

Dissent on agenda item 2A.1/1.1 of the EC meeting of 17 August 2013 for being at variance with the provisions of the Delhi University Act

The draft amendments in Appendix II to Ordinance V(2) and VII of the Ordinances of the University for the consideration of the Executive Council vide agenda item 2A.1 circulated with the notice dated 8 August 2013 are not draft of Ordinances.

Syllabi are set out in the Regulations. Drafts of Ordinances are recommended to the Executive Council. As per the Delhi University Act, 1922:

(c) Under Section 31 of the Delhi University Act, all Ordinances can be amended, repealed or added to only by the Executive Council, provided that the draft of an Ordinance affecting the conduct or standard of examinations or any course of study, has to be proposed by the Academic Council.

In particular, Appendix II to Ordinance V(2) can only be amended by the Executive Council.

(e) Under Section 7(1) of the Act, the syllabi for various papers contained in a course of study have to be prescribed by the Regulations. Under Section 23 and 32 (1)(b), such Regulations would have to be made by the Academic Council, and under Section 32(3), the Executive Council has the power to amend them.

We record our dissent on the agenda item 2A.1 on the ground that

(i) it is not formulated in the manner required under the Act

(ii) the courses of study and syllabi were not circulated to the members and thus denying them their right to arrive at an informed decision.



Abha Dev Habib



Ajay Kumar

Op

We, the undersigned, record our dissent on the entire proposal of API/PBAS in case of direct recruitment and promotion for teachers in Colleges and University Departments. We feel that such an irrational system of quantification of teachers' abilities in research and teaching can have disastrous effects on the teaching learning process and can also impact the institutional functioning adversely.

Ashwadev
17/8/13

Ajaykumar
17/8/13

We, the undersigned, record our dissent on the item pertaining to the changes proposed in the examination and the evaluation of Foundation Courses in the Four Year Undergraduate Programme. We feel that the proposal, if implemented, would create logistical difficulties in colleges. Moreover, this will seriously impact the credibility and objectivity of the system that depends on anonymity. Also, we oppose the proposal as we apprehend that this will gradually dismember the University and lead to autonomous colleges.



AbhaDev
17/8/13

~~AbhaDev~~
~~17/8/13~~
AbhaDev

We, the undersigned, record our dissent on the proposed Selection Committees for the following reason/s:

The proposed Composition of Selection Committees for Recruitment of Teachers is in violation of the law and the status of teachers recruited by such committees will remain uncertain. It has been laid down clearly by the Visitor that the Ordinances on composition of selection committees have to be in accordance with UGC Regulations. After the last pay revision, the Ordinance adopted by the Delhi University was set aside by the Visitor. The Visitor instructed the University to follow the UGC regulations.

~~Abha Dev~~
17/8/13 Abha Dev

Abha Dev
17/8/13

Abha Dev

EC meeting of 17 August

The following members dissent on item number 11A-1. We are against the adoption of Mandatory Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Educational Institutions as per UGC regulations 2012.

Abha Dev.
Abha Dev Habib

Aditya Narayan Mishra.

EC meeting of 17 August 2013

The Ordinance XIII.1. which requires ~~the~~ teachers to be available for at least 5 hours daily in the University/colleges is not acceptable for the following reasons:

(i) This ordinance is based on clause 15.1 of the UGC regulations of 2010. It however leaves out an important proviso which the UGC regulation stipulates

"... 5 hours daily in the University/colleges for which necessary space and infrastructure should be provided by the University/colleges".

(ii) Without adequate infrastructure and necessary space such an Ordinance will prove disadvantageous for the academic development of teachers who use the time available beyond teaching hours and co-curricular/administrative work for library work and ~~research~~

research collaborations outside the University / College.

(iii) By adopting only a part of the clause, the University is withdrawing from its responsibility of providing space and infrastructure which is necessary if teachers have to spend stipulated time.

(iv) Mobility of teachers and students is becoming increasingly important for the research work and in fact it is an requirement of the new academic structures put in place in last few years. After implementation of API scheme, imposition of any restriction on the mobility will hamper teachers' work.

I dissent on this clause.

ABHA DEV
17 Aug 2013
ABHA DEV HABIB

EC meeting of 17 August 2013

I record my dissent on Clause 3(7) of the Proposed guidelines for screening/shortlisting of candidates for appointment to the teaching posts in the University and its colleges.

Clause 3(7) (Annexure B, agenda item 15-4) stipulates restrictions on the number of candidates who shall be called for interviews. This clause is not acceptable on the following counts:

- (i) Though the UGC stipulates API scores for entry level of Associate Professor and Professor, we need not use the same rationale of quantification of academic work as the screening process for Assistant Professor. If it is the only place where the UGC does not demand any scores. This criteria should certainly not be put in place suddenly. The fact that API scores may/will be applicable to entry levels of Associate Professor and Professor

was in public domain since 2010.

Teachers have been working without any hint that such a scheme would be put in place abruptly.

(ii) The strict restrictions on the numbers of candidates to be called for the interviews (30 for first vacancy and 20 candidates for every additional post) is bound to take away the opportunity from many to even appear before the selection committee.

(iii) To begin with, this number should be made sufficiently large to enable people to gear up for new changes and so that teachers who have been working on adhoc basis, awaiting filling up vacant positions, are given opportunity to appear before ~~the~~ selection committees.

ABHIA DEV
17 Aug 2013

ABHIA DEV HARIJ

EC meeting of 17 August 2013

Dissent Note on the Item 15-6 of the Additional Agenda tabled in the meeting.

I express my strong disagreement with the decision taken in the EC to allow the Vice Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Dean of Colleges, Director, South Campus, and Director, SOL to continue in their office beyond the age of 65 years. The relevant statutes are being amended to provide that these officers shall superannuate from their teaching post on such date of superannuation and continue for the remainder of their term of office in accordance with the terms and conditions of office prescribed in the ordinance.

My dissent on the matter is on the following counts:

- 1) The agenda item was placed directly in the meeting and not circulated at least seven days

in advance as required under the Regulations. This matter does not qualify to be an emergent matter and on no count should have been brought on the agenda during the meeting.

2. The Academic Council had at an earlier has rejected the proposal of enhancing the retirement age beyond 65 years for ~~the~~ teachers of this University. The University ~~should~~ therefore, should not / cannot bring special provisions for other officers such as PVC, Dean of Colleges, Director, South Campus and Director, SOL who are teachers of this University. Also these are not open posts and names of these officers are recommended by the Vice Chancellor to the EC.

3. The proposal is ~~not~~ based not on any administrative or academic principle ~~or~~ requirement but

appears to be benefiting the Dean of Colleges.
The credibility of the decision making
process has been undermined in
considering and approving impromptu
a decision that unduly benefits
a person occupying a high office
and in allowing the person concerned
to participate in taking the same
decision.

Abha Dev

ABHA DEV HABIB.



Executive Council meeting of 17 Aug 2013

Dissent Note on Rule 64(b) of
Item No 6H-2 (Annexure No 6); an
agenda dealing with terms and
conditions of service of University
Non-Teaching Employees

In case of colleges, the appointing
authority, Disciplinary Authority and
the Appellate Authority are the
same for Group C, Group B and
Group A employees. I strongly
believe that in case of Group A
employees the Disciplinary Authority
competent to impose major penalty
should be the Executive Council
and the Appellate Authority should
be the Executive Council.

Also for Group C and Group B, in
case of major penalty, the
Appellate Authority should be the
Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

ABHA DEV

ABHA DEV HABIB