



Riddhi Shah &lt;rshah@jnu.ac.in&gt;

---

**Re: 271st (Emergency) Executive Council meeting.**

---

RSHAH RSHAH &lt;rshah@mail.jnu.ac.in&gt;

Thu, Dec 21, 2017 at 6:01 PM

To: Ajit Kumar Srivastava <aksrivastava@mail.jnu.ac.in>, vc@mail.jnu.ac.in, chintamani@mail.jnu.ac.in, uakadam@mail.jnu.ac.in, akpatnaik@mail.jnu.ac.in, skgoswami@mail.jnu.ac.in, rdengle@mail.jnu.ac.in, pradipta@mail.jnu.ac.in, saumitra@mail.jnu.ac.in, girishjha@mail.jnu.ac.in, mrshansai@gmail.com, nareshpadha@gmail.com, mazharassam@gmail.com, sanjeevaji@gmail.com, surajitmazumdar@mail.jnu.ac.in, neerakongari@mail.jnu.ac.in, jdbhosale@mail.jnu.ac.in, ps.shukla@rediffmail.com, kulkarnird67@gmail.com, dr.shyam.in@gmail.com, gagan.budhiraja@gov.in, amulya@nii.res.in, lobiyal@gmail.com, lynn.andrew@gmail.com

Cc: registrar@mail.jnu.ac.in, scgarkoti@mail.jnu.ac.in, yashwant@mail.jnu.ac.in, rshah@jnu.ac.in

To Dr. Pramod Kumar  
Registrar  
Secretary of the Executive Council of JNU

Dear Dr. Pramod Kumar,

The attached letter does not clearly mention that the EC approval is being sought by circulation. Besides there is no deadline given for observations and how can EC approve the items in the minutes of the Academic council on 18th December 2017, when the minutes of same AC are circulated on 14th December (afternoon) and the time given for comments/observations in the covering letter of AC minutes is till 27th December 2017? This is a gross violation of norms.

Here are my comments/observations on the minutes of AC minutes.

**On part A**

Item 03 (i). There are some mistakes in factual data as pointed out by some of the AC members including myself. When the data was circulated I had also sent an email that in SPS only 6 PhD students (instead of total 8 shown in the data) had registered. In JRF category, 2 in Physics, 2 in Chemistry and 1 in Maths had registered and 1 in Chemistry in direct category had registered. The data shows 3 instead of 2 in each of Physics and Chemistry JRF category. So the total number of PhD students in JNU comes down from 75 to 73 (at most).

Item 04 and 05, we would have liked to discuss some more since these are big programs but were not allowed to do so. The proposal in item 05 was not circulated nor discussed at all.

Item 07, this proposal came as a table item and it was approved 'in principle' only.

Item 08, 2nd paragraph and 3rd paragraph, they seem misleading. Even though there was a discussion in terms of drop-out rates I do not recall such a resolution for de-linking of BA-MA programmes, or the lateral entry.

As for the attendance, it affects students the most and the Academic council should allow students representatives to discuss this issue before it is just brought out and decided as a bi-product of an agenda item. It is also not clear whether we are talking about attendance only for BA-MA programmes since it is listed under this item.

**In AOM (part A):** Item 02 about MSC Mathematics: The second half of the first line that 'the Chair appraised the Council that observations of the Council made in the last meeting have not been answered

properly so far' is misleading and factually wrong. The observations were made by Rector II about infrastructure and space in the 143rd AC and I, as Dean SPS, had answered there and then in the same 143rd AC that we can manage holding classes in SPS for MSc Mathematics. I had also written a letter to the Vice Chancellor, the chair of the AC prior to the 144th AC clarifying this issue. There were many comments (all of them positive/neutral) from schools and centres sent to the administration but they chose not to collate them.

Contrast this with the main agenda in 144th AC, item number 03, and also the item number 04 about new schools which was not even circulated. One may ask the same questions and more about these two new schools coming up. Where is the space, infrastructure and faculty? But of course, we were not allowed to ask the same questions for these big programmes.

The academic council has failed in its duty and not discussed academic merit of the proposal MSc Mathematics, a fundamental programme at any university.

**On part B:**

Item 07 on page 18, I do not recall such a decision being taken about de-linking of MPhil-PhD. The suggestion was to set up a committee. This de-linking was discussed in summer this year prior to the announcement of December entrance for 2018-19 in the Standing Committee on Admission (STA). It was felt that it needs wider discussion before we can take such a decision, and we may consider it next year for the batch 2019-20. To make such a change a couple of weeks before the entrance exam will be wrong on our part and it would amount to misleading students, there is no new UGC gazette notification for this.

**In AOM** (part B): Item 1, I do not see why we need to justify calling an examiner for a PhD viva. A PhD degree holder will be teaching future students and in many subjects he/she needs to write on the board and explain his views and ideas. It is important that such an exam be held face-to-face.

Item 2 (c). I request to amend this, in case no subject expert is available in other schools within the university, an expert may be appointed from other academic institutions.

Regards,

Riddhi Shah  
Dean SPS  
JNU

On 12/14/17 06:07 PM, **Ajit Kumar Srivastava** <[aksrivastava@mail.jnu.ac.in](mailto:aksrivastava@mail.jnu.ac.in)> wrote:

Sir/Madam,

Please find the enclosed attachment.

with regards,

(A.K. Srivastava)  
Consultant