

**HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINTH
REPORT**

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(1983-84)**

(SEVENTH LOK SABHA)

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
(DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION)**

Presented in Lok Sabha on _____ **23** MAR 1986
Laid in Rajya Sabha on _____ **24** MAR 1986

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

February, 1984/Phalguna, 1905(S)

Price : Rs 5.30

CORRIGENDA TO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINTH
REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(SEVENTH LOK SABHA)

.....

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para/ Col No.</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
11	1.32	20	contraveition	contravention
11	1.32	32	dealin	dealing
11	1.33	1	Vidvadya	vidyalaya
15	1.45	4	<u>delete</u> is	
16	1.47	8	la	lakhs
16	1.54	5	applied	applied
20	1.54	22	resource ful- ness	resourceful- ness
22	1.59	7	registeration	registration
32	2.13	18	equ pmen	equipment
32	2.14	5	state	stated
32	2.14	1 and 2	ab-nted	ab-sented
			(from bottom)	
40	3.8	8	to	go
41	3.15	6	theses	thesis
45	3.23	7	eview	review
48	3.29	9	their	the
75	6.21	6	attitute	attitude
75	6.26	12	<u>Add</u> 'by' <u>before</u> 'these'	
75	6.28	2	wokring	working
105	1.48	1	in ordinate	inordinate
106	Col 2	-	1.50	1.59
107	Col 4	3	on	of
118	Col 2	-	2.27	6.27
118	Col 4	3	<u>Add</u> 'by' <u>before</u> 'these'	
120	Col 2	-	2.31	6.31

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	v
 REPORT	
CHAPTER I PLAN PROGRAMMES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY	1
A. Introductory	1
B. Provision of land.	1
C. Construction Programme in First Phase.	4
D. Services of Architect for Construction Programme	5
E. Delays in completion of works	12
F. Execution of works through contractors.	17
G. Excess issue of Materials.	22
CHAPTER II PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT	26
CHAPTER III ACADEMIC PROGRAMME	37
CHAPTER IV ORGANISATION	49
A. Administrative Staff.	49
B. Payment of Overtime Allowance	52
CHAPTER V FINANCIAL MATTERS	55
A. Finance, Audit and Accounts.	55
B. Utilisation of Grants.	57
C. Investment of Provident Fund Accumulation	62
CHAPTER VI REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE	64
 APPENDICES	
APPENDIX I Paragraph 36 of the Advance Report of the C&AG for the year 1980-81—Union Government (Civil) relating to the Ministry of Education & Culture —Jawaharlal Nehru University	78
APPENDIX II Statement of Recommendations/observations	101
 PART II*	
Minutes of the sitting of the Public Accounts Committee (1982-83 and 1983-84) held on	
7-2-1983	
10-3-1983	
11-3-1983	
17-12-1983	

*Not Printed (one cyclostyled copy laid on the Table of the House and five copies placed in the Parliament Library)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(1983-84)

CHAIRMAN

Shri Sunil Maitra

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Chitta Basu
3. Shrimati Vidyavati Chaturvedi
4. Shri C. T. Dhandapani
5. Shri G. L. Dogra
6. Shri Bhiku Ram Jain
7. Shri Satyanarayan Jatiya
8. Shri K. Lakkappa
9. Shri Mahavir Prasad
10. Shri Dhanik Lal Mandal
11. Shri Jamilur Rahman
12. Shri Ut'am Rathod
13. Shri Harish Rawat
14. Shri G. Narsimha Reddy
15. Shri Ram Singh Yadav

Rajya Sabha

16. Dr. Sankata Prasad
17. Shri Syed Rahmat Ali
18. Shrimati Pratibha Singh
19. Dr. (Shrimati) Sathiavani Muthu
20. Dr. Harekrushna Mallick
21. Shri Nirmal Chatterjee
22. Shri Kalyan Roy

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri T. R. Krishnamachari—*Joint Secretary.*
2. Shri H. S. Kohli—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*
3. Shri K. K. Sharma—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*
4. Shri Krishnapal Singh—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

INTRODUCTION

1. I, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Hundred and Seventy Ninth Report of the Public Accounts Committee (Seventh Lok Sabha) on Paragraph 36 of the Advance Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1980-81, Union Government (Civil) relating to Ministry of Education and Culture—Jawaharlal Nehru University.

2. The Advance Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1980-81, Union Government (Civil) was laid on the Table of the House on 21 April, 1982. The Public Accounts Committee examined the Audit Paragraph at their sittings held on 7 February and 10 and 11 March, 1983. The Committee considered and finalised the Report at their sitting held on 31 December, 1983. The Minutes of the sittings of the Committee form Part II* of the Report.

3. In 1969, Jawaharlal Nehru University came into existence to disseminate and advance knowledge, wisdom and understanding by teaching and research and by the example and influence of its corporate life. The University was to endeavour to promote the study of the principles for which Jawaharlal Nehru worked during his life-time. The University was to make special provision for integrated courses in humanities, science and technology and to take appropriate measures for promoting inter-disciplinary studies. As to the achievements of the Jawaharlal Nehru University in the light of its objectives, the Ministry of Education have stated that out of seven projected schools to be set up in the first phase, six schools have already been set up. Integrated courses in Humanities, Social Sciences and Sciences to promote inter-disciplinary academic and research programme have already been introduced. The University has maintained its all-India character in terms of its student body and faculty.

4. As against the above achievements claimed by the Ministry of Education, the Committee have observed that the academic and student strength is less than the planned target in all the schools, the exceptions being the schools of International Studies and

*Not printed. One cyclostyled copy laid on the Table of the House and five copies placed in Parliament Library.

Languages. The schools are beset with the problem of drop-outs. A study in respect of only two schools has revealed that out of 8826 students admitted to the various courses of duration of 1 to 5 years upto 1979-80, 3420 students had discontinued the courses. The most dismal performance had been of an important centre—Centre for Studies in Science Policy. This Centre had admitted 40 students in M.Phil/Ph.D. Programmes since its inception in 1972-73 but had failed to produce a single Ph.D. upto 1979-80. Only 4 students were awarded M.Phil Degree and in August 1981, 6 students were on roll with a faculty of 3.

5. For making an independent evaluation of the performance of the University in the light of its objectives, a Committee under the Chairmanship of a distinguished educationist Shri V. S. Jha was appointed in July 1979. But the Committee could not complete its work. The circumstances in which the Jha Committee was forced to leave its work unfinished is a sad commentary on the general atmosphere prevailing in the University.

6. Two principles dear to the heart of Jawaharlal Nehru were tolerance and discipline. The Committee have, therefore, deeply regretted the confusion that prevailed in the University which culminated ultimately in the closure of the University with effect from 12 May, 1983 for over two months. In the opinion of the Committee, this does not redound to the credit of the Institution. The Committee have observed that the academic, administrative and student communities together owe it to the great ideals with which the Institution was set up to maintain all the time an atmosphere conducive to translating Jawaharlal Nehru's ideals into reality.

7. In this Report, the Committee have also pointed out that financial discipline was sadly lacking in the University and the prescribed procedures had little sanctity. Stock registers were not properly maintained nor was proper record of utilisation of costly equipment maintained. Physical verification of equipment was also not done regularly.

8. The Committee have suggested suitable amendment of the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act, 1966 with a view to establishing a mechanism to conduct an independent periodic review of the University in all its aspects.

9. For reference facility and convenience, the observations and recommendations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report, and have also been reproduced in a consolidated form in Appendix II to the Report.

(vii)

10. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the commendable work done by the Public Accounts Committee (1982-83) in taking evidence and obtaining information for this Report.

11. The Committee also place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in the matter by the office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

12. The Committee would also like to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry of Education and Culture and Jawaharlal Nehru University and the non-official witness for the co-operation extended by them in giving information to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;

February 27, 1984

Phalguna 8, 1905 (S)

SUNIL MAITRA

Chairman,

Public Accounts Committee.

CHAPTER I

PLAN PROGRAMMES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

A. *Introductory*

The Jawaharlal Nehru University came into existence in August, 1969 under the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act, 1966. The development of the University in accordance with the objectives laid down in the Act was planned in three stages; in the first stage covering period upto April 1980, it was decided to establish 7 multi-disciplinary schools of studies, viz. schools, of (i) Social Sciences, (ii) languages, (iii) international studies, (iv) life sciences, (v) computer and systems sciences, (vi) environmental sciences, and (vii) creative arts as basic academic units of the University. Of the 7 schools of studies, 6 were established by 1975 and the 7th (the school of creative arts) had been postponed for establishment in the Sixth Plan. By 1980, the University had students and faculty strength of 2759 and 295 against the envisaged target of 3200 and 400 respectively.

1.2 In addition, the University ran a centre of postgraduate studies at Imphal (Manipur) between 1971-72 and 1980-81; this centre had since been handed over to the Manipur University.

B. *Provision of Land*

1.3 According to the Audit paragraph, in 1970, 1009.38 acres of land were acquired by Government at a cost of Rs. 2.44 crores and allotted to the University for development of its campus to provide facilities for 10,000 students and 1250 faculty members in three stages. In the first stage to be completed by April 1980, 350 acres of the acquired land were to be developed to cater to 3200 students and 400 faculty members.

1.4 Programmes of development at the second and third stages were yet (August 1981) to be drawn up, with the result that the remaining 659 acres had not been planned for any use. Out of the 350 acres earmarked for development in the first stage, only 250 acres of land (approximately) had so far been (August 1981) utilised. It would, thus, be seen that land had been acquired by Government far in excess of the needs resulting in non-utilisation of 659 acres (cost: Rs. 1.59 crores) of the acquired land and without there being any plan for its utilisation in the near future. The

surplus land could not be used for growing crops as it was a rocky area and hence non-cultivable. Details of expenditure was not booked in accounts activity-wise.

1.5 The Committee were informed that out of 1009.38 acres of land acquired by Government only 1006.90 acres of land was handed over to them and that the University was in correspondence with the Delhi Development Authority for taking over the balance land of 2.48 acres.

1.6 Asked as to why Government had procured land far in excess of the needs of the University, the Ministry of Education have stated in a note:

“Considering the pressure on land in a place like Delhi, it became necessary to earmark sufficient land for the University. Once the land was earmarked, it was acquired so that its development and utilisation could proceed in phases. It would have been impossible to ensure availability of adequate and contiguous land area as the University grew. Hence the total area earmarked was acquired in the initial stage itself.

Conceived as a national and residential university, drawing its teachers and students from all parts of the country, and from other countries, and offering specialised programmes of advanced teaching and research, it was anticipated that the University would have to provide substantial facilities for residences, hospitals, etc. and would require an extension campus for the purpose.”

1.7 The Committee desired to know the reasons for shortfall in development of land during the first phase. The Ministry have stated in a note as follows:

“The programmes for the development of land were initiated on the basis of the estimated immediate requirements for buildings and other facilities. According to the University, no specific target of 350 acres to be developed in the first phase was laid down, though while preparing the Fifth Five Year Plan proposals, the University had tentatively visualised 350 acres of land utilisation. An area of over 200 acres has been developed on which the present facilities have been built up. Further, no separate grant was earmarked by the UGC to ensure development on a continuing basis according to any specified target or time frame.

The construction programme of the University was, however, affected on account of several factors beyond the control of the University, such as lack of flow of funds on a continued basis; constraints in obtaining building materials at times; virtual non-availability of water resources on the campus: due to rocky terrain of the campus, the contractors faced difficulties in execution of construction projects, and almost all such projects took longer time in their completion; sudden spurt in cost of building materials and labour was the main reason for a number of construction projects going into arbitration due to contractor's demanding higher costs and ban by Government on all new construction activities during 1974-75."

1.8 The Committee desired to know by what time the Jawaharlal Nehru University expected to achieve its target of 10,000 students with 1250 teachers. In a note, the Ministry of Education have stated as follows:

"While planning the initial phase of development, it was felt desirable to plan the Campus in such a way that ultimately the needs of about 10,000 students and 1250 Faculty Members are catered to. This ultimate capacity was not prescribed as a target to be achieved within a specified time frame.

In the first stage of its development, the University has established six out of the seven projected schools. the University had on its rolls, 3,300 students (2,400 of whom are postgraduate and research students) and 315 Faculty Members. Although, there have been considerable shortfalls in achieving the targets of providing physical facilities, some proposals of the University for institution of Masters' Degree courses and Honours Courses in various disciplines had to be dropped as the UGC was of the view that the University should avoid duplication. On this advice from the UGC, the University initiated a second look on the priorities and targets initially set for development of research and instructional programmes at different levels. In the Sixth Plan the University has sought the establishment of a School of Physical Sciences and provision of building accommodation.

In the context of the special emphasis on interdisciplinary studies or on research, and the advice of the UGC that the Jawaharlal Nehru University should not, as far as possible undertake conventional academic programmes.

the subsequent phases of development of the University will have to be drawn up in consultation with the UGC, which the University hopes to do before the commencement of the Seventh Plan."

1.9 The Ministry have further stated:

".....The University is having a second look on the targets and priorities set and by the commencement of the Seventh Plan, the revised second and third phases of development of the university are likely to be finalised."

1.10 In 1970, 1009.38 acres of land acquired by Government at a cost of Rs. 2.44 crores was allotted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University for the development of its campus to provide facilities for 10,000 students and 1250 faculty members in three stages. In the first stage to be completed by April 1980, 350 acres of the acquired land was to be developed to cater to 3200 students and 400 faculty members. However, upto August, 1981, only 250 acres of land had been utilised. The surplus land could not be put to any use. Some proposals of the University for the institution of Master and Honours Degree courses had been dropped as the UGC had taken the view that the JNU had to be developed as an educational institution of its own kind on the lines given in the Schedule to the Act and was not, as far as possible, to undertake conventional academic programmes. In this context, the University is having a second look on the targets and priorities initially set by it and will now have to re-draw its subsequent phases of development in consultation with the UGC. The Committee desire that while drawing up the subsequent phases of development of the JNU, it should be ensured that the resources are utilised optimally having regard to the basic objectives and the University takes its pride of place in the world as one of the foremost centres of learning and research. There should be a timebound programme of development and it should be adhered to.

C. Construction programme in first phase

1.11 According to the audit paragraph, the programme of construction for the first stage envisaged a tentative outlay of Rs. 14.91 crores, of which Rs. 4.11 crores were planned for the Fourth Plan ending 1973-74 and the balance outlay of Rs. 10.60 crores by April, 1980. The actual expenditure during the Fourth Plan amounted to only Rs. 2.06 crores and the shortfall was attributed to initial difficulties, viz., absence of power, water and connecting roads for transportation of material and shortage of cement. The expenditure on construction between 1974-75 and 1980-81 amounted to Rs. 4.64 crores, resulting in overall shortfall of Rs. 8.21 crores in the planned outlay for the period upto April, 1980. This was attributed by the University to the same factors as mentioned for the shortfall in the Fourth Plan and additionally to the ban on new construction between 1973-74 and 1975-76. The space requirement in the first stage was.

assessed at 33.93 lakh square feet of covered plinth area whereas till April 1980, 10.44 lakh square feet of plinth area only was available. Thus, the coverage had been less than one third, although the delay did not affect academic activities as the University had procured adequate hired accommodation to house its schools at annual rent of Rs. 14 lakhs (approximately).

1.12 The Committee desired to know the time by which the entire plinth area of 33.93 lakhs square feet (350 acres) envisaged in the first phase was expected to be covered. The Ministry of Education have in a written reply stated as under:

“The targets and priorities initially set are being reviewed, in consultation with the University Grants Commission. The University by now has covered an area of 12,11,200 square feet, and the proposal to add a plinth area of 5,18,650 sq. ft. during remaining part of the Sixth Plan at a total estimated cost of Rs. 6,47,32,000 has been forwarded to the University Grants Commission on 1st May, 1982 for their consideration.”

1.13 The Committee note that the construction programme of the university envisaged space requirement of 33.93 lakh square feet of covered plinth area in the first stage, whereas till April 1980, construction of only 10.44 lakh square feet of plinth area had been completed. The coverage was less than one third. After April 1980, another 1.67 lakh square feet have been covered and proposal for covering another 5.18 lakh square feet has been forwarded to the University Grants Commission for their consideration. In the meanwhile the University has been meeting its accommodation requirements on hire at an annual rent of Rs. 13 lakhs. “In the opinion of the Committee, the wide gap between the construction originally envisaged and the construction actually made is indicative of not only lack of proper planning on the part of the University authorities but also the casualness of their approach.” The Committee desire that with so much of surplus land at their disposal, the Ministry of Education and the University should explore ways and means to expedite construction of University's own buildings and totally do away with the hiring of accommodation at the earliest.

D. Services of Architect for Construction Programme

1.14 According to the Audit paragraph, the University conducted (1970) a national competition for the design of the master plan for the University. Based on recommendations of a Board of Assessors constituted for examination of entries in the competition, a private architect was appointed for the work of developing the master plan of the campus and an agreement was entered into with him on 20th

March, 1971. According to the agreement, the University was entitled to use his services for:

- preparation of preliminary and detailed plans and estimates and getting them approved by appropriate authorities;
- assisting the University in finalising the contracts;
- preparation of detailed drawings and designs for construction
- supervision of the work till its completion and finally obtaining the completion certificate from municipal authorities for the works.

1.15 In 1976, the University employed the services of another architect, in addition, on the ground that it was considered necessary to bring in some competition to improve quality of works. The University was not "very happy" at that time with the design and supervision of work by the first architect, 'who was very fond of expensive design and with adverse cost-benefit ratio'. Both the architects were assigned separate works in different sectors for designing and supervision.

1.16 No action was, however, taken against the first architect (to whom Rs. 18.06 lakhs were paid) for any default on his part. In February, 1980, the University came to the conclusion that the system of executing works through the architects had proved a 'complete failure' as (i) there were abnormal delays in completion of almost all major works, (ii) the contractors had been allowed to use their own discretion to stop the works, (iii) several contracts had to be rescinded, (iv) heavy amounts had been claimed from the University as compensation in arbitration proceedings, and (v) the architects had been approving defective works executed by the contractors. In respect of the first architect, the University felt (February 1980) that (i) he was not discharging his functions and responsibilities faithfully, expeditiously and honestly, (ii) he was trying to exploit the situation to the maximum extent by non-performance and non-cooperation, and (iii) he was fully responsible for all the ills, namely stoppages of works, disputes about measurements, pilferage of steel, roof collapse of a building, etc. He had also, it was stated, not obtained completion certificate for any of the works duly approved by the local authorities. Despite the above position, no action was taken against the architect and instead, based on a policy directive of the UGC, the University decided in April 1980 to entrust the construction programme to the Central Public Works Department (CPWD) and to pay fees to the architects at 1.75 per cent of the sanctioned estimated costs of works whenever

their services were utilised, upto the stage of detailed architectural designs and working drawings including approval of plans from local authorities.

1.17 The Committee desired to know why the services of the first architect were not dispensed with when the University was not satisfied with his work. In a written reply, the Ministry of Education have stated:

“The building works supervised by the first Architect were “School of Life Sciences Building residences and hostels of Sector-I, and the Library Building”. These buildings were either in an advanced stage of completion or in the middle and could not be entrusted to any other Architect. Such supervision is always carried out by the Architect who takes full responsibility of technical soundness and structural strength from the architectural design point of view.

The deficiencies in the performance of the first architect largely related to expensive designs of the buildings and inadequate supervision, which were not considered to be lapses of the type, which would call for the imposition of penalty in accordance with the provisions of the contact. Nevertheless, there was a gap between the expectations of the University and the performance of the architect, and as a result thereof, the University entrusted new construction work to another architect, who stood second in the competition.”

1.18 The Audit Report has also made a reference to the payments made to this architect. According to terms of agreement, the first Architect was “entitled for payment for services rendered at each step viz., (i) preliminary estimates, (ii) detailed technical estimates, (iii) finalisation of contract, and (iv) control over progress of work till completion at certain prescribed rates less the amounts paid up at the earlier stages. However, at the fourth stage, the University paid additional amount to the architect at 1½ per cent of value of work done. Consequently, in respect of abandoned or incomplete works, remuneration of 2½ per cent for the portion of work left incomplete or abandoned resulted in overpayment of Rs. 1.19 lakhs. These payments related to (i) Kendriya Vidyalaya (ii) School of Life Sciences (iii) Library Building and (iv) 40 Nos. Type I and 20 Nos. Type II quarters.

1.19 In all these cases, the original contracts were rescinded and out of the four, the last work was awarded to a second agency. The first architect, however, declined to continue his services for execution of balance work by the other agency. His refusal was in contravention of the terms of agreement.

1.20 On the Committee enquiring why a correct procedure was not adopted while making payment to the architect resulting in over-payment of Rs. 1.19 lakhs in respect of four works, the Ministry of Education have explained:

“As per agreement between the University and the Architect, fees required to be paid has been indicated in Serial No. 7 of the contract. On account payment has been made as per this clause. According to the University there is no over-payment.”

1.21 To a further question as to the action taken against the Architect for his refusal to render services for the balance of work in respect of type I and II quarters, the Ministry have observed:

“The University has been taking up with the Architect the question of inadequacy of supervision. The Architect informed the University that if it was not satisfied, he had no objection to dissociate himself from this work. The position taken by the Architect in this case did not amount to refusal, and in the best interest of work, the University had excluded this work from the scope of his supervisory responsibility, and entrusted to its own departmental staff. In these circumstances, it was not possible for the University to impose any penalty on the Architect.”

1.22 According to the Audit paragraph, during the progress of construction, the roof of the Kendriya Vidyalaya auditorium collapsed in December 1978. The University decided to recover Rs. 45,000 from his bills in January 1979 pending determination of the extent of recovery to be made. The contractor stopped further work, and contested the recovery in the arbitration proceeding, claiming that the collapse occurred due to faulty design by the first architect. The architect did not, however, accept the allegation and attributed the collapse to the defective quality of cement used. Before the arbitration proceedings ended, a settlement was reached in October 1980 between the University, the architect and the contractor whereby the assessed damage of Rs. 0.60 lakhs was decided to be shared equally by the three parties. The University had decided in favour of the settlement in the hope (as recorded in the

minutes of the meeting) that the balance work would be resumed and completed by the contractor, apart from reconstruction of collapsed portion in a period of 6 months. The work was not, however, resumed by the contractor as expected by the University and the University stated (September 1981) that negotiations were still on for re-starting the work.

1.23 In regard to the role of the Architect *vis-a-vis* collapse of the roof of the auditorium of Kendriya Vidyalaya, the Ministry of Education have in a note stated as follows:

"The total cost of the contract was Rs. 43.57 lakhs. The damage estimated on account of collapse of the Auditorium roof was Rs. 45,000/-. Since the damage was a negligible part of the total cost of the project, no elaborate enquiry was instituted. The cost of the damage was initially recovered from the contractor in January, 1979. The contractor attributed the reason for collapse to faulty design by the Architect, and the Architect on the other hand maintained that the collapse was due to the use of pozzolana cement, supplied by the University. The University's view was that this cement was not used in the collapsed portion and this view was concurred in by the Chief Engineer, NDZ and the Chief Architect, CPWD at a meeting of the Building and Works Committee on January, 28, 1980.

The contractor went to the High Court and obtained a stay order against the execution of this work by another agency. Since the contractor and the Architect refused to share the cost of damage, and ultimately it was decided as a compromise solution that the damage, which may later estimated at Rs. 60,000/- would be shared equally among the architect, the Contractor and the University. This solution was approved by the Executive Council in October, 1980."

1.24 The Engineer-in-charge stated during evidence.

"We thought the building would not come up; now at least the building is coming up; it will be completed by March, 1983. I am on the job in this regard. I assure you, it will be completed by March, 1983."

1.25 The Committee pointed out that the time taken for completing the building was much more than that envisaged at the time of compromise. The witness stated, "it is most unfortunate it has

been delayed for so long". Asked whether there had been time over-run and cost escalation in this case, the witness replied, "the way the whole thing developed is most unfortunate."

1.26 It has been further stated that as the cause of the collapse of the roof could not be precisely established and considering the legal implications involved and to ensure a practical solution, the Building and Works Committee and the Executive Council, to whom the matter was referred, decided to share the cost of damage among the three parties, viz., the Architect, contractor and the University.

1.27 When further questioned during evidence, the Finance Officer of the Jawaharlal Nehru University admitted that he had not come across a case where the cost of any damage in the building, while under construction, had been shared by the Architect, the contractor and the owner. On the Committee enquiring whether in acting in such a manner the University was not surrendering before the designer and the contractor, the Vice Chancellor conceded by saying, "I accept it".

The Engineer-in-charge of the University added:

"The best thing would have been to have appointed an Enquiry Committee. It would have gone into these matters in great detail and fixed responsibility. They would have told us how to proceed in the matter, how it should be done."

1.28 The Secretary, Ministry of Education added:

"Although the amount involved is not much, the point is where the fault lies. The question is regarding fixing the responsibilities. If an enquiry had been made we would have been able to know where exactly the fault lies."

1.29 On the Committee further probing as to what supervision was exercised by the University over the construction activities, the Vice-Chancellor stated that Members of the building and Works Committee do take care of this. The Engineer-in-charge added that "during execution, we employ a clerk-of-works for supervision. He is full time for supervision of the job and he certifies that the work has been done according to the specification." Asked what action was taken against him for this lapse, the reply was "that fellow has resigned and gone."

1.30 The Committee enquired whether before starting the construction, the University authorities had examined the design the

Engineer-in-charge stated. "They did not do it." In reply to a question, he added:

"The Architect is fully responsible for the design. So far as we are concerned, we have not been asking for the design, etc. In future, we will certainly ask them before we start the work. We will have it checked up."

1.31 In reply to another question, he added: "According to condition, the design has to be given to us."

1.32 The Committee are unhappy over the manner in which the University authorities had acted in the case of the first architect appointed on the basis of a national competition for the design of the master plan of the University. An agreement was entered into with this architect on 20-3-1971 in terms of which the University authorities were entitled to utilise his service inter alia for preparation of detailed drawings and designs for construction, assisting the University in finalising the contracts and supervision of the work till completion. But the performance of this architect, who has been paid a fabulous sum of Rs. 18.06 lakhs, was such that the University had to go in for a second architect in 1976. The finding of the University as to the performance of this architect was that he was not discharging his functions and responsibilities "faithfully, expeditiously and honestly" and "was responsible for all the ills, namely, stoppages of works, disputes about measurements, pilferage of steel and collapse of a building". He had not obtained completion certificate for any of the works and in some cases, the original contracts of the works being supervised by him had to be rescinded. When one of these works—40 Type I and 20 Type II quarters—was awarded to a second agency, he, in contravention of the terms of the agreement declined to continue his services for execution of the balance work by the other agency. By February, 1980, the experience of the University was so disappointing that it came to the conclusion that the system of executing works through the architects had proved to be a 'complete failure' and in April 1980, it decided to entrust the construction programme to the CPWD. One thing which perplexes the Committee is why, in spite of all the lapses on the part of the architect, the University authorities should have failed to take action against him. The explanation of the Ministry that the deficiencies in the performance of the architect were not considered to be lapses of the type which could call for the imposition of penalty in accordance with the provisions of the contract" is far from convincing. In the opinion of the Committee, in dealing with the architect, the University authorities had utterly failed to enforce the terms of the contract and the leniency shown by them was extraordinary and unexplicable. The matter merits a probe.

1.33 The collapse of the roof of the Kendriya Vidyaalaya auditorium is a sad commentary on the supervision and construction of

buildings in the Jawaharlal Nehru University complex. The methodology adopted in settling the dispute arising from the collapse of the roof is equally surprising. The Committee wonder why without fixing responsibility a part of the loss should have been borne by the authorities. Agreed that the amount involved was not much, but on principle the matter should have been thoroughly probed by the concerned authorities to find out the cause of the collapse and the responsibility therefor fixed. This, unfortunately, was not done. It was stated during evidence that a full time "clerk of works" was appointed for supervision. When asked what action was taken against him, it was stated that he had "resigned and gone". Although under the terms of the contract, the design of the building was required to be given, the University authorities had not bothered to get the design and have it examined. A consideration for the compromise in October, 1980 was that the work would be completed in six months. But the hope was belied and instead of six months, the work was expected to be completed in 30 months. Commenting upon the case, the Engineer-in-charge of the University was constrained to observe that "the way the whole thing developed was most unfortunate". The Committee trust that the University authorities will learn from their experience and take care to avoid such lapses in future.

E. Delays in completion of works

1.34 According to the Audit paragraph, since the inception the University had undertaken 14 major works, each costing more than Rs. 5.00 lakhs at a total cost of Rs. 482.43 lakhs, of which 7 works (cost Rs. 302.65 lakhs) were completed after delays ranging from 5 to 32 months; in the remaining 7 works (cost: Rs. 179.78 lakhs) delays ranging from 29 to 79 months had taken place as in August, 1981, but the works were still incomplete.

1.35 Extension of time for completion of works can be granted by the Vice Chancellor, on the advice of Building and Works Committee, according to the prescribed procedure of the University. However, in five completed works, extensions were granted without approval of the Committee. The University has, however, stated that the University Engineer is the final authority for deciding grant of extension of time for completion of works as per clause 5 of the contract. On the Committee pointing out that insertion of clause 5 was in violation of delegation of powers, the Ministry have admitted as follows:

"The contract format was finalised by the Building and Works Committee of the University and most of the clauses are similar to the standard agreement from prevailing in CPWD including the clause relating to the grant of extension of time. In the CPWD the Superintending Engineer has full powers for the grant of extension of time irrespective of the value of the contract. The Chief Engineer in the University is of the rank of the Superintending Engineer of the CPWD.

The question of providing for specific provision for grant of extension of time in the execution of works of varying amounts is under the consideration of the University. However, during the last 3 years, all extensions of time are being granted under the orders of the Vice Chancellor."

1.36 Out of the seven completed works, in two cases, the completion was delayed by 20 months and 32 months. Delay of 10 and 17 months respectively was attributed by the University solely to the contractors (a public undertaking) on whom compensation of Rs. 0.31 lakhs and Rs. 0.32 lakhs was levied. In the remaining five cases extension of time was granted without levy of compensation. It has been stated that the difficulties encountered by the contractors in these cases were genuine and beyond their control—hence extension was granted without levy of compensation.

1.37 The Committee desired to know the reasons for delay in the construction programme, the Ministry have given the following main reasons for delay:

- “1. Drawings were to be revised on account of site conditions
2. Labour strikes
3. Extra work/increase in quantities
4. Acute shortage of cement
5. non-availability of flush door sputters and shortage of railway wagons for carting from Sitapur.
6. Non-availability of machine made bricks and other building materials
7. Rainy seasons
8. Delay in payments
9. Delay due to fixing of A.C. ducts
10. Change of decision due to site conditions
11. Non-availability of site for want of clearance of some machines of other contractors
12. Delay due to other agencies.”

1.38 Out of the 7 works in progress, contracts for 5 works (costing Rs. 149.25 lakhs) were rescinded by the University after they had been delayed for periods ranging from 7 to 58 months and after payments aggregating Rs. 102.17 lakhs had been made.

1.39 The Committee enquired whether the competence of the contractors was ensured before award of works, the Ministry of Education have stated in a note:

“All cases were carefully scrutinised by the Building and Works Committee with regard to safeguards, and the capability and financial soundness of the contractors, before the works were awarded. Beyond this, there is no other mechanism with the Building and Works Committee to ensure that every work would be completed within the stipulated period. The contractors, with good reputation, have also failed in completion of the projects within the stipulated period.”

1.40 A test check in audit of the reason for extension given in respect of four major works revealed that apart from delays due to non-availability of cement, in two cases for works done in 1974-75 and 1975-76 there were substantial delays in making available drawings, modification of drawings, increase in quantity of work, etc. for which responsibility lay with the first architect of the University, but against whom no action had been taken under the terms of contract entered into with him by the University.

1.41 Out of five rescinded works only two were subsequently awarded to other contractors at an estimated additional cost of Rs. 13.00 lakhs at the risk and cost of the first contractor, who, however, went in for arbitration (February, 1980) claiming further payment of Rs. 7.60 lakhs from the University. The arbitration proceedings are stated to be in progress. Of the remaining three works, two have been abandoned from November, 1978 and December, 1979 respectively after an expenditure of Rs. 62.66 lakhs had been incurred.

1.42 The Committee enquired whether the additional cost of Rs. 13 lakhs on the re-award of the two works had since been recovered by the University. In a written reply, the Ministry have stated, “The University in the counter-claim of the work has claimed this additional cost in arbitration. Arbitration proceedings are still in progress.

1.43 The Committee desired to know what steps the University had taken to complete the works at Sl Nos. 2 and 4 where huge amounts were lying blocked. In a written reply, the Ministry have stated:

“The works at Sl. No. 2 and 4 are (a) tower block of the Library Building and (b) Kendriya Vidyalaya Building.

The tenders for the Tower Block were invited for the balance work, after rescinding the first contract. Single tender received was considered to be high by the Building and Works Committee during September, 1982. A modified tender on the advice of the Buildings and Works Committee has since been issued to the Press.

The construction of Kendriya Vidyalaya Building was restarted by the first contractor in January 1982, and the construction is making steady progress and is expected to be completed within the next 10 to 12 weeks, subject to the availability of building materials."

1.44 During evidence, the Committee enquired whether the University had explored the possibility of handing over the construction work to a government agency on CPWD, the Vice-Chancellor stated:

"... the University has taken a decision that no work will be given to any contractor. All the building work will be done by the CPWD."

1.45 Asked why the decision was not taken much earlier, the Engineer-in-charge stated, "Normally giving it to CPWD means delay. The intention was that through the architect, the work will be executed much "faster", but now is the experience had been "otherwise."

1.46 According to Audit paragraph, apart from the difficulties mentioned by the University, there were other significant factors for the slow progress of work, such as. (i) failure of architect to perform his obligations adequately, (ii) delay in supply of drawings and designs, (iii) disputes with contractors and (iv) entrustment of works to a particular contractor who did not qualify for the works allotted to him according to the prescribed standards. The University stated that apart from ban on construction of residential buildings, paucity of funds was the major cause of not achieving the targets.

1.47 The Committee desired to know the basis of the University's contention that paucity of funds was the major cause for the non-achievement of the University's targets of civil works. In a written reply, the Ministry have stated:

"According to the 5th FiveYear Plan proposals of the University, the funds required were Rs. 1,042.15 lakhs, whereas the allocation approved by the UGC was only Rs. 651.52

lakhs. Out of the amount, 425.94 lakhs related to the development of University campus (civil works). Besides, additional allocation for certain other works amounting to Rs. 85 lakhs was approved by the UGC during the Fifth Five Year Plan period, thus bringing the total UGC allocation to Rs. 510 lakhs. Against the provision, the University actually received a sum of Rs. 420 lakhs and incurred an expenditure of Rs. 418.50 lakhs during the said period. It is evident that paucity of funds was the major reason, though the unhappy experience with some contractors also played a part in the university not being able to keep pace with the construction programme, as visualised."

1.48 Inordinate delays in execution of major works had become a rule rather than an exception in Jawaharlal Nehru University. Since its inception, the University had undertaken 14 major works, at a total cost of Rs. 482.43 lakhs, of which 7 works (costing Rs. 302.65 lakhs) were completed after delays ranging from 5 to 32 months; and in the remaining 7 works (costing Rs. 179.78 lakhs), delays ranging from 29 to 79 months had taken place and the works were incomplete as on 31-8-1981. The Committee observe that apart from initial difficulties like absence of power, water and connecting roads, shortage of building material, slow progress of civil works had also been due to substantial delays in making available drawings, modification of designs, increase in quantity of works, etc. for which responsibility lay with the architect of the University. Delay was also caused by entrusting of works to a contractor who had neither the qualifications nor the resources for the execution of the types of works allotted to him. Thus, while the Committee agree that delay in completion of major works was partly due to reasons beyond the control of the University authorities, they were also, to a considerable extent, due to the inability of the University authorities to enforce the terms of the contract on the architect and also due to their having awarded the works to an unqualified and inexperienced contractor.

1.49 The Committee also note that though under the prescribed procedure, extension of time for completion of works can be granted by the Vice-Chancellor on the advice of the Building and Works Committee, extensions for works were given by the Vice-Chancellor without seeking the advice of the Building and Works Committee. The explanation of the University authorities for this was that as per clause 5 of the contract, the University Engineer was the final authority for deciding grant of extension of time for completion of works. The Committee need hardly point out that provisions of contracts entered into by the University cannot override the specific statutory provisions. The Committee, however, note that the University authorities are now thinking of providing for a specific provision for grant of

extension of time in execution of works of varying amounts. The Committee trust that this will be done at an early date.

1.50. The Committee also note that out of 7 works in progress, contracts for 5 works, costing about Rs. 1½ crores, were rescinded by the University after they had been delayed for periods ranging from 7 to 58 months and after payments aggregating Rs. 1.02 crores had been made. Out of these 5 works, two were subsequently awarded to other contractors at an estimated additional cost of Rs. 13 lakhs at the risk and cost of the first contractor who had, however, gone in for arbitration claiming further payment of Rs. 7.60 lakhs from the University. The Committee would like to be informed of the outcome of the arbitration proceedings in the case of two works.

F. Execution of works through contractors

1.51 According to norms adopted by the University, works costing Rs. 10 lakhs and above can be allotted to Class I contractors, those costing Rs. 2 lakhs to less than Rs. 10 lakhs to Class II contractors and other works to Class III contractors. These works were to be awarded till 1975 only to the contractors on the approved lists of certain specified authorities (including Government). In October, 1975, the University framed rules for enlistment of additional contractors to its list of approved contractors (based on reported requests from certain un-registered contractors for their enlistment), and invited applications through advertisement for enlistment. After scrutinising 9 applications which were received, 2 contractors 'A' and 'B' were registered by the University as Class II contractors in May, 1976. No further registration had taken place since then. Out of the 2 registered contractors, no work was awarded to contractor 'B', whereas contractor 'A' was awarded 8 civil works, costing Rs. 69.57 lakhs. Out of these, 2 civil works costing Rs. 5.99 lakhs, which could be allotted to him prior to his registration as Class II contractor in May, 1976 and 3 civil works costing over Rs. 10 lakhs each (total cost Rs. 52.61 lakhs) were also awarded to him, though he was not a class I contractor. These Class I works were allotted to him based on a decision of the Building and Works Committee in January, 1977 to sell tender forms to even one class below contractors due to heavy construction activities then going on in Delhi; this decision to invite tenders from one class below category was not, however, incorporated in the notices inviting tenders except in respect of 2 works (serial Nos. 6 and 7 of annexure). In connection with the works carried out by contractor 'A' for the University, the following points were noticed in audit:

- “(a) Out of a civil works estimated to cost Rs. 69.57 lakhs, which were allotted to him, no work was completed in

time; 3 works were completed after delays of 7, 16 and 22 months and 3 contracts had been rescinded due to disputes; of the rescinded contracts, 2 works were awarded to other contractors at the risk and cost of contractor 'A' at an additional cost of Rs. 13 lakhs. The remaining 2 works which were due for completion in April, 1978 and February, 1979 were still to be completed (August, 1981).

- (b) The rescinded works included the work of providing acoustic treatment (cost Rs. 1.23 lakhs) to walls in school of life sciences, which was awarded on 26th July, 1977 for completion in 3 months; the contract was rescinded in March 1980. In the 2 other rescinded contracts only 10 to 15 per cent of the work was completed by the stipulated date. In these cases, contractor 'A' had claimed additional payment of Rs. 7.60 lakhs from the University whereas the University had prepared a counter claim of Rs. 13.06 lakhs, the claims were pending before arbitration (August, 1981).
- (c) Having regard to the overall poor performance, the University came to the conclusion that contractor 'A' did not have adequate resources and could not be depended upon to handle works of such magnitude and terminated his registration as Class II contractor alongwith that of contractor 'B' in February 1980.

1.52 The Committee desired to know as to what prompted the University to frame its own rules for enlistment of contractors. In a written reply, the Ministry have stated:

“As the response to the wide publicity in press and sending notices to the various offices of the CPWD was observed to be poor, the University thought of enlistment of contractors.”

1.53 The Committee desired to know the circumstances in which wide publicity was not given to the decision of the Building and Works Committee to sell tenders to one class below contractors and how the benefit of this decision went only to one contractor M/s. Home Decolam. The Ministry of Education have submitted the following note:—

“The decision of the Building and Works Committee to sell tenders to one class below contractors was taken in the context of their response to the notice inviting tenders

for the construction of Social Sciences building. The notice was first published on 5-12-1976. Only one tender was sold by 16-12-1976. A second Press Notification was made on 18-12-1976 following which one more tender was sold.

Meanwhile on 17-12-1976, M/s. Home Decolam, who was already enlisted as a class II contractor with the university applied for enlistment in class I category. He also showed interest to quote for social sciences building. In the light of the poor response to the notice inviting tender, and since M/s. Home Decolam was already executing some works for the university it was decided on 21-12-1976, with the approval of the Vice-Chancellor to sell tender to this firm. On the same day, one more tender was sold to a class I contractor enlisted with the DDA. Out of these four tenders sold, only two responded and M/s. Home Decolam happened to be the lower tenderer.

Before any decision was taken on the tenders received, the Building and Works Committee decided that negotiations may be held with a few reputed Class I contractors to undertake the work at the rate quoted by M/s. Home Decolam. Accordingly 13 reputed contractors were invited for discussion but only four presented themselves. None of them agreed to bring down the rates to the level quoted by M/s. Home Decolam. When the result of the negotiations was reported back to the Building and Works Committee on 19-1-1977, they decided to award the work to M/s. Home Decolam.

At the meeting of the Building and Works Committee held on 7 January, 1977 the circumstances under which tender was sold to M/s. Home Decolam was reported and the Committee decided that, in future, tenders may be sold to one class below contractors after giving wide publicity. Notices inviting tenders issued by the University in February, 1978 did mention that contractors one class below could tender for the University works."

1.54 To another question as to how the works were awarded to the said contractor even before his registration, the Ministry explained it as under:

“M/s. Home Decolam was working as furniture contractor since 1971-72, and applied for enlistment on 2-5-1976. Tenders for two works were called on 27-3-1976 and 19-3-1976, with closing dates being 7-4-1976 and 15-4-1976 respectively. M/s. Home Decolam was interested to quote for these works, and his request was approved by the Chief Project Engineer, and he was sold tenders on 6-4-1976. Five tenders for each of the above two works were received. M/s. Home Decolam happened to be the lowest tenderer. At that time, enlistment rules were also under scrutiny and the enlistment of M/s. Home Decolam was under consideration. The enlistment rules and the enlistment of M/s. Home Decolam were approved by the Enlistment Committee, and the Vice-Chancellor on 7-5-1976 and he was awarded the works on the same day.

Certificates obtained from their bankers, and Departments where they had worked earlier and the income tax clearance certificates indicated the resource fulness of the firm.”

1.55 The Committee enquired whether M/s. Home Decolam were having adequate resources when they were enlisted by the University and awarded various works for which class I contractors were otherwise eligible and where these resources had disappeared when their enlistment was terminated due to in-adequate resources. In a written reply the Ministry have stated:

“The contractor has been supplying furniture to the University since 1971-72. The total cost of the furniture supplied by him amounted to over Rs. 3 lakhs till 1975-76. In 1976, he was awarded two construction projects, costing Rs. 2.18 lakhs and 3.16 lakhs respectively. In all these cases, his performance was satisfactory. During 1974-75, this contractor had also undertaken some construction projects in the Irrigation Department of UP, and a Newspaper Society, costing less than Rs. 2 lakhs each. It was for these reasons that his request for enlistment in class II category was approved. However, his

performance in the execution of major works awarded by the University was not satisfactory, and therefore, his enlistment was cancelled in February, 1980."

1.56 Asked whether the entire exercise of enlistment was not done with a view to favouring the particular contractor the Ministry of Education have denied the allegation by saying:

"The University had issued an advertisement in the press, inviting contractors to apply for enlistment with the University. The response to the advertisement was very poor, and only two contractors applied. Both of them were enlisted. It is, therefore, not correct to assume that enlistment was made by the University to favour any particular contractor."

1.57 The Committee enquired why the University's policy of enlistment adopted in 1975 was revised. In a written reply, the Ministry have stated:

"The University felt that no useful purpose is served by the maintenance of enlistment roll with only two firms on it. Hence, the University decided to issue publicity and notice inviting tenders from contractors registered with CPWD, DDA, MES etc."

1.58 As to the present position of the arbitration case, the Ministry have stated:

"Shri V. S. Murti, Project Manager, MBR Housing Project, CPWD has been appointed Arbitrator in the case of two construction projects, and Shri G. V. G. Krishnamurti, Arbitrator, Ministry of Works and Housing has been appointed in the case of the work relating to the acoustic treatment to walls in the School of Life Sciences. In the first two case, the counter statement of facts have been filed with the Arbitrator. No date of hearing has so far been fixed. In the third case, hearing is going on. The matter is being pursued."

1.59 The manner in which the University authorities had awarded contracts to M/s. Home Decolam is intriguing. Till 1975, the University authorities had awarded contracts only to the contractors borne on the approved lists of certain specified authorities. In October, 1975, the University framed rules for enlistment of additional contractors to its list of approved contractors. After scrutinising nine applications

which were received, two contractors were registered by the University authorities as Class II contractors in May, 1976. No registration had taken place since then. Of the two registered contractors, the real beneficiary were M/s. Home Decolam who were awarded 8 contracts for civil works of the value of Rs. 69.57 lakhs. Out of these, two civil works costing Rs. 5.99 lakhs had been allotted to M/s. Home Decolam even prior to their registration as Class II Contractors in May, 1976 and three Class I civil works costing over Rs. 10 lakhs each (total cost Rs. 52.61 lakhs) were awarded to them though they were not Class I contractors. These Class I works were awarded to them on the basis of a decision of the Building and Works Committee in January 1977 to sell tender forms to contractors one class below. Surprisingly, M/s. Home Decolam were again the sole beneficiary of the above mentioned decision of the Building and Works Committee. However, the performance of M/s. Home Decolam did not match their ability to get contracts. Not even a single work was completed by them in time. Three works were completed by them after delays of 7, 16 and 22 months and three contracts had to be rescinded due to disputes. The remaining two works which were due for completion in April 1978 and February 1979 had not been completed till August 1981. Belatedly, the University authorities came to the conclusion that the firm did not have adequate resources and could not be depended upon to handle works of the magnitude awarded to them and terminated their registration as Class II contractors in February, 1980. The explanation of the University authorities for the award of 8 contracts of the value of over Rs. 69.57 lakhs to this firm is unsatisfactory and merits further probe.

G. Excess issue of Materials

1.60 According to agreement entered into with the contractors for construction programmes, the University agreed to supply certain materials for works (mainly cement and steel) at specified rates and according to the terms of agreements with the contractors, the consumption of the materials was to be checked with reference to actual requirement for the specified drawings, designs and specifications, necessary action being taken for recovery of any excess beyond the admissible quantities, either by return of material supplied or by recovery of cost at specified rates. The issue of the materials was to be regulated according to need from time to time, as recommended by the University's architects and the consumption report had also to be cleared by the architects.

1.61 A test-check in audit of the accounts of a few major works, however, revealed that the quantities of cement and steel issued by the University to the contractors had been far in excess of the needs of the works and the excess quantity had neither been recovered, nor

had the cost been recovered at the prescribed rates, resulting in loss to the University to the extent of Rs. 5.60 lakhs as per details below:

Particulars	Quantity required as per estimates (in tonnes)	Quantity actually supplied (in tonnes)	Quantity required for work done as assessed (including permissible wastages in tonnes)	Excess supply not returned (in tonnes)	Amount due for recovery as per terms of contract
(Rs in lakhs)					
1. Library building					
(i) Tor Steel	238	427	347	80	1.24
(ii) Mild Steel	55	90	86	4	..
2. Kendriya Vidyalaya					
(i) Mild Steel	65	69	57	12	0.24
(ii) Tor Steel	265	288	267	21	0.45
(iii) Cement	1329	1406	1487	9	0.04
3. School Building					
(i) Mild Steel	118	86	70	16	0.63
(ii) Tor Steel	472	481	454	27	..
					5.60

1.62 In the Library and school buildings, the excess supplies were also not available at the site of the works. The details in respect of the above three works are as under:

- (i) *Library Building:* The shortages of steel at the site of work came to the notice of the University in February/March 1978, but no action was taken to verify the position till November 1978. In December 1978, the relevant measurement books were reported missing from an almirah kept at the site in the custody of the contractor and in March 1979, the Executive Council was informed by the University that a committee had been constituted to look into the alleged loss of steel. No committee had, in fact, been constituted so far (August, 1981).

(ii) *Kendriya Vidyalaya*: The contract was rescinded in January 1980, but the final bill had not been prepared, nor had the theoretical requirement of material been worked out. Figures in the table above indicate only reported consumption and actual recovery for works done. The balance work had not been taken up for execution so far (August, 1981).

(iii) *School Building*: This contract was also rescinded in November, 1979 and the position was similar to the contract for *Kendriya Vidyalaya*.

1.63 The University stated (September 1981) that in all these cases, the recoveries were pending in arbitration proceedings.

1.64 In this connection, during evidence, the Vice Chancellor informed the Committee:

"As far as steel is concerned, it was not a case of theft; it was a case of over issue to the contractor and the cost of that was Rs. 2.8 lakhs; it had gone for arbitration and in arbitration the judgment has been given in our favour and we are being paid Rs. 4.26 lakhs for that at the present price."

1.65 In regard to theft of measurement books, the Engineer-in-charge stated "the measurement book was missing and the matter was reported to the Police" (in October, 1978)

1.66 The Secretary of the Ministry assured the Committee:

"We will look into this because this is a serious matter. I can only say that he (Engineer-in-charge) has been there only for the last three months. We will request the Vice-Chancellor to go into the whole matter, how this has escaped attention and all that."

1.67 The Committee regret to observe that quantities of cement and steel issued by the University authorities to the contractors had been far in excess of the needs of the works and the excess quantities had neither been returned nor had their cost been recovered, resulting in loss to the University to the tune of Rs. 5.60 lakhs. The Committee are also surprised at the wide variations between the quantities required as per estimates, quantities actually supplied and the quantities required for work done as assessed. While the Committee note that

in arbitration, award has been given in favour of the University which is to be paid Rs. 4.26 lakhs at the present price, the Committee cannot help observing that the present case is an example of poor materials management on the part of the University authorities. They note that in the Library Building, the shortages of steel at the site of work came to the notice of the University in February/March, 1978 but no action to verify the position was taken till November 1978. In December 1978, the relevant measurement books which were kept at the site in the custody of the contractor were reported missing from an Almirah. In March 1979, the Executive Council was informed by the University that a committee had been constituted to look into the alleged loss of steel but in fact no committee had been constituted (August, 1981). The contract of the School Building was rescinded in November 1979 and that of the Kendriya Vidyalaya in January 1980, but the theoretical requirement of the material had not been worked out. All this gives an impression that the University authorities had no concern for the financial interests of the University. In particular, it is not clear why the measurement books should have been kept in the custody of the contractor. In evidence, the Secretary of the Ministry conceded that this was "a serious matter" and promised to have an inquiry held into the whole matter. The Committee desire that this should be done at an early date. They also desire that while holding the inquiry it may particularly be seen whether there was any collusion between the University staff responsible for supplying material and the contractor.

CHAPTER II

PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT

According to the Audit paragraph, as against an outlay of Rs. 100.31 lakhs allocated for equipment in the Fourth and Fifth Plans, the actual expenditure incurred on purchase of equipment was as high as Rs. 149.37 lakhs till 1979-80. Though the UGC was aware of lack of financial discipline in the expenditure on equipment, it released funds requested by the University from time to time and also regularised the excess expenditure *post facto* except for a sum of Rs. 2.94 lakhs. In October 1978, the UGC asked for a categorical assurance from the University that it would in future maintain financial discipline. However, no such assurance was available on record.

2.2 The Committee enquired whether the equipment to be purchased during a particular plan period was identified in advance and cleared by the visiting committee of the UGC. The Ministry have stated in a note:

“While determining the allocation for equipment, visiting Committees do not generally identify each item of equipment to be purchased or indicate the cost of such items. The practice generally followed is to indicate the general allocation for purchase of equipment on the basis of an overall assessment of the stage of development of the various departments and its laboratories, the additional facilities to be provided and the total allocation within which the general development programmes of each university are implemented.”

2.3 To another question as to how the UGC released funds requested by the University from time to time and subsequently regularised the excess expenditure when it was aware of lack of financial discipline in the expenditure on equipment, the Ministry of Education have stated in a written reply:

“While making the initial allocation for purchase of equipment, it may not always be possible to ascertain the actual cost. Further, the allocation for purchase of equipment is made initially for the plan period as a whole.

The University has to place orders for purchases as the academic programmes develop and the need for specific items arises. In the circumstances, it might become necessary for the University to incur expenditure, within of course the broad framework of the recommendations of the University Grants Commission. In such circumstances, the Universities are expected to obtain specific approval of the University Grants Commission for excess expenditure on account of cost escalations and/or purchase of items of equipment, which were not originally envisaged before any commitments are made for purchase of equipment. This is a continuous process."

2.4 When enquired whether there were certain items which were approved by the Visiting Committee but not purchased and those which were not included in the List approved by the Visiting Committee and if so what was the estimated expenditure involved thereon, the Ministry have furnished the following two lists:—

1. *List of items and the estimated cost of equipment which were included in the proposals of the University but were not purchased*

	Name of the equipment	Cost of the equipment	Remarks
		Rs.	
I. School of Computer and Systems Sciences	1. Card Reader	45,000/-	An order was placed with EITDC for supply of Card Reader but finally they expressed their inability to supply the same.
	2. Key to tape Unit	46,500/-	Only one Key-to-tape unit has been purchased against the two originally proposed due to lack of demand for this facility.
	3. Transister Tester	..	No urgent need was felt because generally P. C.Bs level testing and diagnosis is done for computer equipments.
	4. Wire-wrap	..	No Need was felt by the technical staff.
II. School of Life Sciences	1. Pyramtomic	44,000/-	

	Name of the Equipment	Cost of the Equipment	Remarks
	2. Heating and Cooling bath	Rs. 11,000/-	
	3. Electrometer probes	Rs. 16,000/-	
	4. Stimulators (S44) 2	Rs. 15,000/-	
	5. Picometer	Rs. 10,000/-	
	6. Waring Balender	Rs. 10,000/-	
	7. Programmable electronic shutter	Rs. 8,000/-	
II. List of items of a equipment not included in the proposals submitted to the U.G.C. but Purchased by the University			
I. School of Computer & Systems Sciences	1. Analog Computer	5,11,095	It was felt by the University that it will hardly be possible for the School to sustain Simulation and Modelling activity without an Analog Computer.
	2. M. D.S.-800	36,761	This was acquired to provide training to the students on the new technology of micro processor and micro computer.
	3. HP-1000/40 Mini Computer	4,27,387	This was acquired for use in research and development in the area of computer architecture and for providing hands on experience for students as well as a back-up computing facility for E.C-1020 systems.
	4. ASR-33 Tele type set	12,079	This was purchased as an input/output device for MDS 800 micro computer.
	5. Hindi-Tele-printer	13,725	Purchased for research in the use of Hindi in computer processing.
II. School of Life Sciences	1. Polygraph	71,620	
	2. Xenon lamp	19,070	
	3. Metler balances 2	21,560	

2.5 During evidence, the Committee enquired how it was ensured that before giving the subsequent grant the sanctioned amount had been used in the right channel. The Secretary, UGC deposed as follows:—

“Before the second instalment of grant is given, the University gives a certificate of its utilisation wherein the visiting Committee visits the university and reports the matter as to what has been the achievement. The Commission’s assistance is in three or four parts—books, equipments, staff and buildings. Regarding books and equipments, the utilisation certificate is given by the university itself.”

2.6 The students of the School of Life Sciences complained in December 1974 that the School had spent “haphazardly” on purchase of equipment which resulted in massive waste of funds and accumulation of substandard items of equipment. The Vice-Chancellor considered the points raised by the students as of great significance and constituted a working group to look into purchases of equipment costing Rs. 16.00 lakhs. In its report of March 1975, the working group held that ‘some of the purchases could have been avoided’, but observed that there was no point in opening the question and going into great details of each case.

2.7 Referring to the question of excess purchases for the School of Life Sciences, the Vice-Chancellor cited the instance of microscopes purchase in 1974. He stated:

“This has been looked into. They were available through the STC. They were good microscopes. Since it was felt that the need for the microscopes will be positively there in the coming years, these microscopes had been purchased. At that time, about a dozen microscopes had been purchased although at the time need was for 3 microscopes. But in 1976-77 as soon as the number of faculties increased and the number of students increased the number of microscopes fell short.”

2.8 The Committee referred to the view expressed by the Working Group that some of purchases could have been avoided, the witness stated:

“Even now I feel convinced that the purchase was not unwise. I think, it was wise, because at that time in those

days, it was difficult to get import licence easily. If some equipment was available, it was purchased.

The M.Sc. teaching had not started. It was to start in 1975. It was felt that as soon as it was started, the microscopes would be needed and when you need microscopes, they would not be available. So, they were purchased at that time. Of course, some other equipment could have been purchased instead of that. But I really feel convinced that this purchase was not unwise."

2.9 According to the directives of the executive council in June 1972, specific committees were to be constituted before effecting purchases of equipment costing over Rs. 2,000; for purchases exceeding Rs. 50,000 a university stores and equipment committee was to scrutinise and recommend the purchase before sanction was accorded by the Vice-Chancellor. No such committee was, however, constituted till August, 1980 and committees for scrutinising purchases upto Rs. 50,000 also did not exist in 5 out of the 6 schools. Instead, requirements were put forth directly by faculty members to the Vice-Chancellor for his sanction. Up to March 1980, 35 items each costing over Rs. 50,000 were purchased at a cost of Rs. 51.00 lakhs without observing the prescribed procedure.

2.10 Asked as to why the Purchase Committees were not constituted till August 1980, the Ministry have explained in a note as follows:

"The bulk of equipment was purchased by the University for the School of Life Sciences, the School of Computer and Systems Sciences, and the School of Environmental Sciences. Of these three, only the School of Life Sciences came into existence in the Fourth Plan. The other Schools established during the Fourth Plan were the School of Social Sciences, the School of International Studies, and the School of Languages. As there was not much in common between the academic and research programmes of the schools established in the Fourth Plan period, it was not considered feasible to appoint the university level Stores and Equipment Committee in the initial stage of development.

All proposals for purchase of equipment were critically examined by the Faculty Committees of the respective Schools, which went into all aspects, including optimal

utility and cost factors. The purchases were decided on the basis of consensus among the Faculty of the Schools. Even with the establishment of the other two Science Schools in the Fifth Plan, there was not much similarity among the three Science Schools, in respect of equipment purchase. As such, a University-level committee was not considered feasible. The university also felt that it was desirable to consider all proposals for procurement of equipment by the entire faculty of the Schools concerned, rather than leaving the choice to a smaller number of faculty members drawn from different schools.

In the initial stages, purchases were made from the firms at rate contract, approved by the Director General, Supplies and Disposal, Govt. of India, and in some cases, stores were acquired from time to time by inviting quotations or direct from the manufacturers or through Govt. stores, like Super Bazar, Government Emporiums etc. All purchase committees have been constituted in August 1980, and all purchases are being routed through them."

2.11 In regard to the non-formation of Committees at the school level in fine art out of six schools, the Ministry has stated:

"Purchase of equipment by different schools were made, after they were examined by the Faculty committees. Though these were not standing purchase committees, specially constituted Purchase Committees, comprising the Dean of the School concerned, Faculty members in charge of concerned laboratories and other experts, had screened and recommended the requirements in each case. It may be added that in some schools, no significant purchase of equipment was envisaged and the constitution of committees for purchase of equipment was not considered necessary."

2.12 The Committee enquired whether the non-formation of the committees was brought to the notice of the Executive Council and if not, the reasons thereof. In a written reply, the Ministry have stated:

"The Executive Council had delegated full powers to the Vice-Chancellor for purchase of equipment in March

1971. While further delegating the powers to purchase committees in June 1972, by the Executive Council, powers delegated to the Vice-Chancellor were never withdrawn; and as such purchases were made with the approval of the Vice-Chancellor in keeping with the delegation of powers granted by the Executive Council. The non-formation of committees was not brought to the notice of the Council as the University did not experience any procedural difficulty in making purchases as per the delegation to the Vice-Chancellor."

2.13 The Committee enquired whether the purchase of equipment should be left to the faculty members only or should there be an overall university overseeing the schools. The Vice-Chancellor reacted by saying:

"In fact, the requirement of faculty is so much that even with the limited funds that come, they have to fight for this and that there is priority for this and that it is not that money is so much that all the equipment can be purchased."

2.14 To a specific question whether the Vice Chancellor felt the need of supervision at the University level or not, he replied, "I accept that".

To a question whether all the purchased items were duly accounted for and entered in registers the finance Officer of the University state:

"All payments on account of purchases, furniture etc. are paid only when the certificate is recorded that the particular item has been taken on stock register. The problem was that when the audit was there some of the schools could not submit their stock register for inspection to the audit team (as) these were not readily available. Some people were on leave."

In reply to a further question he stated:

"I know one Department—Sports Department where the store keeper, who was in charge of these things ran away, absconded and thereafter resigned."

2.15 The Committee desired to know whether it was a fact that in JNU none of the schools maintained any register showing utilisation of funds as well as register of purchase of articles, including purchases from foreign countries. The Secretary, UGC stated as follows:

"It was only on this matter that a few years back, the Commission had taken a decision that the Finance Officer of a Central University would be on deputation from the C&AG's Office. The idea was apart from his independence, he will be able to devise how things should be done in universities etc. This is one precaution which we had taken. Secondly, we do not send, as mentioned earlier, inspectors to see these things. They have got their own trained staff in-built Accounts Deptt."

Purchase and installation of Computer

2.16 According to the Audit paragraph, on a proposal by the University in 1970-71 for installation of a powerful computer system, Government agreed in 1972 to establish the computer facility with the assistance of an international organisation (UNDP) at a cost of Rs. 260,00 lakhs. A mission of the international organisation which visited the country observed in October 1974 that ancillary machinery was not available to support and justify installation of a powerful computer facility. The proposal was accordingly deferred and had not been revised so far (August 1981).

2.17 Pending procurement of a powerful computer system in due course, Government decided to go in for a smaller computer and as a result of negotiations (March 1975) with a foreign country (Bulgaria) a small computer was purchased at a cost of Rs. 27.50 lakhs and installed by the January 1976. The computer was expected by the University to be self supporting out of income by operating it for 16 hours each day, for user groups. But it was operated for only one shift of 8 hours and its income upto March 1980 amounted to Rs. 0.60 lakh only against an expenditure of Rs. 8.07 lakhs on maintenance. The computer had productive running for 490, 565, 680, 660 and 552 hours only during the years 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1980 respectively and was completely out of order for nil, 106, 135, 41 and 68 days during each of these years. In view of long periods of repair and little use, the finance committee of the University recommended (October 1978) a review of the functioning of the system, but no review had been conducted so far (August 1981).

2.18 The University placed orders for an 'Anolog' computer with the Electronic Corporation of India Ltd. in December 1976 at a cost of Rs. 5.11 lakhs by diverting funds made available to it by the UGC for another equipment. This was required for the purpose of offering courses on simulation and modelling and helping the teachers to carry on their own research projects. The computer was installed (November 1978) 12 months after the scheduled date (October 1977). The functioning of this computer was seriously handicapped due to non-procurement of an ancillary equipment (a generator) which was yet to be procured (August 1981). The extent of utilisation against its capacity could not be ascertained due to non-maintenance of any log book.

2.19 The powerful computer system, which was planned to be procured from an international organisation (UNDP) was proposed to be installed in a seven-storeyed library building with plinth area of 1,42,800 square feet of which 36,000 square feet were earmarked for the computer system. The main hall (area: 10,000 square feet) where the big computer was to be installed, was being used as a science library since August, 1976.

2.20 According to a note furnished by the Ministry, the main reason for poor performance of the Bulgarian computer was frequent faults in the system caused by non-availability of spare parts and documentation. It finally stopped functioning on 27-9-1981, due to an unidentifiable fault in its disk controller. It has also been stated that the Bulgarian suppliers are unable to supply all the spares. During evidence, the Vice Chancellor admitted that:

"My personal view is that this computer will not work. Both the Computers Maintenance Corporation and the Electronics Commission say that they will not be able to procure spare parts and maintain it. It is a fourth generation computer. The computers are changing very fast."

2.21 During evidence, on being enquired by the Committee whether the University had revived the proposal for acquiring a computer under the UNDP at any time, the Vice Chancellor stated:

"Last year the Vice Chancellor was in correspondence with the Ministry of Education..... I do not know what actually has happened. He was very seriously, looking for a bigger computer."

2.22 According to Audit, as against an outlay of Rs. 100.31 lakhs allocated for equipment in Fourth and Fifth Five Year Plans, the actual expenditure was as high as Rs. 149.37 lakhs till 1979-80. Though the University Grants Commission was aware of lack of financial discipline in the expenditure on equipment, it went on releasing funds requested for by the University from time to time and also regularising the excess expenditure post facto.

2.23 According to the directives of the Executive Council in June 1972, specific committees were to be constituted before making purchases of equipment costing over Rs. 2,000; and for purchases exceeding Rs. 50,000, a University Stores and Equipment Committee was to scrutinize and recommend the purchases before sanction was accorded by the Vice-Chancellor. Surprisingly no such committee was constituted till August 1980 and committees for scrutinizing purchases upto Rs. 50,000 did not exist in 5 out of the six schools. Instead, requirements were reported directly by the individual faculties to the Vice-Chancellor. Upto March 1980, 35 items, costing over Rs. 50,000 each, were purchased at a total cost of Rs. 51 lakhs without observing the prescribed procedure. The reasons given by the University authorities for not constituting the Purchase Committees are far from convincing.

2.24 The Committee also note that while some of the items which were included in the University's proposals submitted to the University Grants Commission were not purchased, several items which were not included in the proposals were purchased. The latter included two computers, the value of which was nearly Rs. 10 lakhs. In the absence of the proper procedure being followed in the matter of purchase of equipment, there is force in the complaint of the students of the School of Life Sciences that the School had spent "haphazardly" on purchases of equipment which resulted in massive waste of funds and accumulation of sub-standard items of equipment. The Working Group appointed by the Vice-Chancellor to look into these purchases put it mildly that "some of the purchases could have been avoided".

2.25 The Committee further note that stock registers were not properly maintained; nor was proper record of utilisation of costly equipment maintained. Physical verification of equipment was also not done regularly. Stock registers were not shown to Audit for inspection. The Store-keeper rather than show the stock registers to Audit "ran away, absented and thereafter resigned". It appears to the Committee from the facts that in the JNU, financial discipline was sadly lacking and prescribed procedures had little sanctity. With a view to overcoming these shortcomings, the UGC had decided to induct officer from the Office of the C&AG for financial and materials management. This is a welcome move. The Committee trust that the University authorities will take care to see that all purchase proposals are not only given the most careful scrutiny at appropriate levels but also the prescribed purchase procedures are strictly adhered to. The

University will also take care to see that after purchase, all the equipment are properly recorded and verified periodically.

2.26 The Committee note that the University could not acquire a powerful computer under the United Nations Development Programme assistance as ancillary machinery could not be acquired in time. This proposal is now stated to have been again taken up. The Committee would await the outcome. The main hall (area 10,000 sq. ft.) of the building which was constructed for it at a cost of Rs. 21.61 lakhs is now being used for the Science Library.

2.27 A much smaller computer acquired in January 1976 though expected to be self-supporting could earn only Rs. 0.60 lakh against its maintenance expenditure of Rs. 8.07 lakhs upto March 1980 due to its poor performance. Non-availability of certain spare parts had resulted in non-functioning of this computer since 27 September, 1981. The Committee feel that before purchasing sensitive equipment like a computer, the University authorities should have arranged for procurement of adequate spare parts. Apparently, the University authorities had failed to do so. The story of purchase of 'Anolog' computer is equally disturbing. The Committee would recommend that an inquiry be conducted into the purchases and non-functioning of all the computers of the JNU with a view to fixing responsibility.

CHAPTER III

ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

As mentioned in Chapter I of the Report, the University was to develop in three stages. It was envisaged that on completion the campus would provide facilities for 10,000 students and 1250 faculty members. In the first stage, covering period upto April, 1980, the target was seven schools with 3200 students and 400 teaching staff. Against this target the actual strength in the different schools in 1979-80 was as under:

School of	Faculty			Students		
	Planned strength	Actuals in 1979-80	Shortfall (-) surplus (+)	Planned strength	Actual in 1979-80	Shortfall (-) Surplus (+)
1. Social Sciences	112	94	-18	1200	1111	-89
2. Languages	120	88	-32	1000	1151	+151
3. International studies	50	65	+17	475	437	-38
4. Life Sciences	21	19	-2	250	122	-128
5. Computer and system sciences	25	11	-14	100	38	-62
6. Environmental sciences	28	17	-11	100	72	-28
7. Creative arts	35	—	-35	75	—	-75
Total	400	295	-105	3200	2759	-441

The Seventh school, the School of Creative Arts has not been established and the target of students and faculty members is also behind.

3.2 In the School of International Studies, the students strength was less whereas the strength of the teaching staff was excessive. On the other hand, in the School of Languages, the student strength was more than target. In other Schools, both the student and faculty members strength is less than the planned strength.

3.3 No norms had been laid down by the UGC or the University, at any stage, fixing the student faculty ratio in the different schools.

The cost of operation of the University per student worked out as follows:—

Year	Cost of operation per student
1976-77	Rs. 9,505
1977-78	Rs. 9,623
1978-79	* Rs. 11,155
1979-80	Rs. 10,655
1980-81	Rs. 11,680

3.4 During evidence, the Committee enquired about the distinctive features of the JNU as compared with other Universities. The Vice Chancellor explained as follows:

“We have a School of International studies. In this School, various programmes all over the world are taken up— American study, South American Study, Western European study, East European study, West Asian study and so on.

There is a school of Life Sciences etc. but there is no other university where this programme is being done. There is a school of languages where about 13 international languages are being taught. I don't think there is any other university where this type of programme is being done to this extent. There is a school of social sciences where although basic studies are in basic disciplines, but there also the students have to take course in inter-related areas. For example, student will not be able to know political science or political study of any country unless he also knows what is the economic situation and historical perspective of that country. There also studies in inter-related disciplines should be given. This also is not there is any other university. Here also at the M.A. level they have to take related areas of studies.”

3.5 To a question whether the student-teacher ratio in the JNU is considered satisfactory. The Vice Chancellor replied that the teacher-student ratio was very good as compared with other Universities. For example, in Science it would be 1:5 or 1:6 whereas

in the case of social sciences, it would be 1:10 and in the School of Languages, it would be 1:12 or 1:14.

3.6 Asked how did this ratio compare with that prevailing in other Central Universities, the Ministry of Education and Culture stated:

"The student-teacher ratio in other Central Universities during 1981-82 was as follows:

S. No.	University	Enrolment	Teachers Strength	Student-Teacher ratio
1.	Banaras Hindu University	15,454	1,419	10.9 : 1
2.	Aligarh Muslim University	10,904	1,033	10.6 : 1
3.	Delhi University	13,077	625	20.9 : 1
4.	Visva-Bharati	1,558	420	3.7 : 1
5.	North-Eastern Hill University	1,036	135	7.7 : 1
6.	University of Hyderabad	529	101	5.2 : 1

To a question whether the student teacher ratio in the JNU is considered satisfactory.

The Ministry of Education have stated:

"Considering the fact that a large percentage of students of the University comprise of post-graduate and research scholars, the overall teacher student ratio 1:10 is satisfactory."

3.7 According to the Audit paragraph, the various schools of studies did not maintain any data to indicate the number of students, who left their studies in between and the University had not also examined the causes for the drop-outs, at least where they appeared to be heavy. A study in respect of the schools of social sciences and languages revealed that out of about 35,000 applications for the various courses of duration of 1 to 5 years, 8826 students were admitted upto 1979-80 and of those admitted, 3420 left the course without completion. While going through the records of the drop-outs for the year 1978-79 in the School of Languages, it was observed that out of 518 drop-outs, applications for withdrawal were available only in 156 cases, indicating that many had left the courses without giving any notice. From the large number of drop-outs, it would appear that many students not selected out of the

applicants had been denied the opportunity of admission to the courses. No bonds for completion of courses by the selected candidates had also been taken.

3.8 During evidence the Committee enquired about the reaction of the witnesses to the students leaving the campus in the middle of their studies. The Vice-Chancellor reacted by saying:

“The students do tend to go out because they are not very certain as to what would be their job prospects here. If you look into the history of this University you will find that in the initial few years, the students did not really go in for Central Services and other services. They were committed to the academic line. This trend to go towards the Central Services and IAS started recently and there they have done very well. Secondly, many of the students would positively like to continue only in the academic programmes provided they have an opportunity provided they are sure that after doing their Ph.D there is something for them and they would be able to get something. In this context let me tell you another thing also. We do another programme, i.e., NCERT awards scholarships in a number of disciplines, in other social sciences. There also all those students who were selected immediately after the XII Standard are expected to go to the academic line. Since the job prospects are not there, even these students have gone towards the Central services and there is a clause that if any student goes towards any competitive services, all the money will have to be refunded by the candidate. But that has not been insisted upon by the Government as there are certain constraints and is hardly feasible.”

3.9 He went on to say:

“The number seems to be large because we have counted all those students who have left including those who have taken fellowships. Some students have left after completing three years and again this will not give you a correct picture because a good percentage of them have been selected for the National Fellowships and they have gone outside India to study on Government of India Fellowship and some of them are selected internationally. So, that cannot be considered really as a loss.”

3.10 To a question whether the University has gone into the reasons for the number of drop-outs being high, the Vice Chancellor replied that the University had a one-year diploma course and

that 5000 and odd students had taken up part-time course and in that there was good percentage of drop-outs—particularly among the working people. He added that the University was thinking of dropping the one year Diploma course.

3.11 The Committee desired to know how many students of the Jawaharlal Nehru University who were getting fellowships|scholarships for research from the JNU as well as other institutions like ICSSR, ICHR, CSIR, UGC, State Governments, etc., have either left the University without submitting any thesis or have not submitted any thesis for a number of years. According to a written reply of the Ministry, the number of such students was assessed at 332.

3.12 The Committee referred to reply to Unstarred Question 1926 in Lok Sabha on 4-3-1982 according to which 402 fellowship holders had not completed the fellowship for which they were registered. The Committee desired the representatives of the University to reconcile the two figures. The Coordinator, JNU stated:

“402 is the figure of those who did not complete the Ph.D. But some of them have completed the pre-Ph.D. course i.e., the M. Phil. So, 332 reflects those who did neither of the two and admission is made for M. Phil and Ph.D. together.”

3.13 Asked what action had been taken or proposed to be taken by the University authorities in such cases, the Ministry have stated in a note:

“A large number of fellowship holders who had discontinued their programme of research without submitting their theses, did so to take up careers in academic institutions or Government establishments. The training in research methodology received by them will be relevant and useful to them in their career, and to the organisations. Further, the University Grants Commission guidelines do not provide for recovery of the amount of fellowships| Scholarships.”

3.14 In reply to another question as to what was the total amount of fellowships/scholarships paid to such students so far, the Ministry have stated:

“The information relating to the amount of fellowships| scholarships paid to the students who left without com-

pleting their studies is not readily available. The University is in the process of compiling the figures which will take considerable time and effort. The amount of fellowship in respect of 203 cases compiled so far works out to Rs. 16,59,401.23."

3.15 The Committee desired to know whether any bond was filled up by the students providing for recovery of amounts paid on fellowship in case of drop-out. The Coordinator informed that there was no bond system. In reply to another question, the Vice Chancellor stated:

"Sir, in this connection, may I just for information refer to the matter of the National Sciences Research Scholarsnips scheme? There is a bond system there that if a student after getting the fellowship leaves and goes for any other job, then he will have to refund all this amount. But even in those cases the Government of India has been very lenient and the recovery has not been made."

3.16 The Secretary, UGC added:

"The main purpose is that if he leaves in between, he has at least learnt something which will be useful to him in his work. The number of those leaving in between may be a little larger here as compared to the other universities but even in those cases where we have given fellowships people have taken upto four years and sometimes even six years, to submit their thesis because of the subjects they have taken or because of some other difficulties. This condition has not been practically laid down since the institution of the award of fellowship."

3.17 Asked whether the specific purpose for which fellowships are given—teaching or research—is served in case of drop-out, the Secretary, UGC stated: "I would have to admit that this is not served in the case of those who leave it."

3.18 In reply to a question, the Secretary of the Ministry stated:

"We have to look at it and also see what is the practice, which is being followed in other organisations..... A proper analysis will have to be made. I will take it up in the next meeting which the Chairman of the UGC will be calling."

3.19 According to the Audit paragraph, in the Schools of Life Sciences, Environmental Sciences and Computer & Systems Sciences, the equipment procured was 222, 122 and 165 per cent of the plan proposals, whereas student population was only 46, 67 and 26 per cent of the planned strength. This would indicate that the courses conducted were not sufficiently attractive despite creation of adequate facilities, which consequently remained underutilised.

3.20 The Committee desired to know as to why the planned student strength could not be achieved in Science Study whereas procurement of equipment was far in excess of Plan allocation. The Ministry have submitted the following note:

“The Science Schools had to be built from the scratch. They required substantial inputs in terms of laboratory equipments, buildings and other physical facilities to become viable. It is quite possible that the funds initially sought from the University Grants Commission for procurement of equipment were not realistic in terms of the requirements of the academic and research programmes of the schools. The main factor for increase in expenditure on equipment had been escalation of cost of equipment by about 15 to 20 per cent per year. Even after having spent funds in excess of the plan allocation for building up laboratory and equipment facilities, the facilities created so far are just enough to sustain on going academic and research programmes of unconventional disciplines like Computer Sciences, Environmental Science and Life Sciences, which are relatively new to the Indian Education scene. Moreover, it would not be proper to compare the procurement of equipment with enrolment of students.

The planned student strength was based on corresponding resources like size of the faculty and other inputs. The details of planned and actual strength of teachers and students is given below:

Name of School	Planned strength		Actual strength	
	Faculty	students	Faculty	students
1. School of Life Sciences.	35	250	22	125
2. School of Computer and Systems Sciences	29	100	11	78
3. School of Environmental Sciences.	29	100	17	45

3.21 According to the Audit paragraph, the Centre for studies in Science Policy was established in 1972-73. It had admitted 40 students in M. Phil/Ph. D, since its inception, in 1972-73 but failed to turn out a single Ph.D. upto 1979-80. Only 4 students were awarded M.Phil degrees. In August 1981, six students were on roll with a faculty strength of three. The remaining 30 students had left their studies midway.

A review Committee set up by the Vice Chancellor observed (June 1979) that:

- (a) the performance of the Centre was far from satisfactory considering the drop-outs over the years,
- (b) the centre had not succeeded in integrating research with teaching programme and the objective of developing science policy as an independent applied discipline had not been realised;
- (c) the general atmosphere of the centre was not conducive to academic work and;
- (d) it has ceased to be a viable set up where serious academic work could continue.

Accordingly, on the recommendations of the Committee, all fresh admissions were frozen for 2-3 years until overall atmosphere in the centre improved.

3.22 The Committee desired to know the objectives of the Centre and to what extent the same had been achieved. In a written reply, the Ministry have stated:

"The Centre for Studies in Science Policy was established in 1970. The main objectives of the Centre were that it should develop a conceptual framework and the methodological tools necessary to study, analyse and communicate the dynamics of development of natural science and technology in Indian culture and society. Particular emphasis was to be placed on the need to examine science and its inter-action with society from an Indian perspective, free from the prevailing formulations derived from European experience. The centre should build up high-quality experience to Science in Policy problems. Necessary analytical capabilities may also be developed in various sector, such as nuclear, space, communications, demography, education, etc.

With the passage of time, it was felt that these objectives were not achieved, and that the Centre had ceased to be a viable academic unit. The Executive Council in its meeting held on 20th February 1980, decided that the Centre as an administrative structure, be suspended until such time as the need for reviving it manifests itself."

3.23 The Committee desired to know the main finding of the various committees which had gone into the working of the Centre and follow-up action, if any, taken thereon. In a note, the Ministry have stated:

"The Academic Council of the University, in September 1977, constituted a Committee of which Professor Yogendra Singh was the Convener, to review the work done by the Centre during the last five years, and how far the objectives for which the Centre was set up, have been fulfilled. The Committee came to the conclusion that a Group of nine members drawn from various disciplines be set up to plan out joint research and a viable teaching programme in the field of science policy, and that in the meanwhile, no new appointments at the junior level should be made, and all fresh admissions should be frozen at least, for a period of 2-3 years and a special Research Centre may be created within the purview of the existing Centre."

3.24 The Report was considered by the Academic Council and the Executive Council of the University. The Executive Council in April 1979 decided to constitute a Committee under the chairmanship of Dr. V. S. Jha to identify causes responsible for the state of affairs reported by the Yogendra Singh Committee and to recommend remedial measures for future course of action. The main findings of the Committee were as follows:

- (1) The Centre as an administrative structure should be suspended until such time as the need for reviewing it manifests itself;
- (2) A 9-Member Expert Committee should be constituted to formulate a workable programme for the study of Science policy as a new discipline.
- (3) M.Phil and Ph.D. students on the rolls of the Centre should be given every opportunity to complete their work and continue further work, if called upon to do so.

- (4) The faculty members should be absorbed in the existing schools as best as possible.
- (5) The administrative structure of the Centre should be revived for the new specialised field of study on the advice of the expert Committee.

3.25 The Report of the Jha Committee was considered by the Executive Council on February 20, 1980, and the Centre was suspended as an administrative unit. A nine-member Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. R. Ramanna was constituted in June, 1980, to formulate a workable programme for the study of science policy in the university. The main findings of the committee are as follows:

- (1) In the field of science policy, studies could be undertaken on a number of topics, such as Law of the seas, Science Education, Energy options etc., and as much it does not seem necessary that a centre for studies in Science policy should exist, as the subject matter of research involves a number of disciplines. A teaching programme for M. Phil, in the field of science policy should evolve out of a more active research centre as in the other interdisciplinary fields.
- (2) The work could easily be done in the other centres of the university, and the centre be converted into a research unit till such time as the research programme has achieved a certain international status.
- (3) The existing faculty members should be given an option either to join another Centre or to remain in the special research Centre.
- (4) The students registered for Ph.D. with the Centre should be adjusted in the other existing centres of the university

3.26 The Report of the Committee was considered by the Executive Council of the University in January 1982. The Executive Council decided to revive the academic programmes of the Centre in phases and to strengthen them. The Council also decided to set up a programmes committee under the Chairmanship of the then Vice-Chancellor to formulate the academic and research programmes of the centre. The Committee has not submitted its Report so far.

3.27. In the first phase of the development of the Jawaharlal Nehru University, 7 Schools were to be set up. Of these, six have

already been set up and the seventh—the School of Creative Arts—is still to come into existence. The Committee note that the academic and student strength is less than the planned target in all the Schools, the exceptions being the Schools of International Studies and Languages. According to the latest figures (1st February, 1983) furnished by the Ministry, as against the planned strength of 250, 100 and 100 students in the Schools of Life Sciences, Computer and Systems Sciences and of Environmental Science, the actual strength was 125, 78 and 45 students respectively. This indicates that the courses offered by the JNU in these Schools had not yet proved to be sufficiently attractive to the students. As the equipment procured in those Schools was 222, 165 and 122 per cent of the Plan proposals, and the actual student strength far less than that planned, there was gross under-utilisation of equipment in these Schools. The Committee would like the University authorities to analyse the causes for the under-utilisation of the capacity of Science Schools created at heavy cost and to initiate suitable measures for their optimum utilisation.

3.28 The various Schools of Studies did not maintain any data to indicate the number of students who did not complete their studies. However, a study in respect of Schools of Social Sciences and Languages revealed that out of 8826 students admitted to various courses of duration of 1 to 5 years upto 1979-80, 3420 students had left the courses without completing. As these 8826 students had been selected out of about 35,000 applicants, the manner of selection did not seem to be satisfactory in view of the heavy drop-outs. Further the average cost of operation of the University per student being over Rs. 11,000 per annum the order of the unproductive expenditure on the drop-outs can well be imagined. The Committee think that the contention of the Ministry that those who left the courses in the middle learnt something which would be useful to them in their careers is a poor consolation. They need hardly point out that fellowships/scholarships are given by the University and various other bodies for specific objectives and the objectives for which these are given and these are not served when such students leave their studies without completing. In the opinion of the Committee, an indepth analysis of the reasons for the students discontinuing the courses is called for. In this connection, the Committee would draw attention to the observation made by the Vice-Chancellor in evidence before the Committee that in the initial stages, the students were committed to academic career but of late they were going in for Civil Services as they were not sure about their prospects after completing their studies/research in the JNU. The Committee would like the Ministry to take effective steps to deal with the problem of drop-outs. In particular, the Committee would like the Ministry to examine the feasibility of introducing a suitable bond whereby Scholarship/Fellowship holders are obliged to complete their studies.

3.29 The most dismal performance has been that of the Centre for Studies in Science Policy. This Centre had admitted 40 students

in M.Phil/Ph.D. Programmes since its inception in 1972-73 but had failed to produce a single Ph.D. upto 1979-80. Only 4 students were awarded M.Phil Degree and in August 1981, 6 students were on roll with a faculty strength of 3. The remaining 30 students had left their studies mid-way. A review committee set up by the Vice-Chancellor inter-alia observed that the objective of developing science policy as an independent applied discipline had not been realised and the general atmosphere of the Centre was not conducive to academic work. On their recommendation of the review committee, all fresh admissions were frozen for 2-3 years until the overall atmosphere in the Centre improved. In January 1982, the Executive Council had decided to revive the academic programmes of the Centre in phases to strengthen them. The Council had also decided to set up a Programmes Committee under the chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor to formulate the academic and research programme of the Centre. The Programme Committee had not submitted its report so far. The Committee would like to know further developments.

CHAPTER IV

ORGANISATION

A. Administrative Staff

For the Fifth Five Year Plan, the University proposed a non-teaching staff strength of 745 and observed in its report as under:

“While we are not in favour of increasing the administrative staff unnecessarily, we are examining how we can curtail the administrative staff and maintain standards of efficiency. However, the requirement of minimum staff needed during the Fifth Plan period as shown in schedule XIII seems unavoidable at this stage.”

4.2 The proposed strength of 745 in the administrative staff category was also fully endorsed by the first visiting committee. The number of persons in position had, however, been appreciably in excess of the recommended strength in most categories, as per particulars below:

Offices	Staff required and recommended	Number in position	Surplus(+) Deficit(-)
Registrar	92	103	+11
Finance	68	62	-6
Faculties	49	433	+384
Library	145	138	-7
Student facilities	49	35	-14
Hostels	69	104	+35
Works	74	102	+28
Sanitation	82	84	+2
Security	101	114	+13
Estate	21	24	+3
Total	745	1092	+347

4.3 The fact that the University was over-staffed on the administrative side was within the knowledge of the University before new posts were created with the approval of the UGC, because its finance Committee had made adverse observations on this fact on several occasions, in particular, in October, 1977, it had observed that the increase in the number of the non-teaching staff employed by the University was abnormally high as compared to the increase in the activities of the University. The plan provision for the period up to 1978-79 for the non-teaching staff amounted to Rs. 16.00 lakhs whereas the actual expenditure amounted to Rs. 64.66 lakhs upto 1978-79 and Rs 66.57 lakhs upto 1979-80.

4.4 When enquired why the number of non-teaching staff employed by the University was so high as compared to the increase in activities of the University, the Ministry have submitted the following reply:

“About 20 per cent of non-teaching staff are engaged to look after the needs of 9 hostels in which 1800 students reside. Further, the fact that the University is at present located on two campuses, 2 kilometres apart from one another is also partly responsible for deployment of more staff.

There were some unforeseen reasons in the increase in expenditure on non-teaching staff during Fifth Plan period. These include upward revision of pay scales, based on the Third Pay Commission's Report, sanction of additional instalments of D.A. from time to time and the implementation of an agreement signed by the University with the staff association in April 1977, when the Vice-Chancellor and other functionaries were merged, under which some 45 employees were given promotions and about 60 additional posts were created.”

4.5 As to why the actual expenditure on non-teaching staff rose to Rs. 64.66 lakhs during the plan period as against the allocated amount of Rs. 16.00 lakhs, the Ministry have stated in a note:

“The expenditure estimated by the University on non-teaching staff during the Fifth Plan period was Rs. 36 lakhs. While communicating approval to the Visiting Committee's recommendations, the University Grants Commission had indicated a provision of Rs. 16 lakhs to meet the expenditure on the non-teaching staff. Against an estimate of Rs. 36 lakhs submitted by the University, partly because

of pressing need of the University and partly because of the reasons given in para above, the expenditure on non-teaching staff in the Fifth Plan was considerably more than was indicated by the University Grants Commission."

4.6 Asked if there were any norms in regard to strength of administrative staff, the Ministry have stated as follows:

"The University Grants Commission has not so far prescribed any norms for the appointment of administrative staff in the Central Universities. Posts of non-teaching staff are normally created in these Universities as and when need arises, and after processing the proposals through the authorities, namely, the Finance Committee and the Executive Council. In the circumstances, it has not been possible to ensure the application of any standard criteria in the creation of and appointment to various categories of non-teaching staff.

The question of rationalising the structure and cadres of non-teaching staff in the Central Universities has been under consideration of the University Grants Commission. At the last meeting of the Commission it has been decided to evolve standard procedures for review of the non-teaching cadres and establishment of Work Study Units in different Central Universities for this purpose."

During evidence, the Coordinator of the University stated:

"There is some gap in between. It is not 745.....At the end of the Fourth Plan, the figure was 638 and we asked for 265 in the Fifth Plan period. The figures also include hostel staff attached to 7 to 8 hostels..... (The increase) is 93 over and above what we had asked for. I am submitting the reasons for 93. 30 to 35 was because of the establishment of two new schools."

The witness further stated:

".....When we prepared the Fifth Plan proposals, the question of developing a site which was 2 km. away from the existing new campus was not taken into account. For that, we had to maintain a separate sanitation and maintenance staff."

4.6A The Committee enquired whether, as required by the prescribed procedure, all the proposals for creation of posts of non-teaching staff were first processed by the Finance Committee and the Executive Council. In a written reply, the Ministry have stated:

“The Vice-Chancellor has been delegated powers by the Executive Council to create non-teaching posts the maximum of the pay scales of which does not exceed Rs. 1000/- and as such in most of the cases such posts had been created by the Vice-Chancellor. However, all proposals for creation of posts are now placed before the Finance Committee/Executive Council before any appointments are made.”

4.7 The Committee note that as against the student strength of nearly 3000, the strength of administrative staff in the Jawaharlal Nehru University was a little over 1,000. According to Audit, the Finance Committee of the University had made adverse observations on this aspect on several occasions and, in particular, it had observed in October, 1977 that increase in the number of non-teaching staff was “abnormally high” as compared to the increase in the activities of the University. The Committee further note that as against the plan provision of Rs. 16 lakhs sanctioned by the University Grants Commission for the non-teaching staff of the University for the Fifth Plan period and the University’s own estimate of Rs. 36 lakhs, the actual expenditure amounted to over Rs. 64.66 lakhs. No satisfactory explanation for this phenomenal increase has been given. The Committee note that the University Grants Commission has now decided to evolve standard procedures for review of non-teaching cadres and establishment of Work Study Units in different Central Universities. The Committee desire that an independent study of the existing non-teaching staff position in the Jawaharlal Nehru University be carried out at an early date. They also desire that the Staff Inspection Unit of the Ministry of Finance or a body similar thereto should be appointed to undertake a work study of the staff strength of the JNU and fix norms for different jobs without delay. The staff, if any, found surplus should be suitably re-deployed.

B. Payment of Overtime Allowance

4.8 In spite of increase in the number of staff members, the University incurred expenditure on overtime to the extent of Rs. 11.05 lakhs during the Fifth Year Plan period. For 1979-80 and 1980-81 the original budget estimates for overtime were Rs. 3.00 lakhs and Rs. 4.00 lakhs but were revised to Rs. 4.00 lakhs and Rs. 6.00 lakhs and the actual expenditure amounted to Rs. 6.63 lakhs and Rs. 8.03 lakhs respectively. This happened despite the concern expressed (October 1978) by the Finance Committee on the increase in overtime allowance and its instructions for the need for devising some mechanism on priority basis for reducing the expenditure on overtime.

4.9 The Committee enquired as to why there was abnormal increase in expenditure on O.T.A. in spite of increase in the administrative staff. The Ministry have explained it as follows:

“The increase in the OTA expenditure was due to the fact that the university is yet to have a provision for leave reserve among various cadres and categories of the staff and particularly the essential staff who had to be deployed to avoid any dislocation in essential services like—security, sanitation, messes and hostels, electricity and water supply, air-conditioning plants and library. Yet another reason for increase in OTA expenditure was increase in the DA and ADA sanctioned by the Government of India from time to time in the period under reference.”

4.10 The University claimed in December 1981 the earnest efforts were made to reduce the quantum of OTA paid to the staff and as compared to June 1981 a reduction of 30 per cent had been achieved in October 1981 (Audit para relating to this was issued in August 1981).

4.11 In another note the Ministry has stated that in instructions of the Finance Committee were brought to the notice of all the controlling officers for effecting economy in the expenditure on OTA.

On a query from the Committee, the Ministry have furnished the following statement showing month-wise expenditure on OTA from November 1981 to October, 1982:

Month	Expenditure on OTA (Rs. in lakhs.)
November, 1981	0.69
December, 1981	0.70
January, 1982	0.72
February, 1982	0.74
March, 1982	0.67
April, 1982	0.70
May, 1982	0.79
June, 1982	0.80
July, 1982	0.67
August, 1982	0.78
September, 1982	0.93
October, 1982	0.86

4.12 The Committee note that in spite of increase in the strength of administrative staff, the University had to incur expenditure to the tune of over Rs. 11 lakhs on overtime during the Fifth Plan period. The Committee also note that as against the revised estimate of Rs. 4.00 lakhs and Rs. 6.00 lakhs for the years 1979-80 and 1980-81 respectively, the actual expenditure on payment of overtime allowance had been Rs. 6.63 lakhs and Rs. 9.03 lakhs, respectively. The claim of the University that there had been a reduction of 30 per cent in payment of overtime allowance in October, 1981 has no meaning in the light of the fact that during the 12-month period ending October, 1982, the overtime allowance amounted to over Rs. 9.05 lakhs as against Rs. 8.03 lakhs in 1980-81. In the opinion of the Committee, such large payment of overtime allowance is largely a management failure. The argument advanced by the Ministry, that overtime allowance had to be paid because there was no leave reserve is not convincing in view of the fact that there was surplus administrative staff. The Committee desire the Ministry of Education to impress upon the Jawaharlal Nehru University authorities the imperative need of reducing the payment of overtime allowance to the barest minimum.

CHAPTER V

FINANCIAL MATTERS

A. Finance, Audit and Accounts

The University is mainly financed by grants from Government through the University Grants Commission. A summary of receipts and payments of the University for the years 1975-76 to 1979-80 showed that there were closing balances of Rs. 100.72 lakhs, 134.84 lakhs, 97.03 lakhs, 17.14 lakhs and 55.81 lakhs as on 31st March, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1980, respectively.

5.2 The accounts of the University are audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India under Section 19(2) of the C&AG (Duties, Powers, Conditions of Service) Act, 1971 and the audited accounts are placed before Parliament.

5.3 The Committee enquired the reasons for heavy closing balance during the years 1975-76 to 1977-78. The Ministry of Education have furnished the following information:

"The position of closing balance of these years is as under:

Year	Maintenance account		Earmarked Fund A/C		Deposit Account	Vith Plan Account	Total
	Recpt.	Bal.	Recpt.	Bal.	Balance	Balance	
(Rupees in lakhs)							
1975-76	162.64	3.71	19.95	4.82	10.47	81.72	100.72
1976-77	178.16	2.40	27.16	6.42	19.94	106.08	134.84
1977-78	192.95	0.23	32.77	6.50	18.12	72.18	97.03

Maintenance Accounts

5.4 The closing balances under Maintenance Accounts represent a negligible percentage of the total receipts which signifies that the University has proper budgetary procedure.

Earmarked Fund Account

5.5 Grants under this account are generally meant for "Fellowships and Scholarships", projects and other specific purposes. The

accounts are maintained on the financial year basis i.e., from April to March of the next year whereas the fellowships/scholarships are sanctioned for the academic year beginning from July to June next year. Thus, every year Fellowships/Scholarships for three months from April, June is carried over to the next year.

5.6 Moreover, as the progress of various projects is not always uniform, it affects the expenditure resulting in excessive closing balances. In case of plan grants, closing balances are likely to be higher because the grants received in February-March can be utilised mostly in the next year.

Deposit Account

5.7 Various deposits such as security from students, contractors, students' aid fund, students' welfare fund, Provident Fund of the staff etc. are not required to be refunded at the close of the year.

Plan Account

5.8 The total plan grants received from the UGC during the year 1975-76 to 1977-78 were of the order of Rs. 215 lakhs, 163 lakhs and 90 lakhs, respectively.

5.9 Bulk of these grants were received towards the close of the respective year (1975-76—81.25, 1976-77—122.89 and 1977-78—68.57). Besides in 1975-76, the Department of Electronics paid a grant of Rs. 6.50 lakhs towards the purchase of a computer which was utilised in 1976-77. Similarly, from a grant of Rs. 21 lakhs received in 1976-77 from the Ministry of Education, IIT and NCERT for construction of the building of the Kendriya Vidyalaya, an expenditure of Rs. 5.96 lakhs only could be incurred in the year, leaving an unspent balance of Rs. 15.04 lakhs. Rs. 12 lakhs received from IIT and NCERT in 1977-78 for the same purpose also remained unutilised. The University has a revolving fund of Rs. 20 lakhs for stock suspense out of which an amount of Rs. 6.84 lakhs, 12.28 lakhs and Rs. 16.63 lakhs remained unutilised during 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78 respectively. All these factors resulted in excessive closing balances.

5.10 The University does have a systematic budgeting procedure to regulate the expenditure. However, in the case of expenditure on Capital Works and acquisition of equipment, the actual payments have to be regulated in accordance with the terms of contract, and not merely on the basis of the availability of funds. Hence the large closing balance under Plan accounts during the year under reference "

5.11 In another note, the Ministry have explained the procedure of release of funds as follows:

“The University Grants Commission while releasing the grants takes into account the actual expenditure incurred as reported by the University and the requirements of the funds for next six months. The Jawaharlal Nehru University is a central university and all the funds are to be provided by the Commission. In order that the University is able to meet the requirements, the grants have to be released in advance. Some projects involve substantial expenditure and grants have been released keeping in view the requirements of the University. However, in some cases due to various difficulties the university could not actually utilise the grants resulting in large unspent balances.”

B. Utilisation of Grants

5.12 A summary of grants received by the University for specified purposes from UGC, the Central Government and other sources* during the five years ending 31st March, 1981, the expenditure incurred and balance outstanding is as under:

	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79 (Rupees in lakhs)	1979-80	1980-81
Opening balance of unutilised grant	67.01	96.03	66.89	(—)11.12	12.26
Grant received from UGC	154.95	93.42	87.20	78.17	65.29
Central Government	8.75	3.99	4.36	9.68	13.94
Foreign Governments	0.62	..	1.78	1.30	2.78
Others	21.48	30.86	12.20	11.88	10.45
TOTAL:	252.85	224.30	172.43	89.91	104.72
Expenditure during the year out of grants from UGC	145.29	131.97	154.51	57.50	70.97
Central Government	9.77	8.05	8.16	4.71	10.85
Foreign Governments	0.70	0.24	0.55	0.77	0.87
Others	11.06	17.15	20.33	14.67	9.34
TOTAL:	166.82	157.41	183.55	77.65	92.03
Closing balance	96.03	66.89	(—)11.12	12.26	12.69

*Indian Council of Social Science Research Council of Scientific & Industrial Research, etc.

5.13 The Audit para points out that the regular maintenance and capital expenditure were made from the block grants received from the UGC. The progressive net balance of block grants at the end of the each of the five years 1976-77 to 1980-81 amounted to Rs. (—) 24.64 lakhs, Rs. (—) 44.95 lakhs, Rs. (—) 72.30 lakhs Rs. 2 lakhs and Rs. 4.51 lakhs respectively.

5.14 The Audit in a test check of records of the JNU found that it had incurred expenditure on several items in anticipation of grants and had also incurred expenditure in excess of grants on several items. As on 31 March, 1981 the overspent amount awaiting reimbursement worked out to Rs. 46.03 lakhs. This excess expenditure was met mainly by diversion of the unutilised grants on certain items. The year-wise analysis on unutilised grants is given below:

	<i>Rs. in lakhs</i>
1972-73	12.05
1974-75	2.56
1975-76	0.05
1976-77	5.46
1977-78	0.18
1978-79	4.26
1979-80	4.02
1980-81	9.80
	38.38

Such diversion of funds included the following two cases:

- (i) A sum of Rs. 10.50 lakhs released for construction of an earthen dam in March 1977 was utilised to the extent of Rs. 0.64 lakh only towards investigation whereafter the work was abandoned. No refund was made, but by 1980-81 the excess release was progressively adjusted.
- (ii) A work of construction of a primary school building was executed at a cost of Rs. 4.68 lakhs by December 1977 by diversion of funds intended for other purposes and no grants had been released therefor as yet (September, 1981).

5.15 The University has however, stated that the decision for construction of the school building was taken by a high power committee in July 1975 in the Chamber of Minister and as per UGC

communication of July 1976 it was also decided that the cost of construction would be paid by the Ministry.

5.16 When asked to explain why no financial discipline was maintained by the University, the Ministry replied in a note as under:

“The University Grants Commission approves various programmes of development for a plan period. Within the ceilings of grants approved for each programme, the first instalments of grant is sanctioned on an account basis, and the subsequent instalments, depending upon the progress of expenditure. As the pace of utilisation of grants for all programmes is not even, it becomes necessary sometimes to utilise the unspent balance under the head to meet the immediate requirements under another. Such adjustments become necessary purely as a ways and means support, particularly when the flow of grants from the UGC does not always keep pace with the progress of work separately for each project. It will, however, be ensured that there will be no delay in the adjustment of expenditure in such situations, and that excess expenditure on particular projects is claimed from the UGC, as soon as it is incurred.”

5.17 To another question why huge balance were allowed to accumulate by UGC, the reply was:

“The University Grants Commission has indicated that it releases grants for plan and non-plan scheme separately. In case of plan grants, they are released separately for each scheme as per progress of expenditure. If the grant is released in February-March, of a year so that the University can meet the requirements during the next six months, there would be unspent balance at the end of financial year. The Commission exercises proper Control in this regard for each scheme but sometimes the University is not able to spend the amount as per its requirements indicated in the demand and the grant remains unutilised for sometime.”

5.18 The unspent balances at the close of years beginning with 1978-79 on plan account were as follows:

1978-79	Rs. 8.04 lakhs
1979-80	Rs. 4.73 lakhs
1980-81	Rs. 8.99 lakhs
1981-82	Rs. 17.22 lakhs

5.19 Explaining the financial control exercised by the UGC, the Ministry have stated in a note:

“The release of development grants to various Universities by the UGC is not made on the basis of specific allocation made to each university. The disbursement of development grants is made by the commission on the basis of the progress of expenditure communicated by individual University in respect of the schemes/programmes approved by the Commission, and for which some grants have already been sanctioned. In several cases, such progress reports have to be accompanied by copies of documents to substantiate the claims of the University in respect of expenditure incurred. Further, the Commission makes an attempt to satisfy itself as far as possible, that more grants are paid to those Universities, which have already fully utilised the earlier grants. Since the number of Universities involved is very large (about eighty Universities received development grants from the Commission), the process of actual disbursement of grant gets staggered leading to high releases towards the end of the financial year. In cases, where the Commission is satisfied that grants are due, further disbursements are made without any delay. The practice followed by the Commission is to insist on submission of proper accounts, including supporting documents, before claiming fresh instalments of grants. This procedure ensures that the funds sanctioned for the plan schemes are utilised by the Universities for implementation of these schemes.”

3.20 In March, 1970, the UGC at the request of the University, placed a sum of Rs. 10 lakh at its disposal for use as a revolving fund to enable the University to procure and store certain categories of material commonly required for all works and which were scarce in the market. The corpus of the fund was raised to Rs. 20 lakhs in stages by July 1972 and was subject to the condition that the stock limit would be kept at the minimum and the unutilised amounts would be refunded. A scrutiny of records, however, revealed that the fund had not been utilised fully in any year and the unutilised amount for each of the years 1972-73 to 1979-80 varied between Rs. 6.22 lakhs and Rs. 16.63 lakhs. No review of the extent of utilisation was done, nor did the University refund, on its own, the unutilised amount in any year. Further though the storing of material was intended for use in a period of one year a test-check of utilisation revealed that out of 459.46 tonnes of steel procured

(cost : Rs. 8.62 lakhs approximately) during January 1972 to March 1973, the closing stock had ranged from 300 tonnes in 1973-74 to 137 tonnes in 1979-80 resulting in substantial blocking of funds.

5.21 The Audit para points out that with a view to utilising budget grant and the funds released by UGC for specific purpose, several purchases were charged to works and utilisation of funds reported long before the works had been taken up for execution. A test check in Audit revealed that out of the material costing Rs. 94.36 lakhs debited to several works, the materials costing Rs. 25.21 lakhs were later transferred and debited to other works and funds were reported as utilised in the latter works as well.

5.22 The Committee in this context enquired the ground for procurement of material against works much in excess of their requirements, which had to be transferred to other works. In reply, the Ministry have furnished the following note:

"The material was purchased as per the requirement of the work. But such temporary transfer from one work to another is inevitable in the interest of the work."

5.23 In response to a query whether the time had not come to oversee and evaluate the total functioning of the J.N.U. (including financial and administrative functioning) and to suggest remedial measures, the Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture stated during evidence:

"I have taken a serious note of it and I react positively to it to say that Government will take note of it..... Already this Review Committee (Madhuri Shah Committee) has been set up..... We will draw the attention of the UGC so that they may advise the Review Committee to recommend steps so that proper financial and administrative functioning can be ensured. We will recommend to this Review Committee because this applies not only to JNU but to all the several Central Universities to which we are making 100 per cent funding."

5.24 At a subsequent sitting of the Committee held on 11-3-1983, the Secretary of the Ministry informed the Committee as follows:

"The UGC has taken a decision to carry out five yearly review which you so kindly indicated. Apart from that it was mentioned by the Members that besides the academic review undertaken from time to time, a review with regard to financial and administrative aspects of running

of the universities, specially, the Central Universities, might also be got carried out. I am happy to report to the Committee that that also is going to be done. Further, we are also going to streamline the functioning of the central universities. We are having a monthly meeting of all the Vice-Chancellors now. We have made a plan provision also. A separate sub-plan provision has been provided for so that we can monitor the releases as well as the expenditure. The Committee which would be visiting the universities will be taking care of that to see as to how the money is being spent. We have also taken note of the suggestions of the C&AG, namely, that since some of these universities have expanded in a big way over a period of time, perhaps, a better financial control by high-level officers for the management of these universities and guiding them might be undertaken."

5.25 After going through the whole material, the Committee are led to the conclusion that financial management in the University is far from satisfactory. This may be the cause of many ills in the University. Diversions of funds from allocated purposes to others, non-surrender of savings and mis-representation of utilisation of funds indicate some of the irregularities indulged in. Instead of regulating releases of funds as per the periodic requirements/spending capacity of the University, the UGC had been releasing bulk of the Plan funds at the close of the financial year. Also, as indicated earlier in this Report, it went on regularising the excess expenditure incurred by the University post-facto without ensuring exercise of proper financial control in the University. In the opinion of the Committee, the monitoring system in the UGC needs to be streamlined. Now that the UGC has agreed to a review of the financial and administrative functioning of the University by the Madhuri Shah Committee and it has been decided to induct in the University officers from the Indian Audit and Accounts Department (Office of the C&AG) the Committee hope that the financial irregularities and deficiencies pointed out in the Audit paragraph will be taken due care of, and the financial management in the University will improve.

C. Investment of Provident Fund accumulation

5.26 According to the instructions issued by Government the investment of provident fund balances of the university should be made in various Government securities, national savings certificates, etc. in certain proportion. Government notification of December, 1978 prescribed the investment pattern from January 1979 onwards. According to Audit, in contravention of the instructions, the University invested Rs. 83.77 lakhs (on 31-3-1980) in "Term Deposits" with the State Bank of India. The University stated (in September, 1981)

that the Executive Council to whose notice the directive of the Government was brought, had decided in April, 1979 to continue the existing pattern of investment and that the UGC had been informed of the decision. In a note submitted to the Committee, the Ministry have clarified as follows:

“Government instructions in this regard were also submitted to the Executive Council for their consideration but the Executive Council resolved to continue the then existing practice, i.e., (investment with SBI). Moreover, while examining similar case of University of Delhi in consultation with Ministries of Law and Finance, it was seen that the Government’s instructions referred to above were not obligatory. However, the matter is again being examined in consultation with the University Grants Commission in the light of information being obtained from all the other Central Universities.”

5.27. The University had invested Rs. 83.77 lakhs (as on 31 March, 1980) out of the Provident Fund accumulations of the University in “Term Deposits” with the State Bank of India instead of Government securities etc. as instructed by Government in December, 1978. The Executive Council of the University had decided in April, 1979 to continue the then existing pattern of investment, as it felt that the instructions of Government of India on the subject were not binding on Central Universities. The Committee, however, observe that the entire question of pattern of investment by Central Universities is now being reconsidered by the Ministry. The Committee would like to be informed of the decision taken in the matter.

CHAPTER VI

Review of Performance

In terms of Section 4 of the Jawaharlal University Act 1966, "the objects of the university shall be to disseminate and advance knowledge, wisdom and understanding by teaching and research and by the example and influence of its corporate life and in particular the objects set out in the First Schedule.

6.2 The First schedule to the Act sets in detail the following objects of the University:

"The University shall endeavour to promote the study of the principles for which Jawaharlal Nehru worked during his life-time, viz., national integration, social justice, secularism, democratic way of life, international understanding and scientific approach to the problems of society.

Towards this end, the University shall:

- (i) foster the composite culture of India and establish such departments or institutions as may be required for the study and development of the languages, arts and culture of India;
- (ii) take special measures to facilitate students and teachers from all over India to join the University and participate in its academic programmes;
- (iii) promote in the students and teachers an awareness and understanding of the social needs of the country and prepare them for fulfilling such needs;
- (iv) make special provision for integrated courses in humanities, science and technology in the educational programmes of the University;
- (v) take appropriate measures for promoting interdisciplinary studies in the University;
- (vi) establish such departments or institutions as may be necessary for the study of languages, literature and life of foreign countries with a view to inculcating in

- the students a world perspective and international understanding;
- (vii) provide facilities for students and teachers from other countries to participate in the academic programmes and life of the University."

6.3 During evidence, the Secretary, University Grants Commission added:

"The basic idea was that we should develop the University on the lines given in the schedule of the Act and that it should not, unless it is absolutely essential, duplicate the facilities which are already available in the Delhi University."

6.4 The Committee desired to know to what extent, the objectives of the JNU had been achieved. In a note, the Ministry of Education have stated:

"The salient features of the achievements of Jawaharlal Nehru University, keeping in view its objectives, are briefly as follows:

- (i) Out of seven projected schools, the University has already established six schools of study; the seventh is proposed to be established during the Sixth Plan.
- (ii) Integrated courses in Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences developed by the University have succeeded considerably in the promotion of interdisciplinary academic and research programmes.
- (iii) The admission policy of the University has been formulated, keeping in view its all-India character and with a view to provide adequate representation to economically and socially weaker sections of the society and backward regions.
- (iv) The University has maintained its all-India character in terms of its student body and faculty. A fair number of foreign students are also on its rolls.
- (v) It conducts mainly Post-graduate and Research Programmes; Post-Graduate Courses of the University have a heavy content of research.
- (vi) The School of International Studies and the School of Languages are engaged in the study of the language, literature and life of several foreign countries."

6.5 During evidence of the Ministry of Education when the representatives of the University Grants Commission and the Jawaharlal Nehru University were also present, the Committee enquired about the reaction of the representatives to the statement that the University has failed to achieve the objectives embodied in the Act, the Vice-Chancellor of the University reacted by saying:

“The University might not have achieved all its objectives, but I will not say that the University has failed in achieving its objectives completely because we find that the schools and the Centres that have been developed have developed on these lines that the students and teachers are being recruited from all over India; the teaching is being done on an inter-disciplinary basis; we have a School of International Studies; we have a School of Languages; and I will not say that the University has completely failed in its objectives. But I will positively accept that the University has not yet achieved the full objectives of the Act.”

6.6 As to the assessment of the Government in this regard, the Ministry of Education have stated in a note:

“Considering the short span of its existence and physical and financial constraints under which the University has been functioning, the achievements made by the University indicate that it has been constantly endeavouring to fulfil its objectives.”

6.7 The Government are, however of the view that there is scope for improvement.

The Committee desired to know whether the working of JNU had been evaluated by any independent agency since its inception. In a note, the Ministry of Education have stated as follows:

“The work of the University has not been evaluated so far. However, while making an assessment of the developmental needs of the University, the Visiting Teams of University Grants Commission consisting of eminent scholars, representing a wide spectrum of disciplines, evaluate the progress made by various Schools, Centres of study, and make recommendations to the Commission for their future growth and development.

In 1979, the University decided to review its working, but the review committee did not complete its work.

A committee appointed by the University Grants Commission in January, 1982 to enquire into the working of the Central Universities, including Jawaharlal Nehru University, is also expected to examine *inter-alia* whether the university is fulfilling the objectives set for it in its Act and statutes."

6.8 During evidence, the Secretary, UGC added:

"A Committee was appointed by the University and that has not given its report. No review has been done by any body in regard to the functioning of the Jawaharlal Nehru University, its achievements of the objectives enshrined in the Act."

6.9 In this connection, sub-para 9 of the Audit paragraph reads as follows:

"The period of the first stage of development having become due to expire in April 1980, the executive council appointed a committee in July 1979 to review the working of the university and to recommend lines of growth and development of the university consistent with the objectives. The Committee which started functioning in March, 1980 was to complete its job in a year, but was granted extension of 3 months upto June 1981. The Chairman of the Committee submitted a report in May 1981 stating that its work had remained incomplete for various reasons such as (i) non-provision of accommodation for 5 months to the committee, (ii) non-availability of qualified and experienced workers (iii) failure of the university office and the schools to furnish the data called for by the Committee, (iv) lack of cooperation with the Committee, etc. The Committee, therefore, reported termination of its activities and furnished only a summary of discussions held by it, without any report on any of the topics as per its terms of reference."

6.10 The terms and reference of the Review Committee were as under:

- (i) to review the working of the University since its inception in the light of the objectives stated in the first schedule of the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act;
- (ii) to assess the achievements of the University in the realisation of these objectives and to suggest steps necessary to consolidate and improve upon them;

- (iii) to note handicaps, shortcomings and failures in the academic and administrative functioning of the University, to ascertain the reasons therefor and to propose remedies necessary for a more effective functioning of the University in future; and
- (iv) to recommend the lines of growth and development of the University in the next decade consistent with the objectives stated in the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act."

6.11 In a note, the Ministry of Education have stated as follows:

"The Committee identified certain specific areas of the working of the University and its achievements for detailed study and analysis. These included the life and living conditions of the students, admission policy and procedures, and the system of evaluation. The Committee felt that all these three areas were of particular significance for a meaningful assessment of the Jawaharlal Nehru University's working. The Committee was anxious to study the considerations which influence the selection of candidates, the data relating to social deprivation on which admission is based, the subjective factor in assessment at interview and the role of students on the Students-Faculty committee. The admission policy was a subject of controversy in the discussions with the members of the faculty and the student groups. The Committee also felt that the practices of admission followed so far may have created some vested interests who were keen in maintaining the *status-quo*."

6.12 Asked as to why full cooperation had not been extended by the schools of the University to the Review Committee and what action had since been taken to assess the work done by different schools, the Coordinator of the JNU stated during evidence:

"The Jha Committee was given cooperation by some of the schools, but some of the faculty members felt that the Questionnaire issued was too lengthy. Instead of replying to Questionnaire, several meetings were arranged and the Committee too visited almost all the schools and had meeting with the faculty and also with the students. Besides, they called for certain information from the offices which was furnished. By that time, the Committee decided to wind up its work because of disturbance. After

that, the new Vice-Chancellor took over. He requested all the schools and all the centres to prepare assessment reports on what exactly they have done in terms of the Charter and those reports have been received in the University office and they are being scrutinised by the Executive Council."

6.13 He went on to say:

"When the (new) Vice-Chancellor joined he took it up and he went to each school and centre. They were asked what they had done and what they wanted to project. Based on that, the Sixth Plan proposals were completely revised and then they were sent to the UGC. That was done in May, 1982. The Sixth Plan proposals were completely modified in the light of this recommendation."

6.14 Asked about the reaction of the Ministry to the whole episode, a representative of the Ministry of Education stated during evidence:

"...The Ministry was aware that there was an evaluation committee. Basically the approach of the Ministry in regard to the academic bodies like the University has been that as far as possible the evaluation should be an internal evaluation. That is why when the Executive Council itself appointed a committee for the review of the whole thing, there was no question for the Ministry to go beyond that. Now, unfortunately the Committee could not pursue its work. There are several factors as to why the Committee could not pursue its work. One factor is lack of cooperation to the extent desired by it. Another reason was that there were certain disturbances while the Committee was functioning. In the JNU campus during the disturbances the Chairman pleading this Committee was insulted. This was the overall background in which the Committee decided that it will not continue its work.

In regard to the question that what should be done with regard to the committee, so far as the Ministry is concerned, the question of extension and appointing other committee was not felt desirable to pursue. At that time a new Vice-Chancellor who had been Secretary to the Ministry's Department of Science and Technology and

was internationally known as a scientist having a reputation of a competent administrator, had taken over. Therefore, the Ministry took the view that the new Vice-Chancellor has been appointed, it is desirable that a congenial atmosphere should be created. He should be given an opportunity to start afresh. In that context the Vice-Chancellor had undertaken an exercise of retrospect and prospect. He asked all the internal academics to work out what has been achieved in the context of the objective and what they want to do. It was in the context of that exercise that the Ministry took the view that although the terms of reference of this exercise were considerably narrower than the terms of reference of the evaluation Committee, this would go adequately to meet the needs of the situation. This is the background in which the question of further evaluation did not arise."

6.15 The representative of the Ministry further stated that:

"Another point which was also kept by the Ministry in view was that the functioning of the JNU with certain objectives and the functioning of the seven Central Universities including JNU was also being reviewed in the context of various factors. The terms of reference of that review committee (Madhuri Shah Committee appointed by UGC) were quite broad. One of the terms of reference was whether the objectives for which the Central Universities established was fulfilled or not? Keeping this also in view the Ministry felt that these two things were quite adequate and that the Committee at present is continuing its work and its report is yet awaited."

6.16 As to the action taken by the JNU/Ministry of Education on the status Report of the Review Committee, the Ministry of Education have stated in a note:

"The Executive Council of the University has noted the Report and decided to record the same. The question of Ministry of Education taking any specific action on the Report of the Review Committee does not arise."

6.17 The Madhuri Shah Committee was appointed in January 1982 to enquire into the working of all the seven Central Universities including the Jawaharlal Nehru University with the following terms of reference to examine:

- (a) whether the Central Universities are fulfilling the objectives for them in their Acts and Statutes;
- (b) the general state of discipline in the Central Universities, causes of periodic disturbances in the campuses and remedial action therefor;
- (c) the adequacy of the machinery in the Central Universities to deal with the grievances of students, teachers and the administrative staff and suggest measures for strengthening corporate life in these universities;
- (d) the desirability of evolving a code of conduct for political parties and to set limits to their involvement in the University affairs; and
- (e) to suggest such other measures of reform as are necessary for the efficient functioning of Central Universities and promoting an academic atmosphere conducive to study and scholarship on the campuses."

6.18 The Committee were informed that in the case of Indian Institute of Sciences, Bangalore, it is provided in the statute itself that the Visitor after a specified interval would review the academic functioning of the Institute. Under Section 8 of the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act there is a provision that the Visitor may from time to time appoint one or two persons to review the work and progress of the University and submit a report thereon. But there is no specific provision that it must be done. Reacting to a suggestion that there should be such a provision in the JNU Act, the Secretary, UGC said:

"The question is seriously being considered that there should be a statutory provision in Central Universities to see that their academic work is reviewed at regular intervals and this need not be left open only to Five Year Plan Committee which looks into such matters within the financial constraints.

Very serious thinking has been there. I hope it would be provided that in the near future there should be academic review and not linked up with the Five Year Plan Review."

6.19 In response to a query whether the time had not come to revive the committee of the type of the earlier Review Committee (Jha Committee) so as to oversee and evaluate the total functioning of the JNU and suggest remedial measures for its

future growth, the Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture stated during evidence:

“I have taken a serious note of it and I react positively to it to say that Government will take note of it. . . . Already this Review Committee (Madhuri Shah Committee) has been set up. . . . We will draw the attention of the UGC so that they may advise the Review Committee to recommend steps so that proper financial and administrative functioning can be ensured. We will recommend to this Review Committee because this applies not only to JNU but to all the seven Central Universities to which we are making 100 per cent funding.”

6.20 At a subsequent setting up the Committee held on 1-3-1983, the Secretary of the Ministry informed the Committee as follows:—

“The UGC has taken a decision to carry out five yearly review which you so kindly indicated. Apart from that it was mentioned by the Members that besides the academic review undertaken from time to time, a review with regard to financial and administrative aspects of running of the universities, specially, the Central Universities, might also be got carried out. I am happy to report to the Committee that also is going to be done. Further, we are also going to streamline the functioning of the central universities. We are having a monthly meeting of all Vice-Chancellors now.”

6.21 JNU has of late been in the news on account of indiscipline prevailing in the Campus. The Committee were informed in evidence that a student leader though restituted from the University, continued to be in the University campus, by virtue of a resolution adopted by the Students Union declaring him to be a member of the University community.

6.22 On 28-7-1983, in reply to Starred Question No. 874, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare informed Lok Sabha as follows:

“Since February 1983, there have been some incidents which disrupted the normal academic life on the JNU Campus. The immediate causes were alleged victimisation of a student in the evaluation of a course and the transfer of a student from one hostel to another. A section of a

student demanded immediate suspension of the faculty member concerned in the first case, and the immediate transfer of the warden in the second. To press their demand, the students resorted to agitation paralysing the functioning of the university, and gheraoed the Vice-Chancellor and other functionaries. The attitude of the students caused resentment among the teachers and Jawaharlal Nehru University Teachers Association registered protests.

The incident involving transfer of a student assumed the proportion of a confrontation between students and faculty members and there was a prolonged gherao of the Vice-Chancellor and other functionaries for about fifty hours. Eventually the police had to intervene to rescue them. Following this, violence broke out in the campus leading to destruction of public and private property. Several students were taken into custody, and the university was closed *sine-die* on May 11, 1983.

With a view to restore normalcy, the University decided that various aspects of its functioning, particularly, admission policy and procedures, evaluation procedures, rules for admission to hostels, and the provisions for hostels administration, etc. needed to be reviewed. The University has also decided to set up separate Grievance-Redressal Mechanism for students and non-teaching staff. Committees have been set up for these purposes. Pending these reviews, the University has decided not to make fresh admissions to the Semester beginning in July 1983. However, the University has reopened with effect from 22-7-1983, and the examinations which were disrupted in May 1983 are now being held."

6.23 In reply to another question, the Minister of State informed Lok Sabha on 4 August 1983 as follows:

"Fresh admissions to the various programmes of study for July 1983 semester have been deferred. Students' agitation in April-May 1983, involving gherao of the Vice-Chancellor, the Rec'tor and the Acting Registrar and acts of large scale violence and vandalism on the campus led to the *sine-die* closure of the University with effect from May 12, 1983. Against this background, examinations initiated in April-May were delayed.

The Academic Council of the University while reviewing the situation in June, 1983, noted that the Winter Semester of 1982-83 had already been disrupted and needed to be re-scheduled. After such re-scheduling, the time left for the Monsoon Semester normally starting in July, would fall short of the minimum working days and, therefore, there was no option but to defer the admission scheduled for July 1983. The Council also decided that during this period the admission policy and procedures should be reviewed in the light of the experience gained in the past. It is expected that the programme for fresh admissions would be finalised as soon as this review is completed.

The University has re-opened with effect from 22-7-1983 and the examinations which were disrupted in May 1983, are now being held. The University authorities are also reviewing the various aspects of the functioning of the University with a view to avoid disruption in future."

6.24. In 1969, Jawaharlal Nehru University came into existence to disseminate and advance knowledge, wisdom and understanding by teaching and research and by the example and influence of its corporate life. The University was to endeavour to promote the study of the principles for which Jawaharlal Nehru worked during his lifetime, viz., national integration, social justice, secularism, democratic way of life, international understanding and scientific approach to the problems of society. The University was to make special provision for integrated courses in humanities, science and technology and to take appropriate measures for promoting inter-disciplinary studies. It was also to establish departments or institutions for the study of languages, literature and life of foreign countries with a view to inculcating in the students a world perspective and international understanding. As far as possible, the University was not to undertake conventional academic programmes and to avoid duplication of facilities available in other Universities.

6.25. As to the achievements of the JNU in the light of its objectives, the Ministry of Education have stated that out of seven projected schools to be set up in the first phase, six schools have already been set up. Integrated courses in Humanities, Social Sciences and Sciences to promote inter-disciplinary academic and research programmes have already been introduced. The University has maintained its all-India character in terms of its student body and faculty. It conducts mainly Post-Graduate and Research programmes. The Schools of International Studies and Languages are engaged in the study of languages, literature and life of several foreign countries.

6.26. As against the above achievements claimed by the Ministry of Education, the Committee observe that the seventh school projected to be set up in the first phase—the School of Creative Arts—has not yet come up. The academic and student strength is less than the planned target in all the schools, the exceptions being the Schools of International Studies and Languages. The under-utilisation of capacity is particularly conspicuous in the science schools. The schools are beset with the problem of drop-outs. A study in respect of only two schools—Schools of Social Sciences and Languages—has revealed that out of 8826 students admitted to the various courses of duration of 1 to 5 years upto 1979-80, 3420 students had discontinued the courses. An idea of the wastage caused these drop-outs can be had from the fact that the cost of operation of the University per student works out to more than Rs. 11,000 per annum. The most dismal performance had been of an important centre of study—Centre for Studies in Science Policy. This Centre had admitted 40 students in M.Phil/Ph.D Programmes since its inception in 1972-73 but had failed to produce a single Ph.D. upto 1979-80. Only 4 students were awarded M.Phil Degree and in August, 1981, 6 students were on roll with a faculty of 3. The remaining 30 students had left their studies. A review committee set up by the Vice-Chancellor *inter alia* observed that the objective of developing Science Policy as an independent applied discipline had not been realised and the general atmosphere of the Centre was not conducive to academic work.

6.27. The assessment of the Acting Vice-Chancellor in regard to the achievements of the Jawaharlal Nehru University in the light of the objectives laid down in the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act was in the following words: "I will not say that the University has completely failed in its objectives. But I will positively accept that the University has not achieved the full objectives of the Act." The Secretary of the Ministry also felt that although the University had been endeavouring to fulfil its objectives, there was "scope for improvement."

6.28. The above assessment of the University is by persons connected with the working of the University in one capacity or the other, and no independent evaluation of the performance of the University in the light of its objectives has yet been made. A Committee under the Chairmanship of a distinguished educationist Shri V. S. Jha to review the working of the University was appointed in July, 1979. But the Committee could not complete its work. The circumstances in which the Jha Committee was forced to leave its work unfinished is a sad commentary on the general atmosphere prevailing in the University.

6.29 After the Jha Committee submitted its Status Report stating that it could not do its assigned task, the University authorities asked the different schools to prepare 'achievement report' since the inception of the University. But, the Committee would like to point out.

such achievement reports can hardly be a substitute for an independent appraisal by an independent body.

6.30 The Committee note that in January 1982, a committee has been appointed by the University Grants Commission to go into the working of all the Central Universities including the Jawaharlal Nehru University. As per the terms of reference of this committee, known as Madhuri Shah Committee, the committee will inter alia enquire whether the Central Universities are fulfilling the objectives set for them in their Acts and Statutes. The Committee will also go into the general state of discipline in the Central Universities and the causes of periodic disturbances in the University campuses. The Committee trust that the Madhuri Shah Committee will go into the working of the Jawaharlal Nehru University at a very early date.

6.31 The Committee note that in early 1983, there were some incidents which disrupted the normal academic life of the University campus and subsequently culminated into the sine die closure of the University with effect from May 12, 1983. Pending a review of the whole situation, the Academic Council decided not to make fresh admissions to the Semester beginning in July, 1983. The Academic Council also decided that the admission policy and procedures should be reviewed in the light of the experience gained. The Committee need hardly stress the importance of early resumption of admissions so as to avoid a national waste. They also trust that the admission policy and procedures of the University will be suitably re-oriented so as not only to sub-serve the objectives for which the University has been set up but also to avoid disruptions in the normal academic life of the University in future.

6.32 The Committee observe that in the case of the Indian Institute of Sciences, Bangalore, it is provided in the Statute itself that after a specified interval the Visitor would review the academic functioning of the Institute. Under Section 8 of the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act, the Visitor may from time to time appoint one or two persons to review the work and progress of the University and submit a report thereon, but this provision is only an enabling one. The Committee would commend the idea of suitably amending the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act, 1966 with a view to establishing a mechanism to conduct an independent periodic review of the working of the University in all its aspects.

6.33 The Jawaharlal Nehru University was conceived to be an institution to disseminate and advance "Knowledge, wisdom and understanding" by teaching and research and by the example and influence to its corporate life. It was to promote the principles and ideals for which Jawaharlal Nehru worked during his life-time. The two principles dear to the heart of Jawaharlal Nehru were tolerance and discipline. The Committee therefore deeply regret the confusion

that prevailed in the University which culminated ultimately in the closure of the University with effect from 12 May, 1983 for over two months. This does not redound to the credit of the Institution. The academic, administrative and student communities together owe it to the great ideals with which the institution was set up to maintain all the time an atmosphere conducive to translating the ideals into reality.

NEW DELHI;
February 27, 1984

Phalguna 8, 1905 (S)

SUNIL MAITRA,
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee.

APPENDIX-I

Audit Paragraph 36 of the Advance Report of the C & AG for the year 1980-81—Union Government Civil relating to Ministry of Education and Culture—Jawaharlal Nehru University.

Introductory.—The Jawahar Lal Nehru University came into existence from August 1969 under the Jawahar Lal Nehru University Act, 1966. The development of the university in accordance with the objectives laid down in the Act was planned in three stages; in the first stage covering period upto April 1980, it was decided to establish 7 multi-disciplinary schools of studies viz., schools of (i) social sciences, (ii) languages, (iii) international studies, (iv) life sciences and (v) computer and systems sciences, (vi) environmental sciences and (vii) creative arts as basic academic units of the university. Of the 7 schools of studies 6 were established by 1975 and the 7th (the school of creative arts) had been postponed for establishment in the Sixth Plan. By 1980 the university had students and faculty strength of 2759 and 295 against the envisaged target of 3200 and 400 respectively. In addition the university ran a centre of post-graduate studies at Imphal (Manipur State) between 1971-72 and 1980-81; this centre had since been handed over to the Manipur University in 1981.

2. Finance, accounts and audit

2.1 The University is mainly financed by grants from Government through the University Grants Commission (UGC). A summary of the receipts and payments of the university for the 5 years ending 1979-80 is given below:—

	(Rupees in lakhs)				
Receipts	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
OPENING BALANCE	19.48	100.72	134.84	97.03	17.14
Grants from the UGC	365.46	328.05	264.63	278.35	329.73
Grants for specific projects/schemes, scholarships and fellowships from various organisations.	25.79	46.50	54.01	39.45	43.01
Students and hostel fees.	6.18	6.48	6.15	7.73	7.31

Receipts	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
Miscellaneous income receipts/ other recoveries and funds etc. .	9.59	18.25	25.48	52.09	72.29
Deposits recoveries awaiting remit- tances	11.47	12.47	4.45	19.58	2.89
Provident Fund.	18.70	20.67	29.99	37.92	30.97
Centre of post-graduate Studies, Imphal	23.96	46.65	38.71	53.65	48.00
TOTAL	480.63	579.79	558.26	585.80	551.34

PAYMENTS

Pay and allowances	95.14	106.50	120.66	131.19	145.97
Other charges and common services	51.87	59.01	66.39	99.06	90.70
Scholarship/fellowship.	23.43	27.70	34.90	40.76	45.85
Campus development and other capital expenditure	140.13	147.87	116.53	119.57	57.50
Expenditure met out of specific grants	6.12	13.71	14.08	16.61	17.12
Miscellaneous expenditure includ- ing funds etc.	10.70	8.51	13.66	14.30	19.43
Provident fund and pension	21.91	23.78	32.78	45.20	29.91
Deposits, remittances, refunds	6.65	11.22	23.52	48.32	40.96
Centre for postgraduate studies, Imphal	23.96	46.65	38.71	53.65	48.00
Closing balance	100.72	134.84	97.03	17.14	55.81
TOTAL	480.63	579.79	558.26	585.50	551.34

2.2 The accounts of the university are audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India under Section 19(2) of the Comptroller and Auditor General's (Duties, Powers and Conditions of Service) Act, 1971 and the audited accounts together with the reports thereon are being placed before Parliament.

3. Plan programmes for development of the university

3.1 *Provision of land:*—In 1970, 1009.38 acres of land were acquired by Government at a cost of Rs. 2.44 crores and allotted to the university for development of its campus to provide facilities for 10,000 students and 1250 faculty members in 3 stages. In the first stage to be completed by April 1980, 350 acres of the acquired land were to be developed to cater

to 3200 students and 400 faculty members. Programmes of development at the second and third stages were yet (August 1981) to be drawn up, with the result that the remaining 659 acres had not been planned for any use. Out of the 350 acres ear-marked for development in the first stage, only 250 acres of land (approximately) had so far been (August 1981) utilised. It would, thus, be seen that land had been acquired by Government far in advance of the needs resulting in non-utilisation of 659 acres (cost: Rs. 1.59 crores) of the acquired land and without there being any plan for its utilisation in the near future. The surplus land could not be used for growing crops as it was a rocky area and hence non-cultivable. Details of expenditure on its watch and ward not available as expenditure was not booked in accounts activity-wise.

3.2 Construction programme at the first stage:—The programme of construction for the first stage envisaged a tentative outlay of Rs. 14.91 crores, of which Rs. 4.11 crores were planned for the Fourth Plan ending 1973-74 and the balance outlay of Rs. 10.60 crores by April 1980. The actual expenditure during the Fourth Plan amounted to only Rs. 2.06 crores and the shortfall was attributed to initial difficulties, viz. absence of power, water and connecting roads for transportation of material and shortage of cement. The expenditure on construction between 1974-75 and 1980-81 amounted to Rs. 4.64 crores, resulting in overall shortfall of Rs. 8.21 crores in the planned outlay for the period up to April 1980. This was attributed by the university to the same factors as mentioned for the shortfall in the Fourth Plan and additionally to the ban on new construction between 1973-74 and 1975-76. The space requirement in the first stage was assessed at 33.93 lakh square feet of covered plinth area whereas till April 1980, 10.44 lakh square feet of plinth area only was available. Thus, the coverage had been less than one third, although the delay did not affect academic activities as the university had procured adequate hired accommodation to house its schools.

3.3 Services of architect for construction programme:—The university conducted (1970) a national competition for the design of the master plan for the university. Based on recommendations of a Board of Assessors constituted for examination of entries in the competition, a private architect was appointed for the work of developing the master plan of the campus and an agreement was entered into with him on 20th March 1971. According to the agreement, the university was entitled to use his services for :

- Preparation of preliminary and detailed plans and estimates and getting them approved by appropriate authorities;
- assisting the university in finalising the contracts;
- preparation of detailed drawings and designs for construction;

- supervision of the work till its completion and finally obtaining the completion certificate from municipal authorities for the work.

In 1976, the university employed the services of another architect, in addition, on the grounds that it was considered necessary to bring in some competition to improve quality of works. The university was not "very happy" at that time with the design and supervision of work by the first architect, 'who was very fond of expensive design and with adverse cost-benefit ratio'. Both the architects were assigned separate works in different sectors for designing and supervision.

No action was, however, taken against the first architect (to whom Rs. 18.06 lakhs were paid) for any default on his part. In February, 1980, the university came to the conclusion that the system of executing works through the architects had proved a 'complete failure' as (i) there were abnormal delays in completion of almost all major works, (ii) the contractors had been allowed to use their own discretion to stop the works, (iii) several contracts had to be rescinded, (iv) heavy amounts had been claimed from the university as compensation in arbitration proceedings, and (v) the architects had been approving defective works executed by the contractors. In respect of the first architect, the university felt (February 1980) that (i) he was not discharging his functions and responsibilities faithfully, expeditiously and honestly, (ii) he was trying to exploit the situation to the maximum extent by non-performance and non-cooperation, and (iii) he was fully responsible for all the ills, namely stoppages of works, disputes about measurements, pilferage of steel, roof collapse of a building, etc. He had also, it was stated not obtained completion certificate for any of the works duly approved by the local authorities. Despite the above position, no action was taken against the architect and instead, based on a policy directive of the UGC, the university decided in April 1980 to entrust the construction works to the Central Public Works Department (CPWD) and to pay fees to the architects at 1.75 per cent of the sanctioned estimated cost of works whenever their services were utilised, up to the stage of detailed architectural designs and working drawings including approval of plans from local authorities.

3.4 *Delays in completion of works*

3.4.1 Since its inception, the university had undertaken 14 major works (as per annexure), each costing more than Rs. 5.00 lakhs; at a total cost of Rs. 482.43 lakhs, of which 7 works (cost: Rs. 302.65 lakhs) were completed after delays ranging from 5 to 32 months; in the remaining 7 works (cost: Rs. 179.78 lakhs) delays ranging from 29 to 89 months had taken place as in August 1981, but the works were still incomplete.

3.4.2 Extension of time for completion of works can be granted by the Vice-Chancellor on the advice of its building and works committee, according to the prescribed procedure of the university. However, in 5 completed works, extensions were granted without approval of the committee. In 2 of these works, the completion of which was delayed by 20 months and 32 months, delays of 10 and 17 months, respectively, were attributed by the university solely to the contractors (public sector undertakings) on whom compensations of Rs. 0.31 lakh and Rs. 0.32 lakh were levied. In the remaining 5 cases (4 private contractors and one public undertaking) extensions were granted without levy of compensations.

3.4.3 Out of 7 works in progress, contracts for 5 works (serial Nos. 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 of annexure—cost: Rs. 149.25 lakhs) were rescinded by the university after they had been delayed for periods ranging from 7 to 58 months and after payments aggregating Rs. 102.17 lakhs. Out of these 5 rescinded works, only 2 (serial nos. 6 and 7) were subsequently awarded to other Shri S. P. Dhawan contractors at an estimated additional cost of Rs. 13.00 lakhs at the risk and cost of the M/s. Home Decolam first contractors, who, however, went in for arbitration (February 1980) claiming further payment of Rs. 7.60 lakhs from the university; the arbitration cases were pending (August 1981). Of the 3 remaining works, 2 (serial nos. 2 and 4) had been lying abandoned from November 1978 and December 1979 respectively after an expenditure of Rs. 62.66 lakhs had been incurred.

3.4.4 A test-check in audit of reasons for extension given in respect of 4 major works (serial nos. 9, 11, 12 and 13) revealed that apart from delays due to non-availability of cement, in 2 cases for works done in 1974-75 and 1975-76, there were substantial delays in making available drawings, modifications of designs, increases in quantity of works, etc. for which responsibility lay with the first architect of the university, but against whom no action had been taken under the terms of contract entered into with him by the university.

3.5 *Execution of works through contractors:*—According to norms adopted by the university, works costing Rs. 10 lakhs and above can be allotted to class I contractors, those costing Rs. 2 lakhs to less than Rs. 10 lakhs, to class II contractors and other works to class III contractors. These works were to be awarded till 1975 only to the contractors on the approved lists of certain specified authorities (including Government). In October 1975, the university framed rules for enlistment of additional contractors to its list of approved contractors. (based on reported requests from certain unregistered contractors for their enlistment) and invited applications through advertisement for enlistment. After scrutinising 9 applications which were received, 2 contractors 'A' and "B"

were registered by the university and class II contractors in May, 1976. No further registration had taken place since then. Out of the 2 registered contractors, no work was awarded to contractors 'B', whereas contractor 'A' was awarded 8 civil works, costing Rs. 69.57 lakhs. Out of these, 2 civil works costing Rs. 5.99 lakhs, which could be allotted to class II contractors had been allotted to him prior to his registration as class II contractor in May 1976 and 3 civil works costing over Rs. 10 lakhs each (total cost Rs. 52.61 lakhs) were also awarded to him, though he was not a class I contractor. These class I works were allotted to him based on a decision of the building and works committee in January 1977 to sell tender forms to even one class below contractors due to heavy construction activities then going on in Delhi; this decision to invite tenders from one class below category was not, however, incorporated in the notices inviting tenders except in respect of 2 works (serial nos. 6 and 7 of annexure). In connection with the works carried out by contractor 'A' for the university, the following points were noticed in audit:—

(a) Out of 8 civil works estimated to cost Rs. 69.57 lakhs, which were allotted to him, no work was completed in time; 3 works were completed after delays of 7, 16 and 22 months and 3 contracts had been rescinded due to disputes; of the rescinded contracts, 2 works were awarded to other contractors at the risk and cost of contractor 'A' at an additional cost of Rs. 13 lakhs. The remaining 2 works which were due for completion in April 1978 and February 1979 were still to be completed (August 1981).

(b) The rescinded works including the work of providing acoustic treatment (cost: Rs. 1.23 lakhs) to walls in school of the science, which was awarded on 26th July, 1977 for completion in 3 months; the contract was rescinded in March 1980. In the 2 other rescinded contracts only 10 to 15 per cent of the work was completed by the stipulated date. In these cases, contractor 'A' had claimed additional payment of Rs. 7.60 lakhs from the university whereas the university had prepared a counter-claim of Rs. 13.06 lakhs the claims were pending before arbitration (August 1981).

(c) Having regard to the overall poor performance, the university came to the conclusion that contractor 'A' did not have adequate resources and could not be depended upon to handle works of such magnitude and terminated his registration as class II contractor alongwith that of contractor 'B' in February 1980.

3.6 Reasons for delays in civil works:—In would appear from the preceding observations that apart from the difficulties mentioned by the

university, there were other significant factors for the slow progress of work, such as, (i) failure of architect to perform his obligations adequately, (ii) delay in supply of drawings and designs, (iii) disputes with contractors and (iv) entrustment of works to contractors 'A' who did not qualify for the works allotted to him according to the prescribed standards.

4. *Equipment*

4.1 The requirement of the university towards provision of equipment for the Fourth Plan was assessed at Rs. 16.29 lakhs against which an expenditure of Rs.14.30 lakhs was incurred.

4.2 The requirement towards equipment for the Fifth Plan was assessed by a visiting committee (constituted by the UGC in February 1975) at Rs. 53.75 lakhs as first priority and additional sums of Rs. 17.65 lakhs and Rs. 17.10 lakhs, as second and third priorities in January 1976. The UGC granted approval for the first priority equipment only for the Fifth Plan period. However, during 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77 the university incurred an expenditure of Rs. 59.94 lakhs on equipment, thereby exceeding, in 3 years the allocation for the entire plan period by Rs. 6.19 lakhs.

4.3 The UGC constituted a second visiting committee in August 1977 to reassess the Plan need. In May 1978 this committee recommended a further allocation of Rs. 12.61 lakhs on specific items of equipment for 2 schools (life sciences and environmental sciences); the committee did not, however, make any recommendation on the excess expenditure so far incurred and on its regularisation. However, in April 1979, the UGC regularised expenditure of Rs. 17.66 lakhs out of the excess expenditure incurred till then and also sanctioned funds to meet the liabilities to the extent of Rs. 12.61 lakhs as recommended by the second visiting committee. Further expenditure on equipment during the years 1977-78 and 1978-79 amounted to Rs. 56.55 lakhs, resulting in an overall excess of Rs. 32.47 lakhs after taking into account the amount recommended by the first visiting committee (Rs. 53.75 lakhs), the second visiting committee (Rs. 12.61 lakhs) and the excess expenditure regularised by the UGC (Rs. 17.66 lakhs) in April 1979.

4.4 Notwithstanding the excess expenditure so far incurred, the UGC granted extension of time for implementing the Fifth Plan proposal towards equipment up to the year 1979-80 and a further expenditure of Rs. 18.58 lakhs was incurred during that year on equipment. The total overall expenditure on equipment to end of 1979-80 for the period covered in the Fifth Plan thus amounted to Rs. 135.07 lakhs resulting in an excess of Rs. 51.05 lakhs.

4.5 The entire excess expenditure incurred up to 1979-80 had, however, been *post facto* regularised by the UGC from time to time except an expenditure of Rs. 2.94 lakhs. In this connection, it was noticed that in October 1978, the UGC had asked for a categorical assurance from the University that it would, in future, maintain financial discipline. No such assurance was, however, available on record whereas the university continued to incur excess expenditure and the UGC continued to regularise the excess *post facto*. A school-wise statement of expenditure incurred on equipment (including Rs. 14.30 lakhs spent prior to above sanctions) is given below:—

Year	School of life science.	School of environmental sciences	School of computer and system	School of social sciences	School of languages	School of International studies	University service and Instrumentation Centre	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
(Rupees in lakhs)								
1972-73	5.59	0.63	0.23	6.45
1973-74	6.48	1.24	0.13	7.85
1974-75	4.18	3.90	10.00	0.48	0.09	18.65
1975-76	6.69	3.56	2.57	0.56	0.48	13.86
1976-77	7.36	3.53	13.00	0.29	0.61	..	2.65	27.43
1977-78	12.85	5.33	2.30	1.07	0.84	22.38
1978-79	6.65	4.33	7.20	0.55	0.77	0.57	14.19	34.17
1979-80	6.42	3.84	6.28	0.04	0.84	0.41	0.75	18.58
TOTAL	56.21	24.49	41.35	4.86	3.15	0.98	18.33	149.37

4.6 The students of the school of life sciences complained in December 1974 that the school had spent "haphazardly" on purchase of equipment which resulted in massive waste of funds and accumulation of substandard items of equipment. The Vice-Chancellor considered the points raised by the students as of great significance and constituted a working group to look into the purchase of equipment costing Rs. 16.00 lakhs. In its report of March 1975, the working group held that 'some of the purchases could have been avoided', but observed that there was no point in opening

the question and going into great details of each purchase. In this context the following points were noticed in audit:—

- (i) According to the directives of the executive council in June 1972, specific committees were to be constituted before effecting purchases of equipment costing over Rs. 2,000; for purchases exceeding Rs. 50,000, a university stores and equipment committee was to scrutinise and recommend the purchase before sanction was accorded by the Vice-Chancellor. No such committee was, however, constituted till August 1980 and committees, for scrutinising purchases up to Rs. 50,000 also did not exist in 5 out of the 6 schools. Instead, requirements were put forth directly by faculty members to the Vice-Chancellor for his sanction. Up to March 1980, 35 items each costing over Rs. 50,000 were purchased at a cost of Rs. 51.00 lakhs without observing the prescribed procedure.
- (ii) In June 1972, the executive council directed the canalisation of import of foreign equipment through the State Trading Corporation (STC) in respect of items for which the Corporation had entered into contract; for this purpose the university was directed to compile and maintain an up-to-date list. No entitlement was fixed at any stage for the import of equipment and the university imported its requirements mostly under "Open General Licence" as they were required for research and educational purposes. None of the imports was canalised through the STC and the university could not supply information on the value of equipment imported by it for use in the various schools.
- (iii) No record was maintained by any of the schools regarding utilisation of the various costly equipment. However, at the instance of Audit, the School of environmental sciences started maintaining a record of use in respect of equipment costing over Rs. 1 lakh from 1981. There were 39 different units of the university, which were maintaining stores, equipment, etc.; of these 5 units had not conducted physical verification for the years 1976-77 to 1979-80, 10 for 1977-78 to 1979-80, 1 for 1978-79 and 1979-80 and 23 for 1979-80. The reports of physical verification were not made available to Audit.

5. Academic programme

5.1 As already observed in sub-paragraph 1, a target of 3200 students and 400 teaching staff was envisaged at the end of the first stage of deve-

lopment in April 1980. Against this target, the actual strength in the several schools was as under:—

School of	Faculty			Students		
	Planned strength	Actuals in 1979-80	Shortfall (—) surplus (+)	Planned strength	Actual in 1979-80	Shortfall (—) Surplus (+)
1. Social Sciences .	112	94	—18	1200	939	—251
2. Languages] . .	120	88	—32	1000	1151	+151
3. International studies	59	66	+7	475	437	—38
4. Life sciences .	21	19	—2	250	122	—128
5. Computer and system sciences . .	25	11	—14	100	38	—62
6. Environmental sciences . . .	28	17	—11	100	72	—28
7. Creative arts. .	35	..	—35	75	..	—75
TOTAL . . .	400	295	—105	3200	2759	—441

It will be seen that except in respect of the school of international studies and languages, the academic and student strength was less than the planned targets. In the school of international studies, the students' strength was less whereas the strength of the teaching staff was excessive. On the other hand in the school of languages the students strength was more than targeted, but the academic strength was less than the target. No norms had been laid down by the UGC or the university at any stage fixing the students faculty ratio in the various schools. The cost of operation of the university per student worked out to Rs. 9505, Rs. 9623, Rs. 11,155, Rs. 10,655 and Rs. 11,680 for the years 1976-77 to 1980-81 respectively.

5.2 The various schools of studies did not maintain any data to indicate the number of students, who left their studies in between, and had not also examined the causes for the drop-outs, at least where they appeared to be heavy. A study in respect of the schools of social sciences and languages revealed that out of about 35,000 applications for the various courses of duration of 1 to 5 years, 8826 students were admitted up to 1979-80 and of those admitted, 3420 left the course without completion. While going through the records of the drop-outs for the year 1978-79 in the school of languages, it was observed that out of 518 drop-outs, applica-

tions for withdrawal were available only in 156 cases, indicating that many had left the courses without giving any notice. From the large number of drop-outs, it would appear that many students not selected out of the applicants had been denied the opportunity of admission to the courses. No bonds for completion of courses by the selected candidates had also been taken.

5.3 In the schools of life sciences, environmental sciences and computer and systems sciences, the equipment procured was 222, 122 and 165 per cent of the plan proposals, whereas student population was only 46, 67 and 26 per cent of the planned strength. This would indicate that the courses conducted were not sufficiently attractive despite creation of adequate facilities, which consequently remained under-utilised.

5.4 The centre for studies in science policy had admitted 40 students in M.Phil/Ph.D. since its inception in 1972-73 but failed to produce a single Ph.D. upto 1979-80. Only 4 students were awarded M. Phil degrees and in August 1981, 6 students were on roll with a faculty strength of 3. The remaining 30 students had left their studies midway. A review committee set up by the Vice-Chancellor observed (June 1978) that (a) the performance of the centre was far from satisfactory considering the drop-outs over the years, (b) the centre had not succeeded in integrating research with teaching programme and the objective of developing science policy as an independent applied discipline had not been realised; (c) the general atmosphere of the centre was not conducive to academic work and (d) it has ceased to be a viable set-up where serious academic work could continue. Accordingly, on the recommendations of the committee, all fresh admissions were frozen for 2-3 years until overall atmosphere in the centre improved.

6. *Provision of administrative staff*

6.1. For the Fifth Plan, the university proposed a non-teaching staff strength of 745 and observed in its report as under:—

“While we are not in favour of increasing the administrative staff unnecessarily, we are examining how we can curtail the administrative staff and maintain standards of efficiency. However, the requirement of minimum staff needed during the Fifth Plan period as shown in schedule XIII seems unavoidable at this stage”.

The proposed strength of 745 in the administrative staff category was also fully endorsed by the first visiting committee. The number of per-

persons in position had, however been appreciably in excess of the recommended strength in most categories, as per particulars below:

Offices	Staff requested and recommended	Number in position	Surplus (+) Deficit (-)
Registrar	92	103	+11
Finance	63	62	-6
Faculties	49	233	+184
Library	146	138	-8
Student facilities	40	38	-2
Hostels	69	104	+35
Works	74	102	+28
Sanitation	82	84	+2
Security	104	114	+10
Estate	21	24	+3
TOTAL	745	1002	+257

The fact that the university was over-staffed on the administrative side was within the knowledge of the university before new posts were created with the approval of the UGC, because its finance committee had made adverse observations on this fact on several occasions; in particular, in October 1977, it had observed that the increase in the number of the non-teaching staff employed by the university was abnormally high as compared to the increase in the activities of the university. The Plan provision for the period up to 1978-79 for the non-teaching staff amounted to Rs. 16.00 lakhs whereas the actual expenditure amounted to Rs. 64.66 lakhs upto 1978-79 and Rs. 66.57 lakhs upto 1979-80.

6.2. Notwithstanding such increases in the number of staff members, the university incurred expenditure on overtime to the extent of Rs. 11.05 lakhs during the Fifth Plan period. For 1979-80 and 1980-81 the original budget estimates for over-time were for Rs. 3.00 lakhs and Rs. 4.00 lakhs but were revised to Rs. 4.00 lakhs and Rs. 6.00 lakhs and the actual expenditure amounted to Rs. 6.63 lakhs and Rs. 8.08 lakhs respectively. This happened despite the concern expressed (October 1978) by the finance committee on the increase in overtime allowance and its instructions for the need for devising some mechanism on priority basis for reducing the expenditure on overtime.

7. Utilisation of grants

7.1. A summary of grants received by the university for specified purposes from the UGC, the Central Government and other sources like the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) etc. during the 5 years ending 31st March 1981, the expenditure incurred and balance outstanding as on 31st March 1981, is given below:

	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
	(Rupees in lakhs)				
Opening balance of unutilised grant	67.01	96.03	66.89	(-)11.12	12.26
Grant received from UGC	164.96	93.42	87.20	78.17	65.29
Central Government	8.78	3.99	4.36	9.68	13.94
Foreign Governments	0.62	..	1.78	1.30	2.78
Others	21.48	30.86	12.20	11.88	10.45
TOTAL	262.85	224.30	172.43	89.91	104.72
Expenditure during the year out of grants from UGC	145.29	131.97	154.51	57.50	71.97
Central Government	9.77	3.05	3.16	4.71	10.85
Foreign Governments	0.70	0.24	0.55	0.77	0.87
Others	11.06	17.15	29.33	14.67	9.34
TOTAL	166.82	157.41	183.55	77.65	92.03
Closing balance	96.03	66.89	(-)11.12	12.26	12.69

7.2. The regular maintenance and capital expenditure were met from the block grants received from the UGC. The progressive net balance of block grants at the end of each of the 5 years 1976-77 to 1980-81 amounted to Rs. (=)24.64 lakhs, Rs. (=)44.95 lakhs, Rs. (-)2.30 lakhs, Rs. 2 lakhs and Rs. 4.51 lakhs respectively.

7.3. A test-check in audit of the records of the university revealed that it had incurred expenditure on several items in anticipation of grants and had also incurred expenditure in excess of grants on several items. As on 31st March 1981, the overspent amount awaiting reimbursement worked out to Rs. 46.03 lakhs. This excess expenditure was met mainly by diver-

sion of unutilised grants on certain items, amounting in all to Rs. 38.38 lakhs as on 31st March 1981. The yearwise analysis of unutilised grants is given below:—

	(Rs. in lakhs)
1972-73	12.05
1974-75	2.46
1975-76	0.05
1976-77	5.49
1977-78	0.18
1978-79	4.26
1979-80	4.02
1980-81	9.86
	38.38

Such diversion of funds included the following two cases as well:—

- (i) A sum of Rs. 10.50 lakhs released for construction of an earthen dam in March 1977 was utilised to the extent of Rs. 0.64 lakh only towards investigation whereafter the work was abandoned. No refund was made, but by 1980-81, the excess release was progressively adjusted.
- (ii) A work of construction of a primary school building was executed at a cost of Rs. 4.68 lakhs by December 1977 by diversion of funds intended for other purposes and no grants had been released therefor as yet (September 1981).

7.4. In March 1970, the UGC, at the request of the university placed a sum of Rs. 10 lakhs at its disposal for use as a revolving fund to enable the university to procure and store certain categories of material commonly required for all works and which were scarce in the market. The corpus of the fund was raised to Rs. 20 lakhs in stages by July 1972 and was subject to the condition that the stock limit would be kept at the minimum and the unutilised amounts would be refunded. A scrutiny of records, however, revealed that the fund had not been utilised fully in any year and the unutilised amount for each of the years 1972-73 to 1979-80 varied between Rs. 6.22 lakhs and Rs. 16.63 lakhs. No review of the extent of utilisation was done, nor did the university refund, on its own, the unutilised amount in any year. Further though the storing of material was intended for use in a period of one year, a test-check of utilisation revealed that out of 459.46 tonnes of steel procured (cost: Rs. 8.62 lakhs approximately) during January 1972 to March 1973, the closing stock had ranged from 300 tonnes in 1973-74 to 137 tonnes in 1979-80 resulting in substantial blocking of funds.

7.5. With a view to utilise budget grant and the funds released by the UGC for specific works several purchases were charged direct to works, and the utilisation of funds was reported, long before the works had been taken up for execution. A test-check in audit revealed that out of materials costing Rs. 94.36 lakhs debited to several works, materials costing Rs. 25.21 lakhs were later transferred and debited to other works and funds were reported as utilised in the latter works as well.

8. Other points of interest

8.1. *Excess issue of materials.*—According to agreements entered into with the contractors for construction programmes, the university agreed to supply certain materials for works (mainly cement and steel) at specified rates and according to the terms of agreements with the contractors, the consumption of the materials was to be checked with reference to actual requirement for the specified drawings, designs and specifications, necessary action being taken for recovery of any excess beyond the admissible quantities, either by return of material supplied or by recovery of cost at specified rates. The issue of the materials was to be regulated according to need from time to time, as recommended by the university's architects and the consumption report had also to be cleared by the architects. A test-check in audit of the accounts of a few major works, however, revealed that the quantities of cement and steel issued by the university to the contractors had been far in excess of the needs of the works and the excess quantity had neither been recovered, nor had the cost been recovered at the prescribed rates, resulting in loss to the university to the extent of Rs. 5.60 lakhs as per details below:—

Particulars	Quantity required as per estimates (in tonnes)	Quantity actually supplied (in tonnes)	Quantity required for work done as assessed (including permissible wastages in tonnes)	Excess supply not returned (in tonnes)	Amount due for recovery as per terms of contract
(Rs. in Lakhs)					
1. Library building					
(i) Tor steel	23½	427	347	80	} 4.24
(ii) Mild steel	55	99	86	4	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Kendriya Vidyalaya						
(i)	Mild steel	65	69	57	12	0.24
(ii)	Tor steel	265	288	267	21	0.45
(iii)	Cement	1829	1496	1487	9	0.04
3. School Building						
(i)	Mild steel	118	36	70	16	} 0.63
(ii)	Tor steel	472	481	454	27	
						5.60

In the library and school buildings, the excess supplies were also not available at the site of the works. The details in respect of the above three works are as under:—

(i) *Library building*:—The shortages of steel at the site of work came to the notice of the university in February/March 1978, but no action was taken to verify the position till November 1978. In December 1978, the relevant measurement books were reported missing from an almirah kept at the site in the custody of the contractor and in March 1979, the executive council was informed by the university that a committee had been constituted to look into the alleged loss of steel. No committee had, in fact, been constituted so far (August 1981).

(ii) *Kendriya Vidyalaya*.—The contract was rescinded in January 1980, but the final bill had not been prepared, nor had the theoretical requirement of material been worked out. Figures into the tables above indicate only reported consumption and actual recovery for works done. The balance work had not been taken up for execution so far (August 1981).

(iii) *School building*.—This contract was also rescinded in November 1979 and the position was similar to the contract for Kendriya Vidyalaya.

The University stated (September 1981) that in all these cases, the recoveries were pending in arbitration proceedings.

8.2. Points relating to payments made to the architect.

8.2.1. According to terms of agreement with the first architect of the university (mentioned in paragraph 3.3), he was entitled for payment for services rendered at each stage (viz. (i) preliminary estimates, (ii) detailed technical estimates, (iii) finalisation of contract and (iv) control over progress of work till completion) at certain prescribed rates less the amounts paid up the earlier stages. However, at the fourth stage, the uni-

versity paid additional amount to the architect at 1½ per cent of value of work done. Consequently, in respect of abandoned or incomplete works, remuneration at 2½ per cent for the portion of work left incomplete or abandoned resulted in overpayment of Rs. 1.19 lakhs as per particulars below:—

Name of work	Cost of work (in lakhs of rupees)	Amount due at 4 percent	Amount actually paid in all	Amount overpaid
				(in rupees)
1. Kendriya Vidyalaya	26.18	1,04,712	1,49,717	45,005
2. School of life sciences	42.47	1,69,892	2,09,189	39,297
3. Library building	27.92	1,11,678	1,17,581	5,90
4. Nos. Type-I and 20 Nos. Type- II Quarters	1.46	5,840	35,023	29,183
				1,19,38

In all these cases, the original contracts were rescinded and out of the four, the last work was awarded to a second agency. The first architect, however, declined to continue his services for execution of balance work by the other agency. His refusal was in contravention of the terms of agreement.

8.2.2 Between 1971 and 1975 the work of construction of library building was planned on 5 occasions and the first architect was directed to prepare drawings, designs, estimates, etc. but on each occasion, the plan of construction was abandoned for unrecorded reasons, after the architect had done some work. The university stated (September 1981) that modifications were due to 'changes in decision from time to time for the reasons beyond the control of the university'. The work was finally taken up in February 1976, for the services rendered by the architect on the five earlier occasions, when the work was not taken up, he claimed an amount of Rs. 26,500 over and above a sum of Rs. 7,392 paid to him in April 1976.

The claim was rejected by the university on the ground that under the agreement, first payment was to start only after the preliminary estimates were duly sanctioned by appropriate authorities. The architect went in for arbitration (October 1976) claiming Rs. 1.72 lakhs for the work done in the past and in its reply to the arbitrator, the university rejected all claims except for a sum of Rs. 1,050. But before the arbitration proceedings were finalised, the university settled the claim at Rs. 0.40 lakh in

October 1980 stating that the claim of the architect for Rs. 0.47 lakh (including Rs. 7,392 already paid) was reasonable and justified.

8.2.3 During the progress of construction, the roof of the Kendriya Vidyalaya auditorium collapsed in December 1978. The university decided to recover the cost of damage from the contractor and recovered Rs. 45,000 from his bills in January 1979 pending determination of the extent of recovery to be made. The contractor stopped further work, and contested the recovery in the arbitration proceeding, claiming that the collapse occurred due to faulty design by the first architect. The architect did not, however, accept the allegation and attributed the collapse to the defective quality of cement used. Before the arbitration proceedings ended, a settlement was reached in October 1980 between the university, the architect and the contractor whereby the assessed damage of Rs. 0.60 lakh was decided to be shared equally by the three parties. The university had decided in favour of the statement in the hope (as recorded in the minutes of the meeting) that the balance work would be resumed and completed by the contractor, apart from re-construction of collapsed portion in a period of 6 months. The work was not, however, resumed by the contractor expected by the university and the university stated (September 1981) that negotiations were still on for re-starting the work.

8.3 *Purchase and installation of a computer*

8.3.1 On a proposal by the university in 1970-71 for installation of a powerful computer system. Government agreed in 1972 to establish the computer facility with the assistance of an international organisation (UNDP) at a cost of Rs. 260.00 lakhs. A mission of the international organisation which visited the country observed in October 1974 that ancillary machinery was not available to support and justify installation of a powerful computer facility. The proposal was accordingly deferred and had not been revived so far (August 1981).

8.3.2 Pending procurement of a powerful computer system in due course, Government decided to go in for a smaller computer and as a result of negotiations (March 1975) with a foreign country a small computer was purchased at a cost of Rs. 27.50 lakhs and installed by January 1976. The computer was expected by the university to be self-supporting out of income by operating it for 16 hours each day, for user groups. But it was operated for only one shift of 8 hours and its income up to March 1980 amounted to Rs. 0.60 lakh only against an expenditure of Rs. 8.07 lakhs on maintenance. The computer had productive running for 490,565, 580,660 and 552 hours only during the years 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979 and 1980 respectively and was completely out of order for nil, 106,135.41 and 68 days during each of these years. In view of long periods of repair and little use, the finance committee of the university recommended

(October 1978) a review of the functioning of the system, but no review had been conducted so far (August 1981).

8.3.3. The university placed orders for an 'Anolog' computer with the Electronic Corporation of India Ltd. in December 1976 at a cost of Rs. 5.11 lakhs by diverting funds made available to it by the UGC for another equipment. This was required for the purpose of offering courses on simulation and modelling and helping the teachers to carry on their own research projects. The computer was installed (November 1978) 12 months after the scheduled date (October 1977). The functioning of this computer was seriously handicapped due to non-procurement of an ancillary equipment (a generator) which was yet to be procured (August 1981). The extent of utilisation against its capacity could not be ascertained due to non-maintenance of any log book.

8.3.4. The powerful computer system, which was planned to be procured from an international organisation (UNDP) was proposed to be installed in a seven-storeyed library building with plinth area of 1,42,800 square feet of which 36,000 square feet was earmarked for the computer system. This proposal was approved by the UGC in December 1971. In August 1972, the university decided to go in for a new building for the computer as it expected to obtain the system by December 1973. A new building with a plinth area of 53,932 square feet exclusively for use by computer system at a cost of Rs. 29.14 lakhs was accordingly sanctioned by the UGC. The work was put to tender in November 1972 and given to a contractor in January 1973, but due to inability of the university to make available cement for the work, commencement of work was delayed up to June 1973. The work, scheduled for completion in January 1974, was actually completed by April 1976 at a cost of Rs. 21.61 lakhs, after delay of nearly 2 years due to inability of the university to give drawings and designs for the various connected items for installing the computer system. The small computer referred to in sub-paragraph 8.3.2 was accommodated in an area of 1,600 square feet originally earmarked for remote console. The main hall, (area: 10,000 square feet) where the big computer was to be installed, was being used as a science library since August 1976. Several items of work not done by the contractor, due to inability of the university to provide proper drawings and designs, were subsequently got done by other contractors at an extra expenditure (amount not available).

8.4. *Investment of provident fund accumulations:*—According to the instructions issued by Government, the investment of provident fund balances of the university should be made in various Government securities.

national savings certificates, etc. In Government notification of December 1978, the investment pattern from January 1979 was prescribed as under:—

(1) Government securities created and issued by the Central Government	Not less than 20 per cent
(2) (a) Government securities created and issued by State Governments	Not less than 20 per cent
(b) Any other negotiable securities, the principal where of and interest whereon is fully and unconditionally guaranteed by the Central Government of any State Government	
(3) Seven Years national savings certificates or post-office term-deposit	Not exceeding 35 per cent.
(4) Special Deposit Scheme introduced by the Central Government in June 1975.	Not exceeding 35 per cent.

In contravention of the above instructions, the university invested Rs. 83.77 lakhs (on 31st March 1980) in "Term Deposits", with the State Bank of India. The university stated (September 1981) that the Executive Council, to whose notice the directive of the Government was brought, had decided in April 1979 to continue the existing pattern of investment and that the UGC had been informed of the decision.

8.5. *Advances*:—The university made advances to staff suppliers, contractors and others towards purchase of stores and equipment, construction, etc. and these were posted as final expenditure against the respective accounts, the adjustment of the advances being watched through special registers kept for the purpose. Amounts of such advances outstanding as on 31st March 1980 are given below:—

Purpose of advance	Earliest year from which advance is awaiting adjustment or recovery	Paid up to March 1980 and pending in November 1981			
		Over 5 years	3—5 years	1—2 years	Less than 1 year
(in rupees)					
Supplies (to suppliers and staff)	1975	6,623	33,675	6,18,878	
Towards travelling allowance, seminars, etc. to staff	1978	..	1,328	1,74,515	
Others	1978	..	326	31,856	

In addition advances paid out of earmarked funds were also outstanding to the extent of Rs. 5.67 lakhs as on 31st March 1980, but no year-wise details were available.

8.6. *Bank reconciliation*:—The university operates eight bank accounts for its cash transactions. A monthly reconciliation of balances as per pass book and as per cash book is necessary to ensure that all credits and payments are duly accounted for both by the bank and the university. A review of the bank reconciliation by March 1981 carried out by the university revealed that there were large differences between bank and cash book which were pending clearance for considerable period *vide* particulars below:—

	Over 5 years	3 to 5	1 to 3	Less than 1 year	Total (In rupees)
Credits in pass book but not appearing in cash book	24,396	74,117	98,513
Credits in cash book but not appearing in pass book	298	18,942	19,61,477	19,80,717
Debits in cash book but not appearing in pass book	5,555	44,148	32,60,061	33,09,764
Debits in pass book but not appearing in cash book	767	52,039	5,18,801	5,71,607

9. *Review of activities of the university*:—The period for the first stage of development having become due to expire in April 1980, the executive council appointed a committee in July 1979 to review the working of the university and to recommend lines of growth and development of the university consistent with the objectives. The Committee which started functioning in March 1980, was to complete its job in a year, but was granted extension of 3 months upto June 1981. The chairman of the committee submitted a report in May 1981 stating that its work had remained incomplete for various reasons such as (i) non-provision of accommodation for 5 months to the committee, (ii) non-availability of qualified and experienced workers, (iii) failure of the university office and the schools to furnish the data called for by the committee (iv) lack of co-operation with the committee, etc. The committee, therefore, reported termination of its activities and furnished only a summary of discussions held by it, without any report on any of the topics as per its terms of reference. The expenditure incurred on the committee amounted to Rs. 0.87 lakh.

Summing up:—The following are the main points that emerge:—

- Out of 1,009 acres of land acquired, the university had plans for development of only 350 acres, of which only 250 acres had been developed so far, resulting in acquisition of land far in excess of needs within a reasonable period.
- Construction programme had progressed for creation of only 10.44 lakh square feet of covered plinth area against the assessed need of 33.93 lakh square feet by 1980.
- Apart from initial difficulties like absence of power, water and connecting roads and shortage of building material, slow progress of civil works had also been due to substantial delays in making available drawings, modifications of designs, inadequate control over the work of the first architect, entrustment of works to contractors not adequately qualified to take the work etc.
- Again an outlay of Rs. 100.31 lakhs allocated for equipment in Fourth and Fifth Plans, the actual expenditure was as high as Rs. 149.37 lakhs till 1979-80. Though UGC was aware of lack of financial discipline in the expenditure on equipment, it released funds requested by the university from time to time and also regularised the entire excess expenditure except for a sum of Rs. 2.94 lakhs.
- Despite creation of adequate facilities, the schools of the university did not attract adequate student strength and the drop-outs in 2 schools were as high as 39 per cent. the centre for studies in science policy failed to bring out even a single Ph.D. up to 1979-80.
- The administrative staff was far in excess of standards laid down for the Fifth Plan (1,002 against 745 sanctioned) and despite excess staff strength, the university incurred expenditure on overtime to the extent of Rs. 11.05 lakhs in the Fifth Plan period and Rs. 14.66 lakhs during 1979-80 and 1980-81.
- The university had overspent on certain grants to the extent of Rs. 46.03 lakhs by diverting grants from other purposes, in contravention of conditions governing the grants.
- The revolving fund of Rs. 20 lakhs under stock suspense in 1972-73 remained unutilised to the extent of Rs. 6.22 lakhs to Rs. 16.63 lakhs up to 1979-80 and 137 tonnes steel acquired out of revolving fund were lying in stock.

- Steel (169 tonnes) was found short at the site of 3 works and some of it was alleged to have been pilfered away. Loss to the university was Rs. 5.60 lakhs.
- An overpayment to the first architect amounting to Rs. 1.19 lakhs was made against 4 works.
- The university could not acquire a powerful computer with United Nations Development Programmes assistance, as ancillary machinery could not be made available in time. A much smaller computer acquired in January 1976, though expected to be self-supporting, could earn only Rs. 0.60 lakh against its maintenance expenditure of Rs. 8.07 lakhs up to March 1980 due to its very poor performance. An analog computer purchased by diversion of funds (Rs. 5.11 lakhs) could not be used due to non-procurement of ancillary equipment.
- A building constructed (cost: Rs. 21.61 lakhs) for installing the big computer was mainly used as science library since August 1976.
- There were large differences between bank balances as per bank account and cash book and these were pending clearance for considerable period.
- The provident fund accumulations were being invested mainly in term deposits with the State Bank of India in contravention of directions of Government for regulating such investments.
- A review committee appointed (July 1979) by the university to assess the progress of the university closed down its work without furnishing a report due to non-availability of records, want of co-operation, etc. from the university.

APPENDIX II

(Vide para 8 Introduction)

Statement of conclusion/Recommendations and observations

Sl. No.	Para No.	Min./Deptt. concerned	Recommendations/Conclusions
1	2	3	4
1	1.10	M/o Education and Culture (Deptt. of Education)	In 1970, 1009.38 acres of land acquired by Government at a cost of Rs. 2.44 crores was allotted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University for the development of its campus to provide facilities for 10,000 students and 1250 faculty members in three stages. In the first stage to be completed by April 1980, 350 acres of the acquired land was to be developed to cater to 3200 students and 400 faculty members. However, up to August, 1981, only 250 acres of land had been utilised. The surplus land could not be put to any use. Some proposals of the University for the institution of Master and Honours Degree courses had been dropped as the UGC had taken the view that the JNU had to be developed as an educational institution of its own kind on the lines given in the Schedule to the Act and was not, as far as possible, to undertake conventional academic programmes. In this context, the University is having a second look on the targets and priorities initially set by it and will now have to re-draw its subsequent phases of development in consultation with the UGC. The Committee desire that while

drawing up the subsequent phases of development of the JNU, it should be ensured that the resources are utilised optimally having regard to the basic objectives and the University takes its pride of place in the world as one of the foremost centres of learning and research. There should be a timebound programme of development and it should be adhered to.

2 1.13 M/o Education and Culture
(Deptt. of Education)

The Committee note that the construction programme of the university envisaged space requirement of 33.93 lakh square feet of covered plinth area in the first stage, whereas till April 1980, construction of only 10.44 lakh square feet of plinth area had been completed. The coverage was less than one third. After April 1980, another 1.67 lakh square feet have been covered and proposal for covering another 5.18 lakh square feet has been forwarded to the University Grants Commission for their consideration. In the meanwhile the University has been meeting its accommodation requirements on hire at an annual rent of Rs. 13 lakhs. "In the opinion of the Committee, the wide gap between the construction originally envisaged and the construction actually made is indicative of not only lack of proper planning on the part of the University authorities but also the casualness of their approach." The Committee desire that with so much of surplus land at their disposal, the Ministry of Education and the University should explore ways and means to expedite construction of University's own buildings and totally do away with the hiring of accommodation at the earliest.

The Committee are unhappy over the manner in which the University authorities had acted in the case of the first architect appointed on the basis of a national competition for the design of the master plan of the University. An agreement was entered into with this architect on 20-3-1971 in terms of which the University authorities were entitled to utilise his services *inter alia* for preparation of detailed drawings and designs for construction, assisting the University in finalising the contracts and supervision of the work till completion. But the performance of this architect, who has been paid a fabulous sum of Rs. 18.06 lakhs, was such that the University had to go in for a second architect in 1976. The finding of the University as to the performance of this architect was that he was not discharging his functions and responsibilities "faithfully, expeditiously and honestly" and "was responsible for all the ills, namely, stoppages of works, disputes about measurements, pilferage of steel and collapse of a building". He had not obtained completion certificate for any of the works and in some cases, the original contracts of the works being supervised by him had to be rescinded. When one of these works 40 Type I and 20 Type II Qrs.—was awarded to a second agency, he, in contravention of the terms of the agreement declined to continue his services for execution of the balance work by the other agency. By February, 1980, the experience of the University was so disappointing that it came to the conclusion that the system of executing works through the architects had proved to be a 'complete failure' and in April 1980, it decided to entrust the construction programme to the CPWD. One thing which perplexes the Committee is why, in spite of all the lapses on the part of the architect, the University authorities should have failed to take action against him. The explanation of the Ministry that the deficiencies in the performance of the architect were "not considered to be lapses of the type which could

call for the imposition of penalty in accordance with the provisions of the contract" is far from convincing. In the opinion of the Committee, in dealing with the architect, the University authorities had utterly failed to enforce the terms of the contract and the leniency shown by them was extraordinary and unexplicable. The matter merits a probe.

4 4.33 M/o Education and Culture
(Deptt. of Education)

The collapse of the roof of the Kendriya Vidyalaya auditorium is a sad commentary on the supervision and construction of buildings in the Jawaharlal Nehru University complex. The methodology adopted in setting the dispute arising from the collapse of the roof is equally surprising. The Committee wonder why without fixing responsibility a part of the loss should have been borne by the authorities. Agreed that the amount involved was not much, but on principle the matter should have been thoroughly probed by the concerned authorities to find out the cause of the collapse and the responsibility therefore fixed. This, unfortunately, was not done. It was stated during evidence that a full time "clerk of works" was appointed for supervision. When asked what action was taken against him, it was stated that he had "resigned and gone". Although under the terms of the contract, the design of the building was required to be given, the University authorities had not bothered to get the design and have it examined. A consideration for the compromise in October, 1980 was that the work would be completed in six months. But the hope was belied and instead of six months, the work was expected to be completed in 30 months. Commenting upon the case, the Engineer-in-charge of the University was constrained to observe that "the way the whole thing developed was most unfortunate". The Committee trust that the

University authorities will learn from their experience and take care to avoid such lapses in future.

5 1.48

Do.

Inordinate delays in execution of major works had become a rule rather than an exception in Jawaharlal Nehru University. Since its inception, the University had undertaken 14 major works, at a total cost of Rs. 482.43 lakhs, of which 7 works (costing Rs. 302.65 lakhs) were completed after delays ranging from 5 to 32 months; and in the remaining 7 works (costing Rs. 179.78 lakhs), delays ranging from 29 to 79 months had taken place and the works were incomplete as on 31-8-1981. The Committee observe that apart from initial difficulties like absence of power, water and connecting roads, shortage of building material, slow progress of civil works had also been due to substantial delays in making available drawings, modification of designs increase in quantity of works, etc. for which responsibility lay with the architect of the University. Delay was also caused by entrusting of works to a contractor who had neither the qualifications nor the resources for the execution of the types of works allotted to him. Thus, while the Committee agree that delay in completion of major works was partly due to reasons beyond the control of the University authorities, they were also, to a considerable extent, due to the inability of the University authorities to enforce the terms of the contract on the architect and also due to their having awarded the works to an unqualified and inexperienced contractor.

105

6 1.49

Do.

The Committee also note that though under the prescribed procedure, extension of time for completion of works can be granted by the Vice-Chancellor on the advice of the Building and Works Committee, extensions for works were given by the Vice-Chancellor without

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

seeking the advice of the Building and Works Committee. The explanation of the University authorities for this was that as per clause 5 of the contract, the University Engineer was the final authority for deciding grant of extension of time for completion of works. The Committee need hardly point out that provisions of contracts entered into by the University cannot override the specific statutory provisions. The Committee, however, note that the University authorities are now thinking of providing for a specific provision for grant of extension of time in execution of works of varying amounts. The Committee trust that this will be done at an early date.

7 1.50 M/o Education and Culture
 (Deptt. of Education)

The Committee also note that out of 7 works in progress, contracts for 5 works, costing about Rs. 1-1/2 crores, were rescinded by the University after they had been delayed for periods ranging from 7 to 58 months and after payments aggregating Rs. 1.02 crores had been made. Out of these 5 works, two were subsequently awarded to other contractors at an estimated additional cost of Rs. 13 lakhs at the risk and cost of the first contractor who had, however, gone in for arbitration claiming further payment of Rs. 7.60 lakhs from the University. The Committee would like to be informed of the outcome of the arbitration proceedings in the case of two works.

8 1.50 Do.

The manner in which the University authorities had awarded contracts to M/s. Home Decolam is intriguing. Till 1975, the University authorities had awarded contracts only to the contractors borne on the approved lists of certain specified authorities. In October, 1975, the University framed rules for enlistment of additional contractors to its list of approved contractors. After scrutinising nine applications

which were received, two contractors were registered by the University authorities as Class II contractors in May, 1976. No registration had taken place since then. On the two registered contractors the real beneficiary were M/s. Home Decolam who were awarded 8 contracts for civil works of the value of Rs. 69.57 lakhs. Out of these, two civil works costing Rs. 5.99 lakhs had been allotted to M/s. Home Decolam even prior to their registration as Class II Contractors in May, 1976 and three Class I civil works costing over Rs. 10 lakhs each (total cost Rs. 52.61 lakhs) were awarded to them though they were not Class I contractors. These Class I works were awarded to them on the basis of a decision of the Building and Works Committee in January 1977 to sell tender forms to contractors one class below. Surprisingly, M/s. Home Decolam were again the sole beneficiary of the above mentioned decision of the Building and Works Committee. However, the performance of M/s. Home Decolam did not match their ability to get contracts. Not even a single work was completed by them in time. Three works were completed by them after delays of 7, 16 and 22 months and three contracts had to be rescinded due to disputes. The remaining two works which were due for completion in April 1978 and February 1979 had not been completed till August 1981. Belatedly, the University authorities came to the conclusion that the firm did not have adequate resources and could not be depended upon to handle works of the magnitude awarded to them and terminated their registration as Class II contractors in February, 1980. The explanation of the University authorities for the award of 8 contracts of the value of over Rs. 69.57 lakhs to this firm is unsatisfactory and merits further probe.

107

9 1.67 M/o Education and Culture
(Deptt. of Education)

The Committee regret to observe that quantities of cement and steel issued by the University authorities to the contractors had been

far in excess of the needs of the works and the excess quantities had neither been returned nor had their cost been recovered, resulting in loss to the University to the tune of Rs. 5.60 lakhs. The Committee are also surprised at the wide variations between the quantities required as per estimates, quantities actually supplied and the quantities required for work done as assessed. While the Committee note that in arbitration, award has been given in favour of the University which is to be paid Rs. 4.26 lakhs at the present price, the Committee cannot help observing that the present case is an example of poor materials management on the part of the University authorities. They note that in the Library Building, the shortages of steel at the site of work came to the notice of the University in February/March, 1978 but no action to verify the position was taken till November 1978. In December 1978, the relevant measurement books which were kept at the site in the custody of the contractor were reported missing from an Almirah. In March 1979, the Executive Council was informed by the University that a committee had been constituted to look into the alleged loss of steel but in fact no committee had been constituted (August, 1981). The contract of the School Building was rescinded in November 1979 and that of the Kendriya Vidyalaya in January 1980, but the theoretical requirement of the material had not been worked out. All this gives an impression that the University authorities had no concern for the financial interests of the University. In particular, it is not clear why the measurement books should have been kept in the custody of the contractor. In evidence, the Secretary of the Ministry conceded that this was "a serious matter" and promised to have an inquiry held into the whole matter. The Committee

desire that this should be done at an early date. They also desire that while holding the inquiry it may particularly be seen whether there was any collusion between the University staff responsible for supplying material and the contractor.

10 2.22 M/o Education and Culture
(Deptt. of Education)

According to Audit, as against an outlay of Rs. 100.31 lakhs allocated for equipment in Fourth and Fifth Five Year Plans, the actual expenditure was as high as Rs. 149.37 lakhs till 1979-80. Though the University Grants Commission was aware of lack of financial discipline in the expenditure on equipment, it went on releasing funds requested for by the University from time to time and also regularising the excess expenditure *post facto*.

11 2.23 -do-

According to the directives of the Executive Council in June 1972, specific committees were to be constituted before making purchases of equipment costing over Rs. 2000; and for purchases exceeding Rs. 50,000, a University Stores and Equipment Committee was to scrutinize and recommend the purchases before sanction was accorded by the Vice-Chancellor. Surprisingly no such committee was constituted till August 1980 and committees for scrutinizing purchases upto Rs. 50,000 did not exist in 5 out of the six schools. Instead, requirements were reported directly by the individual faculties to the Vice-Chancellor. Upto March 1980, 35 items, costing over Rs. 50,000 each, were purchased at a total cost of Rs. 51 lakhs without observing the prescribed procedure. The reasons given by the University authorities for not constituting the Purchase Committees are far from convincing.

12 2.24 -do-

The Committee also note that while some of the items which were included in the University's proposals submitted to the University Grants Commission were not purchased, several items which were not includ-

ed in the proposals were purchased. The latter included two computers, the value of which was nearly Rs. 10 lakhs. In the absence of the proper procedure being followed in the matter of purchase of equipment, there is force in the complaint of the students of the School of Life Sciences that the School had spent "haphazardly" on purchases of equipment which resulted in massive waste of funds and accumulation of sub-standard items of equipment. The Working Group appointed by the Vice-Chancellor to look into these purchases put it mildly that "some of the purchases could have been avoided".

13 2.25 M/o Education and Culture (Deptt.
of Education)

The Committee further note that stock registers were not properly maintained; nor was proper record of utilisation of costly equipment maintained. Physical verification of equipment was also not done regularly. Stock registers were not shown to Audit for inspection. The Store-keeper rather than show the stock registers to Audit "ran away, absented and thereafter resigned". It appears to the Committee from the facts that in the JNU(financial discipline was sadly lacking and prescribed procedures had little sanctity. With a view to overcoming these shortcomings, the UGC had decided to induct officer from the Office of the C & AG for financial and materials management. This is a welcome move. The Committee trust that the University authorities will take care to see that all purchase proposals are not only given the most careful scrutiny at appropriate levels but also the prescribed purchase procedures are strictly adhered to. The University will also take care to see that after purchase, all the equipment are properly recorded and verified periodically.

- 14 2.26 -do-
The Committee note that the University could not acquire a powerful computer under the United Nations Development Programme assistance as ancillary machinery could not be acquired in time. This proposal is now stated to have been again taken up. The Committee would await the outcome. The main hall (area 10,000 Sq Ft.) of the building which was constructed for it at a cost of Rs. 21.61 lakhs is now being used for the Science Library.
- 15 2.27 -do-
A much smaller computer acquired in January 1976 though expected to be self-supporting could earn only Rs. 0.60 lakh against its maintenance expenditure of Rs. 8.07 lakhs upto March 1980 due to its poor performance. Non-availability of certain spare parts had resulted in non-functioning of this computer since 27 September, 1981. The Committee feel that before purchasing sensitive equipment like a computer, the University authorities should have arranged for procurement of adequate spare parts. Apparently, the University authorities had failed to do so. The story of purchase of 'Anolog' computer is equally disturbing. The Committee would recommend that an inquiry be conducted into the purchases and non-functioning of all the computers of the JNU with a view to fixing responsibility.
- 16 3.27 -do-
In the first phase of the development of the Jawaharlal Nehru University, 7 Schools were to be set up. Of these, six have already been set up and the seventh—the School of Creative Arts—is still to come into existence. The Committee note that the academic and student strength is less than the planned target in all the Schools, the exceptions being the Schools of International Studies and Languages. According to the latest figures (1st February, 1983) furnished by the Ministry, as against the planned strength of 250, 100 and 100 students in the Schools of Life Sciences, Computer and Systems Sciences and of En-

vironmental Science, the actual strength was 125, 78 and 45 students respectively. This indicates that the courses offered by the JNU in these Schools had not yet proved to be sufficiently attractive to the students. As the equipment procured in those Schools was 222, 165 and 122 per cent of the Plan proposals, and the actual student strength far less than that planned, there was gross under-utilisation of equipment in these Schools. The Committee would like the University authorities to analyse the causes for the under-utilisation of the capacity of Science Schools created at heavy cost and to initiate suitable measures for their optimum utilisation.

17 3.28 M/o Education and Culture
(Deptt. of Education)

The various Schools of Studies did not maintain any data to indicate the number of students who did not complete their studies. However, a study in respect of Schools of Social Sciences and Languages revealed that out of 8826 students admitted to various courses of duration of 1 to 5 years upto 1979-80, 3420 students had left the courses without completing. As these 8826 students had been selected out of about 35,000 applicants, the manner of selection did not seem to be satisfactory in view of the heavy drop-outs. Further the average cost of operation of the University per student being over Rs. 11,000 per annum the order of the Unproductive expenditure on the drop-outs can well be imagined. The Committee think that the contention of the Ministry that those who left the courses in the middle learnt something which would be useful to them in their careers is a poor consolation. They need hardly point out that fellowships|scholarships are given by the University and various other bodies for specific objectives and the objectives for which these are given and these are not served when such

17 3.28

-do-

students leave their studies without completing. In the opinion of the Committee, an indepth analysis of the reasons for the students discontinuing the courses is called for. In this connection, the Committee would draw attention to the observation made by the Vice-Chancellor in evidence before the Committee that in the initial stages, the students were committed to academic career but of late they were going in for Civil Services as they were not sure about their prospects after completing their studies/research in the JNU. The Committee would like the Ministry to take effective steps to deal with the problem of drop-outs. In particular, the Committee would like the Ministry to examine the feasibility of introducing a suitable bond whereby Scholarship/Fellowship holders are obliged to complete their studies.

18 3.29

-do-

The most dismal performance has been that of the Centre for Studies in Science Policy. This Centre had admitted 40 students in M. Phil/Ph. D. Programmes since its inception in 1972-73 but had failed to produce a single Ph. D. upto 1979-80. Only 4 students were awarded M. Phil Degree and in August 1981, 6 students were on roll with a faculty strength of 3. The remaining 30 students had left their studies mid-way. A review committee set up by the Vice-Chancellor *inter-alia* observed that the objective of developing science policy as an independent applied discipline had not been realised and the general atmosphere of the Centre was not conducive to academic work. On the recommendation of the review committee, all fresh admissions were frozen for 2-3 years until the overall atmosphere in the Centre improved. In January 1982, the Executive Council had decided to revive the academic programmes of the Centre in phases to strengthen them. The Council had also decided to set up a Programmes Committee under the chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor to formulate the academic and research programme of the Centre. The Programme Com-

mittee had not submitted its report so far. The Committee would like to know further developments.

19 4.7 M/o Education and Culture
(Deptt. of Education)

The Committee note that as against the student strength of nearly 3000, the strength of administrative staff in the Jawahar Lal Nehru University was a little over 1,000. According to Audit, the Finance Committee of the University had made adverse observations on this aspect on several occasions and, in particular, it had observed in October, 1977 that increase in the number of non-teaching staff was "abnormally high" as compared to the increase in the activities of the University. The Committee further note that as against the plan provision of Rs. 16 lakhs sanctioned by the University Grants Commission for the non-teaching staff of the University for the Fifth Plan period and the University's own estimate of Rs. 36 lakhs, the actual expenditure amounted to over Rs. 64.66 lakhs. No satisfactory explanation for this phenomenal increase has been given. The Committee note that the University Grants Commission has now decided to evolve standard procedures for review of non-teaching cadres and establishment of Work Study Units in different Central Universities. The Committee desire that an independent study of the existing non-teaching staff position in the Jawaharlal Nehru University be carried out at an early date. They also desire that the Staff Inspection Unit of the Ministry of Finance or a body similar thereto should be appointed to undertake a work study of the staff strength of the JNU and fix norms for different jobs without delay. The staff, if any, found surplus should be suitably re-deployed.

20 4.12 M/o Education and Culture
(Deptt. of Education)

The Committee note that in spite of increase in the strength of administrative staff, the University had to incur expenditure to the tune of over Rs. 11 lakhs on overtime during the Fifth Plan period. The Committee also note that as against the revised estimate of Rs. 4.00 lakhs and Rs. 6.00 lakhs for the years 1979-80 and 1980-81 respectively, the actual expenditure on payment of overtime allowance had been Rs. 6.63 lakhs and Rs. 8.03 lakhs, respectively. The claim of the University that there had been a reduction of 30 per cent in payment of overtime allowance in October, 1981 has no meaning in the light of the fact that during the 12-month period ending October, 1982, the overtime allowance amounted to over Rs. 9.05 lakhs as against Rs. 8.03 lakhs in 1980-81. In the opinion of the Committee, such large payment of overtime allowance is largely a management failure. The argument advanced by the Ministry that overtime allowance had to be paid because there was no leave reserve is not convincing in view of the fact that there was surplus administrative staff. The Committee desire the Ministry of Education to impress upon the Jawahar Lal Nehru University authorities the imperative need of reducing the payment of overtime allowance to the barest minimum.

21 5.25

Do.

After going through the whole material, the Committee are led to the conclusion that financial management in the University is far from satisfactory. This may be the cause of many ills in the University. Diversions of funds from allocated purposes to others, non-surrender of savings and mis-representation of utilisation of funds indicate some of the irregularities indulged in. Instead of regulating releases of funds as per the periodic requirements/spending capacity of the University, the UGC had been releasing bulk of the Plan funds at the close of the financial year. Also, as indicated earlier in this Report, it went on regularising the excess expenditure incurred by the University *post-facto*

without ensuring exercise of proper financial control in the University. In the opinion of the Committee, the monitoring system in the UGC needs to be streamlined. Now that the UGC has agreed to a review of the financial and administrative functioning of the University by the Madhuri Shah Committee and it has been decided to induct in the university officers from the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the Committee hope that the financial irregularities and deficiencies pointed out in the Audit paragraph will be taken due care of, and the financial management in the University will improve.

22 5.27 M/o Education and Culture
(Deptt. of Education)

The University had invested Rs. 83.77 lakhs (as on 31 March 1980) out of the Provident Fund accumulations of the University in "Term Deposits" with the State Bank of India instead of Government securities etc. as instructed by Government in December, 1978. The Executive Council of the University had decided in April 1979 to continue the then existing pattern of investment, as it felt that the instructions of Government of India on the subject were not binding on Central Universities. The Committee however, observe that the entire question of pattern of investment by Central Universities is now being reconsidered by the Ministry. The Committee would like to be informed of the decision taken in the matter.

116

23 6.24 -Do-

In 1969, Jawaharlal Nehru University came into existence to disseminate and advance knowledge, wisdom and understanding by teaching research and by the example and influence of its corporate life. The University was to endeavour to promote the study of the principles for which Jawaharlal Nehru worked during his life-time, viz., national integration, social justice, secularism, democratic way of life, internatio-

nal understanding and scientific approach to the problems of society. The University was to make special provision for integrated courses in humanities, science and technology and to take appropriate measures for promoting inter-disciplinary studies. It was also to establish departments or institutions for the study of languages, literature and life of foreign countries with a view to inculcating in the students a world perspective and international understanding. As far as possible, the University was not to undertake conventional academic programmes and to avoid duplication of facilities available in other Universities.

24 6.25

-do-

As to the achievements of the JNU in the light of its objectives, the Ministry of Education have stated that out of seven projected schools to be set up in the first phase, six schools have already been set up. Integrated courses in Humanities, Social Sciences and Sciences to promote inter-disciplinary academic and research programmes have already been introduced. The University has maintained its all-India character in terms of its student body and faculty. It conducts mainly Post-Graduate and Research Programmes. The Schools of International Studies and Languages are engaged in the study of languages, literature and life of several foreign countries.

25 6.26

-do-

As against the above achievements claimed by the Ministry of Education, the Committee observe that the seventh school projected to be set up in the first phase—the School of Creative Arts—has not yet come up. The academic and student strength is less than the planned target in all the schools, the exceptions being Schools of International Studies and Languages. The under-utilisation of capacity is particularly conspicuous in the science schools. The schools are beset with the problem of drop-outs. A study in respect of only two schools—Schools of Social Sciences and Languages—has revealed that out of 8826

students admitted to the various courses of duration of 1 to 5 years upto 1979-80, 3420 students had discontinued the courses. An idea of the wastage caused these drop-outs can be had from the fact that the cost of operation of the University per student works out to more than Rs. 11,000 per annum. The most dismal performance had been of an important centre of study—Centre for Studies in Science Policy. This Centre had admitted 40 students in M.Phil/Ph. D. Programmes since its inception in 1972-73 but had failed to produce a single Ph. D. upto 1979-80. Only 4 students were awarded M.Phil Degree and in August, 1981, 6 students were on roll with a faculty of 3. The remaining 30 students had left their studies. A review committee set up by the Vice-Chancellor *inter alia* observed that the objective of developing Science Policy as an independent applied discipline had not been realised and the general atmosphere of the Centre was not conducive to academic work.

26 2.27 M/o Education & Culture
(Deptt. of Education)

The assessment of the Acting Vice-Chancellor in regard to the achievements of the Jawaharlal Nehru University in the light of the objectives laid down in the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act was in the following words: "I will not say that the University has completely failed in its objectives. But I will positively accept that the University has not achieved the full objectives of the Act." The Secretary of the Ministry also felt that although the University had been endeavouring to fulfil its objectives, there was "scope for improvement."

27 6.28

-do-

The above assessment of the University is by persons connected with the working of the University in one capacity or the other, and no independent evaluation of the performance of the University in the light of its objectives has yet been made. A Committee under the Chairmanship of a distinguished educationist Shri V. S. Jha to review the working of the University was appointed in July, 1979. But the Committee could not complete its work. The circumstances in which the Jha Committee was forced to leave its work unfinished is a sad commentary on the general atmosphere prevailing in the University.

28 6.29

-do-

After the Jha Committee submitted its Status Report stating that it could not do its assigned task, the University authorities asked the different schools to prepare 'achievement report' since the inception of the University. But, the Committee would like to point out, such achievement reports can hardly be a substitute for an independent appraisal by an independent body.

29 6.30

-do-

The Committee note that in January 1982, a committee has been appointed by the University Grants Commission to go into the working of all the Central Universities including the Jawaharlal Nehru University. As per the terms of reference of this committee, known as Madhuri Shah Committee, the committee will *inter alia* enquire whether the Central Universities are fulfilling the objectives set for them in their Acts and Statutes. The Committee will also go into the general state of discipline in the Central Universities and the causes of periodic disturbances in the University campuses. The Committee trust that the Madhuri Shah Committee will go into the working of the Jawaharlal Nehru University at a very early date.

30 z.31 M/o Education and Culture (Deptt.
of Education)

The Committee note that in early 1983, there were some incidents which disrupted the normal academic life of the University campus and subsequently culminated into the *sine die* closure of the University with effect from May 12, 1983. Pending a review of the whole situation, the Academic Council decided not to make fresh admissions to the Semester beginning in July, 1983. The Academic Council also decided that the admission policy and procedures should be reviewed in the light of the experience gained. The Committee need hardly stress the importance of early resumption of admissions so as to avoid a national waste. They also trust that the admission policy and procedures of the University will be suitably re-oriented so as not only to sub-serve the objective for which the University has been set up but also to avoid disruptions in the normal academic life of the University in future.

31 6.32 -do-

The Committee observe that in the case of the Indian Institute of Sciences, Bangalore, it is provided in the Statute itself that after a specified interval the Visitor would review the academic functioning of the Institute. Under Section 8 of the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act, the Visitor may from time to time appoint one or two persons to review the work and progress of the University and submit a report thereon, but this provision is only an enabling one. The Committee would commend the idea of suitably amending the Jawaharlal Nehru, University Act, 1966 with a view to establishing a mechanism to conduct an independent periodic review of the working of the University in all its aspects.

The Jawaharlal Nehru University was conceived to be an institution to disseminate and advance "Knowledge, wisdom and understanding" by teaching and research and by the example and influence to its corporate life. It was to promote the principles and ideals for which Jawaharlal Nehru worked during his life-time. The two principles dear to the heart of Jawaharlal Nehru were tolerance and discipline. The Committee therefore deeply regret the confusion that prevailed in the University which culminated ultimately in the closure of the University with effect from 12 May, 1983 for over two months. This does not redound to the credit of the Institution. The academic, administrative and student communities together owe it to the great ideals with which the institution was set up to maintain all the time an atmosphere conducive to translating the ideals into reality.

LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Sl. No.	Name of Agent
BIHAR		TAMIL NADU	
1.	M/s. Crown Book Depot, Upper Bazar, Ranchi (Bihar)	10.	The Manager, M.M. Subscription Agencies, No. 2, 1st Lay Out Sivananda Colony, Coimbatore 641012
GUJARAT		UTTAR PRADESH	
2.	The New Order Book Company, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-6.	11.	Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P.B. No. 77, Allahabad, U.P.
MADHYA PRADESH		WEST BENGAL	
3.	Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas Palace, Indore City.	12.	Mrs. Manimala, Buys and Sells, 128, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta-12
MAHARASHTRA		DELHI	
4.	M/s. Sunderdas Gian Chand, 601, Girgaum Road, Near Princes Street, Bombay-2	13.	Jain Book Agency, Connaught Place, New Delhi.
5.	The International Book Service, Decan Gymkhana, Poona-4.	14.	J. M. Jain & Brother, Mori Gate, Delhi.
6.	The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-1.	15.	Oxford Book & Stationery Co., Scindia House, Connaught Place, New Delhi-1.
7.	M/s. Usha Book Depot, Law Book Seller and Publishers' Agents Govt. Publications, 585, Chira Bazar, Khan House, Bombay-2.	16.	Bookwell 4, Sant Nirankari Colony, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-9.
8.	M&J Services, Publishers, Representative Accounts & Law Book Seller, Mohan Kunj, Ground Floor, 68, Jyotiba Fuele Road, Nalgaum-Dadar, Bombay-14.	17.	The Central News Agency, 23/90, Connaught Place, New Delhi.
9.	Subscribers Subscription Savices India, 21, Raghunath Dadaji St., 2nd Floor, Bombay-1.	18.	M/s. Rajendra Book Agency, IV-D 59, IV-D 50, Lajpat Nagar, Old Double Storey, Delhi-110024.
		19.	M/s. Ashoka Book Agency, BH-82, Poorvi Shalimar Bagh, Delhi-110033.
		20.	Venus Enterprises, B-2 85, Phase-II, Ashok Vihar, Delhi.

P. A. C. No. 990

1983 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PUBLISHED UNDER RULE 382 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT
OF BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA (SIXTH EDITION) AND PRINTED BY THE
GENERAL MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS,
MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI.

