



**WORLD BANK GROUP**

# INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

**Govt. Kamla Raja Girls PG Autonomous College (305)**  
**August 2019**

**Dr. Manoj Sharma**

**Associate Professor**

**JIWAJI UNIVERSITY, GWALIOR (M.P.)**

## PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The **Madhya Pradesh 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 assess 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

**Govt. Kamla Raja Girls Post Graduate Autonomous College (Formerly Known as KRG), Gwalior** is one of the **BIGGEST** and prestigious Institute for female education in Madhya Pradesh. Affiliated to Jiwaji University, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh initially established in July 1937 and taken over by Government in 1948. The Institute offers 08 UG Courses, 21

---

<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*

PG courses and Ph.D. program in 15 subjects on one main campus. The institute is having basic research orientation on the basis of research paper publication and other research activities.

In the session 2018-19, institute is having total 10595 student strength (UG= 7800 students, PG=1849 students and rest of the doctoral and STCC students). On gender point of view being a Girls college, there are 10595 female students in the institute. The institute is having 2643 SC, 59 ST, 4289 OBC and 3604 unreserved category students; out of which 13 PWD students are also.

Presently institute is having total 170 teaching faculty (111 regular & 59 guest faculty) are working in this institute. Number of Non-teaching staff is 98 (54 regular & 44 non-regular). It has been awarded **A-Grade** in Cycle 3 by National Assessment and Accreditation Council, Bengaluru in Dec. 2016.

Statement on the governance model:

The Screening Card of 40 questions and some additional questions under five axes was tested in this college on 24 August 2019. Score indicate that the college is following a mix of governance model. The College seems to strike a balance between the different dimensions of governance measured. The relatively moderate accountability, relatively high mission & management orientation and average autonomy & participation suggest that the college has good governance practices.

## RESULTS AND BENCHMARK

### AXIS 1 – CONTEXT, MISSION AND GOALS

A key element in defining institute 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 Govt. Kamla Raja Girls Post Graduate Autonomous College, Gwalior (305), the general mission and its specific goals are formally and clearly stated, as reflected by institution's score average on the Mission axis [3.39]. The institution's self-perception of its context, mission and goals [4.00] is slightly higher to its score in the questionnaire. The results show that the institution has some good examples 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, AQAR, wall of the college at the entrance, hoarding and boards in whole campus. The institution was key in involving the state government, civil society representatives, industry & business representatives, faculty, students, and alumni members in framing its mission. First-time mission and vision formulated in the year of 2013 and revised in 2016 at the time of the third cycle of NAAC assessment. The state, institutional

leadership, social council, senior management team, highest decision-making bodies and other institutional councils 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 higher education institute (Jaramillo et al., 2012). Several features of daily management that are essential for good governance have been analyzed to see to what extent the institute adopts a result-based management aligned with international best practices and new public management model.

### Traditional or results-based

The institution tends to slightly overestimate its management orientation as the results of the score average on the Management axis [3.28] differs from its self-perception score [4.00]. The institute management is result-based but has not yet reached the level it aims for. While institute appears to have a strong strategic process, the selection of decision-makers and staff evaluations still include some features of traditional management. Therefore, institute follows leading state trends and is comparatively well engaged in the implementation of modern management practices.

### Strategic planning:

The institution reports to have engaged in the development of a strategy as reported in developing an annual report, IDP, SSR, and NAAC recommendations, but has been engaged in the development of an institutional strategic plan. Within the scope of ensuring results-based management, the institution has received A-Grade in third cycle of National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) accreditation in 2016-17 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 etc.

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, students and it has conducted student survey and All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) as per the guidelines of MHRD.

### Selection of decision makers:

As far as the selection process of the principal and other higher decision making committees concerned, it is directed by the state government as per the service rules. Additionally, In the selection process of the principal, the state government is involved, for which the principal needs to be a senior educationist and can remain in his post until even

his transfer or any other senior person does not come to that college. Head of Departments selected on the basis of their seniority, their tenure as HOD is not decided. In other important highest decision making bodies such as the IQAC, NAAC, RUSA and JANBHADARI member and convener selected by state government and principal jointly. Public representatives are also nominees by the State Government and nominees by the Principal and these committees are formulate as per the composition guideline given by the UGC directions.

#### **Evaluation of Staff:**

The institution has also introduced some tools like PBAS as per UGC guidelines for the performance evaluation of staff that support a results-based management. Establishment staff and accounts staff report to head clerk and DDO while the teaching staff report to Principal through Head of the department. The performance and evaluation of staff is based on online performance based appraisal system report, 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**

This is a government autonomous institute and working under administrative control of MP Government, therefore it has average autonomy. For this dimension, the institution scored average [3.00] reflecting average autonomous structure and management, which is consistent its self-perception of its autonomy as reflected [3.00].

#### **Academic autonomy:**

This institute has average autonomy to decide on the introduction of new programs on self- finance basis under Jan-Bhagidari committee, the type of courses, number of hours per program per year, assessment of students (learning outcomes), format of exams and the academic partnerships it pursues with other institutions. However, it must comply with the UGC guidelines as well as Jiwaji University guidelines in order to obtain or keep their legal status.

The institution's average autonomy is further demonstrated by its partial freedom to decide on student admission, including the overall number of student admitted, the number of students per program, the admission mechanisms and the student profiles it seeks.

#### **Human Resources Autonomy:**

The institution reports having limited autonomy on all aspects of the human resources management, including the hiring, dismissing, promoting, assessment and professional

development of staff, if they abide by the UGC and state guidelines. The institution is more autonomous in managing human resources related to both teaching and non-teaching staff hired on contractual basis. However, the institution is bound by the restriction of seeking state government clearance for hiring regular teaching and non-teaching staff. Moreover, the institute is having autonomy to develop staff training programs.

#### **Financial autonomy:**

The institution has limited autonomy in managing its financial resources. The distribution of its revenue from government allotted budget, fee, research grant, and other sources shows a clear reliance on funds from the government 70 percent and student fees 29 percent. The institution receives funds raised from (government funds 70 percent, students 19 percent 1 percent from revenues obtained from research grants. The institution has the limited autonomy to use RUSA unspent funds from one year to another, set the level of self -finance courses student fees, use a multi-year budget and allocate funds inside a block-grant budget. It also has the autonomy to decide to establish endowments. The institution owns all kinds of different assets, including buildings, land, financial assets and equipments.

### **AXIS 4 – ACCOUNTABILITY**

#### **Academic Accountability:**

The institution appears to have a relatively moderate level of accountability [2.56] which is also somewhat lower to their self-perception i.e. [3.0]. 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 UGC recognition, 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, links budget allocation with results and implements corrective measures.

#### **Standardized Sanctions:**

The institution applies standardized sanctions against examination fraud. In the review year many unfair means cases registered during examination against students. 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. But institute was not able to produce the documentary evidences at the time of visit.

#### **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. Institute is keeping observation in this aspect.

The institution implements tracking surveys across various programs at graduation and publicly disseminates the results through its institutional website as well as through technical and promotional reports. The institution is well advanced in terms of information sharing and transparency practices as it disseminates various strategic information on its website, including facts & figures, institutional mission & goals, strategic plans and executive progress reports, institutional policies and financial information, minutes of the members of the highest decision-making bodies even being a government organization its following RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005.

#### **Financial Accountability:**

The institution also shows a low level of financial accountability as financial documents are available for review to limited stakeholders, including state government, principal and students (on demand by students union /RTI (but student union does not exist as on date - no election).

The institution is submitted to an annual financial audit conducted by Audit committee through Chartered Account; that results in a report that is made available to the institutional leadership and inside audience but not mention if the report is disseminated outside the institution or made public. The institute provides standardized sanctions in its internal regulations against embezzlement, inappropriate spending, and misprocurement though institution strictly using MP Bhandar Kray Niyam 2015 for any purchasing.

### **AXIS 5 – PARTICIPATION**

Stakeholder participation in the decision-making process is an area in which the institute presented relatively average scores.

The institution is aware of its actual orientation in terms of stakeholder participation as reflected by the average score obtained in the questionnaire [3.18] while the institution's self-perception score [4.00] which means that the institution has an average level of active and formal stakeholder participation in decision making than what the leadership thinks it



has. The results in the participation axis are higher than the average score of other local participating state Government institutions.

Teaching staff have active way of representation, where they are represented on the senate 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 bodies within the institution and are consulted on major issues within the institution including strategic and budget issues. Students are involved in limited issues. Other stakeholders like alumni and private sector representatives have representation or participation in the decision-making process of institute, academic programs and elaboration of strategy.

## POINTERS FOR ACTION

There are the following pointers to be develop by institute in perspective way.

- ↗ In the light of obtained scores in questionnaire, study suggest that this institution has full potential to develop as a women university some more autonomy should given to this institution to develop few department as center of excellence.
- ↗ Institute should increase the evolvment of teachers and students in research activities.
- ↗ To improve the relevance of the education and can better prepare the students for follow-up studies and to the new and emerging demands of the job market in the twenty-first century.
- ↗ Being Government autonomous institute, it has average autonomy in academic and human resource aspect. But institute should also trying to get funds from other different revenue sources like research grants etc.
- ↗ Develop accountability systems and measures, especially on the social and financial accountability aspect.
- ↗ Institute should enhance industry-institute collaboration.



## ANNEX

### 305. KRG PG College, Gwalior

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

305 KRG PG College, Gwalior	Self-Perception	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
	Score Assessment	3.39	3.28	3.00	2.56	3.18

