

MINUTES OF THE 114TH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF MANAGEMENT HELD ON JULY 28, 2012 AT 11.00 A.M. IN THE BOARD ROOM, NEW VCO BLOCK, IGNOU CAMPUS, MAIDAN GARHI, NEW DELHI-110068 (revised by the Board at the 115th meeting held on 19.9.2012)

The following were present:

1	Prof. M. Aslam, Vice-Chancellor	- Chairman
2	Shri Anant Kumar Singh, Jt. Secretary(CU&L), MHRD	- Representative, Secretary, MHRD
3	Shri Upamanyu Basu, Director, MHRD	-do-
3	Prof. Vinay Kumar Pathak	- Member
4	Prof. G. Sundar	- Member
5	Er.R.K. Gupta	- Member
6	Prof. B.K. Pattanaik	- Member
7	Prof. E. Vayunandan	- Member
8	Dr. Srikant Mohapatra	- Member
	Shri Udai S. Tolia, Registrar (Admn.)	- Secretary

The Secretary, Ministry of I&B, Member, BOM could not attend the meeting. Shri L.M.Pandey, Finance Officer attended the meeting as a Special Invitee.

At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members to the 114th Meeting of the Board of Management. In his prefatory remarks the Vice Chancellor stated that there are a number of initiatives taken since the 113th meeting of BOM was held. These included:

- Extension of ODL Soft for financial and administrative management operations, which were confined to Hqrs. only, in a phased manner to cover all the Regional Centres. To begin with, Regional Centre, Dwarka has already been covered.
- Planning to introduce Smart-Card Scheme in IGNOU for the Student Life Cycle in collaboration with NIC.
- Taking responsibility of teacher education in a big way through School of Education.
- Constitution of number of committees to review Community College Scheme, Convergence Scheme and MOUs, etc., as mandated by the BOM.

- Holding of Finance Committee, Establishment Committee, Purchase Committee and Research Council Standing Committee meetings.

The Chairman expressed his sincere thanks for the support and encouragement he received from the Board of Management in streamlining IGNOU activities.

The Chairman then requested the Registrar/Secretary, BOM to present the items on the Agenda.

The following items were taken up for consideration:

ITEM NO. 1 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE 113TH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF MANAGEMENT HELD ON MAY 31, 2012 (THE ACTION TAKEN REPORT THEREON WILL BE SENT SEPARATELY/TABLED)

BM 114.1.1 The Registrar informed that the Minutes of the 113th Meeting of the Board of Management held on 31.5.2012 were circulated to the Members of the Board. The comments received from the two Board Members namely, Prof.B.K. Pattanaik and Prof. E.Vayunandan were also placed before the Board. The Action Taken Report on the Minutes of 113th Board meeting was also placed before the Board.

BM 114.1.2 As regards the comments from Prof. B. K. Pattanaik on BOM **Res.113.5.4**, the Board was of the view that rotation is a fundamental principle in the matter of appointment of Directors. The spirit behind appointment of Director on rotational basis is that no person should be encouraged to continue after the prescribed period and therefore, the decision of the Board in the event of only one Professor or where there is no Professor in the School concerned, the appointment of Associate Professor as Director is in order. Therefore, there is no need for reviewing the same.

BM 114.1.3 In regard to the comments from Prof. E. Vayunandan on BOM **Res.113.9.1 & 2**, the Chairman informed that as per the direction of the 111th BOM, a High Power Review Committee was constituted by the Vice Chancellor to look into the activities and mandate of IGNOU. The recommendations of the Committee were placed before the 113th Meeting of the BOM held on 31.5.2012. Therefore, the view of Prof. Vayunandan that the

decision for review of Community College Unit, Convergence Unit, MOUs and face-to-face programmes was that of High Power Committee is not in order. The Board agreed that it has taken a conscious decision based on the recommendations of the High Power Review Committee and the decision stands.

BM 114.1.4

The Board noted the Action Taken Report. The Board while considering the appointment of Dr. V.S.P. Srivastava, Head, Comp. Division, observed that if the procedure followed in absorption of Dr. Srivastava is faulty, his services are liable to be terminated. The Board also noted the views of the Central Vigilance Commission that there have been lapses on the part of Administration as well as Dr. Srivastava. The appointment of Dr. Srivastava has also been viewed adversely by the CVC and it was on record that Dr. Srivastava misrepresented the facts and, thereafter, was absorbed against a permanent post. The Board also noted that the post against which Dr. Srivastava was absorbed was not advertised, which was in violation of the prescribed rules and procedure in the matter, hence appropriate administrative necessary action be taken as per rules.

BM 114.1.5

Expressing its serious concern about inordinate delay in implementing the decisions of the Board, the Board observed that the Board of Management is the Principal Executive body of the University and the decisions taken by it are required to be implemented in right earnest, in order to maintain the dignity of this August Body. It was further observed that if such item(s) which could not be considered due to paucity of time or deferred for any reason whatsoever, the same should be given priority while listing the agenda items for consideration by the next BOM. The Board agreed to the suggestion and directed that this may be followed in future.

BM 114.1.6

Dr. Vinay Kumar Pathak, Member, BOM pointed out that non-implementation of the decision of the 113th BOM in the matter of appointment of Dr. R.P. Singh, as Director, RSD is a serious matter. This view was also endorsed by Sh. Anant Kumar Singh, Joint Secretary, MHRD. The Board was, however, of the view that legal opinion in the instant case should not have been sought, particularly when the direction of the Board was clear. The Board reaffirmed the decision taken at its previous meeting to the effect that suitable placement of Dr. R.P. Singh may be considered in the University and the appointment of Director, RSD as per the seniority from amongst Sr. Regional Directors be made since

neither seniority nor any process of selection/presentation was followed in the appointment of Dr. R.P. Singh as Director, RSD.

BM 114.1.7 After detailed discussion in the matter, the Board directed that a self-speaking order regarding shifting of Dr. R.P. Singh elsewhere in the University and the senior-most Regional Director be appointed to the post of Director, RSD following the principles of seniority.

BM 114.1.8 With the above observations, the Board confirmed the Minutes of 113th Meeting held on 31.5.2012.

ITEM NO. 2 TO CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 78TH MEETING OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE HELD ON 18.7.2012

BM 114.2.1 The Item was taken up for consideration. The Board considered & approved the recommendations of the 78th Meeting of the Finance Committee held on 18.7.2012 except Item No.11 relating to granting of GP of Rs.4600/- to Sr. Assistants/Personal Assistants Grade-II wherein it was decided to constitute a Committee comprising one representative from IFD, MHRD. The Committee's recommendations shall be put up to the Vice-Chancellor for further necessary action.

Further, the Board specifically approved the Annual Accounts of the University for the year 2011-2012 for submission to the statutory Auditors viz. the DGACE for Audit. The Board appreciated the special efforts made by the University to finalize the Annual Accounts for the financial year 2011-2012, ensuring its timely submission to the Statutory Audit & for its further submission to the MHRD, along with the Audit Certificate in due course under the provisions of Section 29(1) of IGNOU Act.

A copy of the Minutes of the 78th meeting of the Finance Committee is placed as **Appendix-1**.

ITEM NO. 3 TO CONSIDER AND CONFIRM THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT COMMITTEE MADE AT ITS 66TH MEETING HELD ON 17.7.2012

BM 114.3.1 The Board considered the recommendations of the Establishment Committee made its 66th Meeting held on 17.7.2012. As regards

Item No.5 regarding granting of GP of Rs.4600/- to Senior Assistants/Personal Assistants Grade-II, it was decided to constitute a Committee comprising one representative from Integrated Finance Division (IFD), MHRD. The Committee's recommendations shall be put up to the Vice-Chancellor for further necessary action.

BM 114.3.2

As regards the recommendations of the Committee constituted as per **Res.EC 66.7.1** to examine the Performance Appraisal Reports of teachers/academics & Group-A officers, the report of the Committee was submitted to the Vice Chancellor who directed that the same may be placed before the Board. The Committee found that the Performance Appraisal Reports of Dr. R.P. Singh, Director (RSD) and Dr. Bini Toms, Dy.Director (EDNERU) did not contain verification & authentication as they are reported to be functioning under the direct control of the Vice Chancellor owing to non-availability of a Pro Vice Chancellor. The Committee after going through the Performance Appraisal Reports of the above academics found nothing adverse against them and has, therefore, recommended that lifting of their probation & confirmation from the respective dates may be considered. Further, the Committee also examined the case of Dr. Kameshwary Moorthy, Regional Director, IGNOU RC, Pune and found her Performance Appraisal Report in order in all respects and recommended that lifting of her probation & confirmation from the date may also be considered retrospectively from the date of completion of the period of probation of one year.

BM 114.3.3

The Board approved the recommendations of the 66th Establishment Committee with the above decisions. A copy of the recommendations of the Establishment Committee is placed as **Appendix--2**.

ITEM NO. 4

TO CONSIDER AND CONFIRM THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PURCHASE COMMITTEE MADE AT ITS 60TH AND 61ST MEETINGS HELD ON 22.3.2012 AND 18.7.2012, RESPECTIVELY

BM 114.4.1

The item was taken up for consideration. Shri Anant Kumar Singh, Jt. Secretary pointed out that placement of the recommendations of the Purchase Committee before the Board was not required, though Statute 16(2) provides for the same. He was of the view that the Board is a policy-making body and under the provisions of IGNOU Act, the Board has no authority for approving the purchases of goods & services by the University. Replying to the query of the Finance Officer regarding enhancement of the limit of financial powers of

officers/authorities, he reiterated that raising the limits will not serve the purpose and opined that the powers already given under GFR to various officers including the Head of the Organization should be followed. He also advised for a review of the decision taken by the Board at its 18th & 38th Meetings regarding constitution, powers & functions of the Purchase Committee. The Board agreed to the suggestions.

BM 114.4.2 With the above observations, the Board approved the recommendations of the Purchase Committee made at its 60th and 61st meetings.

ITEM NO. 5 TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATIONS OF TWO MEMBERS ON THE SEARCH COMMITTEE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY

BM 114.5.1 The Secretary/Registrar explained briefly the extant provisions under Statute 1 of IGNOU Act, dealing with the appointment of Vice-Chancellor of the University, explaining further that the Board is required to nominate two Members on the Search Committee under Statute 1(2). He further informed that nominations of two members made by the Board at its 111th Meeting held on 29.12.2011 have been rejected by the Visitor and the MHRD has desired that the Board of Management of the University may consider fresh nominations of two Members for the purpose. The matter was accordingly placed before the Board for consideration.

BM 114.5.2 The Board considered letter No.F.5-18/2011-DL dt. 6.7.2012 received from the MHRD regarding fresh nominations of two Members on the Search Committee for selection of the Vice-Chancellor of the University, in terms of the provisions of Statute 1 of IGNOU Act. The Board nominated the following as Members on the Search Committee, in order of preference, for submission to the Ministry after obtaining the consent of the Members:

1. Shri J.M. Lyngdoh, Former Chief Election Commissioner of India
2. Prof. S.K. Joshi, Former Director General, CSIR & Professor Emeritus, National Physical Laboratory, New Delhi
3. Dr. M. Anandkrishnan, Chairman, Board of Governors, IIT Kanpur
4. Shri Anil Kakodkar, Former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission

The Board directed that the consent of the Members at Sl.Nos.1 & 2 may be obtained in first place and based on the consent so received, a communication in this regard may be sent to the MHRD expeditiously.

The copies of the brief profiles of the above four Members are placed as **Appendix-3** for perusal.

ITEM NO. 6 TO CONSIDER THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXPERT COMMITTEES FOR RE-EMPLOYMENT OF SUPERANNUATION OF PROFESSORS

BM114.6.1 The Chairman left the meeting and requested Prof. Vinay Kumar Pathak to chair as the item pertained to him as well. The recommendations of the expert committees in the matter of re-employment of the following superannuated Professors were placed before the Board:

1. Prof. B.S. Hansra, SOA
2. Prof. Manohar Lal, SOCIS
3. Prof. M. Aslam, SOCE
4. Prof. Pandav Nayak, SOSS

The Board also noted that if any of the above Professors have already worked on re-employment on superannuation, such period will be reckoned towards the first spell of 3 years.

BM114.6.2 The Board approved the recommendations of the above expert committees in the light of the guidelines approved by the Board at its 113th Meeting held on 31.5.2012 and notified vide notification No. IG/Admn(G)/Not./2012/2830 dt.27.7.2012 on re-employment of Professors after superannuation.

BM114.6.3 The Board also considered the issue of re-employment of those teachers who are promoted as Professors under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) of IGNOU. After deliberations, it was decided that the cases of Professors under CAS may also be considered for re-employment after superannuation as per the aforesaid guidelines. The re-employment shall be against the personal posts of Professors granted to them under CAS. The substantive posts shall remain vacant till the re-employment period ends. The guidelines on re-employment of Professors after superannuation shall stand amended to this extent.

ITEM NO.7 TO CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUNCTIONING OF THE CHAIRS IN THE UNIVERSITY

BM114.7.1 The item was taken up for consideration. The Board considered the Report of the Committee constituted by the Board at its 113th meeting held on 31.5.2012 vide **Res. 113.4.3**. The Board appreciated the work done by the Committee and approved the guidelines evolved by the Committee.

ITEM NO. 8 TO CONSIDER THE CASE OF SHRI M. RAJAMANNAR, PRODUCER (SG), EMPC

BM 114.8.1 The Board observed that the Five Member Committee headed by Prof. A.K. Singh was mandated to look into the issue of any alleged violations/reason for non-inclusion of an SC/ST representative in the first Selection Committee and any lapse(s) on the part of the official(s) concerned. The Committee was also to give an opportunity to Shri Rajamannar, Producer (SG) to present his case along with the supporting material before the Committee. The report also mentioned that it procured necessary papers and documents related to the case from the Director, ACD in the form of two files for the perusal of the Committee Members. The report of the Committee has made five observations, but has miserably failed to fix the responsibility of the officials for the five lapses mentioned there. The Committee has accepted the allegations of Shri Rajamannar that the Chairman and In-charge VC in the Selection Committee misinformed the Committee that the interview was not under the CAS and this interview was post based and only one candidate was to be recommended for promotion on the basis of the statement of two members of the Committee, viz. Prof. Iftexhar Ahmed and Prof. Grace Kuzur.

The Board also observed that brief presented before the Second Selection Committee, which had found Shri Rajamannar unfit clearly mentions that the selection process was for grant of Selection Grade under CAS. Further, the minutes of the Selection Committee signed by all these members mentioned at 3 different places that the matter relates to “placement in Selection Grade under CAS.

Therefore, the finding of the Inquiry Committee headed by Prof. A.K. Singh cannot be accepted that the Selection Committee was

misled to believe that the selection process was not under CAS. In view of these facts, the Board sticks to its decision taken in its 91st Meeting held on 2.7. 2007 and re-affirmed the same at its 110th Meeting held on 5.10.2011 vide **Res.BM110.4.2**. The Board expresses its displeasure on the Committee for not fixing the responsibility on the person responsible for not including the SC Member when Mr. Rajamannar faced the Selection Committee for the first time. The Board requested the Vice Chancellor to constitute another Committee which will fix the responsibility and submit its report to the Board within one month.

ITEM NO. 9 TO CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE PROPOSAL FOR REVISING THE AMOUNT OF HONORARIUM PAYABLE TO THE INQUIRY OFFICERS AND PRESENTING OFFICERS IN DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

BM 114.9.1 The Secretary informed the Board that the Board at its 106th Meeting held on 19.11.2010 while considering the recommendations of the 62nd meeting of the Establishment Committee regarding the revision of amount of honorarium payable to Inquiry Officers & Presenting Officers in disciplinary proceedings, had desired that the old/existing rates of remuneration should also be indicated whenever the revision of such rates is proposed. Accordingly, the agenda item including the old & revised rates was placed before the Board for consideration.

BM 114.9.2 The Board approved the proposal for revision of the rates of honorarium payable to the Inquiry Officers/Presenting Officers from the date of notification.

ITEM NO.10 TO REPORT THE ENGAGEMENT OF CONSULTANT DR. MANORAMA KHANNA AT REGIONAL CENTRE, DELHI-3

BM 114.10.1 The Board approved the proposal for engagement of Dr. Manorama Khanna as Consultant at Regional Centre, Delhi-3 for a further period of six months as per the existing terms.

ITEM NO.11 TO CONSIDER THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF DISTANCE EDUCATION COUNCIL & AN ACTION PLAN OF MHRD ON MADHAVA MENON COMMITTEE REPORT

BM 114.11.1 The item was taken up for consideration. Prof. E. Vayunandan wanted the matter to be deferred for another date because the Report

of the Madhava Menon Committee is voluminous and has far reaching effect, therefore, it should not be taken up in a hurry. Prof. B.K. Pattanaik and Dr. S.K. Mohapatra also wanted this to be deferred. Shri Anant Kumar Singh, Joint Secretary, MHRD informed the Board that although the University seems to have circulated the Agenda Note late but this issue has been deliberated in the Distance Education Council (DEC) at length in its 40th meeting held on 8th June, 2012. The very minutes of the DEC, which is before us now, indicate that the discussion there was exhaustive covering all the aspects including various apprehensions raised by the members. They were all settled through appropriate facts and legal provisions. Thereafter, considering all facets of the issues, the DEC has taken a considered view to recommend to the Board of Management of IGNOU to repeal Statute 28 after following due procedure. The Report of the Madhava Menon Committee may be voluminous but the portion dealing with this limited issue is hardly two pages. One can go through it in this meeting itself. Further, the deliberations of the DEC is also in about two pages which is actually relevant at this moment.

Participating in the discussion, Prof. E. Vayunandan stated that the issues like the dissolution of Distance Education Council and the dilution of the Statute 28 are very sensitive and a decision taken by the Board in this regard in hurry without the involvement of stakeholders would not be appropriate. He argued that the existence of UGC itself is at stake in view of the proposed National Council of Higher Education and Research Bill which is pending in the Parliament. Therefore, the decision for shifting of DEC to UGC even as an interim arrangement should be taken only after seeking the views of the stakeholders. These views were also supported by Prof. B.K. Pattanaik and Dr. S.K. Mohapatra.

Shri Vinay Pathak appreciated the point raised by Prof. Vayunandan about consulting the stakeholders and clarified that as a part of this consultative process only this aspect of the Report of the Madhava Menon Committee was first placed before the DEC. DEC deliberated on it in detail and has passed a resolution to dissolve the DEC. As a next step, this issue has come up before the BOM of IGNOU today. He further added that because DEC is a body created by IGNOU through Statute 28 and is also headed by the VC, IGNOU, it cannot be the regulator of other Universities in respect of Distance Education Programmes. There is an apparent conflict of Interest between IGNOU and other Universities.

Shri Anant Kumar Singh supplemented that there is a case pending in the Delhi High Court, filed by Delhi University, challenging the regulatory authority of the DEC. Many Universities/Institutions are offering Distance Education Courses without even caring to seek the recognition of DEC. In order to end the confusion prevailing in the field of Distance Education System, the Madhava Menon Committee recommended to remove DEC from IGNOU. We must not forget that VC, IGNOU and Chairman, DEC was a Member of the Committee and is also a signatory of this Report.

So far as the uncertainty of existence of UGC in view of the proposed HER Bill pending before the Parliament is concerned, it was clarified by Shri Singh that until HER Bill becomes an Act, UGC is in existence and it has the mandate to regulate the norms and standards in the University system including the Distance Education Systems. That is why the Madhava Menon Committee has suggested that the task of regulating the Distance Education System in the interregnum period should be entrusted to the UGC. It was also clarified that DEC is not going out of existence because of its disassociation with the IGNOU. DEC will be very much in existence, performing its current duties, but it will do so under the UGC until HER Act becomes effective.

Prof. G. Sundar, participating in the debate, read out several provisions of Statute 28 which, according to him, are required to be retained for maintenance of quality of education in IGNOU itself. Therefore, he argued that repealing Statute 28 would be counter productive. Chairman clarified that Statute 28 is meant only to regulate the standards in other Open Distance Learning Institutions. Maintenance of standard of Education in IGNOU is taken care of by the other provisions of the Act and Statutes than Statute 28.

Referring to the provisions under Preamble of the IGNOU Act, 1985, Dr. Srikant Mohapatra, Member, stated that the Act ibid sought to establish and incorporate an open University at the national level for introduction and promotion of open University and distance education system in the educational pattern of the country for the coordination and determination of standards in such system. He added that the deletion of the provision enumerated in the Preamble and further provisions under Sections 4 & 5 of IGNOU Act dealing with the objectives of the University amounts to modification in the basic structure of the Act and this can be done by the Parliament only. Board of Management of IGNOU has no power to take such decision which amounts to amendment in the Act.

Responding to Dr. Mohapatra's observations, Shri Singh clarified that enactment of law and any modifications therein is done by the Parliament but it does not do so suo moto. The proposal to that effect in the form of a Bill has to be made by the respective Ministry. Although Madhava Menon Committee has recommended amendment in the Act, but the proposal before us is not the amendment in the Act, but repeal of Statute 28 as resolved by the DEC in its meeting held on 8th June, 2012. Section 25 (2) of the IGNOU Act authorizes the Board to make new or additional Statute or amend or repeal the existing Statutes. Therefore, the Board is fully competent to take a decision about the repeal of Statute 28. He appealed to the members of the Board that if they are satisfied with the limited point that DEC being a statutory authority of IGNOU cannot be a regulator for other Universities, then it should resolved to accept the recommendations of the DEC. Other aspects of the Madhava Menon Committee report may be discussed on a convenient date.

Intervening in the discussion, Er. R.K. Gupta appealed to the Members to kindly go through the resolution of the DEC in which all the issues that are being raised here now have been discussed and settled. DEC is a statutory authority created by IGNOU, which is a university itself. Therefore, when DEC plays the role of a regulator for other Universities, it creates a conflict of interest between IGNOU and other Universities. Considering this limited point, the DEC has decided to dissolve itself. Therefore, the Board should respect that decision and pave the way for repeal of Statute 28.

The Board accepted that there is a conflict of interest. One University must not regulate others.

BM 114.11.2 After taking into consideration all aspects of the issues, the Board felt that accepting the recommendations of the DEC and requesting the Visitor to repeal Statute 28 will be in the larger interest of the Distance Education System in the country. Therefore, it decided accordingly keeping the dissent of the teacher members on record.

ITEM NO. 12 TO NOTE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COUNCIL MADE AT ITS 40TH MEETING HELD ON JUNE 08, 2012

BM 114.12.1 The Minutes of the 40th Meetings of the Distance Education Council held on 08.6.2012 were taken up for consideration. As regards DEC **Res.40.11**, a view has been taken under **BOM Res.114.11.4**. The

rest of the items were approved.

BM 114.12.2 With the above observations, the Board confirmed the Minutes of the 40th meeting of the Distance Education Council. A copy of the Minutes of the Distance Education Council is placed as **Appendix-5**.

ITEM NO. 13 TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSAL FOR CONDUCTING 25TH CONVOCATION AT IGNOU REGIONAL CENTRES

BM 114.13.1 The item was taken up for consideration. The Board considered the provision under Clauses 5 & 6 of the Ordinance on the Convocation (under Statute 21 of the IGNOU Act). The relevant provision in this regard is reproduced below:

“5. The students who have passed their examination in the year for which the Convocation is held shall be eligible to be admitted to the convocation:

Provided that in case the convocation is not held in a particular year for any reason, the Vice-Chancellor shall be competent to authorize admission of successful students in that year to the respective Degrees/Diplomas, in absentia and issue the Degrees/Diplomas, on payment of prescribed fees.

BM 114.13.2 The Board approved the proposal for distribution of degrees on payment of prescribed fee for 25th Convocation without convening the function (in absentia).

ITEM NO. 14 TO CONSIDER NOMINATIONS OF THREE MEMBERS ON THE WORKS COMMITTEE, A STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE BOM

BM 114.14.1 The proposal was placed before the Board. The Board authorized the Vice-Chancellor to nominate three Members on the Works Committee one each representing Civil, Electrical and Mechanical, respectively.

ITEM NO. 15 TO CONSIDER PURCHASE OF LAND FOR REGIONAL CENTRE NOIDA

BM 114.15.1 The Secretary informed the Board that the Regional Centre, NOIDA is currently functioning from a rented building. The University wishes to have its own building for accommodation of Regional Centre at Noida. In this regard, the Regional Centre, Noida has sent a proposal for purchase of land for construction of RC building at the tentative cost of the land measuring 1000 sq. mt. (plot) as Rs.3.5

crores (approx.). It was further informed that the delegation of financial power provides for seeking prior approval of the Board of Management for purchase of land exceeding Rs.50 lacs. The BOM approved the same.

BM 114.15.2 The Board further authorized the Vice Chancellor to constitute a Committee for purchase of land for Regional Centres in future on case-to-case basis and decision may be taken on the basis of the recommendations of the Committee. The recommendations of the Committee may be placed before the FC/BOM.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

(M. Aslam)
Chairman