

**Proceedings of the sitting on 22-12-2008 of Hon'ble Member
Shri Tsering Samphel with V.C. Saurashtra University, Rajkot**

A list of officers present in the sitting is at Annexure.

ISSUE

Refusal of Saurashtra University for amendment of Marks in Mark Sheet of First Year B. Pharma Examination in respect of Ms Sapra Hansaben Jamalbhai.

BACKGROUND

A representation dated 08.11.2008 was received from Ms Sapra Hansaben Jamalbhai regarding refusal of Saurashtra University for amendment of marks in her Mark Sheet of first year B.Pharma Examination. Ms Sapra mentioned that she belongs to Padhar (PTG) and is the first girl candidate to pursue the B.Pharma Course. The result of the examination was issued on 06/07/2008 and on the same day she represented her case to the college principal that she got 16 marks less in her marks sheet. The principal of the college took up the case with controller of examination, Saurashtra University on 11/07/2008 for amendment of marks. She along with her family members also represented verbally with the University authorities, but on 07/11/2008 Vice Chancellor refused for amendment.

The matter was taken up with the Vice Chancellor, Saurashtra University vide this Commission letter dated 14/11/2008. The Controller of Examination vide his mail dated 20/11/2008, intimated that there is no mistake on part of the University and the internal marks are as intimated to the University by the College authorities vide their letter dated 18.06.2008. He has mentioned following points for consideration of the Commission:

- i) Ms Sapra has failed in the examination.
- ii) College sent a letter on 11.07.2008 to the University for correction in the internal marks well after the declaration of the University result.
- iii) The College claims that after the applications from the students, it came to know of its mistakes and hence sent a corrected statement to the University. However, this argument of the College does not seem convincing because, though there are applications of the students attached with its letter to our University, there is no application of Ms. Sapra Hansaben J.. How come that the student makes no representation of error on the part of the college either to the College itself or the University concerned and directly makes representation of grievance to the Commission.

- iv) Further, some of the applications of the students are written after the college sent its letter to us! That is, the applications of the students are procured, rather than received by the college. How come that the students make representation after the college feels the need of corrections! After, the college already dispatches its letter to the University!
- v) The University has a provision in First B. Pharm. exam that if a student gets 50% of the total marks, he or she is given ATKT in three subject heads. The student is also allowed to go for re-assessment in one paper. The mentioned student Ms. Sapra needed 15 marks to reach the figure of 650/1300 marks. Perhaps, the college thought that in re-assessment, she would not get 15 marks and hence, it has taken this smart trick of increasing her internal marks and taking her figure of marks to 650. This is absolutely unfair and immoral. The University cannot validate this.
- vi) If, at all, there is a mistake, it can be at one or two places, it cannot be at so many places! The University is not at all convinced of the argument of the college. The University has decided to issue a show-cause notice to the college authorities for their sheer negligence (if we accept what they say about themselves) with regard to the interest and future of the students.

It is further expressed by the University that the college has deliberately done these corrections to take the students to the next Semester and expects the University to make correction in the internal marks of several students and that too in their several papers which is not possible as per the rules of the University.

It was explained by the Principal of the College that few candidates are giving two internal exams which are compulsory and some are appearing for three internal exams which is optional. The college has taken first two exams only for averaging the internal marks of the students by mistake. When few of the students represented to the college for their less internal marks in the marks sheet, he records were checked for all students, without waiting for their representation. It was noticed that mistake is in the marks of those students, who had appeared for the third internal examinations.

In view of the above, Shri Tsering Samphel, Hon'ble Member decided to have a discussion with Vice Chancellor, Saurashtra University and Principal, KNV Phama College on 22.12.2008 at 3.00 pm in the Commission.

ANALYSIS

Whatever reason may be, students should not be made to suffer for the mistakes of the College authorities. It is matter of one academic year of students, therefore University authorities should be considerate towards them.

DISCUSSION

It was explained by the college representative that the person who has compiled the internal marks, could not consider the marks of the third sessional marks by mistake. Twenty five students have appeared in the third sessional and the difference of marks is for them only out of 60 students in the first year B. Pharma. It was also clarified that because of holidays, there was no student and hence the result sent to the University was not displayed on the notice board. Answer sheets of the third sessional exam for one subject were also shown. It was further explained that out of 25 students, the status of 3 students is getting changed by the proposed amendment in the marks sheet. One student will be shifted to Pass category from ATKT and two students including Ms Hansa will be shifted from Fail to ATKT category.

University officials expressed that at present they are managing 350 colleges and about 2 Lakh students. It is very difficult for the University to entertain such type of modifications in the Marks-Sheet, as it will tarnish the image of the University. College authorities were silent for more than 20 days period after sending the sessional marks to the University, till the result was declared. As per circumstances, it appears that College is trying to increase the marks of the students after seeing the final result. It was clarified by them it has to be put up to the Disciplinary Examination Enquiry Committee, which includes the Syndicate of the University, for their consideration.

Commission expressed that University should act fact and marks of Ms Hansa should be corrected at the earliest. It appears that there was a mistake on part of the college, but student must not be penalized for mistake of the college. It is a matter of one academic year of a PTG student. One side in our country, we are trying for the upliftment of the deprived society, on the other hand, if such type of harassment occur, then all our efforts are useless. College authorities must write immediately to the University for permission to Ms Hansa to continue studies in second year B.Pharma.

RECOMMENDATION

In view of the discussion, the Commission recommends that the marks of Ms Hansa may be upgraded as per proposal of the college at the earliest. In case University rules do not permit, it is recommended that Ms Hansa may be permitted (as an exception) to study in second year B.Pharma and appear in the examinations, as per rules applicable in case of ATKT students, to save one academic year of her.

The action taken in this case may be intimated to the Commission latest by 20.01.2009.

ANNEXURE

The following were present in the sitting on 22.12.2008 :

NCST

1. Shri Tsering Samphel, Hon'ble MemberIn Chair
2. Shri Vinod Aggarwal, Director

Saurashtra University

1. Shri G. M. Jani, Registrar
2. Shri J. M. Mamtora, Controller of Exams

K.N.V. Pharmacy College

1. Shri K. J. Patel, Lecturer

Petitioner

1. Ms. Sapra Hansa Jamalbhai
2. Shri Sapra Jamalbhai Fuljibhai, Father of Ms Hansa