

Sunday, 25 Mar, 7:25 AM

Fwd: Dissent on AC minutes

by pradip datta | pradip.pk@gmail.com

This is my dissent note, pradip datta

From: **pradip datta** | pradip.pk@gmail.com

To: **mamidala@mail.jnu.ac.in**

The Chairperson/Secretary

Academic Council,

Jawaharlal Nehru University

Dear Sir,

Subject: Recording of Dissent on the decisions taken on the following items, as recorded in the minutes of the 144th AC meeting

Prof. Ayesha Kidwai has been listed in the minutes as "Acting President, JNUTA". Please correct this mistake in designation in both Part A and Part B.

Part A Meeting, Item No. 3(i): I would like to record my dissent at the approval of Agenda Item No 3(i) of the 144 Academic Council because to approve them would be to condone the drastic violations of the Central Educational Institutions (Reservations in Admission) Act, 2006 and the JNU Act in the M.Phil./PhD admissions for 2017-18. Less than 50 per cent of the intake has been filled, with only 13 students admitted under OBC, 1 under ST, 2 under SC, quotas. No discussion was allowed on the contention that this drastic shortfall is because of several arbitrary decisions taken by the Vice-Chancellor and various university officials about the JNUEE — 50% qualifying marks in the written examination, a weightage of 100% for the viva voce, no relaxations given at the written stage for reserved categories, imposition of a pass mark as cut-off in the viva voce, and withdrawal of deprivation points. None of these decisions were approved of or ratified by the 143rd Academic Council meeting. Please therefore record my dissent on this decision against my name.

Part A Meeting, Item No. 3(vi)-(vii): I would like to record my dissent at the approval of Agenda Item No 3(vi)-(vii) of the 144 Academic Council because I do not approve the following recommendations of the Standing Committee on Admissions. The Chair did not allow any discussion on this Agenda item, on the pretext that the matter is sub judice (when it is in fact not):

- I do not accept the suggestion for the delinking of M.Phil. and PhD for all programmes in the university (p. 37). The present plurality of both integrated M.Phil./PhD and PhD programmes must continue. Any decision on this choice must be made by Centres alone.
- I do not approve the decision of the SCA (p. 37) that the intake provided by each Centre/School may "be resolved in consultation with the Admissions Branch". Only the AC may approve intake.
- I do not approve the Schedule pertaining to the 2018-19 admissions. In particular, I find 20 days for the evaluation of answer scripts too short and we also do not think it is feasible to hold JNUEE viva voce examinations in March. This date should be held in the first week of May 2018.
- I do not ratify the admission policy of the university insofar as it imposes a 50% qualifying marks in the written examination, a 100% weightage to marks of the viva voce, no relaxations in eligibility given at the written stage for reserved categories, imposition of a pass mark as cut-off in the viva voce, and withdrawal of deprivation points. These provisions do not allow for the realisation of the governing principles of the university admission policy as laid out on page 43.

· I also do not endorse an admission policy in which UGC minimum criteria are interpreted as maximum, e.g., where an M.A. degree is enough for eligibility for admission to a PhD programme across the board.

Part A Meeting, Item No. 4: I would like to record my dissent on the decision to approve the creation of School of Engineering in the University. The 144 AC was asked to arrive at an opinion on this proposal when none of the suggestions/objections made by the Centres/Schools/Special Centres have been presented in detail before it. It also became apparent that the opinions of some Centres was repeated twice, with contradictory conclusions, and that the opinions of some Centres/Schools were reported wrongly. Individual opinions from Deans were listed, when the mandate was the opinions of academic units.

Discussion of the particular merits of the programme proposed for its uniqueness and sustainability was not allowed. Observations that a few courses in the programme did not justify the tag of a specialization were immediately dismissed, and members' queries about the uniqueness of this vis-à-vis the available programmes in other institutions, which also allow for humanities and social science courses, were not allowed to be discussed. Similarly, no discussion of the merits and demerits of a research university starting such courses or of the necessity of conducting the entrance examination through JEE rather than JNUEE, was allowed. Please therefore record my dissent on this decision against my name.

Part A Meeting, Item No. 05: There were no papers placed on before the AC that contained responses from the Schools/Centres/Special Centres. No discussion of this proposal took place. I dissent because I don't think that the AC can have arrived at this opinion when no opinion from the various academic units on the matter was placed on it. The Chair simply announced the decision as passed, and did not open up the agenda for discussion. Please therefore record my dissent on this decision against my name.

Part A Meeting, Item No. 07: The proposal for 'upgrading' Special Centre for Sanskrit Studies to a full-fledged School of Sanskrit and Indic Studies was not placed before the AC. Members' comments that the AC cannot approve the creation of a School on a promissory note that a proposal will be presented eventually were ignored, and that a proposal must be circulated and discussed before any approval can be given. Please record my dissent on this decision against my name.

Part A Meeting, Item No. 08: The minutes on this item are an inaccurate record in the following respects:

- a) There was a long discussion regarding the dropouts which has not been recorded in the minutes, wherein the JNU administration agreed to members' requests to provide the data pertaining to the students whose enrollment ended before obtaining the B.A./M.A. degree.
- b) There was a proposal, not a decision, to dispense with lateral entry into the undergraduate integrated programme. This proposal was referred to the SLLCS BoS for discussion.
- c) There was a proposal, not a decision, to make attendance compulsory for all regular registered students. When this proposal made by the Vice-Chancellor was met with dissent from a number of teachers, it was recorded that the matter would be considered by a committee set up for the purpose.
- d) The minutes on this item do not record that on this agenda item, Rector I made the proposal for delinking the M.Phil./PhD programme, and the Vice Chancellor announced that the proposal would be referred to a committee for consideration.

Please record my dissent on these alleged decisions as that were never made, and complete the minutes as indicated.

Part A Meeting, Any Other Matter, Point (2): Please record my objection to the non-inclusion of the M.Sc. Mathematics proposal from SPS for discussion in the agenda of the 144th AC. The minutes appear to have reported events that did not occur – there was no assertion made that comments had not been received in time. Rather, the statement by the Dean SPS that about 30 comments had been received was not disputed; instead, what was on display appeared to be a desire on the part of Rector II and the VC not to let the matter be discussed in this AC, despite the request by many members, that the matter should be taken up. The overwhelming sense of the house was that the course should be approved has not been recorded. Please record my dissent on this decision against my name.

Part B Meeting, Items No. 1 and 2: The minutes of the 143rd Part B Meeting do not record the objections/dissents made by several members with regards to the decisions taken therein. As a consequence, I cannot confirm the minutes as prepared. I therefore also do not approve Agenda Item no.2, which is the Action Taken Report based on Item 1. Please therefore record my dissent on this decision against my name.

Part B Meeting, Item No. 7: I would like to record our dissent with the decision to approve a draft M.Phil./PhD Ordinances without circulation to Schools/Centres for comments. Further, this decision creates confusion as to which Ordinances are currently in operation in the university -- the Ordinances of April 2017 (approved by the JNU Court on 8 December 2017) or these Draft Ordinances? Or neither – since the date of the applicability of the April Ordinances are equally sub judice. Please record my dissent with the decision on this matter as this decision only causes further confusion.

The rest of the minutes on this item w.r.t. de-linking of MPhil-PhD, starting from the year Academic 2018-19, are misleading. First of all, this discussion took place in Part A of the meeting, as it should have, when the students were present. Second, no decision to delink the programmes from the academic year 2018-19 was taken; rather, the proposal made by the Vice-Chancellor was to set up a committee that will examine the issue and report back. Third, please note that the AC approved the minutes of the Standing Committee on Admission held on 5.09.17, wherein it was recorded that the issue needs wider discussion with all stake holders before such a decision could be taken.

Pradip Kumar Datta,

Chairperson, CCP&PT.

SIS.