

Decisions of 353rd Meeting of SRC-NCTE

Sl. No.	Brief Description	Remarks of SRC
1.	Confirmation of Minutes of 352 nd Meeting of SRC 04 th & 05 th , January, 2018	Confirmed
2.	Action Taken Report (ATR) on of 351 st Meeting of SRC 28 th & 29 th , December, 2017	---

Members: Dr. J. Prasad

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Consideration of Court cases, Appeal case, Vt report: (Volume-1)

1.	APS01349	D.T.Ed 1 Unit	St. Joseph Teacher Training Institute for Women, Salem, Tamil Nadu	TN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The High Court order is noted. 2. No coercive action is contemplated. 3. Send a copy of this High Court order to NCTE (HQ)
2.	--	--	A letter received from the Special Chief Secretary to Government (I/c).	GN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The letter is addressed to the NCTE (HQ). Only a copy has been endorsed to us for information. 2. SRC is not competent to impose 'ban' orders. Only the Council can. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. 2018-19 in any case is a 'Zero Year'. 3.2. The NCTE (HQ) will take appropriate action on the letter in respect of 2019-20. 4. Send a copy, by way of abundant Caution, to the NCTE (HQ).
3.	SRCAPP14683	B.Ed 1 Unit	Chenna Keshava College of Education, Rangareddy, Telangana	TS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their B.P.Ed application was withdrawn even before FR. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. The B.Ed case did result in issue of FR w.e.f. 2016-17. But, apparently, they did not make any admissions to start the programme. 2.2. The No Dues certificate from the Faculty indicates that all of them left the college by 31.01.2017 2.3. In other words there were no students ; and, there were no new admissions in 2017-18. 3.1. That being so, there is no need to talk of phased reduction of Faculty.

353rd Meeting of SRC
10th & 11th, January, 2018

					<p>3.2. The mistake committed by SRO is condoned.</p> <p>3.3. There is no need to issue any corrections</p>
4.	SRCAPP2448	B.Ed 1 Unit	Sri Shiva Sai College of Education, Mahabubnagar, Telangana	TS	<p>1. This is a complicated case involving many legal issues.</p> <p>2. On the face of it, this case involves only one issue about one Asst Prof serving at 2 places at the same time. But, there are more important issues attached.</p> <p>3.1. The Regulation requires applicant-institutions to “appoint” Faculty, get the Faculty list authenticated by the Registrar, and report accordingly to the Regional Committee, so that the case can be processed for issue of FR.</p> <p>3.2. In practice, however this does not happen. The applicant selects the Faculty, issues appointment letters and, the affiliating body authenticates. But, the Faculty does not actually “join”.</p> <p>3.3. This is because, even after issue of FR by the NCTE, the affiliating body grants affiliation only after receipt of a G.O from the State Government conveying their approval. This process may take even a whole year in some cases ! The applicant institutions do not ask the ‘selected and appointed’ Faculty to join so that they do not have to start paying salary in fructuously.</p> <p>4.1. This fractured process of faculty recruitment leads to several anomalies /</p>

353rd Meeting of SRC
10th & 11th, January, 2018

					<p>irregularities / illegalities:</p> <p>(i) The applicant institution is required to play a charade of showing 'Faculty in position'.</p> <p>(ii). The individual faculty Members concerned file false affidavits stating that they have been "appointed".</p> <p>(iii). The affiliating body authenticates the list in a non-committal way even while refusing to give affiliation for want of State Government approval.</p> <p>4.2. All these aberrations are made to happen because the State Government and the affiliating University ignore the legal position (under the NCTE Act) that an affiliating body SHALL grant affiliation once a Regional Committee of the NCTE grants recognition. There is no scope for any State Government intervention at this stage.</p> <p>4.3. it is only to avoid this eventuality that the Regulations require the applicants to obtain NOCs from State Governments right at the start. If a State Government does not utilise that opportunity, then, it loses its right to halt the case at a later stage.</p> <p>4.4. In this case, the State Government of Telangana has been doing just that. The procedure for issue of a G.O. after issue of FR by the NCTE is at initio void.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Members: Dr. J. Prasad

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

353rd Meeting of SRC
10th & 11th, January, 2018

					<p>5. It will be necessary for the NCTE (HQ) to take up these issues with the State Governments, sensitise them about the legal niceties involved and make them follow the prescribed legal procedures.</p> <p>6. The aberrations / irregularities / illegalities committed by the others are all so done under procedural duress illegally imposed by the indefensible 'G.O. procedure' prescribed by the State Governments. (the state Government of Telangana in this case.)</p> <p>7.1. In the result, and for the reasons given above, the explanation given by the 'Sri Shiva Sai College of Education' about Asst Prof Anjaneyalu's appointment is accepted.</p> <p>7.2. The State Government of Telangana may be informed accordingly.</p> <p>8. SRO is directed to make a comprehensive formal reference accordingly to the NCTE (HQ) for examining the issues' listed above for removal of the procedural anomalies. Even the NCTE Regulations will require to be amended appropriately.</p>
5.	SRCAPP2016 30183	BSc.B.Ed/ BA.B.Ed (2 Units)	Sri Gowthami Integrated B.Ed College, Prakasam, Andhra Pradesh	AP	<p>1. They have not given any reply to our letter dated 07.04.2017.</p> <p>2. But, their intention to persist with the application is clear from their statement, "Because we postponed the</p>

353rd Meeting of SRC
10th & 11th, January, 2018

					<p>VT Inspection for the academic year 2018-19", in their e-mail dated 15.02.2017.</p> <p>3.1. Order VT again.</p> <p>3.2. Alert them about the Supreme Court prescribed time-limit of 03.03.2018 and advise them to respond quickly so that this case can be considered for 2018-19 at least.</p> <p>3.3. Ask VT to collect LUC, latest EC, duly approved BP, duly approved BCC and FDRs.</p> <p>4. Put up in the first meeting in Feb 2018.</p>
6.	SRCAPP2016 30143	B.Ed 2 Units	Muthukkaruppan Memorial Educational Trust, Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu	TN	<p>1. Their reply dated 04.01.2018 is seen.</p> <p>2. They have made 3 new appointments to rectify the deficiencies.</p> <p>3.1. Appointment of a History Asst Prof, strictly speaking, cannot be said to meet the requirement of an Assistant Professor in Sociology.</p> <p>3.2. They will have to recruit a duly qualified Assistant Professor in Sociology / Philosophy.</p> <p>4. Issue SCN accordingly.</p>
7.	SRCAPP2016 30219	M.Ed 1 Unit	Sathyasai B.Ed College, Thiruvallur, Tamil Nadu	TN	<p>1. They have B.Ed (2 units) & BSc.B.Ed (2 units).</p> <p>2. Title is clear. Land area for B.Ed (2 units), M.Ed (1 unit) and BSc.BEd (2 units) is adequate for the programmes in reference. The requirement is 4500</p>

353rd Meeting of SRC
10th & 11th, January, 2018

					<p>sqmts ; availability is 4775 sq mts.</p> <p>3. EC is in order.</p> <p>4. BP is in order. Built up area shown is 4056.27 sq mts.</p> <p>5. BCC-there are 2 BCCs.</p> <p>(i) The names of Engineer given in the 2 BCCs are different from each other although both have been approved on the same date.</p> <p>(ii) One bears the seal of the Avadi Municipality ; the other bears the seal of the college !.</p> <p>(iii)The total built-up area shown is (4670.35 + 4047.48) 8717.83 sq mts. This is more than double of what is permissible under the BP. They should explain this discrepancy.</p> <p>6. FDRs are required in original, in joint account, with a 5-year validity @ 7 +5 lakhs per programme.</p> <p>7. NOC is submitted correctly.</p> <p>8. NAAC certificate is there. Validity expired on 04.01.2018. But, they can not approach NAAC again because of the QCI litigation.</p> <p>9. Cause VT Inspection-Composite-for B.Ed (2 units), BSc.B.Ed (2 units) and M.Ed (1 unit).</p>
8.	SRCAPP2016 30099	BA.BEd BSc.BEd	Pope John Paul II College of Education, Pondicherry	PU	<p>1. The Court has accepted our contentions and, directed the college to abide by the SRC orders about dropping the subject wise nomenclatures.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p>

353rd Meeting of SRC
10th & 11th, January, 2018

9.	APS04085	D.T.Ed 1 Unit	Bharathi Teacher Training Institute, Villupuram, Tamil Nadu	TN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this case, we had withdrawn recognition in 2009. 2. Consequent upon remand of the case by the Appellate authority, we processed the case further, caused VT Inspection and restored recognition in 2010. 3. The Court has now rejected their Writ Petition as in fructuous. 4. No action is pending. 5. Court order is noted. 6. Close the file.
10.	APS09060	B.Ed	Sri Parasakthi College of Education for Women, Madurai, Tamil Nadu	TN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The agenda note is not at all clear. 2.1. We do not know who filed W.P when and, for what purpose. 2.2. Be that as it may, the Court has dismissed the W.P. for non-prosecution. 3.1. Meanwhile, the case has progressed at our end. We had ordered VT Inspection. The Inspection was done. The VTI report has come. 3.2. The VT has also collected and submitted originals of the relevant documents. 4. Process and put up this RPRO (shifting) case.
11.	SRCAPP2016 30046	B.P.Ed 1 Unit	DNC Manivannan College of Physical Education, Dharmapuri, Tamil Nadu	TN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The note from the Panel lawyer is seen. He has not sent a copy of the petition. 2.1. We had rejected this application mainly on the ground of non-submission of NOC within the prescribed time-limit. 2.2. The Appellate Authority has also confirmed our order.

353rd Meeting of SRC
10th & 11th, January, 2018

					<p>3.1. The Panel lawyer now advises that we should accept the petition, process it and, grant FR w.e.f. 2018-19.</p> <p>3.2. We do not agree with him. His advise is not acceptable.</p> <p>3.3. In another similar case of Tamil Nadu, we had decided to go to the Supreme Court against the High Court order. Our lawyer (Shri. Harikrishnan) had also advised similar action. We accepted his advice.</p> <p>4. Let us take a similar stand in this case. Oppose the petition on the same grounds.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Members: Dr. J. Prasad

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman