



**WORLD BANK GROUP**

**GOVERNMENT MADHAV SCIENCE PG COLLEGE, UJJAIN**

**AUGUST 2019**

**DR. SANJAY SAHAY**

**PROFESSOR (BOTANY)**

**GOVERNMENT NSCB COLLEGE, BIAORA (RAJGARH)**

## PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The MadhyaPradesh Higher Education Quality Improvement Project (MPHEQIP) is a collaboration between the Government of Madhya Pradesh (GoMP) and the Education Global Practice of the World Bank. Its purpose is to support the GoMP in implementing its vision for the higher education sector as articulated in the Vision 2018 Document and the State Higher Education Plan 2014.

**TO BE FURTHER COMPLETED BY WB TEAM**

## THE TOOL, THE METHODOLOGY AND HOW TO INTERPRET RESULTS

The Higher Education Governance Screening Card (HEGSC) is a benchmarking tool that uses an institution-based approach that focuses on universities and institutions of tertiary education as opposed to (only) national systems or country ratings.<sup>1</sup> It has the capacity to: i) identify strengths and weaknesses at individual institutions; ii) identify governance trends and practices by type of institution; iii) illustrate governance trends at the national level and iv) generate interest - and peer pressure - in initiating reforms at the institutional, national, and regional level.

The HEGSC uses five dimensions that together capture the multidimensional nature of governance: 1) Overall Context, Mission, and Goals; (2) Management Orientation; (3) Autonomy; (4) Accountability; and (5) Participation. Each dimension is attributed a set of indicators and a questionnaire from which governance indicators are scored (by an independent observer based on an interview with the institution's representative and supporting documents). A weighting system aggregates those indicators and translates the questionnaire to a scoring instrument to record the results by institution. The institution's score on one dimension is interpreted as an indication of the university's situation vis-à-vis one of the global trends in governance practices<sup>2</sup>, and *not* as a performance score. In addition to the questionnaire, the HEGSC includes a self-perception tool, which assesses the extent to which the leadership of tertiary education institutions is aware of the governance model and practices they follow.

The HEGSC is not a ranking tool and does not point to an ideal governance model; it only identifies trends allowing institutions to reflect on their practices. The aim is not to get the maximum score on each dimension but instead to determine if the governance arrangement is coherent. Therefore, scores from each axis are interpreted in correlation and not in isolation.

The tool has been used on a voluntary basis and the results of the institutional report are confidential. Aggregated results at the national and regional level will be publicly disseminated while respecting anonymity of participating institutions.

## PROFILE OF THE INSTITUTION

Government Madhav Science PG College, Ujjain has its origin in legendary Madhav Arts and Commerce College as Science faculty started in 1957, and in 1969, it was separated from its parent institution and elevated to an independent status as today's Science College. Presently, it is centrally located highly sought after college catering to the students desiring science education and degree in the city and adjoining areas. It is non-autonomous college affiliated with Vikram University, Ujjain. The type of

---

<sup>1</sup>The HEGSC tool was developed in 2010 and at present over 200 institutions of tertiary education from across nine countries have participated in the benchmarking exercise managed by the World Bank.

<sup>2</sup>For further information on the methodology, see: WB Regional H.E. MENA Report (2012) *Universities Through the Looking Glass: Benchmarking University Governance to Enable Higher Education Modernization in MENA* very popular

degrees it offers are Undergraduate (UG), Postgraduate (PG), Diplomas and doctoral (PhD) in Sciences. Research orientation of this institution is both basic and applied ones. Current enrollment register exhibits a total of 2920 students, 2478 pursuing UG courses, 78 completing various diplomas and 442 doing PG courses. The college has less representation of female (31.2 %) possibly due to existence of two Girls College in the city. Students from various sections of the society however find representation in the college as the college has students belonging to ST (8 %), SC (26.5 %) and OBC (39 %) categories apart from GEN ones. The college has support of as many as 72 teaching staff, 46 being regular and 26 Guest faculties. The college does have substantial number of administrative staff whose number is 59, 38 of which are regular. The college has subjected itself to NAAC accreditation and successfully clinched “A” grade.

### Statement on the governance model:

Generally, the institute seems to have a very good perception of its governance practices within the instructions as reflected in the minimal difference in the scores on the self-perception and the questionnaire. The different dimensions of governance present a balanced approach to managing the institution given despite its limited autonomy and limited capacity in engaging stakeholders in decision-making.

## RESULTS AND BENCHMARK

### AXIS 1 – CONTEXT, MISSION AND GOALS

A key element in defining university governance is the overall framework of the system and the interaction between the institution and the state (Jaramillo and al. 2012). In the case of Government Madhav Science PG College, Ujjain, the general mission and its specific goals are formally and clearly stated, as reflected by institution's score average on the Mission axis [2.53]. The institution's self-perception of its context, mission and goals [4.00] is not similar to its score in the questionnaire. Despite that, the institution has some good practices of stability and alignment of mission and goals.

The mission and the goals are clearly stated in several official documents, like in the website, annual report, IDP, wall of the college at the entrance and principal chamber. The institution was key in involving faculty and staff in framing its mission. The state, the institutional leadership and highest decision-making bodies at the college oversee the achievement of the institutional goals.

### AXIS 2 – MANAGEMENT ORIENTATION

Strong leadership and strategic planning are key elements of a well-performing university (Jaramillo et al., 2012). Several features of daily management that are essential for good governance have been analyzed to see to what extent the university adopts a result-based management aligned with international best practices and new public management model.

The institution seems to be aware of its management orientation as the results of the score average on the Management axis [2.42] is similar to its self-perception [3.00].

#### Traditional or results-based

This means that the university management is more oriented towards the traditional mode of management and is well aware of this orientation. It also means that the institution does not employ evidence-informed decision-making.

#### Strategic planning:

The institution reports to have engaged in the development of a strategy as reported in developing an annual report, AQAR, SSR, and NAAC recommendations, but have not been found to have engaged in the development of an institutional strategic plan. Within the scope of ensuring results-based management, the institution has received National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) accreditation in 2018 under the University Grants Commission (UGC). During the development of their institutional plan, the college reports to have discussed issues related to access, equity, employability and green campus.

The college reports that they do not have quantitative surveys conducted at the national level to measure the attainment of strategic goals. However, the college has data on basic information related to course programs, staff, and students.

#### E-governance:

Although the institution is aware of e-governance system as it encounter such system while interacting with parent (Higher Education Department) and other Government departments (Finance department etc.) in the matter of admission and scholarship of students and maintenance of service books and handling of salary of its staff, the institution per se does not have its own e-governance mechanisms in place.

#### Selection of decision makers:

Head of the institution (The principal), chairman of the Janbhagidari samiti (one of highest decision making bodies) and administrative staff of class III grade II are appointed by the Government. The appointing authority of administrative staff class III grade III and all class IV is the Principal. Other highest decision making bodies at the college level are appointed/nominated by the Principal.

#### Evaluation of Staff:

The institution has also introduced some tools for the performance evaluation of staff that support a results-based management. Teaching staff, establishment staff and accounts staff report to the Principal. Each staff member has a job description with clear duties and objectives that are reviewed annually by the direct supervisor. The performance and evaluation of staff is based on performance appraisal report which is further followed up by higher authority and that may form the basis for the career advancement and promotion, and punitive measures in case of professional misconduct. These evaluation and incentive procedures are useful to improve the accountability of staff.

### AXIS 3 – AUTONOMY

The institution presents a low level of autonomy, which is consistent with the current state trends of the same type. For this dimension, the institution scored low [2.23] reflecting a limited autonomous structure and management, which is consistent its self-perception of its autonomy as reflected [3.00].

#### Financial autonomy (for all institutions):

The institution has limited autonomy in managing its financial resources. The distribution of its revenue shows limited sources as well as a clear reliance on funds from the government (88 %) and/or student fees (12 %). The institution has the autonomy to set the level of student fees and allocate funds inside a block-grant budget. It also has the autonomy to decide investing money to obtain additional revenues. The university owns all kind of different assets, including buildings, land, financial assets and equipment.

### AXIS 4 – ACCOUNTABILITY

#### Academic Accountability:

The institution appears to have a relatively low level of accountability [2.63], which is also consistent with its self-perception of accountability measure [2.00]. Therefore, the institution presents some practices that could be further developed within the scope of transparency and accountability. However, when studied in details, the level of accountability varies across the academic, social and financial aspects.

The institution has a quality assurance (QA) system that takes place both inside and outside of the institution, and addresses issues of institutional and program accreditation – NAAC accreditation, assessing learning outcomes, teaching methodologies, research and facilities. The institution put in place several key internal mechanisms for ensuring academic quality, including external program review and graduate performance monitoring processes. In order to follow up on the results of the evaluation procedures, the institution establishes action plans and implements corrective measures.

#### Standardized Sanctions:

The institution applies standardized sanctions against examination fraud. It also provides in its internal regulations standardized sanctions against unethical behavior of faculty, non-compliance with admission standards, and the unethical management of faculty careers.

#### Social Responsibility:

Ensuring a prosperous future for students is an essential component of university social responsibility. Measuring graduate employment outcomes is critical in collecting relevant data and promoting continuous improvement of academic systems.

The institution implements tracking surveys across various programs at graduation but does not publicly disseminate the results through its institutional website nor through technical and promotional reports.

#### Financial Accountability:

The institution also shows a good level of financial accountability as financial documents are available to several stakeholders, including Government, faculty and non-teaching staffs and students. The institution is submitted to an annual financial audit conducted by chartered accountant that results in a report that is made available to the institutional leadership and inside audience. The institute provides standardized sanctions in its internal regulations against embezzlement, inappropriate spending, and misprocurement.

## AXIS 5 – PARTICIPATION

Stakeholder participation in the decision-making process is an area in which the university presented relatively lower scores than on the other dimensions.

The institution is not well aware of its actual orientation in terms of stakeholder participation as reflected by the gap between the institution's self-perception score [3.00] and the score obtained in the questionnaire [2.31], which means that the institution has a lower level of active and formal stakeholder participation in decision making than what the leadership thinks it has. Teaching staff, non-teaching staff, students, alumni and private sector representatives have representation within the institution but except the teaching staff, the impact of all other stakeholders seems limited as they mainly have a consultative role.

Students are consulted with respect to the expenditure made out of amalgamated fund. Teaching staff have a formal way of representation, where they are represented on the staff council for deciding many decisions that are both academic and non-academic, participating in decisions related to strategic, academic and budget issues. Non-teaching staff are also represented on formal body within the institution and are consulted on budget issue within the institution. Private sector representatives have appointed representatives at the Janbhagidari samiti and have a consultative role in defining the institutional goals, strategy, budget and academic issues.

## POINTERS FOR ACTION

The college needs to formulate long-term strategy involving most of the stakeholders aligned with its mission. Reasonably, a substantial number of staff members are its strength, and their useful utilization for the larger interest of the students and society is challenge of the college management. It has obtained huge funds (for example grant under FIST scheme) for infrastructure especially laboratory upgradation, the optimum utilization of these resources is also essential. This can be ensured by creating central instrument facility by pooling costly and multipurpose equipments such as HPLC (high performance liquid chromatography) and making the institution a resource center for the city and nearby areas from where teachers/research scholars can come over here and get training or carry out advanced experiments using this facility. Maintaining logbook for costly equipment is also necessary to enhance accountability.

The institute should promote further involvement of various stakeholders in the decision-making processes across a variety of key issues, such as the elaboration of the strategy and budget allocation in order to help the institute establish a dialogue critical for institutional development. This engaged participation is critical to provide further understanding of the education and training needed that would allow the institution to match the needs of the students, the society and the human resource requirement at the national and local level. One of the key areas of engagement is a formal mode of representation of students beyond the current means of engagement on social clubs and select academic councils. This formal representation on governance bodies is recommended to provide with voting capacities rather than consultative roles within the institution.

The institute is also expected to develop social accountability measures, to increase its relevance with labor market and students' needs. This may include further development of the existing systematic implementation of tracking surveys to measure graduates' employment and average salaries after graduation and maintain consistent public dissemination of the survey results beyond the institution's fact book through the office of alumni. Accelerating the activity of SV career counseling cell with additional function resembling "labor market observatory" at the institute may also help in ensuring a better alignment of the college and its socio-economic environment.

# ANNEX

## 1812. GovtMadhav Science College Ujjain

Mission	Management	Autonomy	Accountability	Participation
---------	------------	----------	----------------	---------------

GovtMadhav Science College Ujjain	Self-Perception	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
	Score Assessment	2.53	2.42	2.23	2.63	2.31





