

Decisions of 366th Meeting of SRC-NCTE

Sl. No.	Brief Description	Remarks of SRC
1.	Confirmation of Minutes of 365 th Meeting of SRC 31 st October to 01 st November, 2018	Confirmed
2.	Action Taken Report (ATR) on of 365 th Meeting of SRC 31 st to 01 st November, 2018	

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh, Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N., Dr. J.Prasad, Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

1

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh, Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N., Dr. J.Prasad, Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

Consideration of Court Cases, SCN reply and Requesting for Closure : (Volume-1)

1.	APSO232 APSO2786	B.Ed. D.El. Ed.	Dr. Rajendra Prasad B.Ed. College, Asifabad, Telangana.	TE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have B.Ed (2 units) and D.EL.Ed (1 unit). 2. They had shifted without permission. They want ratification. 3. For B.Ed, the RPRO has also to be regularised. 4. Title is clear. Land area is adequate. 5. LUC is accepted. 6. The mortgage has been redeemed. EC is accepted. 7. BP is still an illegible photocopy. But, the two basic facts are clear: It is approved by the Executive Engineer; the built-up area permissible is 4602 sq.mts. which is more than the 3835 sq.mt. built-up area reported in the BCC. 8. BCC is in order. Built-up area of 3835 sq.mt is adequate for both courses. 9.1 Faculty list for D.EL.Ed is in order. 9.2.1. Faculty list of 1+15 to B.Ed. is given. It is approved by the Registrar. 9.2.2. But the following deficiencies are there:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Principal has no Ph.D. ii) One more Assistant Professor in Perspective is required. iii) One Assistant Professor (Maths) is required in Pedagogy. 10. Issue SCN accordingly.
----	---------------------	-----------------------	---	----	---

366th Meeting of SRC
03rd & 04th December, 2018

2.	SRCAPP3 195	B.Ed.	P.Narayana Reddy College of Education, Mahubnagar, Telangana.	TE	<p>1. This is a B.Ed (2 units) case cleared by us.</p> <p>2.1 The Telengana Govt. had pointed out many deficiencies.</p> <p>2.2 The SCERT's name has wrongly come into this B.Ed. case. This will be a complaint from the Higher Education wing of the Telengana Govt.</p> <p>3. The Telengana Govt. has now issued clearance for this B.Ed programme subject to the outcome in the court – case concerned.</p> <p>4. Let us issue a SCN to the Narayana Reddy College w.r.t. the inspection report sent by the Telengana Govt.</p> <p>5. Keep the State Govt. and the affiliating university informed.</p> <p>6. Put up in the February 2019 meeting.</p>
3.	APSO5907	B.P.E d.	Mother Teresa College of Physical Educatoin, Mettu Salai Illuppur Post, Pudukkottai, Tamilnadu	TA	<p>1. This is a RPRO case.</p> <p>2. They had given their affidavit to accept adherence to the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p>3. They have not complied with the requirements stipulated in the RPRO and other communications from us.</p> <p>4. In addition, we need the following documents:</p> <p>(i) LUC.</p> <p>(ii) Latest EC.</p> <p>(iii) BP duly approved by competent authority.</p> <p>(iv) BCC duly approved by competent authority.</p> <p>5. Issue SCN accordingly. Give time till 15.01.2019. Failure to adequately</p>

3

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh,

Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N.,

Dr. J.Prasad,

Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

366th Meeting of SRC
03rd & 04th December, 2018

					<p>respond may entail withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>6. Put up in the February 2019 meeting.</p> <p>7. Keep the State Govt. and the affiliating university informed.</p>
4.	APSO7745 /APSO580 2	M.Ed.	Mother Teresa College of Education, Mettu Salai Illuppur Post, Pudukkottai, Tamilnadu.	TA	<p>1. This is a RPRO case.</p> <p>2. They had given their affidavit to accept adherence to the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p>3. They have not complied with the requirements stipulated in the RPRO and other communications from us.</p> <p>4. In addition, we need the following documents:</p> <p>(i) LUC.</p> <p>(ii) Latest EC.</p> <p>(iii) BP duly approved by competent authority.</p> <p>(iv) BCC duly approved by competent authority.</p> <p>5. Issue SCN accordingly. Give time till 15.01.2019. Failure to adequately respond may entail withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>6. Put up in the February 2019 meeting.</p> <p>7. Keep the State Govt. and the affiliating university informed.</p>
5.	APSO5733	B.Ed.	M.K.P. College of Education, Thachoor, Aruvikkarai Post, Kalkulam Taluk, Kanyakumari-629177, Tamilnadu.	TA	<p>1. This is a RPRO case.</p> <p>2. They had given their affidavit to accept adherence to the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p>3. They have not complied with the requirements stipulated in the RPRO and other communications from us.</p> <p>4. In addition, we need the following documents:</p> <p>(i) LUC.</p>

4

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh,

Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N.,

Dr. J.Prasad,

Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

366th Meeting of SRC
03rd & 04th December, 2018

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (ii) Latest EC. (iii) BP duly approved by competent authority. (iv) BCC duly approved by competent authority. <p>5. Issue SCN accordingly. Give time till 15.01.2019. Failure to adequately respond may entail withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>6. Put up in the February 2019 meeting.</p> <p>7. Keep the State Govt. and the affiliating university informed.</p>
6.	APSO6002	B.Ed.	Ganapathi College of Education, Melakanoor Post, Paramakudi, Ramanad-623706, Tamilnadu	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a RPRO case. 2. The College had given an affidavit assuring adherence to the 2014 Regulations. 3. They have still not complied with the requirements stipulated in our RPRO. 4. The reply received is not satisfactory. 5. Meanwhile, further requirements have emerged. 6. Let us issue a SCN accordingly, listing all the requirements. 7. Give time till 15.01.2019. 8. Put up in the Feb, 19 meeting.
7.	APSO5846	B.Ed.	Sri Angalamman College of Education, Vadakadampadi, Poonjeri Post, Thirukkazhukundram Main Road, Thirukkazhukund	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a RPRO case. 2. They have not complied with the requirements to confirm adherence to the 2014 Regulations. 3.1. On the contrary, they have requested us to withdraw recognition.

5

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh,

Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N.,

Dr. J.Prasad,

Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

366th Meeting of SRC
03rd & 04th December, 2018

			ram Taluk, Kancheepuram- 603104, Tamilnadu		<p>3.2. This request has not been received on line. But, let us not waste time pursuing that deficiency.</p> <p>4. In such cases, there are certain prescribed formalities to be completed. Ask them to complete those formalities.</p> <p>5. After completion of the prescribed formalities put up for SRC's acceptance of their request.</p> <p>6. In the meanwhile, check with the affiliating university whether they have been enrolling any new students; and, whether there are any old students in the pipeline.</p> <p>7. Put up in the February, 2019 meeting.</p>
8.	APSO6004	B.Ed.	Sri Venkateswara College of Education, Parasur, Cheyyar Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District – 604409, Tamilnadu	TA	<p>1. This is a RPRO case.</p> <p>2. They had given their affidavit to accept adherence to the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p>3. They have not complied with the requirements stipulated in the RPRO and other communications from us.</p> <p>4. In addition, we need the following documents:</p> <p>(i) LUC.</p> <p>(ii) Latest EC.</p> <p>(iii) BP duly approved by competent authority.</p> <p>(iv) BCC duly approved by competent authority.</p> <p>5. Issue SCN accordingly. Give time till 15.01.2019. Failure to adequately respond may entail withdrawal of recognition.</p> <p>6. Put up in the February 2019 meeting.</p>

6

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh,

Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N.,

Dr. J.Prasad,

Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

366th Meeting of SRC
03rd & 04th December, 2018

					7. Keep the State Govt. and the affiliating university informed.
9.	APSO4958	B.Ed.	Amrita College of Education, 50E, Alangayam Road, Tirupattur-635601, Vellore District, Tamilnadu	TA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a RPRO case. 2. They had given their affidavit to accept adherence to the 2014 Regulations. 3. They have not complied with the requirements stipulated in the RPRO and other communications from us. 4. In addition, we had the following documents: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) LUC. (ii) Latest EC. (iii) BP duly approved by competent authority. (iv) BCC duly approved by competent authority. 5. Issue SCN accordingly. Give time till 15.01.2019. Failure to adequately respond may entail withdrawal of recognition. 6. Put up in the February 2019 meeting. 7. Keep the State Govt. and the affiliating university informed.
10.	APSO4868	B.Ed.	KEC College of Education, Thindivanam Road Chinnakangeyanur Pallikondapatti Post, Thiruvannamalai – 606611, Tamilnadu	TA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a RPRO case. 2.1. It was clarified by the NCTE (HQ) that, if information about adequacy of built-up area is already available on record, there would be no need to inspect the Institution. 2.2. In this case, they need 2000 sq.mt for B.Ed (2 units). The BCC shows that they have 3236 sq.mt. There is, therefore, no need to cause inspection.

7

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh,

Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N.,

Dr. J.Prasad,

Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

366th Meeting of SRC
03rd & 04th December, 2018

					<p>3.1 They have referred to some correspondence with NCTE (HQ) for seeking postponement of inspection till further classification by the Member Secretary.</p> <p>3.2. We are not aware of any such correspondence. Be that as it may, as earlier stated, no inspection in any case is required in this case. We need not, therefore, defer action in this case.</p> <p>4. We need to examine the latest approved faculty list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The list should be of 1+15 in number. The list sent by the Principal shows only 1+13.- The list should be approved by the Registrar of the university and not by the Principal himself. <p>5. Issue a SCN accordingly.</p> <p>6. Put up in the February 2019 meeting.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

8

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh,

Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N.,

Dr. J.Prasad,

Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

366th Meeting of SRC
03rd & 04th December, 2018

11.	APSO005	B.Ed.	Sri Vidyodaya College of Education for Women, 2-2-232, Brundavan Road, Tirupathi, Andhra Pradesh.	AP	<p>1. This is an extraordinary case of 2003.</p> <p>2.1 They had applied for starting a B.Ed programme in 2003.</p> <p>2.2 SRC had rejected their application.</p> <p>2.3 They appealed against that (Rejection) order.</p> <p>3.1 There is nothing on record to show what happened thereafter.</p> <p>3.2 In August 2014, SRO received by FAX an order supposed to have been passed by the Appellate Authority on 17.12.2003.</p> <p>3.3 It was not clear from the FAX who sent it. Even the genuineness of the document could not be conclusively established.</p> <p>3.4 Only the applicant was claiming knowledge of it and continued action thereafter to run the B.Ed Course on the strength of that order.</p> <p>3.5 All references to the NCTE (HQ) also failed to get any response.</p> <p>4.1 It was difficult for the SRC to proceed with action on the basis of the FAX for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) It is not clear who sent the fax.</p> <p>2) It is not clear whether the Appellate Authority had entertained the appeal and decided the case:</p> <p>3) It is not clear whether the Appellate Authority passed the order in reference.</p> <p>4) Even if the said order was indeed passed, how could the Appellate Authority “GRANT” recognition when under law they could only ‘reverse’ our</p>
-----	---------	-------	---	----	--

9

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh,

Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N.,

Dr. J.Prasad,

Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

				<p>order and remand case with or without directions.</p> <p>5) In any case, why was the (alleged) order not communicated to SRO.</p> <p>6) If the Appellant College had received it, why did they not contact the SRO/SRC.</p> <p>7) How could the applicant college proceed with action to start the course when there were objections about their not having title to the lands, parts of the roofing being of the ‘ ’ (highly hazardous and strictly prohibited) ‘asbestos’ materials.</p> <p>8) How could the college commence classes without having an approved team of Faculty.</p> <p>9) How did the university affiliate the programme without recognition from the SRC.</p> <p>4.2 In view of the forgoing, it will be difficult for the SRC to further consider the case without appropriate classifications from the NCTE (HQ).</p> <p>4.3 SRC cannot be accused of not following ‘judicial discipline’ because the genuineness of the Appellate order is in doubt.</p> <p>4.3.2 It has also to be recognized that complying with the said order will involve (incidental) violation of some regulation (eg. Not having proper title to the lands; use of the strictly prohibited ‘asbestos’ roofing; not having a team of approved faculty; etc)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

366th Meeting of SRC
03rd & 04th December, 2018

					<p>5. That being so, the SRC has no option but to approach the NCTE (HQ) again for appropriate clarifications, certification of facts, advice on the line of action to be pursued, etc. Until this happens, we may have to keep the case pending.</p> <p>6. The applicant college can not indulge in emotional pressuring by citing the uncertain future of the students. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has clearly directed that institutions should behave responsibly and the students, being adults, should know what they are accepting.</p> <p>7. Please send a copy of this decision to NCTE (HQ) and seek specific advice.</p>
12.	APSO1983	D.Ed	SCMM D.Ed College, Somanahally, Maddur Taluk, Mandya District- 571429, Karnataka.	KA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The college has now completed all the formalities. 2. Issue a formal communication permitting closure. 3. Withdraw recognition for D.El.Ed (1 unit) w.e.f. 2017-18. 4. Return the FDRs. 5. Close the file.
13.	APSO4589	B.Ed.	G.R. Govindarajulu College of Education, Maddampalayam, Bilichi Village, Mettupalyam Road, Coimbatore-	TA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The college has requested for permission to close B.Ed (2 units) programme. 2. They have completed all the formalities. 3. Issue a formal communication accepting their request and permitting closure

11

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh,

Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N.,

Dr. J.Prasad,

Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

366th Meeting of SRC
03rd & 04th December, 2018

			641019, Tamilnadu		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Withdraw recognition for B.Ed (2 units) w.e.f. 2017-18. 5. Return the FDRs. 6. Close the file.
14.	APSO9654	D.Ed	Poornaprajnya Education Association, Near Town Municipal Council, Rampur, Rabkavi, Jamkhandi, Bagalkot, Karnataka.	KA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This case has not been properly handled 2.1 We had asked for compliance of the prescribed formalities but, they have done something very different. 2.2 And, the case has been put up for consideration. 3. Resubmit properly in the next meeting.
15.	APSO2449	D.Ed	Sri Ranganatha Teacher Training Institute, Madderahalla, N.H-14, Hiriyyur- 572143, Chitradurga District, Karnataka	KA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have requested for permission to close down the D.El.Ed programme. 2. They have completed all the formalities. 3. Their request is accepted. Issue a formal communication permitting closure 4.1 Withdraw recognition for D.El.Ed (1 unit) programme w.e.f. 2018-19. 4.2 The applicant has been extraordinarily responsible in arranging for completion of the second year course for the students in the pipeline. 5. Return the FDRs. 6. Close the file.

12

Members: Dr. J.D.Singh,

Smt. Gayatri Devi T.N.,

Dr. J.Prasad,

Ms. P Anuradha Reddy

Shri M. Nadasabapathi

(S. Sathyam)
Chairman

16.	Language Pandit Colleges/ Course in the State of Telangana – Writ Petition No.35073 of 2018	TE	Court (NCTE Letter)	Cases HQrs	<p>1. This matter has unnecessarily been pending for long</p> <p>2.1 NCTE has jurisdiction only over the 15 programmes listed in the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p>2.2.1 It will have no jurisdiction over other programmes.</p> <p>2.2.2 It will have no jurisdiction even over the programmes that were earlier within its regulatory – fold and which have been excluded from its preview in the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p>3.1 The observation of the Hon’ble Supreme Court that, after notification of the 2014 Regulations, no programme will be recognised under any other Regulation was obviously in the context of the 2014 Regulations (approved by the Hon’ble Supreme Court) and with limited reference to the 15 programmes listed in the 2014 Regulations.</p> <p>3.2 The consequential legal position will be that all other Teacher Education Programmes will be open to be regulated by State Governments through their affiliating instrumentalities like universities, SCERTs, etc. Otherwise, there will be unlimited scope for proliferation of unregulated programmes. Such a development will be incongruent with the overriding emphasis laid by</p>
-----	---	----	---------------------	------------	--

				<p>Hon'ble Supreme Court on improving the quality of Teacher Education programmes.</p> <p>4. In the result, and for the reasons given above, in respect of Teacher Education Programmes not covered by the 2014 Regulations, it will be for the State Governments to take on the regulatory responsibility with the aid of such statutes, Rules and Regulations as are available or as may be formulated by them.</p> <p>The SRC has always been of this stands. Earlier, this stand was over-riden by NCTE (HQ)'s opinion that Language Teacher Education Programmes, excluded from the list of programmes recognised by the 2014 Regulations will continue to be governed to the extent of retaining their recognition until new norms and standards are formulated leading to their reintroduction in the list of Recognised Programmes. NCTE (HQ) have now formally clarified that the circular on the subject earlier issued by them has been withdrawn. In other words, the SRC now is free to adopt its legal position in the matter.</p>
--	--	--	--	--