffiliation and the University should not accept the returns of the students as suggested by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua read out the provisions of Regulation 11.1, which are reproduced below –

- “11.1. If, at any time, Vice Chancellor finds that a college appoints a Principal or a teacher whose qualification do not conform to those laid down by the University or is not complying with the requirements of Section 27 of the Panjab University Act, various regulations and rules of the University, or any instructions issued by the Syndicate, the Syndicate will have the authority to impose one or more of the following penalties –
- (1) students of the College concerned shall not be accepted for the University examination;
 - (2) the college staff shall be debarred from University work, such as appointment as examiners, superintendents of examination centres, etc;
 - (3) the Principal or the teacher concerned shall be debarred from seeking election to a University body or his name shall be removed from the list of members of the University body;
 - (4) the papers for grants to the colleges shall not be forwarded to the State Government/University Grants Commission;
 - (5) the University may withdraw affiliation granted to the college, in part or in whole.”

If the Colleges defied to follow the Regulation/Rules/Norms/ Instructions of the University, the Syndicate could impose any of the penalty/penalties listed above. They did not want to harm the College(s), but it would be a deterrent for the Colleges if the Syndicate decided not to accept the returns of the students of such Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that first, the report of the Committee should be accepted and the teachers, who have been terminated by the College authorities arbitrarily, on the flimsy grounds in violation of the Regulations/Rules of the University, should be got reinstated.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the Committee has made specific recommendations, a couple of which are as follows –

1. The Committee recommends that necessary directions be issued by the University to the concerned College authorities to reinstate the following three teachers, who were terminated by the college authorities arbitrarily, on flimsy grounds and with manipulation of workload, etc., in violation of Panjab University Calendar, with immediate effect, in continuation of their service:
 1. Shri Lakshmindra Bhorawal, Assistant Professor in History
 2. Mrs. Manjeet Kaur, Assistant Professor in Punjabi
 3. Shri Kuldeep Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi.
2. The Committee also recommends that the college authorities be issued directions to appoint Officiating Principal strictly in accordance with seniority, in compliance with the University directions.

Though the teacher, who has been Officiating as Principal is a very nice person and did not refuse to provide any document to the Committee, is at No.33 in the seniority. As per the Regulations/Rules of the University, only the senior-most teacher of the College could be appointed as Officiating Principal. The Committee members had met all the teachers of the Colleges, both who had declined to Officiate as Principal and also who had given their consent to Officiate as Principal. He, therefore, suggested that the senior-most teacher from the persons, who had given their consent to officiate, should be got appointed as officiating Principal. The third recommendation made by the Committee is “In view of the serious violations of Panjab University Calendar committed by the College authorities, to the prejudice of not only concerned teachers, but also to the prestige and image of Panjab University, appropriate action be taken against the college authorities”. Keeping in view this recommendation of the Committee, penalties that the returns of the students should not be accepted and the papers for grants to the College shall not be forwarded to the State Government/University Grants Commission should be imposed on R.S.D. College, Ferozepur, under Regulations 11.1(1) and 11.1(4) at page 161 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022. He further suggested that all the Colleges, which have retrenched the teachers, should be issued this show cause notice.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the report of the Committee, be accepted;

- (2) the College authorities be written to –
- (i) reinstate the following three teachers, who have been terminated by the college authorities arbitrarily and on flimsy ground in violation of Regulations/Rules of the University;
 - 1. Shri Lakshmindra Bhorawal, Assistant Professor in History
 - 2. Mrs. Manjeet Kaur, Assistant Professor in Punjabi
 - 3. Shri Kuldeep Singh, Assistant Professor in Punjabi.
 - (ii) appoint senior-most teacher from the persons, who had given their consent to officiate, as officiating Principal;
- (3) following two penalties be imposed on R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City, for violating the Regulations/Rules/Norms of the University, under Regulations 11.1(1) and 11.1(4) at page 161 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022:
- (i) the registration returns of the students be not accepted; and
 - (ii) the papers for grants to the College be not forwarded to the State Government/University Grants Commission.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That show cause notice, be issued to all the Colleges, which have retrenched the teachers without following due process, as to why the following penalties be not imposed on them for violating the Regulations/Rules/Norms of the University, under Regulations 11.1(1) and 11.1(4) at page 161 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2022:

- (i) the registration returns of the students be not accepted; and
- (ii) the papers for grants to the College be not forwarded to the State Government/University Grants Commission.

23. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 25.08.2023 (**Appendix-LXXX**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for finalization of Examination Fee and all other related charges for the session 2023-24.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that the meeting of the Committee was held yesterday. She was a member of the Committee, but by the time she reached in the meeting, the meeting had concluded. She reached late due to unavoidable circumstances. Although she had signed the minutes, she wanted to point out that the hike in fee in the year 2022-23 was 12.5% of the fee approved for the year 2021-22. The University used to take a fee of Rs.1,575/- from the students of B.A., which was enhanced to Rs.1,775/- in the year 2022-23, and at that time a plea was given that no fee had been increased during the last two years (corona

pandemic). The fee was increased by 12.5% at a single stroke. Hence, the Colleges were under the impression that since the fee had been increased by 12.5%, this year, there would be no hike in fee. Anyhow, the Committee yesterday decided to recommend 5% hike in fee annually. She requested that the decision of the Committee to hike the fee by 5% every year should be reconsidered, because next year and in future the position could be entirely different.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, referring to page 160 of the appendix, said that since LL.B (3 year) is a second Bachelor Degree and a Professional Course, it should be enlisted in Sr. No. 2 (Master Courses) and its normal fee should be Rs.2,980/- instead of Rs.1,870/-, reason being that the examiners are always given the remuneration, which is fixed for Postgraduate Courses, for evaluating the answer-books of B.A. LL.B. 3-year course. Moreover, the fee of Law courses being offered in the Department of Laws is very less. He further suggested that the fee for the 4th year of the 4-year Integrated Courses, i.e., B.A. (Hons.) (Education), B.Ed. should be the same as for the Masters Courses. Referring to B.A./B.Com. LL.B. 5-year course, he pointed out that though they charged a fee of about Rs.80,000/- from them, but the examination fee they charged from the students is only of other graduate courses. He, therefore, suggested that this should be considered and more examination fee should be charged from the students of this course.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that though he had pointed out several times that the difference between the fees for obtaining transcripts by the students from within the country and abroad is very high. Referring to page 162 of the Appendix, he pointed out that the proposed fee for transcript from the students within the country is Rs.630/- per certificate, whereas, the fee from the students from abroad is US\$ 304. Due to this high fee, the students gave local address and pay fee fixed for the students from within the country. Instead of prescribing differential fees for the students from within the country and abroad, same fee should be prescribed and, if need be, it should be enhanced to Rs.1000/- or Rs.1500/- per certificate. Transcripts are obtained only by those students, who go abroad or reside abroad.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that most of the times it happened that though the students are at abroad, they gave local address and pay the fee prescribed for the students residing within the country.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that perhaps the University had a software through which they know from where the student is applying for the transcripts.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it should be confirmed whether the University charged US\$ 304 per course or per semester. Even if the fee is US\$ 304 per course, the fee would be around Rs.1 lac for getting the transcripts of 4 courses.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that the fee for B.Ed. courses has been recommended to be Rs.2,980/-, whereas the fee for B.A. (Hons.) (Education) B.Ed. has been recommended to be Rs.1,870/-, which is a professional course. He suggested that the fees for all B.Ed. courses should be same/equal, i.e., Rs.2,980/- for B.A. (Hons.) (Education) B.Ed. also.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the fee, which is being charged from the students from abroad, is more than the fee, which he/she had paid to the College for the whole year. A fee of Rs.23,000/- to Rs.24,000/- for certification only did not seem to be genuine.

It was clarified that if a student had done B.A. consisting of 6 semesters and is applying for transcripts from within the country, he/she has to pay a fee of Rs.630/- per certificate (6 Detailed marks Cards and 1 Degree), i.e., Rs.4,410/-, and for the students residing abroad the fee is US\$ 304 per course, i.e., around Rs.21,000 to Rs.22,000/-, and this fee is as per Regulations enshrined in Panjab University Calendar. It has been mentioned in the Calendar that if someone applied from outside the country, he/she has to pay a different fee and if someone applied from within the country, he/she has to pay a different fee. Moreover, the Syndicate had approved it time and again. At the moment, they are following the fee structure, which had been approved by the Syndicate in the year 2019. Whenever the fee for transcripts had been revised, the fee for the students applying from abroad had not been revised.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the fee for transcription for both the categories of students is fixed at Rs.1,000/- per certification, it would not be a big issue to pay a fee of Rs.7,000/- for B.A. degree instead of Rs.4,200/-.

It was pointed out that the students, who applied from within the country, they have to apply for immigration, employment, etc., and sometimes their Government agencies seek transcripts from the University directly. When the Government sought transcripts, the University provided the same free of cost, but the students himself wanted to get it verified, they charged fee from him/her. However, when the students applied from abroad, the cost of application there is much high. They usually trusted the students and most of them mention their place of application correct and did not conceal the place. 8-10% of the students might be giving their incorrect place of residence. In fact, it is a very transparent system and owing to this, the University is earning good revenue. When the incumbent joined as Controller of Examinations in the year 2019, the waiting period for issuance of transcripts was 8-10 months, which has now been brought down considerably. Moreover, the entire interface, which earlier used to be, has been eliminated. Now, no stationer and other middlemen approach the University for issuance of transcripts. As such, the system is now totally transparent. So far as multiple courses are concerned, now-a-days the students are very smart and got transcripts of only of higher/highest examination, they had passed.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is appropriate time to enhance fees as the affiliated Colleges are passing through a crisis.

Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that the fee for correction in date of birth has also been prescribed/enhanced, whereas now date of birth is not mentioned on any certificate issued by the University. Moreover, the rule for correction in date of birth has also been deleted from the University Calendar.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that a fee of US\$ 304 has been prescribed for obtaining transcripts by the students from abroad, but sometimes the students had to get the transcript for 2-3 times, e.g., firstly for studying abroad (WES), secondly for employment, etc. Could they fix a definite time that if the student applied for transcripts against within 2-3 years, no fee would be charged, because they had prescribed the fee on the higher side?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is not possible.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu pointed out that the late fee for submission of examination form late is Rs.23,075/-. The enhancement in examination fee is nominal, but the late fee of Rs.23,075/- is not genuine as they failed to submit the

examination form only because they did not have fee to pay to the University. Although the examination fee is around Rs.2,000/-, the late fee is Rs.23,075/-. The parents of the students, who are labourers, did not have money to pay the examination fee, how could they pay such a huge late fee?

Continuing, Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that along with the hike in examination fees, the remuneration for evaluation of answer-books should also be enhanced. The remuneration for evaluation of answer-books was enhanced about 10 years ago.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that the Committee had already made recommendations for the purpose and the recommendations of the Committee would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that the fee for the examination under golden chance has been fixed at Rs.15,000/- per paper. Certain students had to appear in 2-3 papers, how would they be able to pay a fee of Rs.45,000/- for appearing in three papers under the golden chance?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the fee for golden chance is always prescribed for the whole examination and not paper-wise.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 25.08.2023, including that the examination and other related fees, be increased by 5% every year, as per **Appendix**, be approved. However, so far as rationalization of examination fees for LL.B (3-Year), which is a second Bachelor Degree and a Professional Course and B.Ed. courses, including B.A. (Hons.) (Education) B.Ed., is concerned, the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take appropriate decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

24. Information contained in **Items R-1 to R-34** was read out, viz. –

R-1. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Leave Cases Committee dated 27.06.2023 (**Appendix-LXXXI**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of the Syndicate decision dated 16.05.1981 (Para 18), to look into the cases of teaching staff.

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

R-2. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Admission Guidelines (**Appendix-LXXXII**) for Affiliated Colleges, Constituent Colleges, P.U. Teaching Departments and Regional Centres, for the session 2023-24.

R-3. The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 21.07.2023 (**Appendix-LXXXIII**) and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Regulations for Four Year Undergraduate Programme (NEP-2020) (**Appendix-LXXXIII**) in Social Sciences under the Framework of Honours School System effective from the session 2023-24.

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

R-4. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 07.07.2023 (**Appendix-LXXXIV**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review Panjab University Handbook of Hostel Rules and suggest amendment (addition/deletion), if required in the Handbook to be printed for the session 2023-24.

R-5. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted extension in (Ex-India) half pay leave to Ms. Inderjeet Kaur, Personal Assistant to Dean of University Instruction, Panjab University, w.e.f. 22.07.2023 to 15.12.2023, with the permission to avail prefix and suffix holidays, if any.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-6. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the fee structure of following courses for the session 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 as under:-

Session	Name of the Course	Tuition Fee	Mts. & other user charges	Contribution to Funds	Total
2023-2024	Certificate Course in Music (Vocal/Instrumental)	4000	2690	5135	11825/-
2024-2025	Advance Practical Training Course in Indian Classical Music	6345	2690	5205	14240/-

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

R-7. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved enhancement of honorarium to Enquiry Officer & Presenting Officer in the instant case of misappropriation of funds by Ms. Pooja Bagga, Daily wage clerk, Pension Cell as under:-

Honorarium as on date in the instant case as per Senate decision dated 05.12.2015 (Para XLI (R-12))	Enhanced Honorarium	Total Honorarium
Enquiry Officer	Rs.80,000+T.A./D.A.	Rs.1,40,000+T.A./D.A.
Presenting Officer	Rs.11,500+T.A./D.A.	Rs.23,000+T.A./D.A.

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

R-8. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Zareen Fatima as Assistant Professor on contract basis in the Department of Urdu, P.U. at fixed emoluments of Rs.30400/- p.m. in the subject of Urdu for the academic session 2023-24 or till the post is filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions according to which she has worked previously during the session 2022-23, under Regulation 5 at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-9. The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the JAAC dated 31.05.2023 (**Appendix-**) and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Lipika Guliani and Mr. Gaurav Kashyap as temporary Assistant Professors for the Academic session 2023-24 in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs. 6000/-, on the same terms and conditions, according to which they have worked previously during the session 2022-23, under Regulation 5 at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-10. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Gurpreet Kaur as Part-Time Assistant Professor in the Department of Laws, for the academic session 2023-24 on an honorarium of Rs.43,275/- p.m. (for teaching 12 hours a week) against the vacant positions of the department w.e.f. the date she starts work for the academic session 2023-24.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-11.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has appointed the following persons as Part-Time Assistant Professor in the Department of Laws, for the academic session 2023-24 on an honorarium of Rs.43,275/- p.m. (for teaching 12 hours a week) against the vacant positions of the department, on the same terms & conditions according to which they have worked previously in the department:-

Sr. No.	Name of the person
1.	Ms. Neetu Gupta
2.	Ms. Sonia
3.	Dr. Reena Kansal
4.	Mr. Vivek Arora
5.	Ms. Vibhuti Nakta
6.	Dr. Manisha Garg
7.	Dr. Rohtash

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-12.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has appointed following persons at UILS, PU as under:-

- (i) Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) w.e.f. the date they start/started work for the Academic session 2023-24 against the vacant posts are filled on regular basis, whichever is earlier on the same terms and conditions according to which they have worked previously, under Regulation 5 page 112, P.U, Calendar, Volume-1, 2022.

1.	Dr. Abha Sethi
2.	Ms. Shafali
3.	Mr. Harvinder Singh

- (ii) Assistant Professor (Part-Time) on an Honorarium of Rs.43,275/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week) w.e.f. the date they start/started work for the academic session 2023-2024 against the vacant positions of the Institute, on the same terms and conditions according to which they have worked previously.

1.	Dr. Nancy Sharma
2.	Mr. Sanjeev Sharma
3.	Dr. Supreet Gill
4.	Dr. Shivani Gupta
5.	Dr. Gurjinder Singh
6.	Dr. Jatinder Mann
7.	Dr. Rita

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-13.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Dr. Chander Shekhar Marwaha as Part-time Assistant Professor in Law at P.U.S.S. Giri, Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/-p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week) w.e.f. the date he start work for the Academic session 2023-24 upto 27.09.2023, i.e. date of attaining 65 years by him.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-14.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) the following persons as Assistant Professor, purely on temporary basis at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), P.U., w.e.f. the date they start/started work for the academic session 2023-24 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same term and conditions according to which they have worked previously during the session 2022-23. They will automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the academic session:-

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

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-15. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U.:-

- (i) the following faculty purely on temporary/ contractual basis w.e.f. 18.07.2023 for 11 months i.e. up to 17.06.2024 with break on 17.07.2023 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of PU. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same terms and condition on which they were working earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation & Nature of Appointment
1.	Dr. Shally Gupta	Professor (Contract)
2.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma	Associate Professor (Temporary)
3.	Dr. Ikreet Singh Bal	Associate Professor (Temporary)
4.	Dr. Simranjit Singh	Senior Assistant Professor (Temporary)

- (ii) Dr. Vandana Chhabra, Associate Professor, on temporary basis w.e.f. 26.07.2023 for 11 months, i.e., up to 25.06.2024 with break on 25.07.2023 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of PU. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same terms and condition on which they were working earlier.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-16. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed the following Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at Shaheed Udham Singh, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur, w.e.f. the date they will start work for the Academic Session 2023-24 up to the start of summer vacation (with one day break) against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules, under Regulation 5 at Page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2022-23:

Sr. No.	Name	Post against which salary to be charged
1.	Dr. Gurdeep Singh	Punjabi
2.	Dr. Resham Singh	Punjabi
3.	Dr. Harnam Singh	Physical Education
4.	Ms. Simarjeet Kaur	Mathematics
5.	Ms. Nishi	Commerce
6.	Mr. Mohammad Sazid	Commerce
7.	Mr. Varun Maini	Computer Science

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-17.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate has, re-appointed the following as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. the date they start work for the Academic Session 2023-24 i.e. upto the start of the summer vacation (with one day break), against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100 +AGP Rs. 6000/- plus allowances as per University Rules, under Regulation 5 at Page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2022-23:

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Navdeep Kaur	English
2.	Mr. Sukhdev Singh	Punjabi
3.	Ms. Mamta Rani	Commerce
4.	Mr. Harpreet Singh	Economics

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-18.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed the following persons as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Distt-Moga w.e.f. the date they will start work for the Academic Session 2023-24 i.e. upto the start of summer vacation (with one day break) against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2022-2023, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022:-

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology
2.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai	Hindi
3.	Ms. Monika	Commerce
4.	Dr. Ritu Mittal	Economics
5.	Mr. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-19.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed (afresh) the following persons as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) at Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, S.B.S. Nagar w.e.f. the date they will start work for the Academic Session 2023-24 upto the start of summer vacation (with one day break) against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled on regular basis, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances, as admissible as per University Rules, on the same term and conditions on which they

were working earlier for the session 2022-2023, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022:-

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Kamalpreet Kaur	Punjabi
2.	Ms. Sukhjit Nahar	Sociology
3.	Dr. Hari Krishan	History
4.	Ms. Gurdeep Kaur	Punjabi
5.	Ms. Ruby	Mathematics
6.	Mr. Ramandeep Singh Nahar	Commerce

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-20. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed the following persons as Part-Time Assistant Professor at P.U. Regional Centre, (P.U. Extn. Library), Civil Lines, and Ludhiana, on an honorarium of Rs.43275 /- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours per week), against the vacant positions of the Centre w.e.f. the date they start/started work for the session 2023-24:-

1	Ms. Vandana Bhanot	Law
2	Ms. Sarita Paul	Law
3	Mr. Sunil Mittal	Law
4	Ms. Renu Sharma	Law

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-21. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed the following three Demonstrators purely on temporary basis at Dr. HSJIDS & Hospital, P.U. (whose present term of appointment for the academic session 2022-2023 expired on 30.06.2023) further for the next session 2023-2024 w.e.f. 03.07.2023 to 30.06.2024 after one day break on 01.07.2023 (02.07.2023 being Sunday) or till the regular selection is made, whichever is earlier, at the minimum of the scale of Rs.10300-34800 + GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions:

1. Dr. Harkirat Sethi, Deptt. of Pharmacology
2. Dr. Anupam Vijayvergia, Deptt. of Physiology
3. Dr. Ravi Kant Sharma, Department of Biochemistry.

NOTE: 1. The persons possessing Medical/Dental qualifications i.e. M.B.B.S./B.D.S. are also entitled for Non-Practising Allowance (NPA) @ 25% of the basic-pay, subject to the condition that the basic pay + NPA shall not exceed Rs.85000/- p.m. in the terms of Senate decision dated 29.09.2013 (Para LX) Item No.20(III).

2. An office note was enclosed.

R-22. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has granted extension in term of appointment to Ms. Rajni Rajan Chauhan as Assistant Professor in Commerce (purely on temporary basis) for the Academic Session 2023-24 w.e.f. 11.07.2023 to 18.10.2023 (with one day break on 10.07.2023) 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.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-23. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the period of deputation upto 02.09.2023 of Professor Karamjeet Singh (who is continuing beyond the age of 60 years as per interim orders of the Court) University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-24. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of the following Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology up to 09.07.2023, on the same term and conditions, on which they were working earlier, with one day break as usual:-

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

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-25. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of following doctors for further period as mentioned against each, on the previous terms and conditions:-

Sr. No.	Name and Designation	Earlier Term Expired/ing on	Dates of Break	Period of further Extension
1.	Dr. Nainy Puri Full Time Medical Officer	31.07.2023	01.08.2023	02.08.2023 to 31.07.2024
2.	Dr. Meenu Kapila Part-time Ayurvedic Medical Officer	31.07.2023	01.08.2023	02.08.2023 to 31.07.2024
3.	Dr. Madhu Tuli Part-time Medical Specialist	31.07.2023	01.08.2023	02.08.2023 to 31.07.2024
4.	Dr. Seema Chaudhary Part-Time Medical Specialist-Gynaecologist	31.07.2023	01.08.2023	02.08.2023 to 31.07.2024
5.	Dr. Kamaljit Singh Rana Part-time Ophthalmologist	31.05.2023	01.06.2023	02.08.2023 to 31.05.2024

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-26. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of the following Laboratory Instructors (purely on temporary basis) at University Institute of Engineering and Technology (UIET) in the minimum pay scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules w.e.f. 11.07.2023 for one year with one day break on 10.07.2023 or till the vacancies are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier:

Sr. No.	Name	Post against which salary to be charged
1.	Mr. Nand Kishore, (I.T.)	Technical Officer
2.	Mr. Sandeep Trehan, (M.E.)	Technical Officer
3.	Ms. Seema, (Biotechnology)	Workshop Instructor
4.	Mr. Lokesh, (C.S.E.)	Senior Workshop Superintendent
5.	Ms Sunaina Gulati, (C.S.E.)	Deputy Librarian

NOTE: 1. The 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.

2. An office note was enclosed.

R-27. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of contractual appointment of Dr. Rashmi, Medical Officer (Full Time on contract basis), BGJ Institute of Health for further period of 86 days more w.e.f. 28.06.2023 to 21.09.2023 with one day break on 27.06.2023 on the previous terms & conditions.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-28. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of Dr. (Mrs.) Shruti Sahdev, Full Time Medical Officer (Homoeopathic), PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, @ Rs.35,134/- per month fixed for further period of one year i.e. from 02.08.2023 to 31.07.2024 with one day break on 01.08.2023, on the previous terms and conditions, as recommended by Director, PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-29. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the tenure of Ar. Parmodh Kumar Nanda, Technical Advisor (Architect), Architect Office, PU for further period of one-year w.e.f 19.07.2023 to 18.07.2024 on the previous terms & conditions.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-30. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of following Programmers for further period as mentioned against each, on the previous terms and conditions:-

Sr. No.	Name	Earlier term upto	Date of break	Period of further extension
1.	Ms. Jasmine Ahluwalia, Programmer, College Branch @Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400+DA	31.07.2023	01.08.2023	02.08.2023 to 31.07.2024
2.	Mr. Bhawan Chander, Programmer, Computer Centre @Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400+DA	31.07.2023	01.08.2023	02.08.2023 to 31.07.2024
3.	Mr. Deepak Kumar, Programmer, Computer Centre @Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400+DA	31.07.2023	01.08.2023	02.08.2023 to 31.07.2024

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-31. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Shefali Singh, Assistant Professor (Part-Time), UILS, w.e.f. 30.06.2023, with the condition that she will have to deposit amount equivalent to one month's honorarium in lieu of notice of one month, as she has

tendered her resignation without giving one month notice, under Rule 2.5 at page 59 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019.

NOTE: 1. Rule 2.5 at page 59 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019 which reads as under:

“A part-time lecturer wishing to resign shall give at least on month’s notice or in default pay an amount equivalent to one month’s honorarium to the University”.

2. A copy of application dated 22.06.2023 of Dr. Shefali Singh was enclosed.

3. An office note was enclosed.

R-32. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Sangeeta Bansal nee Sangeeta Rana, Senior Assistant, R&S Branch (now posted in Esstt. Branch-II), P.U. w.e.f. 13.09.2023 (including 3 months notice period), under Regulation 6 available at page 119-120 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 6, page 119-120, Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

2. An office note was enclosed.

R-33. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the request dated 12.07.2023 of Shri Sanjiv Arora, Assistant Registrar, Accounts Branch, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for voluntary retirement w.e.f. 13.10.2023 (A.N.) from the University service and has accordingly sanctioned the following retirement benefits:-

1. Gratuity, as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and 17.8 at page 132 & 134 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.
2. Encashment of Earned Leave, as may be admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, but not exceeding 300 days.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-34. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses as mentioned against each:-

Sr. No.	Name of the College	Name of the Courses/ subjects
1.	Government College Hoshiarpur (Pb.)	M.Com-I & II (40 seats each), (ii) M.A.-I & II Music(Vocal)-one each, (iii) M.Sc. (IT)-I & II (One unit) (iv) BCA-I,II & III (One unit each), (v) B.Sc.-Agriculture 3 rd & 4 th year-40 seat each and (vi) PGDCA (one unit) for the session 2022-23.
2.	D.A.V College Hoshiarpur(Pb.)	B.B.A-I & II (*One Unit each) (ii) Add-on-certificate course in communicative English-1 st year for the session 2022-23.
3.	MBBGDRGC Girls College of Education, Mansowal, Distt-Hoshiarpur (Pb.).	B.Ed Course (One Unit-50 seats) for the session 2023-24.
4.	S.D. College, Hoshiarpur (Pb.).	B.A. I, II, III (Psychology) for the session 2023-24.
5.	Principal Homoeopathic Medical Coll58ege & Hospital, M-671, Sector-26, Chandigarh	B.H.M.S Course (50 seats) for the session 2023-24.
6.	Principal Govt. College of Education, Sec-20,Chandigarh	P.G. Diploma in Guidance & Counseling (20 seats) for the session 2023-24.
7.	Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh.	(i) M.D. Radiotherapy (05 seats) (ii) DM Cardiology (02 seats) (iii) M.Sc. Mental Health (Psychiatric) Nursing (04 seats) (iv) B. Sc Nursing (60 seats) (v) MD Physiology (02 seats) (vi) DM-Pulmonary (02 seats) & (vii) DM Neonatology (03 seats) for the session 2023-24.
8.	R.S.D. College, Ferozepur City (Pb.).	B. A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed. - 1 st Year (2 nd Unit-50 seats) for the session 2023-24.
9.	Maharaj Lal Dass Brahma Nand Bhuriwale Garib Dassi Girls College, Tapprian Khurd, Distt- SBS Nagar (Pb).	B.A.-I, II & III (History) for the session 2023-24.

Sr. No.	Name of the College	Name of the Courses/ subjects
10	Principal Post Graduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh.	M.Sc.-I (Physics) (Self- Financed Course) – One Unit for the session 2023-24.

NOTE: The relevant documents in respect of Sr.No-1 to 10 were enclosed.

Referring to Sub-Item R-2, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this item related to Admissions guidelines for affiliated Colleges, Constituent Colleges, Panjab University Teaching Departments and Regional Centres for the session 2023-24. The Colleges are facing several problems owing to decrease in number of students. Though it has not been mentioned in the guidelines, the Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE) has made mandatory for the students to bring character certificate from their previous institutes. However, when the students go to the Institute concerned obtaining the Character Certificate, the Institute asked them to pay fee for the entire years. If the students have fee, to pay for the whole years, why should they take admissions at CDOE? Moreover, there is a set procedure adopted by the affiliated Colleges that they allow the students to appear in the University examination only after getting No Dues Certificate issued by the concerned College. When the student had passed the examination, the mandatory condition of obtaining the Character Certificate should not be imposed on him/her. He, therefore, suggested that the CDOE should be written to that it should not insist upon the students to get Character Certificate from their previous Institute, because the students leave regular study owing to non-availability of fee and take admissions at CDOE. In the communication dated 8.06.2023, it has been written that all admissions are required to be made online/offline by the Colleges/Departments strictly in accordance with the Regulations/Rules contained in latest University Calendars. Although the University had issued this letter, they had not made admissions according to this communication. Principal N.R. Sharma had also sent an e-mail to her on the issue, because they had joined the portal before. This communication in itself is self contradictory, because they are saying that admissions should be made in accordance with the Regulations/Rules of the University, whereas the Colleges are making admissions in accordance with the instructions/guidelines of Punjab Government. If the Colleges have to remain with the University, they should follow the Regulations/Rules of the University; otherwise, of Punjab Government and get the age of superannuation reduced from 60 years to 58 years.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that the relaxation of 5% marks to the candidates belonging to SC/ST/BC has been mentioned in certain courses, but in certain others, this provision has not been mentioned. Whenever a clarification is sought from the University office, no satisfactory reply is given. Citing an example, she pointed out that the provision of 5% relaxation to SC/ST/BC candidate has been mentioned in the guidelines for admission to M.Ed. (General) 2-Year Course. No clarity is there to the Colleges whether this provision is meant for admission to all the Courses. She said that a student belonging to reserved category had sought admission to PGDCA, for which the minimum eligibility is 50% marks in the qualifying examination, but the candidate concerned had secured 49.3%. She enquired, could they admit him to the course as he belonged to BC category, because there is no clarity as this provision did not contain in the Regulations/eligibility conditions for PGDCA Course? In future, it should be explicitly made clear in the guidelines whether the 5% relaxation in minimum

percentage of marks is to be given for admission to all the courses or it is only for those courses where it has been mentioned.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that either the information should be obtained from the R&S Branch and given to Principal Kirandeep Kaur or the R&S Branch should be asked to provide this information to Principal Kirandeep Kaur directly.

Referring to Sub-Item R-7, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this item related to enhancement of honorarium to Inquiry Officer and Presenting Officer in the case of inquiry of misappropriation of funds by Ms. Pooja Bagga, Daily Wage Clerk. It has been mentioned at page 283 of the appendix by Justice (Retired) Harbans Lal, "However, it is worth mention here that five witnesses namely, Honey Thakur, EW-1, Senior Assistant, G.J. Hardy, EW-2, Assistant Registrar, Ms. Ajit Pal Kaur, Clerk, Estt., EW-3, Mrs. Poonam Chopra, Deputy Registrar (Estt.), EW-4, Mrs. Raj Manchanda, Deputy Registrar (Estt.), Retired, EW-5, have been examined till date in the enquiry proceedings. In the peculiar circumstances, it is requested that the honorarium/remuneration fixed at Rs.80,000/- (lump sum) vide letter No. 791/Estt. dated 18.01.2016 may be revised". It has also been mentioned in the above said communication that they did not have to go anywhere to appear in the inquiry. Thus, the honorarium/remuneration may be enhanced. It is not a justifiable reason to enhance the honorarium. However, if otherwise, it has been recommended by a Committee, than its okay. If the Finance & Development Officer could throw some light as to why the enhancement in the honorarium to the Inquiry Officer has been sought.

It was informed that two cases are simultaneously going on, i.e., criminal case and a recovery suit. The members are well aware that the departmental proceedings go side by side. The Inquiry and Presenting Officers have been appointed to conduct the departmental proceedings. There are certain common witnesses, both in the criminal case and as well as departmental inquiry. The delinquent employees have got a stay from the High Court till they did not complete their appearances in the criminal trial, they should not be called to the departmental inquiry, owing to which the departmental inquiry got pending. Shortly, the witnesses in the criminal trial could be completed. Thereafter, those witnesses would be called to the departmental inquiry. Though the inquiry would be got stretched, the remuneration to the Inquiry and Presenting Officers would not be affected, because as per rules, the payment to them would be made in accordance with per sitting. The enhancement in the honorarium has been sought to be on the safer side that in case the Inquiry Officer has to conduct several more hearings.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that then the matter with regard to enhancement of honorarium/remuneration to the Inquiry and Presenting Officers should have come to the Syndicate for consideration.

It was clarified that the payment of Presenting Officer (former Finance & Development Officer) got stuck and the same had to be approved in anticipation approval of the Syndicate, and that is why, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate for ratification.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if an employee of the University is found guilty of the charges after conducting the inquiry, all the expenses incurred for conducting the inquiry should be recovered from him/her, because University has to conduct so many inquiries simultaneously and a minimum expenditure of Rs.25,000/- is incurred on each inquiry. Meaning thereby, the University is spending so much money on the conduct of inquiries.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Dr. Dinesh Kumar has given a good suggestion and this should be referred to the Committee constituted by the University to prepare the panel of Legal Retainers and Advocates for consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that what Dr. Dinesh Kumar meant to say that if the employee(s) of the University found guilty of the charges after the inquiry, the entire expenses incurred on the inquiry should be recovered from him/her/them.

Referring to Sub-Item R-9, Professor Devinder Singh said that the JAAC of University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management has recommended that two persons be appointed as temporary Assistant Professors for the academic session 2023-24, whereas the Director, University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management has requested for appointment of four persons as temporary faculty by giving reasons that the session has commenced. Why is he going beyond the recommendation of the JAAC?

It was clarified that the appointment of only two persons, i.e., Dr. Lipika Guliani and Dr. Gaurav Kashyap as temporary Assistant Professor for the academic session 2023-24, has been approved, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate.

Referring to Sub-Items R-10, R-11 and R-12, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that an issue was raised in one of the previous meeting of the Syndicate that if a member of guest faculty is teaching in a department and his lectures are less than required for getting a maximum remuneration of Rs.50,000/- per month, he/she should be allowed to teach in other Department/College, so that he/she could get a maximum remuneration of Rs.50,000/-. At that time, this suggestion was objected by some of the members and the reason was given that the department/college concerned might need his/her services at any point of time. Now, one of the guest faculty members namely Mr. Gurjinder (Mr. Gurjinder Singh) has been appointed as guest faculty at two places, i.e., Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies. Mr. Gurjinder Singh, who has been appointed as guest faculty in the Department of Laws, has also been appointed as part-time faculty in the University Institute of Legal Studies for the session 2023-24. As per the latest remuneration, he is getting Rs.43275/-per month (fixed) from University Institute of Legal Studies and Rs.50,000/- from the department of Laws. As per rules, one could get a maximum remuneration of Rs.50,000/- per month as guest faculty, how could he be appointed as part-time teacher in another department at a remuneration of Rs.43275/- per month?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that the nature of appointment of Mr. Gurjinder Singh in the Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies is different.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it should be clarified whether one could work as guest faculty/part-time teacher (temporary) at different departments in the University and get a remuneration of more than Rs.50,000/-. If yes, it should be told as to where it has been written.

It was informed that there are no such guidelines as to in how many departments, one could teach as guest faculty/part-time teacher.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he himself had taught as part-time teacher and knew that the capping is only for maximum remuneration and not for teaching.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that since the upper bar for getting the remuneration is there, one could not get a remuneration of more than Rs.50,000/-.

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

Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that it should be enquired whether Mr. Gurjinder Singh is getting a remuneration more than Rs.50,000/- per month for teaching in the Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies as guest faculty and part-time teacher respectively.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the terms and conditions for guest faculty and part-time teachers are different. The persons, who are working somewhere else on regular basis, could also teach on part-time basis and the advocates had been teaching in the Department of Laws as part-time teachers, since many years. The remuneration to the part-time teachers is Rs.43,275/- per month fixed, whereas the remuneration to guest faculty is Rs.1500/- per lecture subject to a maximum of Rs.50,000/- per month. He pointed out that Dr. Benny Paul (Sr. No.2 at page 310 of the appendix) has been appointed as guest faculty. In fact, Dr. Benny Paul is a Chief Pharmacist at Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health and is supposed to work there from morning to evening. How could he be appointed as guest faculty to teach in the Department of Laws in the afternoon? How the Registrar is giving him permission to work as guest faculty?

Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that earlier, one of the Senate members used to teach in the morning in his department and later on teach in the evening as guest faculty. However, on their objection, he was stopped from teaching as guest faculty in the evening. He emphasized that none of the guest faculty members could get remuneration more than Rs.50,000/- per month under any circumstances. When Dr. Dinesh Kumar asked as to how Dr. Benny Paul, Chief Pharmacist, has been allowed to teach as guest faculty, he said that Dr. Benny Paul should also be removed.

Professor Devinder Singh pointed out that it has been mentioned at page 312 of the Appendix that Dr. Benny Paul has submitted No Objection Certificate (NOC) from his parent department.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the NOC has been given by the Chief Medical Officer of the Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health. How could they know as to how the NOC has been given by the Chief Medical Officer?

Shri Sandeep Singh said that if something wrong has been done, the same should be rectified.

Referring to Sub-Item R-10, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the composition of the Selection Committee, which had recommended these appointments, is not in accordance with the UGC Regulations/Rules/Guidelines. He pointed out that the university authority has issued a communication on 07.02.2023 regarding the composition of the Selection Committee for appointment of guest faculty. They could themselves see that the Selection Committee constituted for appointment of part-time Assistant Professor in the Department of Laws comprised of four subject experts. As per circular dated 07.02.2023, the composition of the Selection Committee for appointment of guest faculty is the same as those of regularly appointed Assistant Professors and the composition of the Selection Committee is as under (page 180 of the Appendix);

1. The Vice Chancellor or his/her nominee - Chairman
2. One expert in the subject concerned to be nominated by the Vice Chancellor
3. Dean of the Faculty concerned, wherever applicable
4. Head/Chairperson of the Department
5. An Academician representing SC/ST/OBC/Minority/Women/Differently-abled categories to be nominated by the Vice Chancellor, if any of the candidates representing these categories is the applicant and if any of the above members of the Selection Committee does not belong to that category;

Moreover, the recommendations of the Selection Committee for appointing guest faculty/part-time teachers should have come to the Syndicate for consideration and not for ratification. He pointed out that the Selection Committee constituted for recommending these appointments and the Selection Committee proposed to be constituted as per circular dated 07.02.2023 is entirely different. When it was pointed out by one of the members that this Selection Committee is for recommending appointment as part-time Assistant Professors, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that that was what he was saying earlier that the nature of appointment of guest faculty and part-time Assistant Professor is totally different. He suggested that a policy decision should be taken that no regular employee of the University should be engaged for teaching as guest faculty/part-time faculty neither during office hour nor after office hours.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is no need to take such a decision as they are employees for 24×7 a week.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would take appropriate decision in respect of both the categories of employees, i.e., teaching and non-teaching.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that appointments of guest faculty in certain items have been made in different pay-scales.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that they should take a decision regarding the composition of Selection Committees for appointment of part-time faculty.

It was informed that the composition of Selection Committees for appointment of guest faculty/part-time faculty has been decided under item C-18, which they had approved in the morning.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that in the Selection Committee constituted for appointment for part-time faculty in the Department of Laws comprised of Professor Jyoti Rattan as Vice Chancellor's nominee, who is the junior-most Professor in the department. In the criteria approved in the morning, it has been written that the Vice Chancellor's nominee would chair the Selection Committee. It meant that the Selection Committee was constituted in clear-cut violation of the UGC Regulations.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the nature and terms of condition of appointment of guest faculty and part-time faculty is different. Moreover, there is no condition for UGC-NET, Ph.D. etc., for appointment as part-time faculty. In fact, advocates with experience of 10 years or more are eligible for appointment as part-time faculty and this practice is being followed in the department since long.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are now deciding that irrespective of whether one is appointed as guest faculty or part-time faculty, he/she would not be paid a remuneration of more than Rs.50000/- per month. At the same time, none of the regular non-teaching and teaching employees of the University would be engaged to teach as guest faculty/part-time faculty in the University. On a point raised by Dr. Dinesh Kumar, the Vice Chancellor said that in accordance with the circular dated 07.02.2023, which was being referred to them, the composition of the Selection Committees for guest faculty/part-time faculty would be the same as is for appointment of Assistant Professors on regular basis. If they want change, they could take another decision in this regard.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired whether the selections, which have already been made, would be cancelled or they would continue.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever decision is taken, the same is implemented from prospective effect.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the appointed persons would continue, but they would not get a remuneration of more than Rs.50,000/- per month.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he did not agree that the half of the decision should be implemented from the prospective effect.

When Dr. Dinesh Kumar insisted and continued to argue, the Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Dinesh Kumar should record his dissent.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the appointments of part-time teachers under items R-10, R-11 & R-12 have been made for the session 2023-24 on an honorarium of Rs.43,275/- per month (fixed), whereas the appointment of Dr. Chander Shekhar Marwaha under item R-13 has been made as part-time teacher on an honorarium of Rs.22,800/- per month (fixed). Why such a huge disparity is there?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in Sub-Item R-13, un-revised honorarium has been mentioned.

When Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that equal honorarium should be paid to all the part-time teachers, Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Professor Devinder Singh suggested that correction should be made in respect of Dr. Chander Shekhar Marwaha, who has been appointed part-time Assistant Professor in Law at P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur.

Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that Dr. Zareen Fatima has been appointed as Assistant Professor on contract basis under Sub-Item R-8 at fixed emoluments of Rs.30,400/- per month and Dr. Lipika Guliani and Mr. Gaurav Kashyap as Assistant Professors (on temporary basis) in the pay-scale of Rs.15,600-39,100+AGP Rs.6,000/-. Why disparity is there?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that since there is disparity in the emoluments of the persons appointed under Sub-Items R-8 to R-16, there might

be a problem. He suggested that in the emoluments to be paid to the persons appointed in similar nature of appointments, uniformity should be maintained.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the pay-scale/remuneration of all the persons, who have been appointed on temporary basis, should be the same.

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **R-1 to R-34** on the agenda, be ratified with the following modification that the re-appointment of Dr. Chander Shekhar Marwaha (**R-13**), as part-time Assistant Professor in Law at P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, be ratified on an honorarium of Rs.43,275/- per month (fixed) instead of Rs.22,800/- per month (fixed).

RESOLVED FURTHER: That –

1. a maximum remuneration of Rs.50,000/- per month be paid to all the guest faculty irrespective of whether someone has been appointed as guest faculty in one department and part-time teacher in another department;
2. regular non-teaching and teaching employees of the University engaged to teach as guest faculty/part-time faculty in the University will not be paid honorarium;
3. if an employee of the University is found guilty of the charges levelled against him/her after the inquiry, the entire expenses incurred on the inquiry, be recovered from him/her; and
4. after verification, a circular be issued by the R&S Branch to the affiliated Colleges clarifying that 5% relaxation in minimum percentage of marks is available to all the SC/ST candidates for admission to all the courses offered in the affiliated Colleges.

25. Information contained in **Items I-1 to I-7** was read out and noted, i.e. –

I-1. The Vice-Chancellor has:-

- (1) accepted the terms and conditions and donation of Rs.10,00,000/- made by Dr. Manjeet Kaur, 54 Spruce Meadows Drive, Monroe, NJ 08831, USA for institution of two Endowment at UIPS, P.U. as under:
 - (i) Professor Harkishan Singh Highest Academic Achievement Award:- Cash Prize of Rs.25,000/- to be awarded in Departmental convocation to the B. Pharma. topper student.
 - (ii) Professor Harkishan Singh High Impact Research Publication Award:- Cash Prize of Rs.25,000/- to be awarded for Research Publication by M. Pharma. Student and his/her corresponding author, on 25 November each year.
- (2) allowed that the investment of Rs.10,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year and the interest so accrued there on be credited annually in the Special Endowment Trust Fund (S.E.T.) A/c No. 10444978140.

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

I-2. The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to increase the additional seats reserved for serving defence personnel for Postgraduate Diploma in Disaster Management and Security and PG Diploma in Homeland Security, at Defence and National Security Studies Panjab University, Chandigarh.

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

I-3. In pursuance of orders dated 29.04.2023 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.9042 of 2023 (titled 'Dr. Meenu Paul and others Vs. Panjab University and others), wherein, the following petitioners have been given the benefits of continuing in service, in view of the similarly situated cases:-

Sr. No.	Name of Faculty members	Department	Date of superannuation (i.e. 60 years)	w.e.f. the date they continue in service as per interim orders
1.	Prof. Meenu Paul	Law	30.06.2023	01.07.2023
2.	Prof. Archana Bhatnagar	Biochemistry	31.07.2023	01.08.2023
3.	Prof. Satya Prasad Padhi	Economics	31.05.2023	01.06.2023

4.	Prof. Karamjeet Singh	UBS	30.06.2023	01.07.2023
----	-----------------------	-----	------------	------------

In this regard, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the above faculty members be considered to continue in service w.e.f. the date mentioned against their names, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No. 1505 of 2016 (O&M) (titled Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. P.U. and other) & other similar cases and salary be paid to them which they were drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by them. The payment made to them will be adjustable against the final dues payable to them, for which they should submit the undertaking as per Performa.

NOTE: The teacher (s) residing in the University campus (who 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 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. Prabha Vig, Professor, Department of Life Long Learning and Extension (who had attained the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 31.08.2018), and allowed to continue in the Panjab University service upto the age of 65 years i.e. 04.08.2023, 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 Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 184-187 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-5. The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits in respect of Late Shri Varinder Kumar, Superintendent, Re-evaluation Branch, P.U., (who expired on 20.06.2023, while in service) to Smt. Nirmala Devi (Wife), who is the nominee of the deceased employee:-

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.
- (ii) Ex-Gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 144 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019.

- (iii) Encashment of Earned Leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019.

I-6. The Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Attloo (Atlo) Wd/o the deceased as per nomination, Late Shri Sheetal, Cleaner, Boys Hostel No.8, P.U., Chandigarh (who expired on 20.11.2022, while in service):-

- (i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.
- (ii) Ex-Gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 144 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019.
- (iii) Encashment of Earned Leave upto the prescribed limit under Rule 17.4 at page 98 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2019.

I-7. The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Surjinder Singh Superintendent DUI Office, P.U.	18.09.1990	31.12.2022	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
2.	Shri Ashok Kumar Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Chemistry, P.U.	24.09.1985	31.07.2023	
3.	Shri Rattan Lal Daftri Department of Mathematics, P.U.	23.06.1983	31.07.2023	
4.	Dr. Sushil Kumar Superintendent Examination Branch-III, P.U.	15.09.1989	31.08.2023	
5.	Shri Dinesh Kumar Sharma Workshop Superintendent CIL/SAIF/USIC, P.U.	12.12.1986	31.08.2023	
6.	Shri Varinder Kumar Technical Officer (G-I) Dr. S.S. B. UICET, P.U.	30.07.1986	31.08.2023	
7.	Mrs. Sunita Behl Assistant Registrar G&P Section, Accounts Branch, P.U.	14.12.1983	30.09.2023	
8.	Shri Dattu Kishan Gorey Superintendent CDOE, P.U.	24.03.1984	30.09.2023	

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

General Discussion

1. Shri Varinder Singh said that he would like to make a request to the Vice Chancellor that a Committee should be constituted for appointing Research Degree Committee for University Institute of Applied Management Sciences. In fact, the Senate in its previous meeting had decided that the faculty members of University Institute of Applied Management Sciences be allowed to supervise Ph.D. students independently.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that a decision to allow faculty members of University Institute of Applied Management Sciences and University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management to supervise Ph.D. students independently had been taken, but nothing has been done in this regard.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the Department of Evening Studies – Multi-disciplinary Research Centre should also be included for constituting Research Degree Committee(s).

2. Shri Varinder Singh suggested that no communication from Shri Rajinder K. Singla and Dr. Tarun Ghai should be entertained. Even the information sought by them should not be given to them. At the moment, the University is wasting so much time and energy in replying to their communications.
3. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that there is a student named Myank Kalra, who has sought admission to LL.M. course, but he has been denied admission on the ground that the sports certificate, which he had produced, is not valid. In fact, he had also sought admission to LL.M. course and similar sports certificate was produced by him. At that time, he was denied admission, because he had not obtained qualifying marks. Now, he has obtained qualifying marks and produced similar sports certificate, but the admission has been denied saying that the Baseball Association is not valid. On similar footing, admission was denied by the PEC, but when the candidate concerned approached the High Court, the High Court passed orders to the competent authority to decide his representation. Now, PEC has granted admission to the said candidate. His submission is that since both the candidates are on similar footing, the case of this student (Mr. Myank Kalra) should also be considered and he be given admission to LL.M. course, because there is a judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Satvir Singh Vs. State of Haryana that if the similarly situated persons are representing the authorities, they may be given similar relief. He handed over the representation of the candidate to the Registrar on the floor of the House with the request that the representation of the candidate may be considered.

It was pointed out that the candidate might not have been qualified the trial conducted for admission under the sports category.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that, in fact, the certificate issued by the Baseball Association is in question. They had pointed out that the certificate of Baseball Association is not valid this year, but when the

candidate had played the game and got the certificate, at that time the said Association was valid. That was why, the High Court had asked the PEC to consider the representation of the candidate, and the PEC had given the admission to the candidate. On an information sought, he said that considering the Association invalid, the sports trial of the candidate was not taken.

4. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the issue relating to guest faculty was raised under Item C-18. He said that whatever documents have to be sought from the guest faculty or appraisal done, the same should be for the academic session and not semester-wise. The guest faculty should not be asked to submit so many documents at the end of each semester (every six months). Meaning thereby, the term of guest faculty be for an academic session and not for a semester.

The Vice Chancellor said that maybe after one year, the performance report of the guest faculty has to be got assessed.

It was clarified that it is not as lengthy as is being perceived. In fact, it is just a feedback, which is also given by the teachers appointed on regular basis.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that after every six months appraisal of guest faculty should be got done.

5. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the remuneration of the guest faculty working in the affiliated Colleges should be the same, which is being given to the guest faculty working in the University. He requested that the Dean, College Development Council should be asked to send a circular to the affiliated Colleges asking them to pay maximum remuneration of Rs.50,000/- per month at the rate of Rs.1,500/- per lecture.

6. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that he had earlier also pointed out that the nomenclature has been changed time and again, e.g., guest faculty, part-time faculty, etc. Now, a new term has been created, i.e., visiting faculty, by an affiliated College. Though the Britishers had gone, they did not leave the system of slavery and are exploiting the teachers on one way or the other.

7. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the recommendations of 7th Pay Commission have not been implemented in the case of temporary teachers working in the P.U. Constituent Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that none of the temporary teachers had got the 7th Pay Commission.

8. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk pointed that the FTR Instrument of Department of Chemistry is non-operational, owing to which the practical work of the students are suffering. He is making a request from his own behalf and on behalf of the students that the said FTR Instrument of the Department of Chemistry should be got made operational. Similar is the position of FTR Instrument of the Sophisticated Analytical Instrument Facility Laboratory. The same should also be got made operational.

9. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that there is a request from the student side that the rent of Girls Hostel No.10 is on the higher side. He requested the Vice Chancellor to consider this issue and fix the rent of Girls Hostel No.10 equivalent to other Girls Hostel at the University Campus.
10. Professor Gurmeet Singh pointed out that they usually come across with the situation that the students come to the Campus in autos and say that they had taken admission in Chandigarh University, and they told them that this a Panjab University and not a Chandigarh University. A little help had come after the issuance of the circular that the students, who could not study off-line could study online. However, they still are facing a problem, because of flood situation in Himachal Pradesh. In fact, the students could not get migration certificate, because of declaration of holidays owing to floods. He suggested that the last date for submission of migration certificate should be extended.
11. Professor Gurmeet Singh said that when he was going through Item C-19, he found a suggestion for filing a Public Interest Litigation against Chandigarh University. However, the Legal Committee of the University is saying that it is not legally tenable, because Chandigarh University has been established under a State Government Act. Earlier, when he had raised this issue in one of the meetings of the Senate, the former Vice Chancellor had constituted a Committee. Professor M. Rajiv Lochan was a member of that Committee and he had said/talked about an Act. Though they did not have much time now, they should look into this seriously, because majority of the candidates took admission in Chandigarh University, owing to the confusion of name. He pleaded that they must contemplate and find a solution to this problem.
12. Professor Gurmeet Singh pointed out that there is shortage of auditoria in this University. Citing an example, he said that the Department of English and Cultural Studies had an auditorium and another with Department of Evening Studies & Multidisciplinary Research Centre, and in their neighbourhood, there are certain other Departments (Departments of Hindi, Punjabi, Sanskrit, History, etc). Even if the students of Department of English and Cultural Studies have to rehearse for 15 days for a function, it has no problem, whereas there is problem for other Departments. Earlier also, he had suggested that there should be a policy in place under which first choice should be of the parent Department, but they should hold a meeting with other Departments at least within a period of 3 months for sparing the auditorium for other Departments for the academic activities. He pointed out that these Departments (Departments of English and Cultural Studies and Evening Studies & Multidisciplinary Research Centre) held their cultural programmes in their respective auditorium, but other Departments could never do so. In nutshell, he suggested that a policy should be in place for proper utilization of auditoria at the Campus, so that each and every Department could get at least 3 functions free of cost. He remarked that the Chairperson(s), who had links, is/are still getting the auditorium free of cost. When he was Chairperson of the Department, he got the auditorium free of cost for all the functions.
13. Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the Vice Chancellor, with the efforts of the Dean of Student Welfare, had made the Coffee House functional. For this, she deserved congratulations. However, he pointed

out that the building, which houses Dean of Student Welfare office, is a heritage building. The structure of the building at the ground floor had its own beauty as the structure was on the pillars. People used to take shelter there at the time of rain. Now, certain temporary offices and shops had been created, which did not look nice. He requested the Vice Chancellor to get the beauty of that building restored. If it is got done by the Vice Chancellor, they would think that they had succeeded in their term of one year as members of the Syndicate. He requested the Vice Chancellor to consider it and restore the beauty of the building. There is not much to do as these are only temporary structures.

14. Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that the Regulations for constitution of Research Board available at page 445 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007, are very old. According to these Regulations, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Principals of Engineering Colleges/Head of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, Professors of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology and Professors of Postgraduate courses in affiliated Engineering Colleges, could become the members of Research Board in Engineering. Besides, three experts to be nominated by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Faculty and one specialist co-opted by the members for the occasion, could become members of Research Board in Engineering. He pleaded that all the Professors of Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology and University Institute of Engineering & Technology, should be members of Research Board in Engineering by default. He requested that a Committee should be formed to recommend appropriate amendments in Regulation 3 at page 445 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007, because this Regulation was framed when the Department of Chemical Engineering was created. Although University Institute of Engineering & Technology was established in the year 2003, the Regulation was not amended. As per practice, the General Branch sends a communication to the Chairperson of the Department, who at his/her own recommend certain persons and the Research Boards are constituted accordingly.
15. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that he had pointed out in the last meeting that this year, the seats at P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, had got filled. He suggested that the transfer of Technician, which had been made, should be reconsidered, as there was only one Technician against the posts of six Technicians. Moreover, there is resentment amongst the faculty members as they are not being transferred.
16. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the purpose of constitution of Pre-Screening Committee is to get the pre-screening done. He requested the Vice Chancellor to instruct the Pre-Screening Committee to do pre-screening.
17. Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that with the orders of the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor some persons had got increments for MDS, but certain others had not got the increments for MDS. Perhaps, they did not know about it. When they would apply for MDS increment, they would be asked, as to why they have applied so late.

18. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 27th May 2023, the notification of Government of Punjab, with regard to retirement age of teachers at Private aided Colleges was discussed. In the said notification, the age of superannuation of teachers working in the Colleges of Punjab had been reduced from 60 years to 58 years. The entire discussion centered around that the age of superannuation as per the University Calendar is 60 years. The discussion was concluded with the statement of the Vice Chancellor that the matter would be referred back to the Punjab Government, and the Syndicate did not accept this notification, and as per University Calendar, the age of superannuation of teachers of affiliated Colleges would be 60 years. However, what happened was that when Item C-15 was announced, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there is no alternative, but to adopt the notification of Punjab Government, and same had been incorporated in the resolved part of Item C-14. He had listened to the videography of the meeting again and again and found this mistake. He is not saying that it has been done intentionally. It is necessary because when the members had made adverse observations that how could they accept the age of superannuation of College teachers from 60 years to 58 years. Hence, it needed to be corrected. He said that he had brought it in writing and handed over the written document to the Registrar on the floor of the House. He requested that the decision of the Syndicate should be rectified.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu also said that the decision of the Syndicate should be rectified.

19. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that a letter had come from Punjab Government (from Jasprit Talwar) on 19.07.2023. They could say that through that letter, the Government had abolished the Boards of Studies, which however, is not their jurisdiction. The Government had sent this letter to all the three Universities of the State. Perhaps, the said letter might also have been received by the Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Boards of Studies have not been abolished; rather, it was about the Experts Committees, and the concern of the University about this had already been raised.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua intervened to say that he had already sent the relevant part to the Government and the Government had written to the UGC. The UGC has now written to the Government that the syllabi would be framed by the concerned University as the Universities had the autonomous status.

The Vice Chancellor said that, in fact, the Experts Committees would give the suggestions/guidelines, but the syllabi would be framed by the Boards of Studies of the respective University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the issue is that whenever any such letter is received from the Government, the same should be placed before the Syndicate/Senate for consideration. He is sorry to point out that the letter relating to Portal of Punjab Government was not placed before the Syndicate/Senate for two years. This letter has been received about a month back and should be placed before the Syndicate as an agenda item, so that the Syndicate members could apply their minds and deliberate on it. He added that perhaps, it did not affect the University right now, but might affect it after some time. He reiterated that the matter should be

brought to the Syndicate as an agenda item for consideration by the Syndicate.

20. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Vice Chancellor might have received a representation from the teachers of P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, regarding non-fixation of their pay owing to Clause 6.3 of UGC Regulations. Though the teachers concerned had been given the designation of Associate Professor, the pay has not been fixed and salary not released accordingly. Wherever the ambiguity existed in the Regulations/Guidelines, the same should be got sorted out.
21. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had sought information about 2-3 times remuneration being paid to the staff of the University Institute of Engineering & Technology for the counselling conducted for admission to engineering courses. He just wanted to know as to how much remuneration is given to the faculty and staff members for the counselling being done by the University Institute of Engineering & Technology for admission to engineering courses, and if there is a need to bring parity, the same could be done. He, therefore, requested that the information about the remuneration being given to the faculty and staff members for the counselling being done by the University Institute of Engineering & Technology for admission to engineering courses should be provided to him at the earliest.
22. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that since the election year has started, none of the Senators should be given the designation of any post, e.g., coordinator, directorship, etc., through which they could influence the voters.
23. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that a Committee has been appointed to consider and frame transfer policy for teachers. It would be better, if the meeting of the Committee should be convened at the earliest.
24. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the merit list for admission to LL.M. course at University Institute of Legal Studies had been prepared on 21st August. He urged that the said merit list should be released.

It was informed that the merit list for admission to LL.M. course at University Institute of Legal Studies has got been released.

Dr. Mukesh Arora suggested that the waiting list should also be got prepared and released.
25. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that, earlier, it had been decided that migration to Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies would be allowed on the basis of entrance test to be conducted for the purpose. He suggested that the entrance test should be conducted at the earliest, so that the students may not get migrated to other Universities.
26. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that there are about 2000 students studying at University Institute of Legal Studies and they faced a problem in parking their vehicles. He pleaded that their parking problem should be solved.
27. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that as had been decided, Research Degree Committee for University Institute of Applied Management Sciences would be constituted. He pointed out that the Supervisors outside the campus

had a complaint that the synopses of their students remained pending in the University for months for consideration by the Research Degree Committee. He pleaded that the synopses of such students should be got considered by the Research Degree Committee within a period of one month. He requested the Dean of University Instruction to get a circular issued by her office that if there are cases for consideration, the meeting of the Research Degree Committee should be convened at least within a period of one month.

28. Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, had conducted its own Entrance Test to fill up the vacant seats of MBA course. He suggested that if after filling the MBA Course seats through CAT, certain seats are still vacant, DAV Institute of Management, Sector 10, Chandigarh, should also be allowed to fill up the vacant seats through an Entrance Test to be conducted by the University or the Institute.
29. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that two types of nomenclatures are being used by the Colleges, i.e., guest faculty and visiting faculty. In Government Colleges, both type of faculty took 24 lectures a month, but their experience is not counted, even if they are teaching for the last 10-12 years, whereas the experience of *ad hoc*/contract/temporary teachers is being counted. He was thinking of making this request to the Directors, Higher Education, for appointing such persons on *ad hoc*/contract/temporary basis on a monthly emoluments (which is being paid to guest faculty) instead of guest faculty/visiting faculty, so that their experience could be counted.
30. Dr. Mukesh Arora pointed out that earlier, the former Vice Chancellor(s) used to be given the designation of Professor Emeritus, who is granted a contingency grant of around Rs.25,000/- per annum. Certain former Vice Chancellor(s) have also applied for grant of designation of Professor Emeritus. He urged that the meeting of the Committee constituted/to be constituted for the purpose should be convened at the earliest.
31. Dr. Jagtar Singh said that they had just now discussed the issue related to R.S.D. Colleges, Ferozepur, and decided that the provisions of Regulation 11.1 be imposed on it. Though the meeting yet to end and the minutes are to be prepared, the decision of the house has been circulated via social media. He had also got the message about it on his phone. He suggested that a strict action should be taken against the person, who has disclosed the decision of the House.

The Vice Chancellor said that she could assure that none of the persons sitting in her left and right sides has done this. This might has been done by one of the members.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it could have been done from one of them.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he had sent the message, which is being shown by Dr. Jagtar Singh. Had it not been resolved?

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that, being confidential, the proceedings of the Syndicate should not be leaked.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Officers/Officials of the University possessed impeccable integrity. She had received the communication regarding conduct of Panjab University Campus Students' Council election on 6th September 2023 yesterday evening, but no one except her and Dean of Student Welfare (Professor Jatinder Grover) knew about it. Professor Jatinder Grover had just now left the meeting to organize a Press Conference during which the date of election would be announced.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the information about the election of Panjab University Campus Students' Council election on 6th September was with him, Shri Lajwant Singh Virk, and Principal Kirandeep Kaur, but none of them leaked the information.

32. Dr. Jagtar Singh suggested that the last date for admission to various courses with the permission of Vice Chancellor should be extended from 31st August 2023 to 20th September 2023, because there was flood in Himachal Pradesh, Uttrakhand, and Punjab, due to which the candidates could not travel to the University. Moreover, it would be an additional income to the University.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua supported the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Jagtar Singh.

33. Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the students, who participated in Olympics and won medals (Gold, Silver and Bronze) are given scholarship by the University. However, the participants are not given anything. He pleaded that even to participate in Olympics, is a big achievement. Hence, something must be given to them. The neighbouring Chandigarh University is giving a scholarship of Rs.5 lac to each of such players in addition to free education and Hostel accommodation.

34. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that everybody is observing that the traffic in the University is increasing day-by-day. Hence, they should start banning four wheelers in the hostel premises. Even though accommodation in hostels and food in the hostel mess is given to the students on subsidized rates, but they might see that the four wheelers parked near the hostels are of more than Rs.15 lacs to Rs.25 lacs each. This could be verified by visiting any of the hostels in the evening. Leave aside day time, even at night one could not walk on the roads easily. He, therefore, suggested that this issue should be taken seriously.

35. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that though the XEN Office has done some work before the visit of the NAAC team, the grass near the garages needed to be trimmed. Even the grass had grown above Gate No. 1. He had also sent the photo of the same to the XEN for trimming the grass. If they did not cut the grass in time, the cost would escalate.

36. Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that a digital platform should be prepared and individual user Id and Password should be given to the University teachers, so that they could upload the data on regular basis. It would certainly help the IQAC in acquiring the data.

37. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as pointed out by Dr. Parveen Goyal, he is also receiving messages from the faculty members of P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, stating that all the seats of the courses being offered at the Regional Centre have got filled, and

they are facing a lot of problems due to transfer of Technician. He urged the Vice Chancellor to reconsider the transfer and post him/her at Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

38. Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that recently a news item had appeared in the newspapers that the rare scripts at V.V.B.I.S & I.S., Hoshiarpur, are getting spoiled. There they had many resources, which needed to be preserved. It would be better to get those rare scripts digitized. The strength of faculty in the Department of Sanskrit at the Campus is almost nil and only 2-3 faculty members in the subject of Sanskrit are left at V.V.B.I.S & I.S., Hoshiarpur, but owing to the dilapidated structure, they could not run any course there. He requested the Vice Chancellor to find a solution to this problem.
39. Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that since the templates for the posts of Principal and Assistant Professor had been finalized and approved, panels for the Selection Committees should be sent to the concerned Colleges, so that they could make the compliances and start the courses.
40. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that irrespective of whether it is the University Administration or the members of the Syndicate, wherever any harassment is meted out to the College teachers, they all are supposed to take it seriously. Whatever decision is taken by them, it is always taken independently and after deep contemplation and never under pressure of any individual. If somebody is saying that the decision has been taken under any individual's pressure, they could condemn it. In fact, they had taken a conscious decision and not under the pressure of any individual.
41. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they had already talked about the salary of teachers working on *ad hoc*/temporary/contract basis in the affiliated Colleges as well as at P.U. Constituent Colleges. He requested the Vice Chancellor to get the salary to these teachers paid in accordance with 7th Pay Commission.
42. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that they had enhanced the fees to be charged by the affiliated Colleges on the condition that they would pay full salary and retiral benefits in accordance with the 7th Pay Commission. Though all the affiliated Colleges had started charging enhanced fee from the students, none had implemented the recommendations of 7th Pay Commission. He suggested that the University should issue a letter in this regard.
- Dr. Jagtar Singh endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu.
- Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that for issuing the letter, the concerned branch should not wait for the copy of the relevant portion of the minutes.
- Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the resolved part should not be waited for issuing the letter as it itself is resolved.
43. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the University has conducted the various examinations, but the Supervisory staff has not got the payment. So far as the remuneration for evaluation of answer books is

concerned, they knew that the payment is usually received in the month of October-November.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that earlier, the payment of evaluation used to be received on the spot.

It was clarified that they are trying to streamline the system. Perhaps, from next year, they would be able to make the payment to the evaluators at the earliest possible. Whatever delay is occurring; it is because the teachers frequently change their bank accounts. When it was pointed out that earlier payment of evaluation was made on the spot, it was said that in the era of digital India, they had stopped making payment in cash.

Shri Sandeep Singh pointed out that if someone withdraws a sum of Rs. 2 lacs or more, the bank charges some amount.

44. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that although the unit strength has been specified in the Regulations/Rules of the University, the strength of students in a practical class has nowhere been specified. He suggested that the strength of students in a practical class should be also specified and mentioned in the Regulations/Rules. The problem is that in Colleges, usually the number of students in practical class is more than the apparatus needed for the practical. While inspection for grant of affiliation, they had thought about a batch of 15 students, but when the College prepare the batch of 30 students, the quality of education deteriorates. If need be, they would propose a resolution on the issue.
45. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that he had earlier also raised the issue of opening of canteen in the College Bhawan, but no heed has been paid by the University authorities. He once again requested that the canteen of the College Bhawan should be made functional at the earliest, because whosoever stayed at the College Bhawan faced problem for dining.
46. Shri Sandeep Singh suggested that the office of the Dean College Development Council should send a communication to the affiliated Colleges that NEP is going to be implemented in the Colleges w.e.f. the next academic session 2024-25, so that the Colleges might not request that the implementation of NEP should be postponed as they had not prepared themselves for the purpose.
47. Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is still being observed that the results of the students, who are getting the benefits under the PMS Scheme, are being declared as RL (Fee). He requested with folded hands that the University should not declare their results as RL (Fee) as the students would get their DMCs and degrees after paying the dues.

It was clarified that now the University has changed its system and now the RL (Fee) result is declared only in those cases where the students qualified the examination and those who got reappears so that they can apply for re-appear examination in time.

Shri Sandeep Singh pleaded that they should find some other via-media because certain Colleges had started charging late fee from the students whose results are declared as RL (Fee).

48. Professor Devinder Singh said that first of all he would like to thank the Vice Chancellor and her team for successfully conducting the Law Convocation, wherein a huge number of students got the degrees as the Convocation was held after a gap of couple of years.
49. Professor Devinder Singh said that Dr. Jagtar Singh has sought extension in last date of admission with the permission of the Vice Chancellor owing to floods in the states of Himachal Pradesh, Uttrakhand and Punjab. In the Department of Laws, what they had seen in the previous years is that the students usually leave their seats, when they got admission in Delhi University. This year, Delhi University had conducted its first counseling before Panjab University and about 40 seats in the department had fallen vacant. As a precaution, they had prepared a long waiting list, so that no seat in the department remained vacant. He, therefore, requested the Vice Chancellor to keep on extending the last date for admission, especially for the Department of Laws. Moreover, the students of Regional Centers also migrate to Department of Laws, whenever a seat fell vacant. He had received a phone call from Shri Kapil Sharma, Fellow, requesting that they may be allowed to fill up the vacant seats without the entrance test. He requested that they should have a liberal approach so that all the seats could be filled up.
50. Professor Devinder Singh pointed out that they had discussed the issue in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate and decided that a separate Research Degree Committee (RDC) should be constituted for University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, but the said decision is not being executed. If any problem is being faced for the execution of the decision, a Committee should be formed to remove the difficulties.
51. Professor Devinder Singh said that, being the PI of RUSA, he would like to point out that certain teachers had spent some funds from their own pockets, but the reimbursement is not being made to them, even though more than six months have elapsed. He pleaded that the reimbursement should be expedited, so that the teachers did not get discouraged. Perhaps, the reimbursement is getting delayed owing to audit objection.
52. Professor Devinder Singh said that if P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana could make admission to MBA course, through its own entrance test, but without C.A.T. Similar relaxation should be allowed to D.A.V. Institute of Management, because the Institute had already been given affiliation.

Y.P. Verma
Registrar

Confirmed

Renu Vig
VICE-CHANCELLOR