

**MINUTES OF THE 115<sup>TH</sup> (EMERGENT) MEETING OF THE BOARD OF MANAGEMENT HELD ON SEPTEMBER 19, 2012 AT 11.30 A.M. IN THE BOARD ROOM, NEW VCO BLOCK, IGNOU CAMPUS, MAIDAN GARHI, NEW DELHI-110068, (confirmed by the Board at the 116<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 24.11.2012).**

The following were present:

1	Prof. Gopinath Pradhan, Vice-Chancellor	- Chairman
2	Shri Anant Kumar Singh, Jt. Secretary(CU&L), MHRD	- Representative, Secretary, MHRD
3	Prof. Mahendra P. Lama	- Member
4	Dr.(Ms.) Ruth Manorama	- Member
5	Prof. Vinay Kumar Pathak	- Member
6	Prof. B.K. Pattanaik	- Member
7	Prof. E. Vayunandan	- Member
8	Dr. Srikant Mohapatra	- Member
9	Er.R.K. Gupta	- Member
	Shri Udai S. Tolia, Registrar (Admn.)	- Secretary

The Secretary, Ministry of I&B, Prof. D.B. Phatak, Prof. Bakul Dholakia, Shri Arvind Sanghvi and Prof. G. Sundar, Members, BOM could not attend the meeting.

At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members to the 115<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Board of Management. He informed that the President of India in his capacity as Visitor of the University has nominated five Members to the Board of Management, namely, Prof. Mahendra P. Lama, Prof. D.B. Phatak, Dr.(Ms.) Ruth Manorama, Prof. Bakul Dholakia and Shri Arvind Sanghvi. Prof. Mahendra P. Lama and Dr. Ruth Manorama, who were attending the Meeting of the Board for the first time were introduced to the members of the Board. The Chairman also introduced the other Members of the Board to the new Members.

The Chairman gave a brief account of the distinguished positions held by Prof. Lama and his contribution made in different fields. It was informed that he served previously in different capacities as Professor of South Asian Studies, the Chairman of the Centre for South, Central, and South East Asia and South West Pacific Studies, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. He had also served as the Chief Economic Adviser to the Chief Minister of Sikkim with a Cabinet Minister rank for seven years since 2002. Prof. Lama is

presently a member of the National Security Advisory Board. He has published 15 books and a number of research papers. Presently, Prof Lama is holding the position of Vice-Chancellor of Sikkim University, Gangtok.

The Chairman also introduced Dr. Ruth Manorama to the Board. He informed that Dr. Manorama is one of the most effective organizers and advocates of Dalit women, belonging to scheduled castes. She has worked with women living in slums, trained and empowered them to face the issues like violence, discrimination and deprivation enabling them to stand on their own. Presently, she is the President of National Alliance of Women, Bangalore.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Board, placed on record the appreciation for the valuable contributions made by Prof. M. Aslam, the outgoing Vice-Chancellor & Chairman of the Board.

The Vice Chancellor, thereafter, informed the members that the Urgent Meeting of the Board has been convened due to the exigency arising out of urgent academic and operational issues which have cropped up in implementing certain decisions of the Board taken at its 113<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 31.5.2012. The Chairman called upon the wisdom and the guidance of the Board members, in the deliberations relating to the launching of academic programmes particularly under Community College Scheme, Convergence Scheme and review of MOUs etc. He informed that the academic programmes under aforesaid schemes are under review in reference to the BOM decisions and consequently further admissions under these schemes have been kept in abeyance, till the review is complete. The Chairman also informed that the results of the students registered under these schemes have not been declared, registration has been withheld and that a number of court cases have been filed in this regard.

The Chairman informed that an emergent Meeting of the Academic Council (59<sup>th</sup>) was also convened on 13.9.2012 to deliberate on the specific academic operational issues mentioned above arising out of the decision of the Board particularly on matters pertaining to academic programmes launched by the University in collaboration with other educational institutes/agencies for July 2012 Cycle, under the 'Community Colleges Scheme', 'Convergence Scheme', 'Campus F-2-F Programme', etc. respectively which have happened before the issue of notification of the BOM decisions. Though the fresh admissions under these schemes have been kept in abeyance, the issues of their examination, declaration of results and re-registration, etc. has remained to be resolved. The Academic Council has recommended that such students may be allowed to continue their programmes till its completion but the examination shall be conducted by the University under appropriate mechanism to be devised.

The Chairman, thereafter, 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 114<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE BOARD OF MANAGEMENT HELD ON JULY 28, 2012 AND THE ACTION TAKEN THEREON**

**BM 115.1.1** The Registrar informed that the Minutes of the 114<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Board of Management held on 28.7.2012 were circulated to the Members of the Board. The comments have been received from the MHRD vide their letter No.F.5-28/2011-DL (Part) dt. 17.9.2012 and the other Board Members namely, Prof. M. Aslam, (the then Chairman, BOM), Prof. B.K. Pattanaik, Prof. E.Vayunandan & Dr. S.K. Mohapatra which were placed before the Board. The Action Taken Report on the Minutes of 114<sup>th</sup> Board meeting was also placed before the Board.

**BM 115.1.2** (i) With regard to the comments from Prof. M. Aslam relating to Res. BM114.6.1, it was confirmed that when the Item No.6 was taken up for discussion, the Chairman had left the meeting and had requested Prof. Vinay Kumar Pathak to chair the meeting since the item also pertained to him. Therefore, the Board decided to incorporate the sentence '*The Chairman left the meeting and requested Prof. Vinay Kumar Pathak to chair as the item pertained to him as well*' in the beginning of **BOM Res.114.6.1**, as desired by Prof. Aslam. The resolution stands corrected and ratified to that extent.

In the above context, Prof. Mahendra P. Lama desired to be apprised regarding the procedure followed by the University in the matter of re-employment of teachers vis-à-vis the decision taken by the Board at its 113<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2012. The Secretary, BOM informed the Board at its 110<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 7.10.2011 while considering the issue of re-employment/extension of Professors of the University after superannuation resolved that the definite guidelines evolved by the UGC in the matter of re-employment of teachers after the age of superannuation may be perused. Accordingly, with the help of a Committee, Guidelines for re-employment of superannuated Professors in the University were evolved keeping in view the guidelines framed by the UGC. The draft guidelines were placed before the BOM at its 112<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 9.4.2012. These guidelines were finally

approved by the BOM at its 113<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 31.5.2012. The Board at its 114<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 28.7.2012 also decided that the cases of Professors under CAS may also be considered for re-employment after superannuation as per these guidelines. Prof. Mahendra Lama suggested that the guidelines regarding reemployment of retired professors should be brought out in the form of an ordinance because as per the Act as such issues are governed by ordinances.

**BM 115.1.3** Agreeing to the proposal, the Board desired that the draft Ordinance on re-employment may be placed in the next Board meeting for consideration of the Board.

**BM 115.1.4** (i) With regard to the comments received from the MHRD and the Board Members namely Prof. B. K. Pattanaik, Prof. E. Vayunandan and Dr. S.K. Mohapatra on Item No.11 of the 114<sup>th</sup> BOM, it is informed that all the issues related to the status of DEC as separate autonomous entity will be taken into consideration vide Resolutions **BM 115.1.7 & 8** separately (Please refer to Annexure-7 to Item No.1 of 114<sup>th</sup> Meeting of BOM held on 28.7.2012).

(ii) With regard to comments of Prof. E. Vayunandan relating to Item No.3 of the 114<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Board held on 28.7.2012 read with **EC Resolution 66.4.1**, it was clarified that the Board adopts resolutions with regard to policy matters. The Board noted that the recommendations of the 66<sup>th</sup> Establishment Committee meeting authorizing the Vice Chancellor to constitute a Committee for examining the cases, is in order.

In this connection, the Board expressed its concern that in spite of repeated directions agenda notes are not coming with full facts relevant for taking a considered decision. It was resolved that in future no item will be taken up if it does not have all relevant facts for taking a decision. Secretary will ensure this. It was also decided that the proceedings of the meeting should be recorded so that minutes are recorded accurately and inadvertent omissions are avoided.

(iii) With regard to Item No.6 of 114<sup>th</sup> BOM held on 28.7.2012 vide Resolution **BM114.1.6** in reference to the representations from the Associations, the Board observed that the matter should be placed before the Board only after examining the issues in all its details by the concerned Division, School, etc., vis-à-vis the relevant facts and extant rules.

(iv) With regard the comments of Dr. S.K. Mohapatra on **Res.BM114.1.2**, the Board noted that at its 113<sup>th</sup> Meeting vide **Res.BM113.5.5** the Board has directed that till the amendment to Statute is made and the assent of the Visitor obtained, the University may take necessary action in the light of above proposed amendments. The Board, therefore, resolved that the 'last sentence' from the **BM Res.114.1.2** be deleted and further necessary action be initiated based on the BOM decision. Accordingly, the relevant minutes will stand amended as under:

*“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.”*

Dr. S K Mohapatra also raised the issue of Career Advancement Scheme and enhancement of retirement of academics in the university.

The matter was discussed in the 114<sup>th</sup> meeting of the BOM but the same was not made part of the minutes. Dr. Mohapatra requested that these two issues pertaining to the academics be made part of the minutes.

The members of the Board agreed to make it part of the minutes and requested the Chairman to constitute a committee to examine these issues.

(v) With regard to BOM resolution **BM114.1.4**, the Board observed that once the opportunity of final hearing was given and the decision to declare the appointment of Dr. Srivastava illegal was taken, then there was no occasion to appoint any Inquiry Officer & Presenting Officer. The Board was informed by the Secretary, BOM that this was done on the basis of the appeal made by Dr. Srivastava to the Vice Chancellor that his services cannot be terminated without holding proper enquiry. The Board observed that action taken by the University in appointing Inquiry Officer and Presenting Officer for inquiry against Dr. V.S.P. Srivastava is not proper. If there was any justification for

appointing Inquiry Officer and Presenting Officer, then full facts in support of the same should have been presented before the Board for reviewing its decision. Honouring the decision taken by the Vice Chancellor, the Board directed that an agenda item giving full facts of the case right from the very beginning, in chronological order, be placed before the Board at its next meeting to enable it to take an informed decision in the matter.

#### **BM 115.1.5**

The Board considered the comments received from the MHRD vide their letter dt.17.9.2012 with regard to Item No.8 of the 114<sup>th</sup> Board meeting held on 28.7.2012. At this point, Prof. B.K. Pattanaik withdrew from the meeting, as he was one of the Members of the Inquiry Committee, whose report is under consideration. The Board decided to substitute the minutes recorded at Res.No.**BM 114.8.1** as under.

*“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. Iftekhhar 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 91<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on 2.7. 2007 and re-affirmed the same at its 110<sup>th</sup> 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.”*

**BM 115.1.6** The Board further resolved to seek explanation of all the Members of the aforesaid Committee headed by Prof. A.K. Singh, as to why they did not look into the basic documents, viz. the Brief presented to the Selection Committee and the minutes of the Selection Committee while examining the claims of Shri Rajamannar and on what basis they have recorded the statement of four members of the Selection Committee mentioned in their report. The explanation from the Chairman and other members of the said Inquiry Committee will be placed in the next BOM for taking a decision in this matter.”

**BM 115.1.7** In regard to Item No.11 of the 114<sup>th</sup> of the BOM held on 28.7.2012, the Board considered the comments received from the MHRD vide their letter dt.17.9.2012, as per **Appendix-1**. Sh. Anant Kumar Singh, Jt. Secretary reiterated that the Board is not amending the law to repeal Statute 28. The fundamental question before the Board is that DEC being an authority of IGNOU cannot be a regulator for other Universities. Participating in the discussion, Dr. S.K. Mohapatra placed on record that the government had made IGNOU a Regulator. The leadership role of IGNOU as a model for open and distance education system in the educational pattern of India as assigned in IGNOU Act should not be diluted. The Board noted that DEC as an independent entity has a role to regulate the distance education in the country. The Board was, however, concerned about the modalities regarding separation of DEC from IGNOU. It was also noted with concern that if DEC is not separated from IGNOU, there may be a serious conflict of interest. At this point of time, Dr. Ruth Manorama desired that the Board should find out the most feasible workable

solution in the interests of the students across the country.

**BM 115.1.8**

After detailed discussion, it was unanimously resolved to modify the Minutes of the 114<sup>th</sup> Meeting under Resolutions Nos.114.11.1, 2, 3 & 4 based on the comments received from the Ministry vide their letter dt.17.9.2012. Accordingly, the revised Minutes in respect of No.11 of 114<sup>th</sup> BOM Meeting are reproduced below:

*“BM114.11.1: 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 40<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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.*

*BM114.11.2: 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.”*

**BM 115.1.9** With the above rectifications/incorporations/decisions, the Board confirmed the Minutes of 114<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Board of Management held on 28.7.2012.

**ITEM NO. 2 TO CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE DECISIONS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL TAKEN AT ITS 59<sup>TH</sup> (URGENT) MEETING HELD ON 13.9.2012 TO DELIBERATE ON SPECIFIC ACADEMIC OPERATIONAL ISSUES**

**ITEM NO. 3 TO CONSIDER THE INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**BM 115.3.1** These Items (Item No.2 and Item No.3) were taken up for consideration. Registrar (Admn.) informed the Board that review of Community College Scheme, Convergence Scheme and MOUs is under process as per IGNOU Mandate. On receiving varied facts from different members, the Board felt that it would be premature to take a decision on evaluation, re-registration, etc. of the students already admitted in programmes under the aforesaid schemes as these schemes have been prima facie considered against the statutory provisions of the University. The respective review committees may be requested to expedite their report so that appropriate decision is taken under the extant rules of the University at the earliest and the uncertainty prevailing in this regard is addressed appropriately.

Prof. Mahendra P. Lama emphasized the need for well-structured and defined systems to be in place for smooth functioning of the University. He also emphasized that the Legal, Institutional and Academic Frameworks are three important pillars for systematic operation and sustainability of credible functioning of the University. All these cases need to be examined on these criteria.

**BM 115.3.2** After detailed discussion in the matter, the Board decided that the Vice Chancellor should immediately constitute a preliminary

screening committee which will obtain the requisite information from the concerned Divisions, Schools, Centres, etc. and feed the same to the respective review committees to facilitate early finalization of report. The Review Committee may also be requested to submit part reports in batches.

**ITEM NO. 4 TO NOTE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COUNCIL MADE AT ITS 41<sup>ST</sup> MEETING HELD ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2012**

**BM 115.4.1** The Board considered the recommendations of the Distance Education Council made at its 41<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on 14.9.2012. While considering the recommendations, the Board felt that the orders for release of grants to the recognized institutions should be posted on the University website and a time-bound recognition system has to be in place to avoid complaints.

**BM 115.4.2** The Board approved the recommendations of the 41<sup>st</sup> Distance Education Council except Item Nos.3 & 4 wherein a decision has to be taken in the matters by the concerned Divisions in consultation with the Finance Committee and other authorities. A copy of the recommendations of the DEC is placed as **Appendix-3**. The Board directed the DEC to take effective action against the institutions which are functioning without its recognition or operating beyond their territorial jurisdiction. Periodical public notification to that effect should be published in the newspapers to educate the general public about the legitimacy of such programmes and institutions.

**ITEM NO. 5 TO CONSIDER THE RECTIFICATION OF NOMENCLATURE OF THE IGNOU-NGA PROJECT TO MGIED**

**BM 115.5.1** The Board approved the proposal of EDNERU for change of nomenclature of the IGNOU-NGA Project to ‘Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education and Development (MGIED)’.

**ITEM NO. 6 TO CONSIDER THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE VICE-CHANCELLORS OF SOUs HELD ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2012.**

**BM115.6.1** The Item was taken up for consideration. The Secretary, BOM informed the Board that in order to resolve the emergent issues relating to the DEC, a Meeting of the Vice-Chancellors of State Open Universities was convened on 18.9.2012 which was chaired by

the Vice-Chancellor, IGNOU. After detailed discussions, the following resolution was adopted unanimously in the Meeting of VCs of SOUs:

*'The Vice Chancellors deliberated on the recommendations of the Madhava Menon Committee at length. After detailed deliberations the following was resolved unanimously:*

- 1. The DEC should be made an independent regulating body. The Govt. of India may be requested to speed up the process for creation of the DEC as an independent regulator.*
- 2. Till such time the DEC becomes an independent regulator, status-quo with regard to DEC should be maintained.*

A copy of the Minutes of the Vice-Chancellor of SOUs is enclosed as **Appendix-4**.

#### **BM115.6.2**

While considering the above resolution of the VCs of the SOUs, the Board observed that the rationale for repealing Statute 28 and dissolving DEC as a statutory Authority of IGNOU, is discussed at length vide Res. Nos. **BM 115.1.6 & 7**. Therefore, it is not possible to agree to the above resolution in the interest of ODL system. However, it resolved as under:

- (i) To make DEC an independent Regulator as soon as possible.
- (ii) To request the Government of India to strengthen the DEC to enable it to function more efficiently and effectively.
- (iii) The existing officers/staff working in DEC are IGNOU employees. They should be given an option to serve either in DEC or IGNOU as per their choice.

#### **Other Items:**

**BM 115.7.1 (i)** Under any other item, Prof. E. Vayunandan brought the matter of disciplinary proceedings pending against Prof. Kapil Kumar to the notice of the Board. It was observed that Board has not approved the charge sheet issued against Prof. Kapil Kumar. It was resolved that full facts in this regard may be put up as an agenda item in the next Board meeting by the concerned Division.

**BM 115.7.1 (ii)** It was pointed out that the Registrar having administrative responsibility should not hold the charge of CVO also. The Board observed that the Vice Chancellor may make interim arrangement for appointing a CVO Incharge. Further, it was observed that the University should take up appointment of full time CVO with

MHRD and DoPT vigorously and also take steps to incorporate the procedure to appoint a CVO as a statutory provision and put up the same before the next Board.

**BM 115.7.2**

Before concluding the proceedings of the Meeting of the Board, it was decided that:

- (i) The proceeding of the BOM Meetings will be recorded on audio-video mode with a view to record the minutes of the meetings with accuracy.
- (ii) The milestones and major activities achieved by the University during the intervening period of two meetings shall be suitably reported to the Board.
- (iii) Vice-Chancellor & Chairman, BOM shall make a Power Point Presentation of the major activities and achievements of the University at the beginning of each meeting of the BOM.

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

**(Gopinath Pradhan)**  
Chairman