

(viii) Violation of Ordinance for M Phil / Ph D Programme in the Department of Philosophy.

The Committee as constituted in the 61st meeting of the Academic vide Resolution No.AC:61:99:5:3(i) to look into the allegation of violation of Ordinance for M Phil / Ph D programme has submitted its Report which is placed as Annexure-'A'.

The matter was placed before the 62nd meeting of the Academic Council and the Council Resolved to accept the report of the Committee and treat the matter as closed.

The matter is placed before the Council for consideration.

CLJ/

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED BY THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL TO INQUIRE INTO THE COMPLAINT OF VIOLATION OF M. PHIL/PH.D. ORDINANCES IN A DEPARTMENT (PHILOSOPHY).

1. The Committee was constituted by the Academic Council, vide Resolution No. AC: 61: 99: 5: 8(1) on the basis of a representation to the Vice-Chancellor by Professor N. Malla, Dean, School of Humanities & Education (No. F. 48/SHE/99-2020 dt 1st June 1999) regarding "Irregularities & Violation of Ordinances in the Department of Philosophy relating to M. Phil and Ph.D admissions", and notified by the University vide No. AC: 61-4/CONF/99-1322 dated 23rd July 1999.

3. The Committee examined the documents forwarded by the Vice-Chancellor, vide D.O. No. NEHU: VCF: 3-19/99-322 dated July 14, 1999, and subsequently more documents by Deputy Registrar (Academic) in several instalments. The Committee also held discussions with Professor N Malla and other members of the faculty, viz. Professor S. Miri, Dr C.R. Agera, Dr S C Daniel, Dr. Jagat Pal, Mr X P Mao, and Dr. L. Lenka, individually and separately, and examined the documents submitted by some of them. The Minutes of the discussions were recorded and duly authenticated. The Committee also referred to the relevant Ordinances.

3. The specific case of irregularity and violation cited by Professor Malla in his representation, mentioned in para 1 above, is of one Mr Abinash Panda, who was a candidate for admission to Ph.D Programme in Philosophy in 1999-2000 against University's notification and for which the short-listed candidates were interviewed by the Department of Philosophy on 29 April 1999. Therefore, the Committee decided to limit the scope of inquiry to this case only.

4. In his representation to the Vice-Chancellor and submission before the Committee, Professor Malla alleged, among other things, as follows :

Contd...3

(a) Mr. Abinash Panda was not called for interview, though he holds first class degrees in MBA, MCA and International Relations.

(b) Though not called for interview, Mr Panda was actually interviewed on 29.4.99 along with other candidates.

(c) In an earlier year, a candidate with degree in military science worked for Ph D in the department.

(d) An admission Committee was constituted by the Department with Dr. C R Agera as the Convonor and with powers to co-opt two more members, but no such cooption was made by the Convenor. The scrutiny was done by Dr C R Agera alone, and all members of the faculty were present in the interview (except Professor Malla who was out of station).

(e) The tabulation sheet (bio- data of candidates) shows that no credit was allotted for performance in the interview, and the allied and cognate subjects were not taken into account.

(f) Mr Panda's synopsis for ph D registration was already processed by the department and approved by BPGS and School Board. The decision of the BRS that he should formally apply for admission should have been taken as a mere formality to regularise the matter.

5. In course of discussions with Professor S Miri (HOD),

Contd.... 4

CLJ

Dr C R Agera and other teachers in Philosophy Deptt. (as in Para 2) the following were contended :

(a) The faculty in its meeting held on 27.3.99 decided that entire faculty shall act as the Admission Committee and asked Dr C R Agera, who is Convener of DRC, to scrutinise the applications, and he may, if he requires, co-opt one or two teachers to assist him in the scrutiny work. It was also decided in the same meeting that 10 candidates shall be admitted in ph D programme and, in view of large number of applications, only the philosophy students shall be called for interview.

(b) Mr Abinash panda was not called for interview, because his qualifying degree is not in Philosophy, and this is as per decision of the faculty.

(c) On 29.4.99, after the interview was formally over and most of the members (including the HOD) had left the room, Mr Panda entered the room of his own to find out his position. Only one teacher had some conversations with him, but this was not part of the interview.

(d) On some earlier occasions, the department had admitted non-philosophy students also to Ph D programme when there were not many candidates from Philosophy, but this year the candidates with degree in Philosophy were also many and hence, considering the availability of supervisors, the faculty had decided to consider the philosophy students only for admission.

(e) Mr Panda's synopsis was processed by the

Contd....

department and approved by the BPGS and School Board when Professor Malla was HOD and also Chairman of BPGS and then of School Board. The processing was without knowledge of the faculty at the initial stage and when it came to notice at later stages some of them objected, but the objections were either not entertained or not minuted. It was, therefore, necessary to bring the matter to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor and the BRS. The decision of the BRS that the candidate should formally apply for admission only means that the case should start from the beginning as per the Ordinance. The synopsis of a candidate cannot be approved and he cannot be considered for the registration before his admission as a student to the programme.

6. The Committee found that the Ph D Ordinance of the University starts with the Admission to the Ph D programme and the notification inviting application for admission is issued by the University. Therefore, the 'admission' is the starting point for ^a Ph D candidate. The seats for this programme is not fixed by the University, or at least not indicated in the latest prospectus. The prospectus only states that all seats need not be filled in July alone, and it advises the candidates to contact the concerned department for availability of seats and other details. The Ph D Ordinance also does not mention about admission committee or its Convenor or members. It states that the candidates will be required to appear in written test and/or interview to be conducted by the department. Therefore, the department can decide the intake at a point of time on the basis of availability of supervisors and other facilities. Similarly, the allied or cognate or other subjects should come only after the subject concerned when the applicants are many. Short-listing is an established procedure. Moreover, these decisions were taken in a meeting of the faculty. Therefore, not calling Mr Abinash Panda, who has no qualifying degree in Philosophy cannot be construed as a violation of the Ordinance. Similarly, Professor Malla's contention that Mr Panda's application for admission was a mere formality on the ground that his registration was approved by BPGS and School Board cannot be accepted, because a candidate has to be admitted to the programme as a student before he can be registered.

5:1:8(5)

7. In the opinion of the Committee, the allegation of 'irregularity and violation of Ordinance' by the Department of Philosophy in case of Mr Abinash Panda's application for admission is not founded.

Sd/-

(J B Bhattacharjee)

Sd/-

(M N Karna)

(viii) Violation of Ordinance for M. Phil / Ph.D. programme
in the Department of Philosophy.

EC:105:99:5:1: (viii): The Council considered the recommendations of the Committee appointed by the Academic Council to look into the allegation of violation of the M.Phil / Ph.D. Ordinances in the Department of Philosophy and RESOLVED to accept the recommendations of the Committee and the Academic Council that the matter be treated as closed. The Council, further considered the request of Prof. N. Malla to forward a complaint from him to the Visitor and RESOLVED that since the complaint relates to the decision and conduct of the Academic Council and also the findings of the Inquiry Committee his complaint may first be placed before the Academic Council for its views. Meanwhile a copy of his complaints may also be sent to the Inquiry Committee for its comments.

5:5- Examination Matters

(i) Sessional Evaluation / Internal Assessment.

EC:105:99:5:5: (i): The Council considered the system for Sessional Evaluation / Internal Assessment and RESOLVED that the assessment may be made by counting the two best marks of three tests.

(ii) Enhancement of remuneration rates to the Staff engage for
Semesters Examination duty.

EC:105:99:5:5: (ii): The Council considered the enhancement of remuneration rates to the staff engaged for Semester Examinations duty and RESOLVED that the rates may be enhanced as follows:

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Class -IV - Peon / Lab Attendant | Rs.10/- per shift |
| 2. Class III LDC / Lab Assistant / GO / etc. | Rs.15/- per shift |
| 3. STA / SO / PA / Stenographer | Rs.25/- per shift |
| 4. Invigilator for the University Centre | Rs.50/- per shift |

(iii) Evaluation and results of Political Science

EC:105:99:5:5: (iii): The Council considered the complaint received from the Secretary, Meghalaya College Principals' Council and RESOLVED that the matter may be looked into by the Committee appointed by the Academic Council for the purpose.