

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate held on **8th July, 2023 at 10.00 a.m.** in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

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

Shri Amandeep Singh Bhatti, Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, and Shri Amarpal Singh, IAS, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

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

Condolence Resolution

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

- (i) Professor H.M. Dani (Retired), Department of Biochemistry, on 08.06.2023.
- (ii) Pandit Yashpaul Ji 'Sagunpiya' (Retired) Department of Music, on 03.07.2023.
- (iii) Dr. J.N. Joshi, Professor Emeritus, Department of Education and former Dean of University Instruction, on 07.07.2023.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor H.M. Dani, Pandit Yashpaul and Dr. J.N. Joshi, 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) Panjab University, with 26 gold, 17 silver, 26 bronze medals – total tally of 69, won the Khelo India University Games, 2023.
- ii) Professor Gurmeet Singh, Department of Hindi, has been chosen for Babu Ganga Sharan Singh Award (2021-22) under the Hindi Sevi Samman by the Bihar Government Cabinet Secretariat (Rajbhasha Division). He will receive a citation and Rs.50,000/-.
- iii) Professor Pankaj Malviya, Department of Russian, has been nominated for **"Medal of Pushkin 2023"**.
- iv) I also wish to inform the Hon'ble members that as per the decision of the Senate that courses in accordance with NEP 2020 at the Undergraduate Level are to be framed and implemented at Panjab University Campus w.e.f. the session 2023-24, the Board of Control in Social Sciences has reframed the syllabus and Regulations for the course being offered at PUISSER. The Regulations are yet to be placed before the Regulations Committee for consideration and approval. Since the course is to be started from the ensuing session (2023-24), the Vice Chancellor may be authorised to take decision on the Regulations to be recommended by the Regulations Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate".

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that, first all, a lot of congratulations to the Vice Chancellor, Director (Sports) and the sportspersons, who participated in the Khelo India University Games, 2023 and winning it. Secondly, they are implementing the new National Education Policy, 2020 (NEP-2020), but it would be better if it is monitored; otherwise, it would get stuck or delayed. In fact, the students are a worried lot because of non-implementation of the NEP-2020, as several of them wanted to go abroad where they demanded 4-Year course/degree. He, therefore, suggested that NEP-2020 should be implemented in the affiliated Colleges at the earliest so that the students do not suffer.

When Professor Gurmeet Singh enquired whether the NEP-2020 would be implemented in the Department of Evening Studies and University School of Open Learning from the session 2023-24, the Vice Chancellor said that it would be implemented in the Department of Evening Studies, but not at University School of Open Learning.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 25.3.2023 and 23.4.2023 had been placed. Since it has been provided to them late, he could not go through the report. However, he would like to point out that in the proceedings, proceedings relating to certain items are not available. Why the proceedings relating to those items have not been made available to them? When enquired, he said that the discussion relating to item under which certain faculty members had gone abroad is not available in the proceedings. If the proceedings had not yet been prepared, the same should be got prepared at the earliest.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that the Board of Control in Social Sciences has recommended syllabus and regulations for the course being offered at PU-ISSER in accordance with new National Education Policy. He would like to point out that discussion relating to NEP had taken place in each and every meeting of the Syndicate and Senate held in the year 2023. In the meeting of the Senate held on 3rd June 2023, they had decided that NEP-2020 should be implemented in the University Campus from the session 2023-24, but in the affiliated Colleges from the session 2024-25. Implementation of NEP-2020 in the affiliated Colleges has been deferred only because of lack of readiness and certain other weaknesses. At the moment, it needed to be looked into that there are certain courses, which are offered both at the University campus and affiliated Colleges of the University. There are no two opinions about the implementation of NEP-2020. NEP has been implemented at the Panjab University Campus from this session and it would be implemented in the affiliated Colleges from the next session. Technical problem is there in the case of courses (B.Com., etc.), which are offered both at the University Campus and affiliated Colleges of the University. They might face problem in such courses at the time of migration (inter-University and inter-College) of the students, including at the time of transfer of parents of the students. He, therefore, suggested that NEP-2020 should be implemented at Panjab University Campus only in those courses, which are not offered in the affiliated Colleges, and in those courses, which are offered at Panjab University Campus and affiliated Colleges, it should be from the next academic session (2024-25). Otherwise, they might face problems after the period of 3-4 years. Since there are only 1-2 such courses, it would not have any negative effect on the grading by NAAC.

Professor Gurmeet Singh stated that if the suggestion of Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua is accepted, then NEP could also not be implemented in the Department of Evening Studies and if they did not implement NEP in the Department of Evening Studies and PU ISSER, they would not be able to say during the visit of NAAC that they had implemented NEP at the Panjab University Campus, because there are several courses at undergraduate level, which are also offered in the affiliated Colleges of the University. At least, they should implement the NEP-2020 at the Panjab University Campus, so that they are able to say before the NAAC team that they had implemented the NEP at the campus minus University School of Open Learning, because the students do not study at the University School of Open Learning on regular basis, whereas in the Department of Evening Studies, the students study on regular basis. The implementation of NEP should not be deferred just on the apprehension of problem in migration. In future, if they faced any such problem, the same would be sorted out. Considering the concerns of the Colleges, they had already diluted it by not implementing in the affiliated Colleges, and if they further diluted it, its whole purpose would be got defeated. In nutshell, he said that they should not further dilute the implementation of NEP at least at Panjab University Campus. However, if problem(s) is/are faced in future, they would sort them out with their collective wisdom.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the process for implementation of NEP has already been started, and now if they postpone it in certain courses, the students might approach the Court. If the process has been initiated, it must be implemented.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the syllabi under the NEP had already been got approved. He knew this because he is a member of Board of Studies in Physical Education where they had approved the syllabus, including the practicals to be conducted, under the NEP.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that it was not that they did not want to implement NEP-2020 in the Colleges. In fact, the Colleges were not made aware about the whole scheme as all the stakeholders, including Principals of the Colleges had not been involved in the process. However, the persons, who were involved in the process of NEP, were aware of each and every aspect of the matter. Now, what Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua is saying is that in 2-3 courses, which are offered in both the University and its affiliated Colleges, NEP should not be implemented. In rest of the courses, they should go ahead in accordance with the decision of the Senate. He (Dr. Dua) had just apprised them about the implications, which might arise in future. He suggested that they should find out the solution of this problem before hand.

Shri Varinder Singh said that NEP should also be implemented in the courses, which are offered both at the University Campus and affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that if they had difference of opinion, it did not mean that they are against the Vice Chancellor. His only concern is that they might face problem in such courses, if the students sought migration. It was appreciated in the meeting of the Senate that the teachers had done a lot of work on NEP. As suggested, it is not easy to implement NEP in the affiliated Colleges at this belated stage. Moreover, there is a full-fledge system for implementation of NEP, and owing to non-evolving of the system and keeping in view the concerns of the Colleges, the Senate decided to implement NEP in the affiliated Colleges from the next academic session, i.e., 2024-25. He is not saying that the implementation of NEP should further be diluted, but there could not be two nomenclatures of a single degree.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua is apprehending a problem if the students sought migration from the College to University and *vice versa*. According to her, NEP is beneficial to the students because if the students of Panjab University want to migrate to Delhi and other Universities, they would be able to do so, because the other Universities have already implemented the NEP. However, so far as the solution to migration of students of Colleges affiliated to Panjab University is concerned, they have to find a solution.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that migration of students could be from Panjab University to other Universities and vice versa, and not from affiliated Colleges to Panjab University Campus alone. To say generally that 2-3 courses are commonly offered in both the University Campus and affiliated Colleges, is not desirable. Dr. Dua should specifically mention the courses, which are commonly offered in both the University Campus and affiliated Colleges, so that they could consider the same.

To this, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that, that was why, he had named B.Com.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that they might face the problem from the next academic session when they would implement the NEP in the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that NEP has been implemented at Panjab University Campus from the session 2023-24 and it would be implemented in the affiliated Colleges from the session 2024-25. By the time, it would be implemented in the affiliated Colleges, the University would be fully prepared to deal with any problem.

It was informed that the problem would be only for one year as from next year, NEP would be implemented both at University Campus and affiliated Colleges.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the problems relating to examinations, which would be faced by the University for this batch, would not be faced for the next batches, as it would find the solution for the same.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that so far as University School of Open Learning is concerned, a lot of changes are coming there owing to mandate of the UGC for dual degree programme. According to him, they should give a year to the University School of Open Learning. This year, they should keep the University School of Open Learning out of the ambit of the NEP. So far as the issue that there could not be two nomenclatures of a degree is concerned, the degree, which is to be awarded to the students of Department of Evening Studies, would be different from the degree to be awarded to the students of affiliated Colleges. In fact, the students of Department of Evening Studies would be awarded 4-Year (Honours) Degree, whereas the students of affiliated Colleges would be awarded B.A. (General) Degree. As such, both the degrees could not be equated. Moreover, why are they presuming that the seats at the University Campus would fall vacant against which students would seek migration, because migration is always allowed against vacant seats? Hence, NEP should be implemented in all the courses offered at Panjab University Campus, including the Department of Evening Studies. The teething problems to which they were talking about would be sorted out because they are implementing the NEP at the Campus from the session 2023-24. The Controller of Examinations would have the experience of conducting the examinations of the courses, which are offered in about 78 teaching Departments of the University.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that they would be able to implement NEP at University School of Open Learning from next year, i.e., from the session 2024-25, if they implement NEP at the campus from this year (from the session 2023-24).

The Vice Chancellor said that as per the condition of Distance Education Board (DEB), they could implement NEP at University School of Open Learning after one year of the implementation in the regular courses.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that his statement should be recorded with dissent that NEP should not be implemented in the courses, which are offered both at University Campus and affiliated Colleges of the University as there could not be two nomenclatures for a single course/degree.

The Vice Chancellor said that already there are two nomenclatures – (i) the courses at the Panjab University Campus are offered under Honour School System; and (ii) in the Colleges under General Degree.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that now, the teachers of the Colleges are saying that had they been made aware of the NEP Programme in detail earlier, they would have implemented the NEP in the Colleges from the session 2023-24 itself.

To this, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that even the students are saying so.

It was told that even the document of the UGC says that both the nomenclatures would continue in the interim period.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is a fact that a course could not be run in a University with two nomenclatures.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Professor Gurmeet Singh, Department of Hindi, on having been chosen for Babu Ganga Sharan Singh Award (2021-22) under the Hindi Sevi Samman by the Bihar Government; and
 - (ii) Professor Pankaj Malviya, Department of Russian, on having been nominated for **“Medal of Pushkin 2023”**.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor’s Statement at Sr. No.1, be noted;
3. the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, on the Regulations framed for PU-ISSER by the Board of Control in Social Science to be considered and approved by the Regulations Committee; and
4. the Action Taken Report in respect of the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 25.3.2023 and 23.4.2023 **(Appendix-I)**, be noted.

2. Considered if, appointment of Mrs. Amanjot Kaur as Assistant Professor in Education (Teaching of English) at Babe-Ke-College of Education, VPO- Daudhar, Moga, be approved, in view of the legal opinion dated 19.03.2020 of Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate and Legal Retainer, P.U. Information contained in the Office Note was also taken into consideration.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar drew the attention of the House towards page 4, where Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu in his legal opinion has written, “It is also pointed out that the relevant UGC Regulations, 2010 have been superseded by the UGC Regulations 2018, thus, the earlier Regulation 3.4.1 (which did not extend this relaxation to OBC’s has been replaced by the updated Regulation 3.4.1 (which extends this relaxation to OBC’s and many others), thus in future reference may be made to the 2018 Regulations only”. This relaxation does not exist in the Regulations under which the appointment/selections of Ms. Amanjot Kaur has been made. So far as UGC Regulations, 2018 are concerned, as per Punjab Government notification, these are to be implemented in the Colleges situated in Punjab from 27th September 2022, i.e., approximately after four years of the issuance of the notification of UGC Regulations. He did not understand if Ms. Amanjot Kaur is not covered under the Regulations, how could she be given the relaxation? The College could re-appoint her. Who is stopping them to do so?

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that at the time of interview, she did not produce the certificates.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that in the legal opinion itself, it has been written that thus, in future, reference may be made to the 2018 Regulations only.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to why this item has been placed before the Syndicate.

It was informed that the candidate under reference has obtained 50% marks in her Postgraduation, whereas minimum of 55% marks are required.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that her appointment was made in the year 2019, i.e., 4 years before and in the intervening period, the Vice Chancellor had given approval to the appointments of number of teachers and Principals of affiliated Colleges. He did not know, why this particular case has been brought to the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if the University deviate from the prescribed rules, the matter has to be placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua enquired, had approval to appointment of all the teachers and Principals, who had been appointed in the College during the last 10-15 years, been sought from the Syndicate? Or it is a matter of convenience of University authorities to grant approval to the appointment of teacher/Principal or seek approval from the Syndicate for particular case(s).

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that one of his colleagues is asking as to why this item has been placed before the Syndicate. According to him, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate, because the candidate did not fulfil the eligibility criteria laid down for the post of Assistant Professor. The approval is being sought from the Syndicate to cover up the mistake, so that later on, if it is questioned they could say that they had placed the matter before the Syndicate and the Syndicate had approved it. The candidate under consideration has not secured minimum of 55% marks in Postgraduation, which is essential for the post of Assistant Professor. The UGC Regulations, 2010, under which her appointment has been made, did not contained reservation for OBCs. In fact, the OBC reservation is available only in UGC Regulations, 2018, in which relaxation of 5% in marks is available to the OBC candidates. The candidate has obtained only 50% marks. When the reservation to OBC with 5% relaxation in marks did not existed in the UGC Regulations, 2010, how could relaxation of 5% be given to her? Now, Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu has said in his legal opinion that UGC Regulations, 2018, supersedes the UGC Regulations, 2010, which is known to everybody, but relaxation could only be given, if there is a provision in the Regulations, under which the appointment has been made. Either the candidate should again apply as per UGC Regulations, 2018 and compete with other candidates, and if got selected, the appointment would be approved. Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu had nowhere mentioned his legal opinion that the claim of the candidate for the post of Assistant Professor is correct.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the Vice Chancellor did not herself placed the item before the Syndicate; rather, the matter/item is proposed by the concerned branch and thereafter, the Vice Chancellor referred the matter to the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the College should re-advertise the post.

Professor Jatinder Grover pointed out that the candidate had applied for the post of Assistant Professor in the year 2019. The candidate is not at fault rather, the fault lay with them as they implemented the UGC Regulations, 2018, in the year 2022. They had deprived the candidate of her OBC right, which was given to her by the Government of India in the year 2018.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that it is the mistake on the part of the Punjab Government, which had implemented the UGC Regulations, 2018 w.e.f. 28th September 2022.

Principal R.S. Jhanji pointed out that the teacher has completed the probation period of 2 years and is due for confirmation.

Shri Varinder Singh pointed out that since the candidate had not produced the certificate of OBC/BC, she could not be granted 5% relaxation in marks.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that several other candidates, who might have more marks than her, could have appeared in the interview.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that the item should be withdrawn.

It was clarified that the University had earlier appointed a Committee to consider such complicated cases. So far as this case is concerned, a duly constituted Selection Committee had recommended the appointment of Ms. Amanjot Kaur and when the case came to the University for approval, it was found that the candidate is not eligible as the candidate has secured only 50% marks. The office sent the case to the legal retainer for legal opinion. The legal opinion wrote that, as per UGC Regulations, 2018, the candidate is eligible for the post of Assistant Professor. The case has been placed before the Syndicate because the Committee of Syndics, which earlier used to be constituted for considering such complicated cases, do not exist at the moment.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that when the selection is recommended by deviating from the prescribed Rules/Regulations, the matter has to be placed before the Syndicate, as the University authorities did not have powers to approve or reject such a case.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Vice Chancellor had given approval to the appointment of a number of teachers/Principals of the affiliated Colleges and some of appointments had also been rejected by the Vice Chancellor. If there is a grievance to any of the candidate, whose appointment is rejected, he/she could represent and the representation is to be placed before the Syndicate for consideration. The item is now being withdrawn as being suggested by his fellow colleagues. He, however, suggested that action must be taken on it and should not be kept pending under any circumstances.

RESOLVED: That the Item C-2 on the agenda, be treated as withdrawn, because the Vice Chancellor is empowered to take action as per Rules.

- 3.** Considered minutes of the Screening/Selection Committee dated 12.05.2023 (**Appendix-II**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to finalize the promotion cases of Technical Officers-III (System Manager) to Technical Officer-IV (System Administrator) working in the Panjab University and its Regional Centres in accordance with the existing Promotion Policy duly approved by the BOF/Syndicate/Senate in year 2006 and interview of the candidates.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that since the promotions have been recommended in accordance with the duly approved Promotion Policy, the promotions of these persons should be approved.

Dr. Parveen Goyal stated that, first of all, he would like to congratulate the persons who have got promoted. Referring to the promotion of Mr. Varjesh Sharma as Technical Officer-IV (System Administrator) at PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, he pointed

out that there are four Branches in Computer Engineering (Computer Science, Electronics, Information Technology and Mechanical) at Hoshiarpur. There are about 400 students belonging to Engineering Branches, who are taken care of by four technicians of four labs. He added that all the seats of Computer Science and Information Technology got filled every year. Out of these four Technicians, two have already left the job, as they have got appointed somewhere else and one had got transferred. Resultantly, only one technician is working there. Would he able to run all the four labs and take care of requirements of all the 400 students. He suggested that whenever anyone is transferred from there, substitute must be provided.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that –

1. Ms. Nishi Goyal, Technical Officer-III (System Manager), Computer Unit, Panjab University, be promoted as Technical Officer-IV (System Administrator), w.e.f. 06.11.2021 in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP 8700 (Central Government) (pre-revised) subject to the conditions that –
 - (i) the promotion would be personal to the incumbent and on vacation, the post shall be filled as Programmer;
 - (ii) she would continue to do the same work and discharge same duties/responsibilities, which she had already been doing as Programmer along with her new assignment; and
 - (iii) she would fill the commitments as made above with respect to future plans/duties.
2. Ms. Daisy Puri, Technical Officer-III (System Manager), Computer Unit, Panjab University, be promoted as Technical Officer-IV (System Administrator), w.e.f. 15.01.2022 in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP 8700 (Central Government) (pre-revised) subject to the conditions that –
 - (i) the promotion would be personal to the incumbent and on vacation, the post shall be filled as Programmer;
 - (ii) she would continue to do the same work and discharge same duties/responsibilities, which she had already been doing as Programmer along with her new assignment; and
 - (iii) she would fill the commitments as made above with respect to future plans/duties.
3. Mr. Varjesh Sharma, Technical Officer-III (System Manager), PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur, be promoted as Technical Officer-IV (System Administrator), w.e.f. 08.01.2022 in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP 8700 (Central Government) (pre-revised) subject to the conditions that –
 - (i) the promotion would be personal to the incumbent and on vacation, the post shall be filled as Programmer;
 - (ii) she would continue to do the same work and discharge same duties/responsibilities, which she had already been doing as Programmer along with her new assignment; and
 - (iii) she would fill the commitments as made above with respect to future plans/duties.

- 4.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 08.05.2023 (**Appendix-III**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to guidelines issued by the UGC, under NEP 2020 for pursuing two academic programmes simultaneously.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the Committee has recommended that the guidelines prepared on the basis of Guidelines of UGC, under NEP-2020 for pursuing two academic programmes simultaneously, as per Appendix, be approved. He pointed out that the guidelines framed by the Committee on the basis of UGC Guidelines, have been appended, but the Guidelines of the UGC have not been.

The Vice Chancellor said that the guidelines of University Grants Commission were available in the file.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the Guidelines prepared by the University, which have been appended in the agenda, Panjab University Guidelines for two academic programmes simultaneously should be mentioned at the top of the first page.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the guidelines have been mentioned at pages 21- 24, but page 21 showed that these are the guidelines of the UGC.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that, according to him, the guidelines of the UGC should be adopted in toto. Moreover, when he go through the guidelines of the University, he found that they had just inserted few lines in the guidelines of the UGC. Citing an example, he said that a line, "No request for changes in the existing academic programmes shall be entertained" has been added in the first guideline. Certain more additions had been made, e.g., Two academic programmes shall be pursued by the student from the same University or from different Universities/Institutions. However, they should adopt the UGC Guidelines in toto, so that they did not face any problem in future.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that in the resolved part, they should write that the UGC Guidelines for pursuing two academic programmes simultaneously in toto, be adopted and if they approved the Guidelines prepared by the Committee, these additions would also be got approved. He further suggested that the matter be referred back to the Committee for reconsideration.

When Dr. Parveen Goyal suggested that the Guidelines of UGC should be appended, the Vice Chancellor said that the Guidelines of the UGC would be appended.

RESOLVED: That Panjab University Guidelines for pursuing two academic programmes simultaneously, prepared on the basis of Guidelines of the UGC, under NEP 2020, **as per Appendix**, be approved with the condition that the Guidelines of the UGC, be also appended with it before circulation.

- 5.** Considered if, the Intellectual Property Right Policy, 2023 (**Appendix-IV**) of Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP) of the Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.03.2023 (Para 25) (**Appendix-IV**) considered the Intellectual Property Right Policy, 2022 of Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP) and it was resolved that in view of the

above discussion taken place, the matter, be referred back to the Committee for re-consideration.

2. A copy of the minutes of the meeting of Committee constituted for framing of IPR Policy dated 04.05.2023 was enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

Professor Devinder Singh said that he would like to make an observation that since they had two Laws Departments, i.e., Department of Laws and University Institute of Legal Studies, at the Campus, it would be better, if in future, teacher(s) of Law is/are also associated with the Committee while framing such Policies.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that when the Item had been placed in an earlier meeting of the Syndicate, even the minutes of the Committee had not been appended with the Item. He further said that a case was filed in the Punjab & Haryana High Court relating to promotion policy for the teachers/doctors working in Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences. A Committee had been constituted under the chairmanship of Shri Ashok Goyal, in which Professor Jagat Bhushan, Professor Rajat Sandhir and he himself (Dr. Dua) were the members. When they looked into the file, they were surprised to find that a Policy had already been framed for the faculty of the Dental Institute, whereas an affidavit was submitted by the faculty of the Dental Institute that there is no promotion policy for them. He again said that when last time, the item was placed before the Syndicate, the minutes were not appended and they were not able to understand as to how the policy has been framed.

Dr. Parveen Goyal, referring to page 30 of the Appendix, said that under Clause 4, it has been written, "Expenses up to Rs.75,000/- per patent will be funded by the Panjab University", which is good. Problem was the faculty members were not able to spend more than Rs.25,000/-. The Audit had raised objection to those, who had spent more than Rs.25,000/-. The Audit has observed that for more than Rs.25,000/-, they were supposed to invite quotations, whereas under patent, calling of quotations is not possible.

The Vice Chancellor asked Dr. Parveen Goyal, is there any problem in the Policy. Objections should be raised once and not time and again. This Policy has been placed before the Syndicate for the second time.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that, under this Policy, they are giving financial grant to the affiliated Colleges also, whereas the University did not receive any money from them. In fact, there are about 200 Colleges affiliated with the University. Where the name of the affiliated College(s) would come? Therefore, his only concern is that where under Clause 4(C), it has been mentioned, "Financial assistance for protection of IPR can be made available to the inventors from the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University against applications in which Panjab University is one of the assignees". He said that the Policy is approved, but for this provision, the Vice Chancellor is authorized to take appropriate decision.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that money under IPR come from the affiliated Colleges, but only the name of the University is mentioned.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar clarified that the Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP) of the Panjab University, Chandigarh, receives funds/money only

from the University teachers and never from the teachers of the affiliated Colleges. Firstly, they should start receiving from the teachers of the affiliated Colleges and thereafter the financial assistance for IPR should be made available to them.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the policy should be approved, but for this provision, the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to take appropriate decision.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there are two three more issues, which would be reported to the Vice Chancellor through e-mail. He requested the Vice Chancellor to take care of those issues.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the Intellectual Property Right Policy, 2023 (**Appendix-IV**) of Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP) of the Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved. However, so far as Sub-Clause (C) of 4 relating to Financial Assistance for Protection of IPR to the inventors from the affiliated Colleges and other issues are concerned, the Vice Chancellor be authorized to take appropriate decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

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

6. To discuss the issue with regard to webcast of proceedings of the Senate meeting, raised by one of the Fellows during Zero Hour in the meeting of the Senate dated 19.02.2023 (**Appendix-V**).

Initiating discussion, Dr. Jagtar Singh suggested that first of all, the University should ascertain whether other Universities are webcasting the proceedings of the meetings of the Senate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that such a lengthy discussion does not take place in the meetings of the Senate of other Universities.

The Vice Chancellor said that in this University, it took about six months to prepare the minutes of the meeting of the Senate. The proceedings of the Senate meeting should be allowed to be webcasted, and in the minutes after agenda items, only resolved part, should be mentioned.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the webcasting of the meetings of the Senate proceeding should be allowed, but the members should also start behaving properly as the public would be watching them.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua stated that it is a suggestion of Professor Gurmeet Singh, who is a good intellectual, teacher and political analyst. But the way the item has been placed before the Syndicate is not proper, because if they started placing each and every suggestion given by the members during the zero hour discussion of the meetings, it would not be good. There are 91 members of the Senate and a suggestion given by each of them is made a part of the Syndicate agenda, then they would not be able to complete the agenda. He pointed out that whenever any resolution is proposed by a member of the Senate or a concrete/beneficial suggestion is given, a Committee is formed to consider/vetting the same in the first instance and make recommendations. Though it is a good suggestion, it needed to be brought in another form. The Vice Chancellor was herself

saying that it took six months to prepare the minutes, but even if the webcasting of the proceedings of the Senate is allowed, the minutes are still to be written.

The Vice Chancellor said that she does not think that the minutes are to be written even after webcasting. On this issue, they needed to take a call. She further said that the members should speak in one language, so that the University could develop a software to convert their statements into English. Since here the members spoke in different languages, i.e., Hindi, Punjabi, and English, they are not able to develop any software. It is pathetic that it took six months to prepare the minutes of the meetings of the Senate of Panjab University. Although they are meeting here for the next meeting of the Syndicate, the minutes of the previous meeting had been got prepared and released just a few days before. It had taken a full month to complete the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate. They are not able to use technology, because the members spoke in multiple languages. She requested the members to first decide that they would speak in only one language.

Shri Varinder Singh said that there is not a big issue in webcasting the proceedings of the Senate, though Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua had raised certain technical issues. But it might give wrong impression to the general public that the properly examined/drafted items are not placed before the Syndicate and Senate. He suggested that such a message should not be passed on to the Society.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the videography of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate is also supplied to the public under the RTI Act.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that there is no difference of opinion amongst them about the webcasting of the proceedings of the meetings of the Senate, but a Committee is required to be constituted to work out the modalities keeping in view the sentiments expressed by the members.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it is a positive step and they must go ahead with it. He further said that in future, the suggestions given by the members, including during the zero hour, should be placed before the Syndicate after following a proper procedure. However, since this suggestion of Professor Gurmeet Singh has been placed before the Syndicate, they should consider and approve it, so that a message should go to the public as to what they are doing.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that since majority of the members did not know about the technicalities involved in the webcasting, only persons familiar with the technicalities should be made members of the Committee proposed to be constituted.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had the set up required for the webcasting of the proceedings of the meetings of the Senate as they webcast the Convocation.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that why he is insisting upon it, is because tomorrow certain channels might approach the University and it might become a source of income. Secondly, the people around the world know that only Panjab University in India has allowed webcasting of the proceedings of the meeting of its Governing Body, which differentiate it from other Universities.

Professor Gurmeet Singh stated that, first of all, he would like to thank her for bringing the item to the Syndicate. They are right that it has happened for the first time that a suggestion given by a member during zero hour discussion has been brought to the Syndicate as an agenda item. At the same time, he would like to remind that it had happened several times in the meetings of the Syndicate and

Senate that suggestions given by the members were accepted without formally bringing them as agenda items. He is not in favour of allowing the channels to telecast live the proceedings of the meetings of the Senate as it is not Vidhan Sabha of a State and Parliament of the country. Unfortunately, at the moment, the image of the Senate and the stature of the members of the Senate is not such that a channel would approach them and give money. His only purpose for webcasting of proceedings of the meetings of the Senate was that they are required to be innovative at several places. He would like to inform them that before 2008, even the visitors' gallery remained closed, and a Committee was formed to open the visitors' gallery. Now, the President of Panjab University Students' Council sits in the visitors' gallery. Everybody says that he should be made a member of the Senate, but according to him, by sitting there, he had more value because he is not involved in the groupism. To the observation that the webcasting would tarnish their image, he said that its effect could be opposite as the members might start behaving properly. When Shri Satya Pal Jain had suggested that they needed to develop a code of conduct for the members, he had said that there is no need for the code of conduct, because on several occasions misleading statements are given. It was said against him that he is against the teachers as he always talked about the students. There is always advantage in introducing transparency in the system. They should understand that the Syndicate meeting is not a public meeting. However, so far as the Senate meeting is concerned, it has been made public as members of press already watch its proceedings from the visitors' gallery. Earlier, the media persons used to sit in the Senate Hall, which was wrong. If tomorrow, all the members came to attend the meeting of the Senate, there would not be chairs for them. He, therefore, suggested that proper and comfortable seating arrangement should be made, and if need be, the seating structure should be changed/rearranged. He further suggested that besides President of Panjab University Students' Council, pass should also be issued to others to watch the proceedings of the Senate from the visitors' gallery. There is no harm in increasing the transparency, especially where, which is already public. In the end, he said that webcasting of Senate meeting should be approved in principle, but for technicalities involved and the apprehensions expressed by the members, a Committee is required to be constituted.

Professor Devinder Singh, Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Dr. Parveen Goyal, said that proposal of Professor Gurmeet Singh for webcasting the proceedings of the Senate meetings is approved, in principle, and for modalities, a Committee of persons having technical knowledge would be constituted by the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they do appreciate the sentiments of Professor Gurmeet Singh, but since it is neither in the form of a resolution nor a proposal or a proper item has been placed before the Syndicate, a Committee is required to be formed to examine the whole issue and make recommendations.

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

Professor Gurmeet Singh pointed out that it has been written that "This may be treated as most urgent as the Vice Chancellor has taken a serious view on the non-availability of Action Taken Report", for which he is thankful to the Vice Chancellor. If the Vice Chancellor has taken an action on the suggestion of a member, it certainly enhanced the respect of the Senate members. Tomorrow, if any other member gave an important suggestion, the same could also be placed before the Syndicate as an agenda item.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he would like to inform the members that even in the case of video recording of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and

Senate, an instant decision was taken by the Syndicate on the suggestion given by Principal A.S. Bedi, the then member of the Syndicate and Senate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he was just making them aware of the technicalities involved in the issue. He, therefore, stressed that the matter should be referred to a Committee to be constituted by the Vice Chancellor.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that from his side, the item is approved.

RESOLVED: That, in future, the proceedings of the meetings of the Senate be webcasted and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to form a Committee to work out the modalities for webcasting of proceedings.

7. Considered if, the following Faculties (**Appendix-VI**) opted by Sardar Amritpal Singh Sukhanand, MLA, Fellow, be assigned to him:-

1. Law
2. Arts
3. Education
4. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture

RESOLVED: That Sardar Amritpal Singh Sukhanand, MLA, Fellow, be assigned to the following Faculties:-

1. Law
2. Arts
3. Education
4. Dairying, Animal Husbandry & Agriculture.

8. Considered minutes of the Hostel Committee dated 10.04.2023 (**Appendix-VII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to rate revision for the Handbook of Hostel Rules for PUSGRC, Hoshiarpur, for the session 2023-24, as per letter no. 5817/DSW dated 21.03.2023 of Dean Student Welfare.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that in recommendation 1 of the Committee (page 43), it has been recommended that "Any studentThe student aggrieved from the decision of the University shall be entitled to appeal to a Standing Committee to be constituted for the purpose by the Vice Chancellor of which a retired High Court Judge shall be the Chairman". He suggested that the sentence should end at Vice Chancellor because they would not be able to find a retired High Court Judge at Hoshiarpur. Moreover, from where they would pay to the retired High Court Judge?

This was agreed to.

Shri Varinder Singh said that it has been recommended that all M.Phil./Ph.D. students shall be provided hostel accommodation on sharing basis. He pleaded that hostel accommodation to Ph.D. students should at least be allotted independently. Earlier, all the students were used to be allotted single room.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that they could not allot independent hostel accommodation to even all the Ph.D. students, because of shortage of hostel accommodation.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that these rules are for hostel accommodation at P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, where there is no Ph.D. student.

Shri Varinder Singh said that fine for misconduct has also been suggested, which is wrong, because the recommendations of the Committee related to rates for hostel accommodation. How could they include it?

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee had been constituted to recommend revision/change in the charges/hostel rules for the session 2023-24.

When Shri Varinder Singh emphasized that at least Ph.D. students should be allotted independent hostel accommodation, Professor Jatinder Grover said that it is not possible. If allowed, several students would not be able to get hostel accommodation and they have to stay outside at higher rent. He added that the concern shown by Shri Varinder Singh is genuine, but due to great rush of students, they could not allot independent hostel accommodation even to the Ph.D. students. To meet the demand of majority of the Ph.D. students, they are trying to allot hostel accommodation to those Ph.D. students, who are JRF and have supervisors from the affiliated Colleges, and to accommodate them, they have faced a lot of difficulties.

Shri Varinder Singh said that along with Ph.D. students, the sportsperson belonging to games like shooting, should be allotted independent hostel accommodation.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that such sportspersons could be accommodated. He further said that he would like to make them aware about the rules for allotment of hostel accommodation to the sportsperson. As per previous rules, they used to allot hostel accommodation only to those Ph.D. students, whose supervisors were of Panjab University Campus. Now, they have change the rules and would allot hostel accommodation to those Ph.D. students also whose supervisors are from affiliated Colleges, provided they are drawing fellowship and are working on whole time basis in the University. Such research scholars would be allotted hostel accommodation as and when the seats are available after exhausting the list of scholars seeking hostel accommodation, who are registered with University teachers. Moreover, now they would give rent free hostel accommodation to the eligible Divyang students, whereas earlier, they used to allot rent free hostel accommodation only to the blind students. However, they have to pay the mess charges. He added that they are also providing hostel accommodation to the transgenders. Earlier, they were providing hostel accommodation to transgenders at Working Women's Hostel, but now they would allot them hostel accommodation in one of the Foreign Teachers Flats, which is being got renovated.

Shri Varinder Singh pointed out that earlier, they used to allot hostel accommodation at International Hostel only to Girls students and few foreign students (Afghanistan, Iran, etc.,) but now it has come to his notice that several men NRI students have also been allotted accommodation there. If tomorrow any mis-happening takes place, who would be responsible? Would it be the Warden of the hostel?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that male students should not be allotted accommodation in the hostel, where the girl students are staying.

Professor Gurmeet Singh suggested that electric kettle should be included in the electric/electronic devices mentioned in point 47 B 2 at page 45 of the appendix, as it is necessary in winter. He further suggested that in point 40 B only electrical

and electronics appliances should be written except mentioned in 47 B 2 and not electrical/electronic appliances such as air conditioners, induction cook tops, electric heaters, electric rods, table fans, TV, etc.; otherwise, etcetera would have no end. He further said that he is unable to understand that the residents could go outside within the campus only. If the residents can go outside within the campus, why could they not outside the campus. How it would be monitored? He suggested that they should be careful while framing such rules.

Shri Sandeep Singh clarified that when the issue of allowing the hostel residents of Panjab University Campus to go outside 24×7 was raised, the female hostel residents of Hoshiarpur had also gone on strike. He was also approached and requested to approach the authorities to allow them to go outside 24×7. He had clearly told them they could not compare themselves with the female hostel residents of Panjab University Campus as they (hostel residents of Hoshiarpur) stay in the Institute which is surrounded by a forest. Then the students requested him to get them allowed to go outside at least within the campus.

Professor Jatinder Grover clarified that they had just changed Rule 37 (b) and not 37 (a), and that is why, Rule 37 (a) has not been brought to the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there is a lot of space within P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, where the students could go.

Dr. Parveen Goyal pointed out that they had increased the fine from Rs.25/- per month to Rs.50/- per month for use of Hair Ironing/ Hair Dryer/Electric Kettle. These appliances could be hidden in the almirahs. Meaning thereby, fine would be imposed on certain students and certain others not. Whereas, on the one hand, the Mess Contractors are given contract just on the basis of interview and not on the basis of tenders, and on the other hand, electricity meters have not been got installed from any of the mess contractor. Only fixed electricity charges are charged from them, which is wrong.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Hostel Committee dated 10.04.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved with the modifications that –

1. Recommendation 1 be amended to read as “Any student alleged to be involved in any misconduct/unlawful act/illegal activity will be liable to be suspended from the University and on proving the commission of misconduct the student shall be liable to be expelled from the University. The student aggrieved from the decision of the University shall be entitled to appeal to a Standing Committee to be constituted for the purpose by the Vice Chancellor”.
2. recommendation 10 be amended to read as Electric meter must be installed for the mess in hostels “For use of Hair Ironing/Hair Dryer/**Electric Kettle** Devices, Rs.50/- p.m. each”.

9. Considered recommendations dated 02.05.2023 (Item Nos.24 & 27(ii)) of the Executive Committee of PUSC (**Appendix-VIII**).

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired, is any quorum for the meetings of Executive Committee of PUSC existed. In the meeting of the Committee, the recommendations of which are being considered only 11 members had attended the meeting and 14 members did not.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the quorum for meetings of the Executive Committee of PUSC is certainly there, but how the Committee had met and made recommendations in the absence of quorum, he did not know.

Professor Devinder Singh pointed out that there are different provisions in the Calendar for quorum. For the meetings of Board of Studies, 3 members fulfilled the quorum. So far as other Committees, which are constituted by the Vice Chancellor, 51% quorum is required. There must be some specific quorum for Executive Committee of PUSC. That was why, the meeting had been allowed to continue and make recommendations.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that there is a different quorum for the meetings of the Executive Committee of PUSC.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is provision of 4 members quorum for the meetings of Faculty of Engineering & Technology.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that it should be got checked whether the quorum was complete in the meeting of Executive Committee of PUSC.

The Vice Chancellor said that it would be got checked.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the Executive Committee of PUSC has recommended Rs.500/- per day as sitting charges to Coaches/Physical Education Teachers/Office Staff, etc., visiting for Talent Hunt Programme in addition to DA of Rs.500/- per head per day out of the Budget Head, "Indian Universities team trials, Coaching Camp, participation for World University Games, World University Championship, Asian University Championship, etc., AIU Teams/ Individual Trials, Coaching Camp, Participation in National Championship, National Games, etc., Inter University Participation in all games, including coaching camp (all type of expenditure incurred during participation), students of affiliated Colleges and Panjab University Campus for individual/team Coaching Camp, Participation in National Championship, National Games, etc.". When sitting charges of Rs.500/- are being given, where is the need for payment of additional DA?

Dr. Jagtar Singh clarified that the policy for payment to coaches, players, etc., has already been framed and approved.

Principal R.S. Jhanji clarified that sitting charges are paid to the officials, who come to supervise/officiate the games.

The Vice Chancellor said that recommendation of the Executive Committee of PUSC under Item 27 is, "To authorize Director Physical Education and Research & Sports-cum-Secretary, PUSC to depute Coaches/Physical Education teachers/Office Staff of different games to visit in different States for Talent Hunt Programme, so that the outstanding sports students can be got admitted in the Panjab University Campus as well as in the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That recommendations of the Executive Committee of PUSC dated 02.05.2023 (Item Nos.24 & 27 (ii)), **as per Appendix**, be approved.

- 10.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 17.03.2023 (**Appendix-IX**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to the observations raised by the office of the ACLA and to frame guidelines for payment of legal fee to the Advocates.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it has been recommended by the Committee that if the counsel leave the case after filing the reply/petition/appeal, 80% of the fee be paid to him/her. According to him, major work is done by the advocates after filing the reply/petition as he/she has to go to the Court for arguing. If an advocate leave the case deliberately, would he/she be debarred for some time? The Committee has further recommended that if an advocate had to go to Delhi, he/she would be allowed the fare of executive class for to and fro journey. So far as senior advocate is concerned, he has no problem, but some time the senior advocate sent his junior, who should not be allowed to be paid executive class fare, because executive class fare is permissible only to the Professors whose Grade Pay is Rs.10,000/-.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that, as pointed out by Dr. Mukesh Arora, the junior advocate deputed by the senior advocate to visit Delhi relating to a case, should not be made eligible for executive class fare. Referring to the recommendation of the Committee that the advocate be paid 80% of the fee after filing the reply/petition/appeal, he said that under Government of India norms only 25% to 35% fee is released to the advocate on filing the reply/petition/appeal and on the disposal of the case, the advocate is paid 75%/65% of the fee. But the Committee has recommended opposite, i.e., 80% on filing the reply/petition/appeal and 20% on completion. The Committee has also recommended that if the previous counsel has already filed reply/petition/appeal and claimed 80% of the fee, the new counsel shall be paid 50% of the fee. Meaning thereby, they are paying 130% fee in such cases.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra suggested that 50% of the fee should be paid on filing the reply/petition/appeal and the remaining 50% on completion of the case.

Professor Gurmeet Singh pointed out that it has been recommended that in case, the Advocate so appointed has to stay in New Delhi, one day prior to the date of hearing, he/she may be allowed fixed lump sum boarding and lodging expenses of Rs.2500/- per night. He suggested that these boarding and lodging expenses should be allowed on production of bills. Hence, this recommendation should be corrected to read as 'in case the Advocate, so appointed has to stay in New Delhi, one day prior to the date of hearing, he/she may be allowed fixed lump sum boarding and lodging expenses of Rs.2500/- per night on production of bills'.

Continuing, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that confusion in allowing fare of Executive Class to the advocates might has been got created amongst the members, because there is lot of difference between Executive Class and Economy air fare. However, there is not much difference in train fare, i.e., Shatabadi Express.

Professor Jatinder Grover clarified that even Executive Class train fare is not permissible to the Associate Professors and Assistant Professors.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that the Committee was constituted by the Vice Chancellor to find solutions to the objections raised by the Audit Department on the bills of the Advocates. The Committee had tried to address to the objections raised by the Audit. So far as fee to the Senior Advocates is concerned, the University paid a fee of Rs.12,000/- per case to the Senior Advocates and on a fee of Rs.12,000/- none of the Senior Advocate could be hired. Moreover, the Senior Advocate never filed the case and this could be vouched by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk. If a Senior Advocate is to be hired, with him a Junior Advocate has to be hired. In

fact, the Junior Advocate filed the case and the same is argued by the Senior Advocate in the Court. Furthermore, even the Retainers of the University are not designated as Senior Advocates. It is not possible for the University to afford Senior Advocates. So far as payment of 80% or 50% of the fee to the advocate on reply/petition/appeal is concerned, 50% of the amount meant Rs.6,000/-, on which even a Munshi could not be hired in the High Court. The main work is only filing of reply/petition, thereafter, the case is to be argued. Such an incident occurred only in rarest of the rare case, as till date none of the advocate had left the case in between. They had just addressed the objection raised by the Audit. Only those advocates had left the case, who got elevated as Judges, and even those cases were taken care of by their juniors.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that so far as permission of executive class fare to the Advocates is concerned, only in few cases the advocates go to Delhi. As pointed out by Professor Gurmeet Singh, there would not be much difference between executive class and economy fare. Moreover, they are already allowing the advocates to travel by his/her own car/taxi. In nutshell, he said that the Committee had addressed to the objections raised by the Audit.

Principal R.S. Jhanji clarified that the Committee had just split the fee to be paid to the advocates just to settle the Audit objection and had not recommended any increase in the fees.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that normally, a case took 10 years time to get settled. There would not be any advocate, who would leave the case after filing the reply/petition.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that, tomorrow they have to enhance the fee to be paid to the advocates.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it is being reasoned that it is not possible to hire an advocate at a meagre fee of Rs.12,000/- per case. He had suggested a name of a person for appointment as advocate in some of the meetings of the Syndicate, but he has not been appointed, whereas it is being pleaded that it is not possible to hire an advocate at a fee of Rs.12,000/-. He had given the application of a candidate, who had topped from a University of Bangalore. He would again submit the application of the candidate for appointing as a Lawyer. The candidate should be appointed if found meritorious.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk observed that the Committee had addressed to the major concerns, but fee to be paid to the advocates also needed to be enhanced. The points taken care of by the Committee were relevant, but not as important as fee, which is required to be paid to the advocates. A proposal for payment of a fee of at least Rs.25,000/- per case should be brought in for consideration by the Syndicate. So far as authorization to Vice Chancellor for engaging/appointing two advocates is concerned, it should be allowed only if Senior Advocate is required to be engaged/appointed, for which a minimum fee of Rs.50,000/- should be fixed. If they feel that the advocate engaged/appointed is not competent or belonged to the particular area and another advocate is required to be appointed, why he/she has been appointed? However, if they feel that this particular case is a complicated one, only then a designated Senior Advocate should be engaged.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the practice of appointing more than one advocate was started, when the petitions relating to Senate Election were filed, in which the Chancellor was also made a party. In those petitions, Shri Satya Pal Jain was representing the University from the Chancellor's side,

whereas other advocates were representing the University. When the bills of Shri Satya Pal Jain were received by the University and processed for payment, the Audit raised objection and asked in what type of cases the University needed to hire two advocates. This Committee was appointed by the Vice Chancellor to settle the Audit objections. The Committee made its recommendations point-wise and the recommendations of the Committee have been placed before the Syndicate for consideration and approval, so that these issues are resolved for all times to come. He added that they could themselves see that the University did not hire more than one advocate in majority of the cases.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that so far as payment of 80% of the fee on reply/petition/appeal is concerned, first of all, in Government institutions, such a practice did not exist. Moreover, in Government institutions such a meagre fee of Rs.12,000/- is not paid to the advocates. Citing an example, he said that in U.T. Administration, a fee of Rs.25,000/- is being given, and after filing the reply, 1/3rd of the fee is paid. According to him, the recommendations of the Committee needed to be amended and the fee is to be raised to minimum of Rs.25,000/- per case. Thereafter, they did not need to pay 80% of the fee to the advocates after filing of reply; they should follow the norms of the UT Administration or Government of India on this issue.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that so far as the suggestion given by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk is concerned, another Committee has been constituted by the Vice Chancellor comprising Shri Lajwant Singh Virk, he himself (Dr. Dinesh Kumar) and Professor Devinder Singh as Chairman. The recommendations of the Committee were placed before the Syndicate in its previous meeting. In fact, they had decided in the meeting that the issues relating to revising fee to be paid to the advocates and appointment of Legal Retainers would be decided in the next meeting, but the panel of advocates was approved. They would discuss these issues when the recommendations of the Committee relating to aforesaid issues would be placed before the Syndicate. In this, the main recommendation of the Committee is that 80% of the fee should be paid to the advocates on filing of reply/petition/appeal and if they wanted to make it 50% or less, they could do so.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the fee of advocates certainly needed to be enhanced, but if any of the advocates deliberately leave the case after filing the reply and claiming 80% of the fee, he/she should at least be debarred for a year.

Professor Devinder Singh said that he had also a member of this Committee for about 10 years as now Dr. Dinesh Kumar is. On the issue of leaving the case by the advocates, he would like to say that none of the advocates leave the case. But recently, Shri Gupta, advocate, who resides at Panchkula, returned some files saying that now his age do not permit him to continue. In those 10-15 cases, where 80% of the fees had been paid to him, new advocates had to be appointed. Perhaps, the Audit had raised the objection as to how fee could be paid to these advocates as 80% of the fees had already been paid to Shri Gupta.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that it is good that they are retaining the advocates, because it is true that none of the advocate would be ready to work merely on a fee of Rs.12000/- per case. In certain cases relating to service matters, the University needed to hire Senior Advocates, for which the Vice Chancellor is authorized to appoint Senior Advocate. He also suggested that the fee to the Senior Advocates should be paid as is being paid by the Central Government. He is not talking about Panjab University. All other universities are making payment to the Standing Counsel as per the norms of the Central Government. In certain cases, the Standing Counsels have to be paid a fee of Rs.1 lac per hearing and sometime more.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that at the moment, about 1400 cases are filed against the University in the Courts and about 4-5 cases relating to extension in age of superannuation of teachers got added every month. Fee is to be paid to the advocates for each and every case.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that though money did not matter, either the Professors, who are allowed to travel by economy class, should also be allowed executive class fare or the advocates should also be not allowed the executive class fare.

Professor Devinder Singh said that a Committee, of which he is a member, has already been constituted to consider all these points which are being raised now. Now, two views have emerged – (i) that Senior Advocates should be engaged; and (ii) two advocates should be engaged for defending important cases. He assured that all the points, which have been raised by the members, would be considered in the meeting of the Committee. However, he would like to tell them to engage advocate, is a matter of trust. They could themselves see that if the Chief Minister of Punjab got changed within period of two months, the Advocate General is also got changed simultaneously. Only those advocates should be appointed, who have good rapport with University. Citing an example, he said that the newly elected Himachal Pradesh Government appointed a young advocate as an Advocate General, who has not yet been designated as Senior Advocate, which proves that to appoint advocate, is a matter of trust.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the last recommendation, “In case, the Advocate so appointed has to stay in New Delhi prior to the date of hearing, he/she may be allowed fixed lump sum boarding and lodging expensive of Rs.2500 per night” should be amended as **“In case, the Advocate so appointed has to stay in New Delhi prior to the date of hearing, he/she may be allowed fixed lump sum boarding and lodging expensive of Rs.2500 per night on production of bill.”**

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the mandate of the Committee was to remove the objections raised by the Audit Department. Hence, as of now, the recommendations of the Committee should be approved.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the Advocates and Senior Advocates of the University did not fight cases of the University for money. In fact, some of them are alumni of the University. Even though the Advocates of the University are paid less, but sometimes they proved better in the Court than their counterparts who charged a fee of Rs.1 lac per hearing. At certain points of time, they made special requests to Shri Anupam Gupta to represent the University and he agreed & represented the University in the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not the mandate of this Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that, as said by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk, if the mandate of the Committee is only to take care of the Audit objection, then it is okay.

The Vice Chancellor said that the mandate of the Committee is to take care of the Audit objections only.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 17.03.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved with the stipulation that the last line of recommendation 5 be modified as **“In case, the Advocate so appointed has to stay in New Delhi prior to the date of hearing, he/she may be allowed fixed lump**

sum boarding and lodging expensive of Rs.2500 per night on production of bill.”.

Professor Jatinder Grover recorded his dissent on allowing the executive class fare to Junior Advocates.

11. Considered –

- (i) proposal (through e-mail) dated 25.05.2023 (**Appendix-X**) of Dr. Amit Joshi, Dean, Faculty of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture that the “Undergraduate Board of Studies in Agriculture” be renamed as “Undergraduate Board of Studies of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture”.
- (ii) the change in nomenclature of Postgraduate Board of Studies in Agriculture as Postgraduate Board of Studies of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture .

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

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh pointed out that Dr. Amit Joshi had referred to NEP in his e-mail. It would have been better, if the relevant portion of the NEP had been provided to the members for ready reference. Has it been mentioned in the NEP that the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Board of Studies in Agriculture should be renamed as “Undergraduate Board of Studies in Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture and Postgraduate Board of Studies in Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture”? Perhaps, it might not been there in the NEP. Secondly, is any course in Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture being offered in this University? If the detailed information about this provided to them, probably, they would be able to appreciate it. Even if the name is to be changed, it should be Board of Studies in Agriculture, Dairying and Animal Husbandry.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that Dr. Amit Joshi had done a lot of work relating to NEP and there is no doubt about it. So far as he knew, the agriculture is a broader term. Moreover, this proposal should come through the Faculty of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Amit Joshi is the Dean of Faculty of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture.

To this, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Dean of the Faculty has no authority to get the name of the Faculty changed. The word ‘Agriculture’ has been included in the Faculty because the subject of Agriculture is taught in certain affiliated Colleges, whereas the subject of Dairying and Animal Husbandry are not being taught. Secondly, the subject of Agriculture included other subjects like Dairying, Animal Husbandry, Fishery, etc.

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

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that what Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua meant to say is that the proposal should come through the system, which has been laid down.

Shri Varinder Singh remarked that the members should discuss the issue logically.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that there is only one Board of Studies in Agriculture and there is no other Board under the Faculty of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture. He suggested that the Board should be renamed as Board of Studies in Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture.

Professor Gurmeet Singh and Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that several Boards of Studies existed in a Faculty.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, citing an example, said that under the Faculty of Language, there are separate Boards of Studies in each subject, i.e., Hindi, Punjabi, English, Urdu, etc. He, therefore, suggested that the Board of Studies in Agriculture should remain as such and other Boards, i.e., Board of Studies in Dairying, Board of Studies in Animal Husbandry, Board of Studies in Fisheries should be constituted separately.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that there could be many Boards under a Faculty.

The Vice Chancellor said that according to her, this proposal is not required to come through the Faculty of Dairying, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry, because the Deans have been authorized by the Faculties to take decisions in academic matters. The only thing is that it would not be a single Board of Studies; rather, there would be separate Boards of Studies, i.e., Board of Studies in Agriculture, Board of Studies in Dairying and Board of Studies in Animal Husbandry.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since no subject is being taught under this Faculty, what would the Boards proposed to be constituted do?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the subject of Agriculture included Dairying, Animal Husbandry, and other branches of Agriculture. In fact, Agriculture is a broader term. Why are they trying to limit its scope?

The Vice Chancellor said that why the name of the Faculty is, "Faculty of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture"?

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that since the proposal had come from the Dean, Faculty of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture, it should be approved.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the Dean must have discussed this matter with his other colleagues. Hence, it should be approved.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

1. the "Undergraduate Board of Studies in Agriculture" be renamed as "**Undergraduate Board of Studies of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture**"; and .
2. the nomenclature of Postgraduate Board of Studies in Agriculture be changed to that of **Postgraduate Board of Studies of Dairying, Animal Husbandry and Agriculture**.

- 12.** Considered if, the validity of the advertisement No.1/2022 for filling up the posts i.e. Registrar-1 and Dean College Development Council-1, be extended, for one year more from the last date of advertisement. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XI**) was also taken into consideration.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, first of all, during the last one year, several more persons would have become eligible for the posts of Registrar and Dean, College Development Council. Till date, the University had not done anything on the applications received for these posts. Under 2nd paragraph at page 60, it has been written that the screening process of these posts is yet to be initiated. Meaning thereby, the process has not been initiated. The people had just filled up the forms by paying a sum of Rs.375/-. He, therefore, suggested that the posts should be re-advertised and the fee should at least be fixed at Rs.2,500/-, because whosoever would apply for the post of Registrar or Dean, College Development Council, he/she would at least be of the rank of Professor and would be drawing a minimum salary of Rs.2.75 lac. He/She could not be an unemployed person, who could be allowed to fill up the form by paying a sum of Rs.375/-. If the application fee is raised to Rs.2,500/- each, they would be able to meet the entire expenses to be incurred on the process of selection. He, therefore, suggested that the posts of Registrar and Dean, College Development Council, should be re-advertised as majority of the persons did not apply at that time due to certain reasons, which he did not want to discuss here. Moreover, much time would not be taken to fill up these posts.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the process for filling up these posts should be completed within a stipulated time.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that the validity of advertisement should be extended for a year.

To this, a couple of members, namely Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Dr. Jagtar Singh, said that the validity of the advertisement should not be extended for a year.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the posts should be re-advertised. One of the members of this House has applied for one of these posts, but he is going to retire soon. What he meant to say is that some of the persons, who had applied for these posts, have retired and certain others are going to retire shortly. He, therefore, suggested that these posts should be re-advertised and along with these the other posts, which are lying vacant, should also be advertised.

Shri Varinder Singh said that already a much time had got elapsed and if they re-advertised the posts, at least one and a half year more would be taken to fill up these posts.

Professor Jatinder Grover intervened to say that it would not take one and a half year; rather, the posts would be filled up within 3 months.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that what is the fault of those, who have applied for these posts?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that those, who have already applied, be asked to update their CVs.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that the office has written, “huge expenditure will be involved in issuing fresh advertisement”, which is not an appropriate reason for re-advertising the posts. They could re-advertise the posts and ask the candidates to apply within a month. So far as the point that it would take another one and a half year to fill up these posts, is concerned, it depended on the Vice Chancellor to get the process of selection completed. Even if the posts are re-advertised, probably, the Vice Chancellor would get the selection process completed within 3 months or might not get the process completed for 2 years.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if they go through the office note, they would find that the process has not even initiated. He does not think that the envelopes have been opened.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that they are depriving the persons from their due right, who have become eligible during the intervening period.

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

Shri Varinder Singh reiterated that these posts should not be re-advertised; rather, the validity of the advertisement should be extended.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the validity of advertisement should be extended for one year and they should try to complete the process of selection as early as possible.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that the persons, who have applied, are waiting for the interview.

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

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that is it not possible to give one month's time to the new candidates to apply after extending the validity of the advertisement?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is always possible that a notice could be issued that the persons, who have already applied, need not to apply again, but they could update their CVs.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that why they are not giving opportunity to the persons, who have become eligible now.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the year 2020 and half of 2021 got wasted due to Covid-19. Had the Registrar been appointed a year before, how would the new persons, who have become eligible now, been appointed?

The Vice Chancellor said that the fee for the application of these posts was Rs.375 and they received 68 applications for the post of Registrar and about 100 for the post of Dean, College Development Council. The way they functioned, for everything the expenditure of the University is always more than the income. How they are going to run this University?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, that is why, he is suggesting that a minimum fee of Rs.2,500/- should be fixed for the posts of Registrar and Dean, College Development Council.

The Vice Chancellor said that, on the one hand, they are not reducing their expenditure, and on the other hand, they did not want to increase the income.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that the ways and means to enhance the income of the University should be got explored from the Registrar and other members of the Senate and Syndicate. How could a teacher, who is not being paid a salary of Rs.10,000/-, apply for the post of Registrar/Dean, College Development Council, if a fee of Rs.2,500/- is fixed? In which direction, they are going?

The Vice Chancellor said that what they meant to say is that they always wanted to increase the expenditure of the University, but always reluctant to increase the income.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if a person, who is to get a salary of Rs.2.75 lac per month as Registrar/Dean, College Development Council, could not pay a fee of Rs.2500/5000, he/she should not apply. Moreover, it is not compulsory for a person to apply for these posts. There is no University in the country, where the fee for the posts at the level of Registrar or Dean, College Development Council is less than Rs.2,500/-.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that the posts of Registrar and Dean, College Development Council are very crucial posts. He suggested that these posts should be re-advertised, so that the persons, who had become eligible now, could get an opportunity.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that a meeting of the Committee had already been held and the Committee had recommended a fee of Rs.2000/- for the posts of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor. So far as the post of Registrar and Dean, College Development Council is concerned, they could fix the fee of Rs.4000/- or Rs.5000/- here.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the process for filling up these posts could not be completed as initially Professor Renu Vig was given the charge of Vice Chancellor temporarily after the resignation of former Vice Chancellor, Professor Raj Kumar. Thereafter, when she was appointed Vice Chancellor in third week of March, she needed some time to settle down. He, therefore, suggested that the validity of the advertisement should be extended for a year so that she could fill up these posts. Moreover, what is the fault of the persons, who have already applied for these posts?

RESOLVED: That the posts Registrar-1 and Dean College Development Council-1, be re-advertised with a clause that those, who have already applied, need not to apply again, but can update their *curriculum vitae*.

- 13.** Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 11.04.2023 (**Appendix-XII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that provision of Administrative Charges mentioned at Sr. No. 5.10, be deleted in Consultancy Rules of Panjab University as under:-

Existing	Modified
5. While working out the cost of consultancy project, the following be taken into consideration.	No Change

5.1	Cost of Consultants' time, including intellectual fee.	No Change
5.2	Cost of man days of the staff taking part in the project excluding the consultant(s)	No Change
5.3	T.A. and D.A. (as per agreement with the client)	No Change
5.4	Cost of inputs (like chemicals, raw material and other types of consumable (s) and equipments	No Change
5.5	Usage charges on equipments (including depreciation and utilities, inter alia)	No Change
5.6	Payment of outside consultants	No Change
5.7	Cost of stationary	No Change
5.8	Computer charges	No Change
5.9	Miscellaneous	No Change
	5.10 Administrative charges (10% of 5.2 to 5.9)	5.10 Deleted
5.11	Service Tax Charges (as per government notification)	No Change
7.	The distribution of consultancy amount. will be paid to the University as administrative charges. funding industry relevant projects, patenting etc.	No Change

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that would there be no loss to the university with the deletion of this rule?

The Vice Chancellor said that loss in the revenue would be there, but consultancy services are only being provided by the University teachers themselves.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that earlier, double charges were being deducted.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that it has been written at page 64 that 3% out of consultancy amount is to be paid to Panjab University as administrative charges. There is also a mention of administrative charges at Sr. no. 5.10 in consultancy rules of Panjab University. Both the charges are different, which meant that double charges are not being deducted. Now, what is happening is that if somebody has become beneficiary, 5.10 Rule seems to be irrelevant to him/her.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said while explaining, that when someone gets the consultancy project, at the initial stage, 10% is being paid to University and 18% is gone under G.S.T.; hence, the total becomes 28%. Thereafter, of the remaining, 70% is given to the Department concerned and out of the remaining 30%, 50% again given to the University. Out of that some share maybe 10% or 12% is given to CIIPP. Thus, it is meant to say that its share is attributed to the University twice, one as Administrative Charges of 10%, secondly out of the 30% of the share of the

University, 10% is being given to the University. Hence, it is only that the 10% charges, which are being charged at the initial stage, should not be deducted. If the administrative charges out of 30% would not be deducted, ultimately that share of 70% would be increased. It is only to be considered that administrative charges should not be charged twice, so that the Principal Investigator would bring more consultancy projects, so they would not have such feeling that their money is given to University twice and it should not be such that they could not do the work in the consultancy project.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that reason is that, in this case the anomaly is only that head of administrative charges has been used/deducted twice. They could not understand as to what is the logic in charging administrative charges @ 10% initially and later the same is also being charged out of the share of 30%.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it should be made clear whether the administrative charges @ 3% levied at the initial stage or the administrative charges @ 10% being charged later, is to be removed.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is the proposal from the faculty and Director, R&D.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that from these consultancy projects, the interaction is increased which should be got encouraged. He understood the viewpoint of Dr. H.S. Dua that one thing is mentioned at two places, one is @ 3% and at other place it is 10%, why the condition of 10% has been removed instead of 3% as duplicacy would be ended there also if they remove the charges @ 3%.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they are on this side of the table, and on the other side, the Governing body is sitting, which have to consider the decision recommended by the Committee. As Governing body, they have to decide as to what option is best suited for the interest of the University, as they would not be interested to discourage the consultancy projects, and at the same time, they should not discourage any financial loss to the University. If they are proposing to remove 10% charges, then the condition of 3% charges could also be removed. They can consider the charges for removal on 50% (half and half) basis. If the total comes to 13%, they should consider to remove the condition of 7% of charges also. They should not deal with the things according to their choice. At some places, where they are not directly affected, they propose to impose the charging of Rs.5000/- or more instantly.

The Vice Chancellor said that consultancy charges are usually very low, hence it is proposed to remove the condition of charging 10% of administrative charges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, referring to page 66 of the note at the bottom, it is written that, "3% of consultancy sum (existing rule) to be paid to Panjab University as Administrative Charges may be approved". Basically, the charges of 3% are mentioned at both the places. The confusion has got created due to the reason that percentage of administrative charges is the same. When initially 3% administrative charges are deducted and what would they deduct now, either they should consider to deduct 3% at the initial or at the total amount?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had no problem in approving this item, but its perception which appears outside, is the issue of concern. While quoting the issue pertaining to charges for conduct of Counselling of UIET, he said that they

should know as to what were these charges, how the same were disbursed. He is not saying that this should be removed, but they should have the exact figure of the amount. For example, the charges to conduct the Counseling of UIET is done on the basis of rotation, the Governing body should know as to what amount a particular teacher is getting from the Counseling for one month or one week. One teacher located at UIET is getting Rs.2 lacs, whereas the teacher sitting in Social Science Departments are getting Rs.2,000/-. Whenever the profit and loss statements are made, either dealing in Engineering departments or Social Science departments, a uniform policy should be framed. If entrance tests are conducted in all these departments, they should know the exact figure which is being paid to teachers.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the matter, the Committee had been constituted by the Syndicate. When the said Committee gives its recommendations, the same would be placed before the Syndicate.

To this, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that Syndicate had not constituted the Committee, the DUI had formed the Committee.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the current data would be placed before the Syndicate, but the information pertaining to year 2021 and 2022 is not available, at least they should be made aware as to what is going on?

The Vice Chancellor said that there is a Committee to which F.D.O. is also the part of the it, whenever the Committee gives its recommendations, the same would be placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that as members of this Governing Body, they should be made aware as to what amount a teacher is getting for performing duties in Counselling in University Institute of Engineering & Technology? The perception is that for the Counselling in UIET, an amount of Rs.2 to 2.5 lacs is being paid. He asked, is it correct?

The Vice Chancellor replied that she had no idea about it. However, she requested Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua to send an e-mail relating to his queries, so that it could be got examined.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua asked, whether the said item would be placed in the next meeting. He said that he is not talking about the Committee constituted by the present Vice Chancellor, he is asking about the information pertaining to years 2021 and 2022.

RESOLVED: That provision of Administrative Charges mentioned at Sr. No. 5.10, be deleted in Consultancy Rules of Panjab University as under:-

Existing		Modified
5.	While working out the cost of consultancy project, the following be taken into consideration.	No Change
5.1	Cost of Consultants' time, including intellectual fee.	No Change
5.2	Cost of man days of the staff taking part in the project excluding the consultant(s)	No Change

5.3	T.A. and D.A. (as per agreement with the client)	No Change
5.4	Cost of inputs (like chemicals, raw material and other types of consumable (s) and equipments	No Change
5.5	Usage charges on equipments (including depreciation and utilities, inter alia)	No Change
5.6	Payment of outside consultants	No Change
5.7	Cost of stationary	No Change
5.8	Computer charges	No Change
5.9	Miscellaneous	No Change
5.10	Administrative charges (10% of 5.2 to 5.9)	5.10 Deleted
5.11	Service Tax Charges (as per government notification)	No Change
7.	The distribution of consultancy amount. will be paid to the University as administrative charges. funding industry relevant projects, patenting etc.	No Change

14. Considered the enquiry report dated 02.11.2022 (**Appendix-XIII**) submitted by Shri Jagroop Singh Mahal, Chairman of the Enquiry Committee regarding complaint received from Sh. Sanjay Walia of M/S Powerlite Electricals against Sh. Kulwant Singh, SDE (Electrical), Construction Office, Panjab University. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XIII**) was also taken into consideration.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that it is a very strange enquiry where Sh. Mahal had given the clean chit to the delinquent official, whereas the other Enquiry Officer Sh. P.L. Ahuja had showed major involvement. Hence, it has rightly been said that what type of legal opinion is sought, it is provided. After going through both the reports, very strange things have been noticed. Its details would be apprised by Dr. Parveen Goyal as he had read the same minutely.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that in the earlier meeting of the Syndicate held on 27th May, 2023, where he discussed the issue for about 35 minutes and it was decided that University would appoint Investigating Officer and item was approved at that time. Hence, this item is approved this time also.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as also stated by Dr. Mukesh Arora, that two separate Judges had conducted the enquiry. The enquiry was conducted by two Judges, but they had different mandates. The mandate with Sh. P.L. Ahuja was to enquire about the absence of duty without taking permission, and he has proposed punishment accordingly, whereas the other issue of enquiry was entrusted to second Judge. Hence, both the enquiries had not been conducted on a single issue. The Enquiry Officers had submitted their reports.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to what decision has been taken in the matter.

It was informed that item is approved.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that such type of agenda issues are raised in every meeting of the Syndicate. But it is not pointed out that working in XEN office is not proper. It is pointed out owing to the reason that such type of enquiries and allegations have been brought by the Vice Chancellor and they could see that no Agenda is without an enquiry. They should contact personally or call him to enquire the issues which he (Dr. Parveen Goyal) or any other person usually raised in every meeting of the Syndicate, to know as to what is the reality in these issues by forming some Committee of 3-4 members.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should propose the name of the person who is to be deputed at the place of XEN. They should recommend the name of the person to whom his charge is to be given.

Professor Gurmeet Singh and Dr. Dinesh Kumar recommended the name of Dr. Parveen Goyal for giving the additional charge of XEN.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that as to what would be the solution to these problems?

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no use to form the Committee as several Committees had been constituted in the matter. They would take decision on this matter with any other means instead of forming Committees.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they should at least be aware that something is being done in the matter to curtail such malpractices.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that on item C-14, he would like to state that Hon'ble Chancellor had desired that actions, owing to which the former Vice Chancellor had to leave, should not be repeated. They should not leave these issues/complaints unattended. Recently on 8th May, 2023, a budget of Rs.3,36,40,552/- was approved, where after going through, they would find out that type of work, source of income, vendor is the same and even the Convener is same and other members of the Committee like Registrar and F.D.O. are same. But the amount of the tender of Rs.3,36,40,552/- had been divided into 28 tenders amounting to below Rs.15 lacs.

The Vice Chancellor stated that next year, it would not be done in this manner.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that this matter should be taken care of as also suggested by the Hon'ble Chancellor. This tender has been converted into 28 tenders comprising of amount below Rs.15 lacs. He is not only saying rather it is the general public, who is also expressing that embezzlements are being made.

The Vice Chancellor said that she had already constituted the Committee for the purpose, where it has been written "to fix the responsibility". She said that she is aware about these things, next year such things would not happen.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that for fixing the responsibilities on the complaints made regarding construction of UIAMS building, a Committee comprising of Professor Rajat Sandhir and Secretary to Vice Chancellor, has been formed.

Shri Varinder Singh intervened to say that current projects of construction should not be stopped due to previous issues.

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

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the enquiry report dated 02.11.2022 (**Appendix-XIII**) submitted by Shri Jagroop Singh Mahal, Chairman of the Enquiry Committee regarding complaint received from Sh. Sanjay Walia of M/S Powerlite Electricals against Sh. Kulwant Singh, SDE (Electrical), Construction Office, Panjab University, be accepted.

- 15.** Considered request dated 11.04.2023 (**Appendix-XIV**) of Principal, Saint Sahara College of Education, Sri Muktsar Sahib with regard to reimburse the permanent affiliation fee of worth Rs.2 lac relating to year 2012. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XIV**) was also taken into consideration.

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh said referring to page 109 where it is written that the College had deposited Rs.2 lac in the year 2012 for getting the permanent affiliation. In the second para, it is written that D.R. (Accounts) had informed that Rs.2 lac was received, which was conveyed in the year 2022. Later on, in this regard, the office had again sought the clarification to which the College had informed that they had already deposited the affiliation fee of Rs.2 lacs. The office again sought clarification from concerned quarters and the Deputy Registrar (Accounts) and the Finance & Development Officer informed that they had received the amount of fee of Rs.2 lacs. It could not be understood as to why the receipt of Rs.2 lacs was communicated in the year 2022 and in the year 2023, they told that amount has been credited in the account. Secondly, on which basis, the College is demanding the affiliation after 2012. He felt sorry to know, how the University is functioning as the communication pertaining to 2012 was conveyed in the year 2022. This should be got examined and even one Memo should be sent to the concerned at fault. He is not saying that responsibility should be fixed as the system is functioning on these lines. At least some notice/memo should be given. They were writing in their office note that no credit entry was shown in the year 2012 and later on in 2022, they had written that Rs.2 lacs had been deposited. The logic which was given is that Rs.2,18,000/- was received and in that amount the sum of Rs.2 lacs was included.

Several members said that they should refund the amount of Rs.2 lacs to the College.

The Vice Chancellor said that this should be examined as to why they had delayed in responding the receipt of Rs.2 lacs.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in one of the case of the College where theft had occurred, but the said case has not been placed as they did not get the information from the Accounts Branch in writing as to what amount was stolen from that College.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested that some Committee may be formed in this matter.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this time, the amount of Rs.2 lacs should be refunded and for future, a Committee should be formed.

RESOLVED: That a sum of Rs.2 lac deposited for grant of permanent affiliation, be reimbursed to Saint Sahara College of Education, Sri Muktsar Sahib, but responsibility for delaying the process of grant of permanent affiliation be fixed.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor for framing modalities

16.

Considered –

- (i) minutes of the Affiliation Committee dated 22.03.2023 (**Appendix-XV**), constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 04.02.2023.
- (ii) minutes of the Affiliation Committee dated 03.05.2023 (**Appendix-XV**), constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 04.02.2023.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua, while referring to affiliation cases listed in the minutes of the Affiliation Committee at S.No.40, said that there is a mention of the College named Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur. Everybody in the House is very much aware about the said College. It should be got examined before granting affiliation, whether B.Sc. (Agriculture) course is in existence or not, because according to him this course had been shut down.

Dr. Mukesh Arora and Dr. Jagtar Singh said that this affiliation for B.Sc. (Agriculture) is for the outgoing students for the academic session 2022-23.

Shri Varinder Singh asked Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua whether in his College the retiral benefits and P.F. is being paid or not.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua replied that his College is the first College in the Punjab where 7th Pay Commission has been implemented. Moreover, he pointed out and asked Shri Varinder Singh that he should not be personal in any of the official meetings.

Continuing, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that a lengthy deliberation was held in the meeting of the Senate pointing out that these are the 3-4 Colleges in Punjab, where mass copying is taking place. They should take some conscious decision, as they being the members of the Affiliation Committee might have seen the reports, whether they would continue to run Examination Centres in these Colleges. Even the Centre Superintendents and Flying Squads are not interested in visiting these Colleges.

To this, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that cases of copying are not in the purview of the Affiliation Committee.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that, actually, what Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua would like to state is that those Colleges, which are identified for their habitual behaviour and for their major involvement in mass copying, are being granted affiliation in the interest of the students in the mid-way. Moreover, this affiliation is granted for B.Sc. (Agriculture) for the academic session 2022-23.

The Vice Chancellor said that she had already asked Professor Sanjay Kaushik to prepare a list of Colleges, which are involved in mass copying as this matter had been discussed in the meeting of the Senate. She said, as lot of discussion had been held, now it is the time to take action. The list is to be prepared by Professor Sanjay Kaushik, which would be placed before the Syndicate very soon.

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

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that the Affiliation Committee had made the observation appearing at page 128 of S.No. 42 regarding Government College,

Abohar that “case for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2022-23 was placed before the Affiliation Committee. This Affiliation Committee took a serious note for not sending the compliance. The Committee decided that why not the affiliation of the college be withdrawn, because of non-fulfilment of conditions imposed by the Inspection Committee in its report”. When action is not taken against the Government Colleges for not fulfilling the conditions imposed by the Inspection Committees, why the private Colleges would fulfil the conditions?

Shri Varinder Singh said that he had also raised the issue in the meeting of the Senate that when the Government Colleges have not fulfilled the requirement, then how could they point out the private Colleges.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that instead of going to Government Colleges, they should check as to what is done in the University teaching departments.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that they had not constituted the Committee, the Punjab Government had formed the Committee, where the Registrar was the member. So he requested the Registrar to apprise the House.

It was informed that a meeting was held with Director, Higher Education (Punjab), where two recommendations had been made. In fact, the Government had taken a serious view of the Colleges, which did not deduct Provident Fund and pay salaries as per University Rules. The Government has taken the decision to withhold the grant of such Colleges. Secondly, they are also recommending to the U.G.C. to take decision relating to disaffiliation from the next academic session. The minutes of the Committee are awaited, when the minutes would come, the same would be forwarded to the Affiliation Committee for taking decision accordingly.

Shri Sandeep Singh asked the name of the College against whom they are talking.

It was informed that this issue is for Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that some of the Colleges are saying that 7th Pay Commission would not be implemented in their Colleges, whereas his College is implementing the same. The Colleges, which had implemented 7th Pay Commission, should be appreciated, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that this time, the examination centre at Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur, should be cancelled.

To this, the Vice Chancellor said that Centre of examinations would only be created at the places where CCTV cameras are installed.

It was informed that when the Examination Centres were cancelled, they knocked the door of the Court and got the stay orders.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that it is meant that they could not take decision due to fear of stay orders of the Court.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that when he was in D.A.V. College, Abohar, he visited this College at Ferozepur, in 2002. During the examination of English, it was announced to deposit the papers/slips, a full bag of cheating slips was found and even after that, 10 UMC cases were made.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that earlier also when the Examination Centres were cancelled, some Senators got re-created the Centres to impress the voters.

Shri Varinder Singh said that though the members are of the opinion that something wrong is being done, they are granting approval to the teachers at the time of election to woo the voters for which he had already made complaints.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Vice Chancellor is also aware that Affiliation Committee was constituted in the meeting of the Syndicate. It was unanimously approved in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, that Shri Sandeep Singh should be added in the Affiliation Committee. In spite of repeated requests to the Registrar, his name had not been included in the Affiliation Committee. He requested that before next meeting of the Affiliation Committee, the name of Shri Sandeep Singh should be added. When Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that the name of Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua should also be added in the Committee, he said that his name should not be added in the Affiliation Committee, only one name of Shri Sandeep Singh should be added.

Several members suggested that the name of Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua should also be added.

Principal R.S. Jhanji and Shri Varinder Singh suggested that they should be excluded from the Affiliation Committee and the names of Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and Shri Sandeep Singh should be added.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that at this moment, it would be wrong to add his name in the Affiliation Committee. He further stated that none of the members would be excluded from the Committee, only the name of Shri Sandeep Singh is to be added in the Affiliation Committee.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Affiliation Committee dated 22.03.2023 and 03.05.2023 constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 04.02.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Shri Sandeep Singh be also appointed a member of the Affiliation Committee.

17. Considered if, the following committee of three examiners, for award of Doctor of Literature degree to Brig. M.P. Singh (Retd.), be approved:-

1. Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh, PVSM, AVSM (Retd.)
A-1/33, GF, DLF Valley
Near Amravati Enclave
Panchkula-134105
Mob: 09952039375
E-mail: Gopaljim73@Gmail.Com

2. Professor Ashutosh Kumar
Lala Lajpat Rai Chair
Department of Political Science
Panjab University, Chandigarh
Dr. T N Seshan Visiting Chair Professor, IIIDEM
Election Commission of India, New Delhi
Mob: 9815084030
E-mail: ashutoshchd@gmail.com

3. Professor Mahesh Sharma
Professor of History
Chair, DES-Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre,
Panjab University, Sector-14
Chandigarh-160014
Mob: 9463976187
E-mail: replymahesh@gmail.com
Mahesh.sharma@fulbrightmail.org

NOTE: 1. Rule 4 at page 197 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 is reproduced as under:-

1. The work submitted shall be referred to three examiners nominated by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor. The degree shall only be awarded if all three examiners recommend award of the degree.

2. A copy of letter dated 06.06.2023 of Director, R& DC was enclosed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar drew the attention of the House towards Regulation 2.2 at page 198 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007, where it is written that Syndicate would prescribe the fee, after permission by the Vice Chancellor, for taking decision in the matter. If the publications are to be sent to the Examiners, some honorarium is also to be paid to them for evaluation. A minimum expenditure of Rs.15000/- would be spent by the University. Hence, the Syndicate should prescribe a minimum fee of Rs.50,000/-. It is not the *Honoris Causa* degree, where the name is proposed by the University. The applicant has applied for award of D.Litt. degree. According to him, here the applicant is retired Army personnel, who might have good earnings; hence, the fee is to be prescribed by the Syndicate as per Regulation 2.2. A good amount of fee should be prescribed to meet the expenses of the office and other allied activities for awarding the D.Litt. degree. Earlier also, a Committee was constituted, where he was also involved and after evaluation, it was found that all the work done by the candidate for award of degree, was not valid. According to him, as a lot of manpower and time is consumed in it, a good amount of fee should be prescribed for the same.

Dr. Shiv Kumar Dogra and Dr. Parveen Goyal said that at least an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be prescribed per year.

To this, Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that Rs.50,000/- should be prescribed as total fees till the award of degree. He quoted the case of retired Principal of a Government College, whose application had been rejected thrice and still University had to complete the whole process thrice, and ultimately, the Syndicate had to constitute a Committee to examine as to why the matter was sent to the Examiners

directly. At that time, he observed that how tedious process it was, where the Secrecy Branch as well as General Branch and the concerned department was involved. A notional fee should be prescribed as the candidates are applying for this degree, as their past-time requirement.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that for prescribing the fee, the Regulations are very much clear. He is not talking about the fee. He would like to quote that in the item, the field/area of research has not been mentioned by the person to whom the degree is to be awarded. The documents annexed with the item do not contain any information regarding their area of research, whereas they had only provided the list of examiners. He felt sorry to point out that this is the similar case, he himself read the recommendations in the Syndicate, for awarding the D.Litt. degree to Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh. When the recommendations had been placed of a person in the Syndicate and now at the same time, the University is considering him to appoint him as the Examiner, is not justified. The bio-data of both Professor Ashutosh Kumar and Professor Mahesh Sharma, are very well defined. It should be made clear whether the degree, which is to be awarded, is for the Social Sciences or for the Literature. He remembered that it was pointed out to Lt. Gen. K.J. Singh that to provide the total work done by him, to which the reply was received that his books had been lost.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he does not think that their Professors like Professor Mahesh Sharma would recommend wrong work.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the University is appointing these examiners. He is not pointing out to change the examiner, he would have asked for change of Examiner, only if he had the knowledge about this field of research. The agenda brought by the Vice Chancellor is a regular feature for her, but not for him.

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

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that consideration of the item should be deferred and it should again be placed before the Syndicate with complete documents.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that hefty fee should be prescribed for D.Litt. degree as it is the highest degree awarded by the University. If the members are of the opinion that the work submitted by the candidate is not up to the required standard, the request of the candidate could be rejected. If they applied for the same, after evaluation, their submissions would be rejected and University would be get the benefit of fee of Rs.50,000/-.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that being member of the Syndicate, how could they appoint such type of an Examiner, who is not from the relevant field?

Several members suggested that fee of Rs.50,000/- should be prescribed.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it would not be appropriate to decide about the fee, when the credentials for the Degree are not clear. When the file will be placed before the Syndicate, they would check the credentials and decide the fee. It is not worth to get the degree of D.Litt. from Panjab University.

Shri Varinder Singh suggested that the Vice Chancellor should be authorized to take decision on behalf of the Syndicate.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra suggested that a specific policy should be framed regarding eligibility of a person for admission in D.Litt. degree.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is the prerogative of the Syndicate to take decision regarding appointment of examiners, so after annexing the relevant documents, the matter is supposed to come to the Syndicate. It is not the Bachelors' degree; it is the degree which is to be awarded to two or three persons in five years.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he would like to submit that technically, Syndicate has to appoint three examiners, if the list of only three examiners is provided, how could it be possible to appoint three examiners. He suggested that at least names of six examiners should be provided so that they could choose three out of them. Previously, the list of 10 examiners was provided. He suggested that this item should be deferred.

RESOLVED: That –

1. a Committee be constituted by the Vice Chancellor to lay down guidelines/rules for award of D.Litt. Degrees as also to recommend fee to be charged from the aspirants;
2. the candidate be asked to inform the area of his research and provide all the documents related to the research carried out by him;
3. the list of examiners (at least 10) be provided out of which 3 shall be appointed by the Syndicate; and
4. in the meantime, the consideration of **Item C-17 on the agenda**, be deferred.

18.

Considered and

RESOLVED: That –

1. the Entrance Test for the following M.E. courses mentioned in the Prospectus for the NITTTR, be withdrawn, for the session 2023-24:-
 - (i) M.E. Electrical Engineering (Instrumentation & Control)
 - (ii) M.E. (Electronics & Communication Engineering)
 - (iii) M.E. (Computer Science & Engineering)
 - (iv) M.E. (Civil Engg.) (Construction Technology & Management)
 - (v) M.E. (Mechanical Engineering) (Manufacturing Technology)
2. the fee of full entrance test, be refunded to the candidates who have deposited their fee.

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

19. Considered request dated 28.06.2023 (**Appendix-XVII**) of Professor Madhurima Verma, Chairperson-PUCASH, that the UGC directions, (Prevention, prohibition and Redressal of sexual harassment of women employees and students in HEIs) Regulations, 2015, be adopted in toto by Panjab University.

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that on the second page where the minutes of the Committee were annexed, the photocopy has been done by pasting the paper on the remarks and written as confidential on it.

The Vice Chancellor said that this item is pertaining to adoption of U.G.C. Regulations, 2015 with regard to (Prevention, prohibition and Redressal of sexual harassment of women employees and students in HEIs).

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Regulations of PUCASH had come in the year 2013 and the U.G.C. had notified it in 2015. Now, they are recommending adoption of the same from the year 2023. He asked, is there any difference between the old and new Regulations?

The Vice Chancellor said that now the nomenclature has been changed as Internal Complaints Committee and had notified its constitution also.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said while seconding the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Harpreet Singh that this notification had already been adopted. As per the verdict of Supreme Court of May, the said notification is for those institutions, who had not constituted the Committees so far. If any new Regulation is notified, the same should be amended/incorporated.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the circular regarding adoption of UGC directions, (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal of Sexual Harassment of Women Employees and Students) should also be sent to all the affiliated Colleges.

RESOLVED: That the UGC directions, (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal of sexual harassment of women employees and students in HEIs) Regulations, 2015, be adopted in toto.

20. Considered following proposal of the Chairperson, USOL, P.U. (**Appendix-XVIII**) with regard to change in nomenclature of USOL and Chairman/Head of USOL, as recommended by the JAAC in its meeting dated 30.06.2023 (**Appendix-XVIII**) that:-

- (a) the name of University School of Open Learning (USOL), be changed to Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE).
- (b) the designation of the Chairperson/Head, USOL, be changed to Director, Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE) in consistence with the existing policy of Panjab University with regard to rotation policy of Chairmanship/Headship of the Teaching Department as per Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, Chapter LII "Rotation of Headship: Teaching Department" and that too from within faculty of USOL/Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE).

Initiating discussion, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he had gone through the item properly, and had observed that DEB had sent 18 objections and the JAAC

of the Department had taken 4 objections, which have been placed in the Syndicate. The majority of the objections related to submission of one document or the other. These objections should also be brought to the Syndicate. It has been mentioned in the communication that if the University has to say something regarding the objections made by the DEB, the University could send the same within 30 days of its receipt. The University could send the reply till 16th July, 2023. On the objections raised by the DEB, they had reacted in a knee-jerk manner. As per objections of DEB, the Director of USOL should be on full time basis, whereas in University, the term of the Chairperson is of three years on the basis of rotation. These things had been written by the DEB in a funny way. As per DEB, the University should remove the name of the Director from the Faculty list during his/her tenure of Directorship. The JAAC of the Department, on the objections of the DEB, had annexed the rules of the rotation indicating the existing policy of Panjab University with regard to rotation of Chairmanship/Headship of the Teaching Departments. In the rotation rules of the Panjab University, it is mentioned that an Assistant Professor on completion of 8 years' service, can be appointed as Chairperson. It has been mentioned at page 14 of the Appendix, "An Open University shall have designated Schools of Studies for design and development of programmes in Open and Distance Learning Mode and, which shall be headed by a regular functionary on full time dedicated basis not below the rank of an Associate Professor.....". Rightly or wrongly, after DEB's objections, the rotation of P.U. could not be implemented at the proposed Centre for Distance and Online Education. The problem occurs when it was recorded in the minutes and after annexing those minutes and forward the same to the DEB. The officials of DEB would raise objections as they had done earlier. Its reply should properly be filed that this assignment of Chairpersonship is permanent in nature for a fixed tenure of three years. So far as the objection regarding change of name of USOL is concerned, they should submit that they could change its name as USOL - Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE). When the issue regarding change of name for Department of Evening Studies was placed in the meeting of the Senate, it was decided that as DES has its name, therefore, MDRC should be added. Firstly, the University has the time to send the reply of these objection, they should file the reply till 16th July, 2023. The objection that name of the faculty be removed from the list, when he/she is considered for appointment as Director, is not justified.

The Vice Chancellor said that online meeting was taken place, which was attended by the Registrar, it has come to knowledge that it is not the Panjab University alone that they are asking to change the nomenclature, rather they are saying to other Universities also. It was apprised that this decision has been taken uniformly across the nation. The University told them that the nomenclature in Panjab University for the same is University School of Open Learning. They told that it is the time for change and all other Universities have also been asked to change the nomenclature.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he also agreed that on the objection of the DEB, the name of the USOL could be changed. If they saw these guidelines, it is observed that these guidelines were of 2020. The reply should have been sent from the office of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor replied that all the process is going on. The issues regarding shortage of faculty etc. are being redressed. What actually the DEB wanted is that instead of Chairperson, the Director should be posted as already posted in the Centres of the Panjab University. The DEB is recommending for appointing full-time Directors but in the University, the existing rule regarding rotation of the Chairpersonship would continue.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the DEB has raised the objection that the name of the Director should not be in the Faculty list.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that previously, the name of the Department was Directorate of Correspondence Studies, but now on the recommendation of U.G.C., its name would be changed as under NEP, online education or dual degree is to be promoted.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he had gone through the objections of the DEB carefully. It has only been written that Director, who is teacher in the subject of Hindi, should not be included in the list of faculty.

The Vice Chancellor said that any person who is appointed as Director, his name would only be shown at one place. When his name is shown as Director, his name would not be reflected in the faculty list.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that the DEB has only raised objection on the Directorship by saying that Director should be on full time basis. As in other University departments like Dental Institute and UIET, the post is of Director.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that when any person is posted in some other Institute on deputation, in that case also, he has the lien in his previous department. This interpretation is only of the JAAC of the department whereas the DEB has not objected that the name of the Director should not be included in the faculty list.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a minor thing, they only have to change the name of the Department and the designation of the Chairperson for USOL.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as now the dual degree programme has been introduced where the teaching would be in both online and offline mode, hence they would have to change the name of the Department. Secondly, so far as the matter regarding change of designation of Chairperson to Director is concerned, only 4 objections have been placed as Syndicate have to take a call for only these 4 objections. The Syndicate has no role in the 18 objections raised by the DEB.

Shri Varinder Singh said that item should be approved and the minor changes could be rectified later on.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that initially there were 18 objections, some of which have been removed and only 4 objections have been placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that all the 18 objections should have been placed before the Syndicate whether the same have been redressed or not.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the name of University School of Open Learning (USOL), be changed to Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE); and
2. the designation of the Chairperson/Head, USOL, be changed to Director, Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE) in consistence with the existing policy of Panjab University with

regard to rotation policy of Chairmanship/Headship of the Teaching Department as per Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2019, Chapter LII "Rotation of Headship: Teaching Department" and that too from within faculty of USOL/Centre for Distance and Online Education (CDOE).

21. Considered minutes dated 29.05.2023 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of discussion in Syndicate dated 19.12.2022 regarding the procedure of exemption of late fee for Post-Matric Scholarship candidates and issuance of DMC/Degrees as well as payment of examination fee.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that issue regarding fine imposed for Post Matric Scholarship candidates is a major one. The amount of late fee/fine is more than the actual fee. Such type of model should be framed that fees should be credited in the account. He requested that the actual fee should be charged and the late fee should be waived off.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that earlier it was decided that they would charge the actual fee and late fee/fine would be waived off.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that it should be done in a time-bound manner, the Colleges should be directed to pay the actual fee within one month.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that it is good that they are not charging late fee/fine for which he is thankful. But the fees are credited by the Government into the account of the College and thereafter, the College deposited the same to the University, otherwise the student deposited his/her own fee for issue of Degrees and DMCs.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar and Principal Kirandeep Kaur stated that now the fee is directly deposited into the account of the students.

Shri Sandeep Singh said that fine should be waived off and the students should be directed to deposit the actual fee without late fee and get the certificates issued.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that one months' time should be given to the Colleges to deposit the fees.

To this, Shri Sandeep Singh said that at least two months' time should be given to the Colleges.

RESOLVED: That the affiliated Colleges be written to by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) to deposit the pending examination fee, excluding late fee, of the scheduled caste, Economically Weaker Section and PMS students within 15 days of the issuance of the letter, and if any College failed to do so, late fee/fine, would not be exempted.

22. Considered the minutes dated 27.06.2023 of the committee constituted by the Dean of University Instruction of discuss the issue regarding disbursement of salary to Dr. Moniva Sarkar, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, P.U. Information contained in the office note was also taken into consideration.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Jagtar Singh said that being the Chairman of the Committee, he would like to inform that 2-3 meetings of the Committee have been held. He himself along with his team checked all the 8-10 files. The recommendations have not been received from the department. Till the receipt of the report of the Committee, her salary should be disbursed.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the issue is that Dr. Moniva Sarkar, Assistant Professor of Department of Sociology had not taken the classes. The students had also sent written complaints against her, but later on the same has been taken back. Her salary was not disbursed on the policy of “no work, no pay”.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that Dr. Moniva Sarkar herself signed her Absentee Statements as ‘NIL’ and sent the same as Chairperson whereas at present, she is not the Chairperson of the department.

It was informed that there is one Assistant Professor Dr. Moniva Sarkar in the Department of Sociology who was absent from duty since 19th September, 2022. Earlier also, complaints regarding her misconduct were received. An amount of Rs.3,50,000/- in the account of Department of Sociology had been deposited by her in her personal account through net banking. Secondly, she collected money amounting to Rs.1000/- or more from the students and deposited the same in her personal account. Several complaints regarding her misconduct were received at the time, when the Vice Chancellor was the D.U.I. in 2022. The matter was brought in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 27th September, 2022 and before that the then Vice Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, had ordered that Dr. Moniva Sarkar would be removed from Chairpersonship and in her place two senior Professors of the Department of Sociology were given the charge of Academic and Administrative head respectively with the Dean of University Instruction as Overall In-charge of the department. The orders were ratified in the meeting of the Syndicate on 27.09.2022. The whole episode was boiled due to the protest of the students in the department on 16th September, 2022. The issue was resolved but the frictions were going on and thereafter Dr. Moniva Sarkar stopped coming to the department for teaching. Both the Academic and Administrative heads had written letters to her. On the requests of the students, the JRFs were deputed to take classes in her place. Dr. Moniva Sarkar kept agitating on the plea why she had been removed from the Chairpersonship. She did not believe in the decisions of the Syndicate.

Dr. Jagtar Singh said that a letter was sent by the Dean of University Instruction and Dr. Moniva Sarkar replied that she had videography available with her that she had taken the classes and she would produce the evidences in the Court regarding her statement. If she would move to the Court, the Court might favour her for release of salary.

It was apprised to the members that it could not be understood and also not within her purview to decide whether Dr. Moniva Sarkar is speaking the truth or the charges levelled by the students, non-teaching staff, research scholars of the Department of Sociology and two Academic and Administrative Heads are false. Since her joining as D.U.I, two Absentee Statements are being received in the middle/end of every month. On one Absentee Statement, Dr. Moniva Sarkar had submitted “NIL” report, duly signed and stamped by her as Chairperson of the department. She thinks that everybody is aware that “NIL” Absentee statements are submitted in the case when a person had attended the duties for whole month without any leave. On the second Absentee statement, which is received by her from the Department of Sociology, where both the Academic and Administrative Heads

appointed by the Syndicate, it had been written that “Dr. Moniva Sarkar had been missing from the Department since 19th September, 2022. She has neither taken the classes nor taken any kind of leave. Both the Academic and Administrative Heads had written that they would not sign on the Absentee statement, it is the discretion of the D.U.I. at her risk to write ‘NIL’ and sign the Absentee statements. She is not sitting in the Department of Sociology, she, being the D.U.I., has been given the charges of Over-all In-charge of Department of Sociology, Guru Nanak Sikh Studies, Department of French also. Since two statements are being received from the two Heads of the department, appointed by the Syndicate, it should be made clear to her whether she could herself write NIL and sign on the Absentee statement. They should guide her as to what should she do. This is the reason, the matter has been placed before the Syndicate.

Dr. Jagtar Singh suggested that CCTV cameras should be installed in all the Departments so that they could know as who is taking the class or not. It is not one file, rather 8 files have been made and in every file, everybody is against her and not in her favour. The Committee is not in her favour. They only wanted that the Committee which has been constituted should give its recommendations. If they would like to take a decision in the House, then there is no need of the Committee.

Shri Varinder Singh said that the salary of Dr. Moniva Sarkar could not be stopped. If she would move in the Court, as also stated by Dr. Jagtar Singh, the Court might issue orders regarding release of her salary and owing to this, the action which is being taken by the University would be blocked. They are recommending that instead of stopping her salary, the action should be taken against her, either she should be suspended or enquiry should be conducted against her. He suggested that CCTV Cameras should be got installed so that such type of problems may not arise in future. They would only like to say that they are not in her favour, they are also aware that she had taken the loan from the bank and the bank had also made a written complaint against her. If her salary is stopped, and later on, on the orders of the Court, she get the salary, all the efforts of the University would prove to be futile.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that basically they have two Absentee statements, one is signed by herself as Chairperson of the Department and other is received from the Academic and Administrative Heads. Firstly, they have to examine, out of these two statements, which statement is valid. If she has been removed from the Chairpersonship legally, which is meant that she is not in the Chair now, hence the Absentee Statement submitted by her is not considered as valid. As per the second Absentee Statement, she was missing from the Department and had not taken the classes. When the work has not been done, how could they pay the salary? Hence, they should consider that Absentee Statement as valid, which was received from the department.

Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that after going through the whole case and the documents attached here, it is found that she was absent from duty and action should be taken against her. Till the final action is decided, her salary could not be released. As per the documents annexed including the recommendations of the JAAC and all the proceedings, it was made clear that she was continuously absent without any information to the Institution or the Department. Neither she had applied for any kind of leave, nor any document is available on record, which proved her presence. This is the only method of submission of Absentee Statements, as the attendance of teachers is not taken. Only the absentee statement served the purpose of making them aware about the absence/presence of the teachers. All these things are missing; hence, action should be taken against her.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that they are surprised to know that in such a huge University, set pattern is not available. Similar cases have been done in the Colleges, where teachers had been issued Show cause notices and they had also put a serious note of that. When the teacher is absent from September, 2022, and entire procedure regarding her removal of Chairpersonship, appointment of two Heads of the Department have been followed, no concrete action has been taken against her in the fear of Court. Why the service code of conduct has been existed? If they would fear from the repercussions of the Court, how could they run the Administration, how would the University function? In the Colleges, they did not permit the teachers to leave the station for one or two days without obtaining permission. If a teacher is to leave the station during vacation, he/she has to apply for station leave. It meant that in Colleges, the employees are following the service code of conduct better than the University teachers.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that all the teachers of University are following the service code of conduct.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that usually, when a teacher joins the College, an affidavit is to be given by the teachers that he/she would be supposed to be at station, when he/she would leave the station, prior permission for station leave would be obtained. Why the University is fearing in proceeding further in the case when they had an affidavit in the office record.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the major lacuna in this case is that several Fact-finding Committees were formed. The initial reports of the Fact-finding Committees should have been placed in the Syndicate. After accepting the reports of the Fact-finding Committees, the Syndicate would mark the regular enquiry. Thereafter, on the receipt of the regular Enquiry report, the same would be accepted and after that the punishment could be decided. Unfortunately, from the last 1.5 years, the Fact-finding Committees so formed, no report of such Committees is tabled in the Syndicate. He understood that reports are not completed as sometime one or other member left the Committee. He, therefore, suggested that as serious allegations of financial embezzlement are involved in it, the Committee so formed should be directed to submit its report within 15 days. The Fact-finding Committee is for initial enquiry of the documents that whether any concrete case is evolved or not. It is the work of the Regular Enquiry Committee to find out as at what place the financial embezzlement had taken place, the amount of money transferred in her personal account etc. He submitted that the report of the Fact-finding Committee should be sought within 15 days and thereafter, the same should be placed in the Syndicate, so that regular Enquiry could be conducted, otherwise this matter would be lingering on for more years. Secondly, so far as the matter regarding withholding of salary is concerned, the powers should have been distributed as to which power is to be exercised by whom. But the same was not done, as he was also called in the office of the then Vice Chancellor Dr. Raj Kumar, at that time to tell as to under what provision of P.U. Calendar, the Chairperson could be removed from the post. He told him (Dr. Raj Kumar) that there is no provision for that. If the Chairperson is to be removed from the post, the matter should be placed as an item for consideration stating therein that as there is no provision in the P.U. Regulations, hence the same is placed before the Syndicate. As also in the previous item where an amount of Rs.2 Lacs have been refunded, because there are no specified Regulations in the P.U. Calendar, therefore, the same was placed before the Syndicate for consideration. By placing the item before the Syndicate, the Chairperson could be removed from the post and after that, the charge of the Chairperson could be given to the next senior most person so that all such things could be streamlined. Otherwise, the matter would be lingered on as per the statement of the Chairperson that nowhere it was

written in the orders that she was no more the Chairperson of the department. It has only been written in the orders that these two persons have been given additional charge whereas orders regarding removal had not been issued. They should follow a legalized procedure to resolve the issue.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that after going through the said case, it has been observed that on 16.09.2022, a letter was issued from the office of Dean of University Instruction. It has clearly been written by hand in the remarks that these two persons would be given charges of Administrative and Academic In-charge and the overall In-charge would be the D.U.I. but no signatures were appended on it. Secondly, after the matter was placed before the Syndicate, in the resolved part, it had been written that "a Fact-finding Committee be constituted". Perhaps, the Fact-finding Committee might be constituted, if constituted, its report should be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate for consideration. Her salary for 3 months i.e., April, May and June is pending, whereas the show-cause notice was issued to her on 3rd July, 2023. Is it possible to stop anyone's salary without issuing show-cause notice? Only memo was issued on 3rd July, 2023. No action could be recommended without issuing Show-cause notice. On the reply received from Dr. Moniva Sarkar, it had been written that she was taking the classes as per 12th Plan of the UGC, wherein it is specified that a person can take the classes not exceeding 10 hours from the J.R.F. In spite of that she had taken the classes as per the attendance register, on the basis of which the students were issued roll numbers to appear in the examinations, if she would not have taken the class, the roll numbers would not have been issued to the students.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that when a person had given in writing that she was not taking classes; rather, her JRF was taking the classes, which is a very huge confession, made by her. But due to the reason that procedure is not followed, they would lose the case in the Court. Hence, he requested to follow the complete procedure.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that it has been stated that there is no provision in P.U. Calendar, therefore, the said item is placed before the House for consideration, whereas actually, the House is not empowered to do so. The Syndicate has only the powers which are mentioned in P.U. Calendars.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar asked why the Syndicate had taken the decision to refund Rs.2 lacs in the previous item?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the previous item where the decision was taken that Rs.2 Lacs be refunded; the only procedural lapse was there that the Committee was not formed.

Continuing his statement, Dr. Parveen Goyal said that thereafter, this information was neither discussed nor annexed in the report. The members of the Committee comprised of D.U.I., F.D.O, Registrar, S.L.O. and Deputy Registrar to recommend whether the disbursement of salary of April, May and June, is to be made or not. He reiterated that the University could not withhold anyone's salary without following the proper procedure. When the Chairperson is D.U.I., why the doors have been locked there?

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua and other members jointly said that the consideration of the item should be deferred and the item should again be placed before the House with complete details.

It was informed regarding the issues raised in the House, on the minutes of the meeting of the Syndicate dated 27th September, 2022, were not clear, where it was resolved that a fact-finding Committee be constituted. But the word "Former Chairperson" should have been mentioned in the resolved part. Secondly, as asked by members, why the report of the fact-finding was not placed before the House, it is clarified that as per their resolution, another fact-finding Committee should be formed. It was not brought here because that was nothing. Thirdly, when she asked, what are the provisions of P.U. Calendar in this matter, it was replied that as per Accounts Manual, 2002, "salary can be released on the basis of absentee statements forwarded by the Chairperson. The Absentee Statement must contain the names of the employees who have been sanctioned leave other than casual leave during the month and nature of leave sanctioned and the name of the substitute, if appointed, during leave period. The fourth point is that after sending the memo on 3rd July, 2023, they received the reply on 6th July from Dr. Moniva Sarkar that "the customary practice of J.R.F./S.R.F. Scholars teaching and assessing answer-books and assignments is in vogue in the department since a decade and as per 12th Plan of UGC". The faculty members are required to mention J.R.F./S.R.F. scholars to enhance their capacities to teach Post-graduate students, she had been mentoring JRF/SRF scholars as well, thus, it is within Rules to allow such scholars to teach Postgraduate students. The Department of Sociology is the Centre for Advanced Studies with enrolment of about 130 research scholars, including from affiliated Colleges. The department has the deficiency of regular faculty. Under this scenario, it is natural that faculty members are required to devote more time to research scholars and the Postgraduate classes are routinely taken by JRFs.

Several members suggested that proper enquiry should be conducted.

To this, D.U.I said that she only wanted to know whether she is authorized to disburse her salary or not.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this item should be deferred and in the next meeting of the Syndicate, the report of the Fact-finding Committee should be placed so that decision could be taken accordingly.

Shri Varinder Singh said that after conducting the enquiry and on the basis of the report, action should be taken.

Dr. Jagtar Singh intimated that the meeting of the Committee was held on 16th July, 2023 and the department was asked to reply within 10 days. The Department had replied that the report would be submitted after the vacations.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that there are several complaints, viz., she is not taking classes and misbehaving, so to examine all these issues, a Fact-Finding enquiry should be conducted and action should be taken accordingly, but the payment of salaries should be made to her.

Professor Devinder Singh, as stated by Dean of University Instruction that half of the time of her office is usually spent on the case of Dr. Moniva Sarkar. The agenda is only to decide on the matter regarding disbursement of her salary. The Syndicate is to see whether they authorize the D.U.I. to sign the Absentee Statements as she is not the Chairperson of the Department as per orders of the Syndicate, so she could not sign the absentee statement. The agenda is only to evolve the solution for this. The other issues, whether the constitution of Fact-Finding Committee, conducting the enquiries are the issues, which would be taken up later on. Now, the problem is that whether she should be paid salary or not by

signing the Absentee statements. They should only discuss the issue whether they are allowing D.U.I. to sign the Absentee statements or not.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that moreover, the Academic and Administrative In-charges had also refused to sign the Absentee statements.

Continuing this, Professor Devinder Singh said that when a person had not taken the classes for 4 months, how could she be paid salary? The facts should be found on the basis of her claim for payment of salary, whereas she herself admitted that she is not taking classes. She should be given an opportunity. If they would like to resolve the issue, for the same, a Committee of two persons either from the Syndicate or otherwise, should be constituted to examine her claim that she is attending to her duties, if the Committee is satisfied, the Absentee statements should be signed. For other issues, a regular enquiry should be initiated.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that Committee had already been constituted.

Professor Devinder Singh said that he is talking about forming the Committee for the issue pertaining to disbursement of salary.

It was stated that how could the D.U.I. and the Committee verify her Absentee Statements?

Professor Jatinder Grover said that when the Academic and Administrative heads of the department are saying that she (Dr. Moniva Sarkar) is not attending to her duties, how could the Committee prove that she was coming to the department?

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that how could they or Committee decide when the Academic and Administrative Heads had refused to sign the Absentee statements.

It was asked by the D.U.I that she may be authorized to sign the Absentee statements as both the Academic and Administrative Heads have refused to sign the same. The House should authorize the D.U.I. that in the event if both the Academic and Administrative head would send a letter writing therein that they both would not sign, to sign the Absentee Statements, without hearing/paying attention to their refusal. The second alternative is to send an order on behalf of the Syndicate to both the heads to sign the Absentee statements by writing NIL.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that enquiry should be conducted, but her salary should be disbursed. Whenever the salary is not released to the faculty, the faculty usually approached the Court to get the salary released.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that firstly, they should take a call to appoint next senior-most person as the Chairperson of the Department, and if it is done, the problem would automatically be solved.

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

It was stated that she had the legal opinion in her file. The legal opinion sent by S.L.O. is that "Dr. Moniva Sarkar, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology has not attended any classes in April, 2023, therefore, no salary should be paid to Dr. Moniva Sarkar for the month of April, 2023, following the legal principle of "No work, no pay".

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that next senior-most person who would become the Chairperson, would look after the case whether the Absentee Statements are to be signed or not. To deal with the work of one department, two persons and D.U.I. has been engaged, hence, he suggested that next person on rotation should be appointed as Chairperson.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that no Academic In-charge could take decision on signing the Absentee Statements. A proper procedure should be adopted to avoid litigation in resolving the issue.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk when enquired who is signing the Absentee Statements of other teachers of the department, it was replied that after signing by both the Heads, the same is countersigned by D.U.I. He further enquired when any teacher is absent for 15 days, what would they write on his/her Absentee statement.

It was replied that entries regarding leave, whether casual leave, earned or extra-ordinary leave, medical leave etc., are entered in the Absentee Statements.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that if Dr. Moniva was absent without any legitimate leave, what process is to be adopted is that the Absentee Statements sent under the signature of two Heads are to be accepted. Resultantly, her salary would not be disbursed.

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

The Vice Chancellor said that the Fact-Finding Committee proposed to be constituted would be asked to submit its report within 15 days, so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate in the next meeting. Simultaneously, the procedure for appointment of Chairperson should be started. She further said that on the matter regarding issue of withholding of salary of Dr. Moniva Sarkar, legal opinion would be obtained.

It was stated by D.U.I. that until the legal opinion is received by the Vice Chancellor, her salary should be kept on hold.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the Fact-Finding Committee be asked to submit its report within 15 days, so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting;
2. the next senior-most person of Department of Sociology be immediately appointed the Chairperson of the Department; and
3. so far as the issue regarding disbursement of salary to Dr. Moniva Sarkar, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, P.U., is concerned, legal opinion be obtained and until the time the issue is finally decided, the matter of disbursing salary to her, be kept pending.

23. Considered minutes dated 30.06.2023 (**Appendix-XX**) of the committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to adoption of National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF), as per the communication received from UGC vide D.O.F. No.15-2/2021 (QIP) dated 11.05.2023.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that page 108 under sub section 1.2, it is mentioned that medium of instruction or programmes in local/Indian languages, if the University is adopting the same in toto, he asked whether the medium of instruction in all courses is accepted in local/Indian languages.

It was replied that medium of instruction would be English as already existed.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 30.06.2023, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

24. Considered notification dated 30.06.2023 (**Appendix-XXI**) of University Grant Commission with regard to the following amendment (minimum qualifications for appointment of Teachers and Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education), Regulations, 2018:-

1. Short title and commencement -(1)These regulations may be called the University Grants Commission (Minimum Qualifications for Appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) Regulations, 2023.
2. In the University Grants Commission (Minimum Qualifications for Appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) Regulations, 2018, in regulation 3, for sub-regulation 3.10, the following sub-regulation shall be substituted, namely:-
- 3.10 “NET/SET/SLET shall be the minimum criteria for the direct recruitment to the post of Assistant Professor for all Higher Education Institutions.”

As a consequence, in Regulation 3, for Sub-Regulation 3.10, of the University Grants Commission (Minimum Qualifications for Appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in University and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) (1st Amendment) Regulations, 2021 stands deleted.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that with regard to adoption of U.G.C. Amendment pertaining to (minimum qualifications for appointment of Teachers and Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education), where Ph.D. degree is not compulsory, only passing of U.G.C. NET is compulsory.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that clarification to clause 3.10 has been received. Under 3.10, for appointment of teachers in Universities, the Ph.D. degree was compulsory, which has now been withdrawn. Earlier the extension of two years

was allowed during Covid-19 period which has also been withdrawn. Now, whether the Ph.D. and U.G.C. NET cleared, both candidates are eligible.

Dr. Parveen Goyal said that as per this notification, for appointment of Assistant Professor in Panjab University, now the Ph.D. degree is not compulsory.

Professor Gurmeet Singh said that this was not implemented earlier also, the said notification was deferred that Ph.D. degree should be made compulsory for appointment of Assistant Professor in the Universities. They have the apprehension that in the process of screening of applications of Assistant Professors, which have been initiated, as stated by Dr. Parveen Goyal, that point would be valid only if U.G.C. has notified that candidate, who qualify the U.G.C. NET examination, would be made eligible as compared to the previous rule for obtaining the Ph.D. degree. The earlier notification could not be implemented as the matter was deferred. He did not observe that anybody's interest is harmed from this notification. The process of screening of applications, should be completed at the earliest, because it is a long pending requirement as no recruitment had been done after 2014. The forms for recruitment of Assistant Professors have been received in the departments for screening. Hence, he requested that this notification should be adopted as at that time when the advertisement was published, the person with NET qualified qualification could apply for the posts. So, this notification does not affect those candidates, rather they should complete the process of screening of applications at least for Assistant Professors, at the earliest.

RESOLVED: That the notification dated 30.06.2023 (**Appendix-XXI**) of University Grant Commission with regard to the following amendment (minimum qualifications for appointment of Teachers and Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education), Regulations, 2018, be adopted:-

1. Short title and commencement -(1)These regulations may be called the University Grants Commission (Minimum Qualifications for Appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) Regulations, 2023.
2. In the University Grants Commission (Minimum Qualifications for Appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) Regulations, 2018, in regulation 3, for sub-regulation 3.10, the following sub-regulation shall be substituted, namely:-
- 3.10 "NET/SET/SLET shall be the minimum criteria for the direct recruitment to the post of Assistant Professor for all Higher Education Institutions."

As a consequence, in Regulation 3, for Sub-Regulation 3.10, of the University Grants Commission (Minimum Qualifications for Appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in University and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) (1st Amendment) Regulations, 2021 stands deleted..

- R-5.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh the following faculty, purely on temporary/contractual basis w.e.f. 20.06.2023 at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U. for 11 months i.e. upto 19.05.2024 with break on 19.06.2023 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, 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:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation & Nature of Appointment
1.	Dr. Maninder Pal Singh Gill	Associate Professor (Temporary)
2.	Dr. Prabhjot Cheema	Senior Assistant Professor (Contract)
3.	Dr. Rajdeep Brar	Senior Assistant Professor (Contract)

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-6.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Md. Taukir Alam, as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in the Department of CE& DS, P.U. in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100+GP Rs.6000/-, for the session 2023-24 or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions, with one day break as usual according to which he had worked previously during the session 2022-23, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022. He will automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the semester/academic session.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-7.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Monika Sharma as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in Department of Biotechnology w.e.f. the date she starts work for the session 2023-24 or till the posts are filled 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, on the same terms and conditions according to which she has worked previously during the academic session 2022-2023, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022. She will automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the academic session.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-8.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has:-

- (i) extended the term of the following persons as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis/part-time basis) upto

30.05.2023 at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2022-23, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022:-

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
Temporary faculty		
1.	Dr. Inderjot Kaur	Law
2.	Sh. Hardip Singh	Punjabi
Part-Time faculty		
3.	Dr. Rajnish Mutneja	Law

- (ii) re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Inderjot Kaur and Sh. Hardip Singh as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. the date they start work for the academic session 2023-24, or till the regular 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 2022-23, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-I, 2022.
- (iii) re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Rajnish Mutneja as Assistant Professor on Part-Time basis at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. the date he start work for the academic session 2023-24 or till the regular post is filled in, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on an honorarium of Rs. 22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week), on the same term and conditions on which he was working earlier for the session 2022-23.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-9. 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 Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. the date they will start work till the date of end of academic session 2023-24 (with one day break) 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 other 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. Gurjit Singh	Punjabi
2.	Mr. Surinder Singh	Political Science
3.	Ms. Seema	Physical Education
4.	Dr. Kamlesh Narwana	History

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

- R-10.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed the following persons as Assistant Professors (purely on temporary basis) at P.U. Constituent College, Karyal, Dharamkot, District Moga w.e.f. the date they will start work for the Academic Session 2023-24 i.e. upto the start of summer vacation 2024 (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 pages 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022, on the same term and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2022-23:-

Sr. No.	Name	Subject
1.	Dr. Parminder Singh	Punjabi
2.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Political Science
3.	Dr. Poonam Dwivedi	English

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor has allowed that the salary of Dr. Parminder Singh, Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) be charged from the vacant post of Panjab University Constituent College, Mohkam Khan Wala, District Ferozepur.

2. An office note was enclosed.

- R-11.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed (afresh) Dr. Richa Rastogi Thakur, as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in Centre for Nanoscience & Nanotechnology (University Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Tech.) w.e.f. the date she start/started work for the session 2023-24 or till the posts are filled 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, on the same terms and conditions according to which she has worked previously during the session 2022-2023, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-12.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate has:-

- (i) extended the term of Dr. Anuj Gupta, Assistant Professor, Centre for Stem Cell Tissue Engineering & Biomedical Excellence, Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U. (purely on temporary basis) up to 09.07.2023, for the academic session 2022-23, with one day break as usual, on the same term and conditions, on which he was working earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2022.

- (ii) re-appointed afresh Dr. Anuj Gupta as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) at Centre for Stem Cell Tissue Engineering & Biomedical Excellence, Institute of Emerging Area in Science & Technology, P.U. w.e.f. the date he start work for the 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 Rs.6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions according to which he has worked previously during the session 2022-23. He will automatically stand relieved on the expiry of the academic session.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-13. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has:-

- (i) Extended the term of Ms. Twinkle Bedi, Assistant Professor, Dr. S.S. Bhagnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U. (purely on temporary basis) upto 01.06.2023, on the same term and conditions on which she was working earlier, with one day break as usual, under Regulation 5 at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. I, 2022.
- (ii) has re-appointed afresh Ms. Twinkle Bedi as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology w.e.f. the date she start work for the Academic Session 2023-24 or till the regular posts are filled in, through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100/-+ AGP Rs. 6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules under Regulation 5 at page 112 of P.U. Cal. Vol. I, 2022, on the same terms and conditions on which she was working earlier for the session 2022-23.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

R-14. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of Dr. Monika Sharma, Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) in the Department of Biotechnology, for the Academic Session 2022-2023 upto 09.07.2023, with one day break as usual, on the same term and conditions, on which she was working earlier.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

- R-15.** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of the following persons as Assistant Professor at UIET, PUSSGRC, Una Road, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, purely on temporary basis upto 31.05.2023 in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances, for the academic session 2022-23, under Regulation 5 at page 112-113 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2022:

Sr. No.	Name of Person	Branch
1.	Shri Kanwalpreet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
3.	Shri Gurbinder Singh	I.T.
4.	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T.
5.	Mrs. Ritika Arora	I.T.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

Referring to Sub-Item R-2, Professor Gurmeet Singh said that this item regarding allowing to transfer a sum of Rs.20 crores (Rupees Twenty crores), i.e., Rs.10 crores from Development Fund Account No.10444979664 and Rs.10 crores from “University Share in Plan Account” No.10444979267 to SBI Current Account No.10444978333 to meet the committed liabilities of Revenue Account. It is true that amount is deposited back in the concerned account. Being the employees of the University, they felt astonished to know that this is being done every month. They should try to address the problem permanently, so that such a situation of transferring of funds from one account to another might not recur. It meant that University is financially in a “hand to mouth” position. They should make combined efforts to tide over this problem.

Referring to Sub-Item R-14 and R-15, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said these items are for grant of extension of temporary appointments to teachers. He observed that these teachers are working from the last several years. He requested that they should be allowed to pay as per 7th Pay Commission as had been allowed to other teachers. Secondly, he requested that uniform terms and conditions should be made for the temporary teachers. In one case, the condition of two increments has been mentioned. If deemed fit, the Committee should be constituted to remove the disparities. The other members would agree with him that certain other persons have not been given even one increment. They should think over it and ensure that a person, who is serving the University from more than 10 years, should get more salary than a person, who is considered for appointment now.

Shri Varinder Singh, while endorsing the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Dinesh Kumar, said that temporary teachers should be allowed salaries as per 7th Pay Commission.

The Vice Chancellor assured that a Committee would be constituted to remove the disparities as pointed out.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar reiterated that the terms and conditions of all faculty should be uniform rather at least one incentive should be proposed to be allowed to them.

Referring to Sub-Item R-3, Professor Jatinder Grover said that they proposed that there should be a test, now they are saying that there should be no

test. He submitted that this is a very specialized course related to learning for disability students. The minutes of the meeting which are annexed with the item contained the information that 114 students had applied, out of which 50 students appeared in the test, 48 students have qualified for 30 seats, 28 students were enrolled. It is a specialized course, that is the reason, least number of students are enrolled. Majority of students left the course in the mid of the session as B.Ed. (L.D.A.) is to take care for the learning of learning-disabled students. For the same, the learning aptitude and good skill is needed. **Hence, he requested that entrance test should be made compulsory for it.**

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they had specified the reason of discontinuing the entrance test is that as they were not charging any fee for conducting the entrance test. It has been written in the Appendix that “conducting departmental level entrance test for every student is just an additional burden”. He could not understand why they had written this.

The Vice Chancellor said that information regarding conduct of entrance test for B.Ed. (L.D.A.) has been published in the Handbook of Information.

Dr. Parveen Goyal asked, whether the Committee has been constituted for temporary faculty members, who have completed 10 years of service for allowing the increments to them.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the Committee has been formed but it is for the performance evaluation of temporary faculty. The persons who remained in drunken state, could the University grant increments to such faculty members?

Referring to appointment of guest faculty, Dr. Mukesh Arora said that he would like to enquire as to what amount of salary is to be paid to the guest faculty of Constituent Colleges? They were neither being given the remuneration of Punjab Government nor of the University. The circular had earlier been issued for paying the remuneration of Rs.25,000/- per month.

It was informed that a Committee has been constituted under the Chairmanship of Dr. Jagwant Singh to redress the complaints related to it. With regard to salaries, the pay structure of Punjab Government has been followed.

Dr. Mukesh Arora stated that in the Constituent Colleges affiliated to Punjabi University, Patiala, the salary of Rs.50,000/- is being paid to their guest faculty, whereas Punjab Government has directed the Colleges of Panjab University to pay Rs.25,000/-.

The Vice Chancellor replied that the said decision was taken in the meeting of the Board of Finance.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that these Constituent Colleges were given to Panjab University for running in Punjab. These Colleges have to function as per the provisions of P.U. Calendar. If the Punjab Government wanted to control these Colleges, they should pay salaries as per Punjab Government. Instead of paying them on the pattern of Punjab Government, even the Punjab Government had reduced their age of superannuation. The University should be involved to convince the Punjab Government indicating that at what places the Punjab Government could intervene. He remembered when the Constituent Colleges were started, the faculty of Constituent Colleges were paid salaries as per University norms. No separate rules were there for the Constituent Colleges. Why they have started to adopt the Rules of the Punjab Government for Constituent Colleges.

Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the Punjab Government is saying now that they would make the selections of the Principals and teachers whereas the same were done by the Panjab University.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that when the Constituent Colleges were started, in the presence of the nominee of the Punjab Government, the Syndicate had deliberated as ultimately who would bear the liability of these Colleges. When the recruitments and appointments were made at that time, there was no nominee of the Punjab Government. It was decided that, if in future, the Constituent College are closed down, it would be the liability of the University to accommodate/adjust the faculty of the Constituent Colleges. The Lecturers posted there should have been adjusted in the departments in the University. They should make it clear whether the Constituent Colleges are the liability of the Punjab Government or the Panjab University. The Syndicate had opposed the decision of the then Vice Chancellor at that time and it had been repeatedly deliberated that ultimately the University would have to bear the liability of these Colleges. Sometimes, they say that these Colleges are under the Registrar and sometimes, say that these are considered under the Dean College Development Council. The University is saying that as the Constituent Colleges are the liability of the Punjab Government, and on the other hand, it is said that these Colleges are not under the Dean Colleges; rather, these are under the purview of Registrar.

The Vice Chancellor said that a letter has been received from Principal N.R. Sharma, for which a Committee had already been formed comprising Syndicate and Senate members.

Shri Varinder Singh said that this discussion is going on to make benefit to the Guest faculty of the Constituent Colleges. The issue is, either they should be paid as per the norms of the Panjab University or on the pattern of Punjab Government. At that time, it was decided that they would be paid the salary of Rs.38,000/-, he asked, now what is the issue?

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **R-1 to R-15** on the agenda, be ratified.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the departmental aptitude test for admission to B.Ed. Special Education (Learning Disability) (**R-3**), be again started w.e.f. session 2024-25, as it is a specialized course.

26.

Information contained in **Items I-1 to I-11** was read out, viz. –

I-1. In terms of the Senate decision dated 14.12.2019 (Para IV), the Vice-Chancellor, has approved the promotion of Dr. Amandeep Verma nee Puri from Assistant Professor (Selection Grade/Academic Level 12) to Associate Professor (Academic Level 13A) in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET) (IT) w.e.f. 03.07.2019 in the pay scale of Rs.1,31,400-2,17,100/-, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (as per UGC Regulation 18.07.2018) at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of the Panjab University.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

I-2. The Vice-Chancellor, has allowed quarterly rate of interest on Contributory Provident Fund and General Provident Fund paid/to be paid, to the employees w.e.f 01.04.2022 to 31.03.2023, as per rate of interest declared by Government of India Ministry of Finance, Department of Economics Affairs (Budget Division) vide notifications issued from time to time.

NOTE: An office note was enclosed.

I-3. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the following:-

I. The University Grants Commission has notified University Grants Commission (Redressal of Grievances of Students) Regulations, 2023 in 'The Gazette of India' dated 11.04.2023 (**Appendix-XXV**).

II. Committee for Redressal of Grievance of Students:-

1. Professor R.K. Kohli- **Ombudsperson**
2. Professor Akshaya Kumar,
Department of English and Cultural Studies-
Chairperson
3. Professor Sanjay Kaushik, University Business School
4. Professor Anil Monga, Centre for Police Administration
5. Professor Navjot, Department of Political Science
6. Professor Madhurima Verma, University School of Open Learning
7. Shri Manpreet Singh, 2nd year student
Department of Laws- **Special Invitee**
8. Assistant Registrar, Office of Dean Student Welfare-
Convener

NOTE: A copy of letter dated 08.05.2023 of the Dean of University Instruction was enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

I-4. In pursuance of orders dated 22.03.2023 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.4703 of 2023 (titled Uma Sethi and others Vs. Panjab University and others), wherein, the following petitioner has 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.	Dr. Uma Sethi, Professor	School of Punjab Studies (Lexicography)	31.05.2023	01.06.2023
2.	Dr. Prince Sharma, Professor	Microbiology	31.05.2023	01.06.2023
3.	Dr. Vivek Ranjan Sinha, Professor	UIPS	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 titled Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and other) 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-5. In pursuance of orders dated 22.03.2023 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.4157 of 2023 (titled Promila Pathak and Ors. Vs. Panjab University and others), wherein, the following petitioner has been given the benefits of continuing in service, in view of the similarly situated cases.

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
Dr. Kamal Nain Singh, Professor	Department of Chemistry	31.05.2023	01.06.2023

In this regard, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the above faculty member be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.06.2023 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No. 1505 of 2016 titled Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and other Special Leave to appeal (C) No (s) 17457-17491/2022 Choragudi Nagaraja Kumar Vs. Panjab University & Others and connected matters and he be paid the salary which he was drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment to him will be

adjustable against the final dues payable to her, for which she should submit the undertaking as per Performa.

NOTE: The teacher (s) residing in the University campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court.

I-6. In pursuance of orders dated 21.04.2023 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.8218 of 2023 (titled 'Richa Puri 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.	Dr. Richa Puri	Botany	31.07.2023	01.08.2023
2.	Dr. Ashutosh Kumar	Political Science	30.06.2023	01.07.2023
3.	Dr. Roshan Lal	Psychology	31.05.2023	01.06.2023

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 each, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of Special Leave to appeal (C) No(s) 17457-17491/2022 title Choragudi Nagaraja Kumar Vs. Panjab University & Others and LPA No. 1505 of 2016 titled Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and other & entire bunch of connected matters 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-7. In pursuance of orders dated 25.05.2023 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.10386 of 2023 (titled 'Harminder Singh Bains Vs. Panjab University and others), wherein, the following petitioner has been given the benefits of continuing in service, in view of the similarly situated cases:-

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
Dr. Harminder Singh Bains	PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur	31.05.2023	01.06.2023

In this regard, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the above faculty member be considered to continue in service w.e.f. the date mentioned above, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of Special Leave to appeal (C) No(s) 17457-17491/2022 title Choragudi Nagaraja Kumar Vs. Panjab University & Others and LPA No. 1505 of 2016 titled Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and other, salary be paid to him which he was drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the case filed by him. The payment 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 have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court.

I-8. The Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Kavita (Wife) of Late Shri Mukesh Kumar, Senior Assistant, Conduct Branch, P.U., Chandigarh (who expired on 15.05.2023, 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-9. The Vice-Chancellor has granted temporary extension of affiliation to the following Colleges for certain courses as mentioned against each for the session 2022-2023:

Sr. No.	Name of the College	Name of the Courses/ subjects
1.	Sant Hari Singh Memorial College for Women, Chella Makhsuspur, Distt.HSP	(i) B.A-I,II & III English (C & E), Hindi, Economics, Pol. Sci., History, Punjabi (C& E), Home Science, Computer Science, Physical Education. (ii) BCA-I,II & III (One Unit each) (iii) B.Com-I, II & III (One Unit each) for the

Sr. No.	Name of the College	Name of the Courses/ subjects
		session 2022-23.
2.	Sant Majha Singh Karamjot College of Women, Miani, Distt.-Hoshiarpur (Pb).	(i) B.Com-I, II & III (One Unit each) (ii) B.C.A.-I,II & III (One Unit each) for the session 2022-23.
3.	Babbar Akali Memorial Khalsa College, Garhshankar, Distt.-Hoshiarpur (Pb).	(i) B.A. B.Ed./B.Sc. B.Ed.-(4 year's integrated course)-1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd & 4 th year. (ii) B.A./B.Sc.-I (Retail Marketing)-E. (iii) B.A./B.Sc.-1(Functional English)-E (iv) M.Sc.-I (IT) (One Unit) for the session 2022-23.
4.	S.D. College, Hoshiarpur (Pb).	B.A. I, II, III (Psychology) for the session 2022-23.
5.	Sri Guru Har Rai Sahib College for Women, Chabbewal, Distt- Hoshiarpur(Pb).	(i) B.C.A.-I, II & III (One Unit each) & (ii) PGDCA.(One Unit) for the session 2022-23.
6.	SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur, Distt. Hoshiarpur (Pb).	(i) B.P.Ed-1 st & 2 nd year (One unit-50 Seats). (ii) M.P.Ed.-1 st & 2 nd (One unit-50 Seats) for the session 2022-23.
7.	MBBGDRGC Girls College of Education, Mansowal, Distt-Hoshiarpur (Pb).	B.Ed. course (One Unit-50 seats) for the session 2022-23.
8.	Sant Baba Bhag Singh Memorial Girls College of Education. V.P.O-Sukhanand, Distt-Moga (Pb).	(i) B.Ed. Course (Two Units-100 seats). (ii) M.Ed.(One Unit 50 seats) for the session 2022-23.
9.	GKSM Govt. College, Tanda Umar, Distt.Hoshiarpur(Pb)	(i) B.Sc. Agriculture-(4 year integrated course) 3 rd & 4 th year (One Unit each). (ii) B.A./B.Sc. I,II & III (Computer Science) One Unit each. (iii) PGDCA (One Unit) for the session 2022-23.

NOTE: The relevant documents in respect of Sr.no-1 to 9 were enclosed **(Appendix-XXVI)**.

I-10. 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.	Mrs. Kusum Lata Jund Deputy Registrar RTI Cell, P.U.	30.10.1983	30.06.2023	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
2.	Shri Sandeep Arora Assistant Registrar USOL, P.U.	29.01.1986	30.06.2023	
3.	Shri Vinod Singh Personal Assistant Legal Cell, P.U.	21.04.1988	30.06.2023	
4.	Shri Rama Pati Tewari Machine Operator-cum-Daftri P.U. Press	18.07.1985	30.06.2023	
5.	Smt. Kesma Beldar Construction Office, P.U.	02.04.1993	30.06.2023	
6.	Shri Yogesh Kumar Gold Finisher A.C. Joshi Library, P.U.	23.05.1988	30.06.2023	

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

I-11. To note minutes of Joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 30.06.2023 (**Appendix-XXVII**) with regard to Internal and External Weightage in MBA Programme at USOL.

Referring to Sub-Item I-3, Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that the nomenclature of the Committee should be written as per the UGC, i.e., Student Grievance Redressal Committee (SGRC) and not Redressal of Grievances of Students. Secondly, the term of Chairperson and the members of the Committee is of 2 years and the term of special invitee (Students' nominee) is 1 year. He suggested that these provisions should be included in the Committee.

Referring to Sub-Item I-4 to I-7, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that it has been clearly mentioned in the orders of the Court 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 titled Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and other) 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).....". According to the orders of the Court the teachers are continuing in service without any break. He, therefore, suggested that the teachers, who are continuing in service beyond the age of 60 years, should be appointed members of the Board of Studies, Board of Control, statutory Committees, etc., instead of inviting them to the meetings of these bodies as special invitees.

Professor Devinder Singh suggested that the office of the Dean of University Instruction should issue a circular to the Chairpersons/Head of the Departments asking them to invite the teachers, who are continuing in service beyond the age of 60 years, to the meetings of Board of Studies, Board of Control, statutory Committees, etc., as special invitees.

Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua suggested that these persons should be appointed members of Board of Studies, Board of Control, statutory Committees, etc., as are appointed the other regular teachers of the University. He further said that even if a wrong decision has been taken, they could always correct the same. Moreover, it would show to the NAAC that the University has sufficient faculty.

Shri Varinder Singh said that this issue had already been discussed in this House at length and decision taken.

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

Referring to Sub-Item I-9, Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that the Committee has not filled up the *pro forma* meant for grant of affiliation/extension of affiliation properly. If they did not fill up the *pro forma* properly, how could they evaluate it?

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Sub-Items I-1 to I-11 on the Agenda**, be noted with the modifications in **Sub-Item I-3** that –

1. the nomenclature of the Committee is “Student Grievance Redressal Committee (SGRC)”;
2. the term of Chairperson and members (SGRC) is for a period of two years;
3. the term of Special Invitee (SGRC) is one year; and
4. the term of Ombudsperson (SGRC) is for a period of three years or until he/she attains the age of 70 years, whichever is earlier.

General Discussion

1. Shri Varinder Singh said that two students of B.Ed. 2nd year got selected for E.T.T. Now, they want to complete their degree from USOL. The University should give an opportunity to these students, as under NEP, it is also being promoted. Earlier, the University had also given a chance to B.Ed. students. He asked why these students could not complete their B.Ed. degree in USOL?
2. Shri Varinder Singh said that the pre-Ph.D. course work should also be started in the UIAMS as being done in University Business School. He requested that the Ph.D. course should also be started in UIAMS at the earliest.
3. Shri Varinder Singh raised an issue that the faculty members of UIHTM should be allowed to supervise Ph.D. students as is being done in case of others Departments/Institutes. The request of UIHTM was forwarded to the office of Director, Research & Development, which might be pending there. So, he requested that the faculty members of University Institute of Hotel & Tourism Management should be allowed to supervise Ph.D. students.
4. Shri Varinder Singh said that for checking the construction work, a Committee was constituted earlier. Due to this Committee, the future construction work, which is needed to be done in University departments, is stopped. He requested that new construction work should not be stopped, due to the enquiries pertaining to old construction work.

The Vice Chancellor replied that matter is under consideration.
5. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk requested that allocation of Ph.D. seats should be done for the UIHTM.
6. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that permission should be granted to revise the pay structure of temporary faculty.
7. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that last time, he had raised an issue pertaining to a student in the Zero hour. The student had passed M.A. from Panjab University as a private candidate. Due to Covid-19, he could not obtain the migration certificate from the University and he is pursuing Law degree in the Punjabi University, Patiala. Due to overlapping of the time period, the Migration certificate of Panjab University is not being accepted by the Punjabi University, Patiala. Last time, it was resolved that the candidate would be awarded the degree of M.A. after issuance of Migration Certificate, so that he could complete his LL.B. degree from the Punjabi University. He was of the opinion and the student also agreed on it that the University could cancel his M.A. degree. Now, under NEP-2020 and U.G.C. Regulations, both the degrees can be awarded, so he requested that he may be allowed for these two degrees. The said issue was also raised in the previous meeting of the Syndicate, which could not be resolved till date.

It was informed that this case has been discussed in detail. It was pointed out since the candidate in question, has obtained the Migration Certificate and he is no more the student of the University, how could they cancel his degree. Now, since the student belonged to Punjabi University, Patiala, it is for the Punjabi University to take appropriate action in the matter.

8. Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that in any University or Institution, there is need to impart legal education and for the same they have to seek the approval of Bar Council of India. The University has been permitted to impart legal education under Rule 40 of the Bar Council of India. It is very much clear in Rule 16 of BCI, that the Head of the Institution, should only be from the legal background. He was very surprised to know that in the University, the Professor who has become the Director of University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS) is not from the legal background. That appointment has also been challenged. The B.C.I. had filed the reply in the case, he would like to read the relevant lines for the information of the House. They say "it is submitted that a bare reading of Rule 16 of Schedule III, B.C.I. Legal Education Rules, 2008, leaves no manner of doubt that any Head of a Centre of Legal Education has to be a Professor of Law in order to be eligible for such charge. The answering respondent has already filed its reply wherein it has warned the concerned authority (Panjab University), that in the absence of following aforesaid Rules, necessary punitive action would be taken against the Institute". Are they in a position to take that warning? Are they in a position to violate the statutory provisions of B.C.I., 2008, which are mandatory ones? Now this matter has been listed for 17th of July, 2023 and there is a notice regarding stay by the Hon'ble Court on 5th of June itself and 6th of July was the last date and the Court has now adjourned this case to 17th of July, 2023. He asked what would be the stand of the University. Are they in a position to violate the B.C.I. Rules, If BCI would take action against the Institute, what would they do? Could they take the plea of ignorance in doing such type of decisions? He requested to clarify what would be the stand of the University in the Court? In what capacity they had appointed the Professor of Political Science on the post of Director.

The Vice Chancellor said that on the said file, she had very clearly written that the next senior-most Professor may be appointed as Director subject to the outcome of the decision of the Court.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that there is a notice regarding stay as well.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that no notice regarding stay has been received.

Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that he is talking about notice regarding stay. He said that he would read the relevant lines of the Order, "he further submits the respondent No.6 is not having teaching experience of teaching Law, she is the Professor of Political Science, thus she could not be appointed as Director of Institute. The appointment has been made in violation of the procedure prescribed by the University itself. These are the recorded version of the Hon'ble Court. Further, Court says that notice of motion returnable for 5th of July, 2023 and notice regarding stay as well. These are the interim orders of the Court.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Rule 16 which have repeatedly been quoted, firstly he would like to make it clear that this Rule 16 is applicable to Colleges affiliated to Panjab University like Colleges at Ropar, Sidhwan Khurd. It is categorically stated by the Bar Council of India that they would only have to see the appointment of Dean. If this Rule 16 is applicable to University, the P.U. Regional Centres at Muktsar, Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana would have been closed years ago, as the Bar Council of India had conducted 5-5 inspections of these institutes. This writ was not filed for the first time;

this was filed twice. Firstly, the same applicant had filed the writ where the reply was filed by the University and when the Judge asked to state something, she said that she would withdraw the writ and she would file it again. The writ was then withdrawn.

On a point of order, Shri Lajwant Singh Virk said that the writ petition was withdrawn owing to reason as the University has made the appointment, once they have made the appointment, that writ petition become infructuous, in that eventuality, it was withdrawn. The appointment was made and the Court was of the opinion that as the appointment had been made, she had to challenge the appointment. That was why the writ was withdrawn and this petition was filed.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Rule 16 is not applicable to the University.

To this, Principal R.S. Jhanji stated that same Rule is applicable to the Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the morning when the item regarding USOL was discussed, it was made clear that whenever conflicts got created between the Regulatory Authorities and the University Calendar, the regulations of Regulatory Body would prevail.

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

Shri Varinder Singh said that the point raised by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk is correct, the decision of the Regulatory bodies would be accepted. He suggested that in the first instance, for the time being, the charge of UILS should be given to the Chairperson, Department of Laws. If not, the charge could also be given to Dean of University Instruction. So far as matter regarding Dean is concerned, he clarified that Dean has no academic and financial power. It should be got checked as how the Dean has the power to run the UILS. He suggested that a Committee should be formed comprising of persons with legal background.

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

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he has only two observations, first is that, the language/wording of the letter written to Dr. Parvinder Singh should be checked as it is not up to the mark.

The Vice Chancellor said that a Committee would be constituted for examining this issue. The members could suggest the name of persons who are to be included in the Committee.

Shri Varinder Singh said that persons from legal background should be included in the Committee.

Professor Jatinder Grover said that the persons from the Department of Social Sciences would also become the part of the Committee.

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

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in spite of so many complaints against Dr. Moniva Sarkar, they could not remove her officially, how could it be possible to revert a person, who has been deputed officially. There is no provision in P.U. Calendars to remove the Chairperson/Director from the post.

9. Professor Gurmeet Singh said that there is need to overhaul the examination system of the University. At the time of Professor R.C. Sobti, former Vice Chancellor, a decision was taken that every teacher has to evaluate 200 answer-books. The statement regarding details of teachers who marked the answer-books should be sought from the office of Controller of Examinations. There are majority of teachers who are not evaluating even a single answer-book, whereas evaluation of answer-books is also the duty of a teacher. The rule which was prevailing in the past should be re-considered. The assessment of answer-books should be done in real sense, which is not existed in the system. For the purpose, it would be better to constitute a Committee.
10. Professor Gurmeet Singh said that it was decided at the time of the Professor Arun K. Grover that whenever the D.A. would be enhanced by the Central Government, the D.A. would automatically be enhanced by the University without waiting for the notification of the Punjab Government. Since the Central Government had enhanced the Dearness Allowance at the rate of 4% (from 38% to 42%), the enhanced D.A. should immediately be paid.
11. Professor Gurmeet Singh said that under item I-3, he would like to state that U.G.C. had taken a good initiative to form a regular Committee i.e., the Student Grievance Redressal Committee (SGRC). The Standing Committee was also constituted by Professor R.C. Sobti for addressing the complaints/grievances of the students which worked at the University level. He suggested that in the era of technology, an online portal should be created to directly meet and send the grievances of the students to the Vice Chancellor from the coming academic session. The Governments have also introduced the Chief Minister's portal for the purpose.
12. Professor Gurmeet Singh said that he had earlier also requested that there is dire need to construct a new Senate Hall for the meetings of the Senate and other statutory bodies. He further requested that some solution should be evolved for the work related to Multipurpose Hall in Sector 25.
13. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra endorsed the points raised by other members to expedite the matter regarding regularization of temporary teachers after completion of 10 years of service.
14. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the UIHTM should also be made a part of the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce. It is a great injustice with UIHTM to separate from the Faculty of Business Management & Commerce.
15. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that the request of the pensioners regarding opening of option of pension again should be acceded to.
16. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that earlier also it was requested to allocate funds for the repair and renovation of the auditorium of P.U. Extension Library. The funds are available in the account of the P.U.

Extension Library, permission may be granted to spend the money for repair and maintenance of Auditorium

17. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that he would like to express his viewpoint on the issue raised by Shri Lajwant Singh Virk. In 2015, when the meeting of the Bar Council of India was held in P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, Dr. Gosal was the Director of that Institute. He was in the faculty of 5-Year Law and Dr. R.K. Puri was the Co-ordinator of 3-Year Law. The Bar Council of India pointed out as Dr. Gosal was from the Department of Punjabi, hence, the affiliation would not be granted to the institution. On the same day, Professor Arun K. Grover had to issue the orders of his appointment as Co-ordinator for B.A. LL.B five-year course. Even it was not accepted by Bar Council of India that Dr. R.K. Puri would continue to work as Co-ordinator for 3-year Law course rather a common Head was required to be appointed. They desired that Head of the Institution, in any case, would have to be from law background, accordingly, his orders were issued as Co-ordinator. He remained the Co-ordinator of the Institute for 5-6 years before going to H.P. University. It might be very much clear to all of them as they all have to do all the work legally and not politically. It is mentioned that Dean would also be from the Law and Principal/Director should also be from the law background. As per law, they have to take decision as per the Act of Bar Council of India. They could not change the law. When the law is very much clear, they have to take decision accordingly. He submitted that keeping in view the legal point, the right decision should be taken and they all would support her for the same.

18. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that this matter has also been raised in the previous meeting of the Syndicate. In the paper of B.B.A. 1st Semester, the questions of 30 marks were out of syllabus. The two topics of Cash Book and Bank Reconciliation were from the syllabus of 2019. The Department has recommended only 8 grace marks. What would be the state of those students as they have also to appear in Master in Business Administration and other competitive examinations. He requested that this matter should be resolved at the earliest. The grace of 8 marks would not be sufficient for the students, for the purpose.

It was informed that some solution is to be evolved as firstly zero marks had been given and later on 8 grace marks were recommended. Now, the admissions are going on in the Colleges, a number of calls are received from the Principals of the Colleges as for admission to 3rd Semester, 50% papers have to be cleared by a student. The file has been submitted to his office and its result is to be declared. Its solution would be evolved within a day or two, which would be conveyed.

The Vice Chancellor enquired to what has been recommended by the Committee.

It was informed that Committee had earlier recommended zero marks and after review now it was recommended for 8 marks. The reason was recorded as these topics were of the basic concepts which should have been the part of the paper but it was nowhere mentioned whether the same was in syllabus or not. Perhaps, these topics were not in the syllabus. When unofficially it was enquired from the teachers, they came to know that these topics were out of syllabus.

19. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that first of all, he would like to thank the members of the Syndicate and Senate and the Vice Chancellor too for taking the stand regarding the matter related to admission portal. The portal allowed only admissions up to 25th of May. Resultantly, the admission rate has got reduced to 10% in the affiliated Colleges including Constituent Colleges, which could also be got from their own sources. From 25th of May to 11th of July, no admissions were made in the Colleges, but the Colleges have been saved due to the decision of the University to make admissions on provisional basis. Otherwise, the admissions would have been shrunk up to 25%. The Colleges could only be survived due to that very decision of the University, but the Government could not be stopped at this, the Government have earlier apprised that this exercise of admission portal was only to collect data, but actually it was not so. The benefit has been accrued in these 20 days to the Private Universities. When the Government has fixed their salary as Rs.33,000/- and age of superannuation as 58 years in the case of Constituent Colleges, in future, the University has to take the liability of these Constituent Colleges and have to pay salary as per Rules of the Panjab University. It was approved by the Panjab University that the staff posted at Constituent Colleges are the employees of the University. He requested that, if such types of issues are raised or the issues pertaining to the autonomy of the University arose at any level, the University should be with the Colleges, as the Colleges are in dire need of support and assistance.
20. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that three months have expired but no concrete decision has been taken on the matter pertaining to pensioners. He requested that the pensioners should be called and their grievances should be redressed.
21. Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua said that for those 5 Colleges where 7th Pay Commission has been implemented may be given appreciation letters so that it would set an example for other Colleges.
22. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that a case had come on 2nd June, 2023 in the Senior Tender Committee, which comprised of 11 members, of which he is also a member. The meeting was started at 3:30 p.m. he along with 2-3 members in the presence of the D.U.I. kept waiting. The Registrar, Dean of Student Welfare and other 2-3 members did not come to attend the meeting due to one or the other reason. He placed his views in the earlier meetings also that the technical report of the checking of building of UIAMS has been received in the office of Secretary to Vice Chancellor. That technical report should be placed in the Syndicate, if the building has rightly been constructed, the project of extension of the same could be started. If the building is not right, then the Contractor/Vendor of the building should be directed to construct the same on the basis of the technical report. If the matter regarding construction of extension of UIAMS is approved without considering the technical report, the Contractor would say that he has constructed the building rectifying the shortcomings of the ground floor of the building. If, out of the 10 persons present in a meeting, one person is raising objection and the item has been approved, which meant that the person (Dr. Parveen Goyal), who had raised objection, is wrong. After 2nd June, 2023, he had sent the communications both verbally and in writing to the Secretary to Vice Chancellor. Later, he had written to D.U.I. being the Chairperson of the Committee, which has been forwarded to Secretary to Vice Chancellor. He requested that at what price whether less or high, the building is to be constructed, but its quality should be good. But the issue

has been raised by some of the members that work of the construction of extension of UIAMS was stopped by Dr. Parveen Goyal, which is not so, rather he had apprised the House about the facts. He stated that the construction work of roofs and toilets should be completed. It was informed that Rs.90 lacs were spent and Rs.10 lacs are additionally required for the same. He requested to provide the list of roofs where construction/renovation work has been done and Rs.10 lacs has also been allocated. The Technical Adviser of Electrical and Civil department who were present in the meeting asked to approve this tender first and later on the work of roofs would be undertaken. The Vice Chancellor could understand as to what kind of scam is involved in it.

23. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that income of Rs.3-4 crores is earned through issuance of transcripts. There is a problem in it, for obtaining the transcript for Indian students, a fee of Rs.600/- is prescribed whereas for applying the same from foreign, a candidate has to pay \$ 304 per certificate. The applicant has to apply through online portal, he fills his local address of Mohali for getting the certificate with the fee of Rs.600/- for Indians, whereas actually he is residing abroad. The solution to this problem is that if any applicant applies for the issuance of transcript of certificate, he should upload his copy of passport with all the pages, so that his visa entries would automatically be made available. He personally visited the concerned Branch for getting the transcript of certificate for a person who was in Melbourne, and the certificate was got prepared in 25 minutes. It was intimated that if he fills the address of Melbourne, a fee of 304\$ is to be paid and for resident of India, a fee is Rs.600/- is to be paid per certificate. The passport of all the leaves should be made mandatory to be uploaded with the online application for getting the transcript of certificate.

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

24. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that at least a transfer policy should be framed for transferring the persons from one Institute to another, so that the genuine persons could also be benefitted and non-genuine persons get them transferred from their influences.
25. Dr. Parveen Goyal said that circular has been issued on 13th June, 2023 from the office of the Registrar that no employee is to approach to any member of the Senate. He asked is it justified to do so as the rule already existed in Panjab University Calendar, Volume III. If it is justified, they should amend the Rules mentioned in P.U. Calendar. There is no need to approach the member of the Senate if his/her work is settled at the level of the office of the Registrar and Vice Chancellor. Hence, this circular should be withdrawn.
26. Dr. Parveen Goyal requested that 'Turnitin' software to be used in the Library for procuring the books and journals, should be purchased and provided to all the Departments.
27. Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that they should now move to online mode of paper setting, so that the teachers in the remote areas could set the papers and sent on time.
28. Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested that interviews should be conducted for 2-3 posts which were earlier advertised.

29. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there is a trend in the University that another Committee is constituted over the Committee, if the recommendations are not favourable. He requested that only one Committee should be constituted and its recommendations should be placed, rather constituting Committees over committees for favourable recommendations. The Committee should not be so large, as in majority of Committees 20-25 members have been included. The members who come for attending the Committees have to wait for the remaining members to join.
30. Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as stated by Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra, that Dr. Gosal was not removed from the Directorship; rather, Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra was appointed as Co-ordinator of the Institute.
31. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that circular was issued that the officials are not allowed to meet the members of the Senate. It has probably been issued due to the reason that he had sent the list of about 150 persons for considering their cases favourably.
32. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that with regard to point 16 at page 32 of the Regulations of Bar Council of India, the same is applied to the Law Colleges and not for the University. The Regulation says that, "the whole time Principal/Head/Dean, there shall be a Principal for a Constituent or an affiliated Centre of Legal Education of a University and a Dean for the University/Department who shall have minimum qualifications prescribed in Law". He requested that a clarification should be sought from the Bar Council of India whether a person without Law qualifications is eligible for appointment as Director or not.
33. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that meetings of the Screening Committees should be conducted for the remaining cases of teachers under CAS at the earliest, before the visit of NAAC team.
34. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that the report with regard to opening of pension scheme should be placed before the Syndicate at the earliest.
35. Dr. Mukesh Arora said that e-mail from Principal B.D. Budhiraja was sent to Vice Chancellor that treatment charges as per PGI rates should be allowed to him. He requested that the same may be allowed as per P.U. Rules.
36. Dr. Jagtar Singh said that a seminar was conducted by K.C.W. Ludhiana for which Rs. 25,000/- was sanctioned from the office of Dean College Development Council, but till date the bills submitted by the College amounting to Rs. 22787/- on 29.03.2023 have not been adjusted. He requested that it should be got checked.
37. Dr. Jagtar Singh said that Professor Rajiv Puri has desired that on every Seminar/Workshop to be conducted under the banner of RUSA Co-ordinator, his name should have been written. This should be got examined.
38. Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that recently a decision has been taken in the meeting of the Senate that NEP-2020 would be implemented in University Campus from this academic session and in the Colleges, it would be implemented from the next academic session. She humbly requested that before implementation of NEP-2020, the University should take initiative and

Zonal Orientation programmes should be organized periodically so that the Colleges could be prepared and their queries could be settled.

It was informed that till 15th of July, 2023, the information syllabi under NEP-2020 would be uploaded on the University website. He further directed the College to familiarize the Faculty about the syllabus.

39. Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that the issue regarding declaration of result of B.B.A. should be resolved at the earliest as in some Colleges, seats are vacant and they could not admit the students because of non-declaration of results. This should be looked into at the earliest.

It was informed that tomorrow the result of B.B.A. II would be declared.

40. Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that the degrees of outgoing classes should be issued at the earliest after the declaration of results as they have to apply for further studies or future prospects in abroad. A number of students visited daily for applying and getting the provisional degrees.

41. Principal R.S. Jhanji said that he would like to add to the matter discussed by Dr. Harpreet Singh Dua with regard to Admission portal that the Colleges are facing a lot of problems due to this. This data is not being transferred simply, they have to get the OTP individually from every student. There is no provision on the portal to allow admission on the basis of permission from the Principal and the Vice Chancellor. The overall admissions in the Colleges are only 10 to 20%. After 14th of July, the admission portal would be closed. Earlier the admissions were made up to August with the permission of the Principal and the Vice Chancellor. Hence, the Colleges need the support of the University. The Colleges would do admission even after the closure of portal on 14th July to fill the vacant seats. It is not so simple to enter the data on the portal, the Colleges have deputed their teachers during the vacation, in spite of that, the names of the admitted students are not properly uploaded on the portal. The OTP of one student is sent to another and it got difficult for the College to trace the same and their admissions are not got confirmed. The server of the portal is repeatedly crashed. There were the fears in the minds of the College personnel due to which they were reluctant to make admissions through the portal. After 14th of July, the Colleges are not aware as to what would be their fate? The Colleges would do admissions as per previous practice, whether the University is with the Colleges or not or whether it is legally right or not. The admissions would be done as per earlier practice with the permission of the Principal and the Vice Chancellor. They are not known whether the admissions are allowed in other Universities, i.e., Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University, Patiala.

Principal Kirandeep Kaur said that on the admission portal, a list of 90 is shown and after uploading and confirmation, finally 30 students are shown in the list as admitted students.

42. Principal R.S. Jhanji requested that some amount as hill allowance should be allowed to the staff and guest faculty either on *ad hoc* and regular basis, working in hilly areas.

43. Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra said that meetings of the Committee should be conducted in hybrid mode, so that the members located at far-off

places, could be able to attend the meetings and the expenditure incurred on T.A./D.A. could also be saved.

44. Shri Varinder Singh said that on the issue of admission portal, he would like to add that in the meeting which was held with the Presidents of the Managements of the Colleges, they agreed to make admissions through online portal. Mostly, admissions have been made through the portal. The Managements of the Colleges were given the assurance that the Colleges have full discretion in making the admissions as per earlier practice.
45. Professor Jatinder Grover said that conflicts between University Business School and University Institute of Applied Management Sciences are usually pointed out. He requested that the issue should be resolved, so that the same is not raised in the House again and again. Citing an example, he said that they have to take a decision whether the faculty members of UIHTM are to be allowed to supervise the Ph.D. students because as per the latest rules/regulations of the UGC the teachers are required to supervise Ph.D. students to get promotion. This issue should be resolved in consultation with Director, Research & Development.
46. Professor Jatinder Grover said that earlier the issue was raised that a teacher of Physics could not become the Director in UIET. The Rules should be properly defined. When a person is appointed on the post, he/she would come to know that at what time, he/she would become Chairperson/Director, after counting 3 years. All of a sudden, when it was decided and told to a person that he/she would not become Chairperson/Director, in that situation, what would be the condition of such teachers? Resultantly, the teachers have to move to the Court to get their due promotions. It seems very bad amongst the colleagues of the University to face such a situation. The policies and Rules & Regulations should be clearly defined.
47. Professor Jatinder Grover said that recently in the discussion, Dr. Jagtar Singh suggested that CCTV cameras should be installed in the departments of the University. He opposed the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Jagtar Singh that CCTV cameras should not be installed in the Classrooms.
48. Dr. Shaminder Singh said that it is good that University has enhanced the fee @ 12.5% of the Colleges, but it should be subject to the condition that the increased fee would be allowed to be charged only if the Colleges pay the salaries to the teachers as per the 7th Pay Commission. The clause regarding fee hike has been adopted by most of the Colleges, but the revision of remuneration as per 7th Pay Commission has not been implemented. He requested that some circular should be issued to the Colleges in this regard.
49. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that earlier also he had requested in the meeting of the Syndicate that canteen of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan should be started but so far, no action is taken in spite of repeated requests to the Registrar.

It was apprised by the D.C.D.C. that he had talked with D.R. (Estate), he had refused and said that it is not possible to run the canteen of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan. They had written a communication to allow the previous Contractor to run the canteen @ Rs.10,000/- per month till the tender would be finalized. But the D.R. (Estate) stated that there was no possibility to allow the vendor to run the canteen after the expiry of contract.

It was informed by the Registrar that he had discussed the matter with D.R. (Estate), he informed that the extension of contract could not be done, they have to invite the tender for the purpose.

50. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that earlier also the request was made by him to conduct periodic inspections of the Colleges, but no action is taken on it, till date.
51. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu requested that in the Colleges, also the five-day week system should be followed as prevailing in the University. The U.G.C. has already given the option to choose either for six-day week or five-day week. Hence, he requested on behalf of all the Colleges to allow five-day week for the Colleges as being done in the University.
52. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu requested that the rates of evaluation of answer books should be increased. He requested to kindly look into the matter.
53. Shri Sandeep Singh said that the issue regarding Post-Matric Scholarship should be expedited at the earliest so that students would not have to come to the Colleges for the same.
54. Shri Sandeep Singh said that the rooms of Faculty House are in a dilapidated condition, which should be got repaired and renovated out of the existing budget of Rs.4.5 crores.
55. Shri Sandeep Singh further pointed out that a number of complaints are being received about the shortage of water in University Guest House at Shimla. He requested that proper arrangement of water supply should be made available at the Guest House at Shimla.
56. Shri Sandeep Singh said that Dr. Parveen Goyal has raised the issue of issuance of transcripts. In fact, it is a ground reality that parents after managing funds, send their wards to foreign countries for further studies and the students are in need of the transcripts. So, huge amount of fees should not be charged from the students. They could charge hefty fees from the students who had gone for permanent citizenship.
57. Professor Devinder Singh said that he would like to add one more thing in the issue pertaining to pension that earlier the decision of the Syndicate had been taken three years ago that the pension scheme which was implemented on 31.12.2003 and in the University, the same was implemented in February, 2006. The legal opinion and the discussion of the Syndicate is available on the record. Even after the decision of the Syndicate, the file/Agenda has not been placed before the Syndicate for consideration till date.
58. Professor Devinder Singh endorsed the points raised by Professor Shiv Kumar Dogra regarding starting of Ph.D. in UIHTM. Even after the decision of the Senate, the Ph.D. has not been started in UIHTM. Whenever the admissions of Ph.D. are allowed to be started at UIAMS, they should also be allowed to conduct Pre-Ph.D. course work.
59. Professor Devinder Singh said that infrastructure should be provided to the Army personnel to organize some memorial function/seminar to make the students aware, in the memory of Kargil Martyrs, who sacrificed their

lives in 1999. The Auditoriums should be booked for organizing the functions/seminars at the concessional rates.

60. Professor Devinder Singh said that with the motivation of the Vice Chancellor, the Convocation of Department of Laws is scheduled for 12th August, 2023. The co-operation of all the members is solicited for the purpose. The invitation for the Convocation would be sent to all the members in due course of time.
61. Professor Devinder Singh said that this year, with the guidance and support of the Vice Chancellor and Controller of Examinations, the spot-evaluation of answer books was held at the Department of Laws. First time, the Department of Laws was made the Centre of Evaluation for evaluation of 10,000 answer books for which, the result of 6th Semester would be declared by 28th of July, 2023.

Y.P. Verma
Registrar

Confirmed

Renu Vig
VICE-CHANCELLOR